



Outdoor Recreation Facilities & Sports Field Provision Plan

Phase I & II Reports
November 2011



Monteith + Brown
planning consultants

In Association
With



The JF Group

stla



& Environmental Research Centre

CITY OF HAMILTON


**Outdoor Recreation Facilities
& Sports Field Provision Plan**

Phase I & II Reports

November 2011



in
association
with:



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Hamiltonians of all ages and backgrounds identify strongly with local sports and outdoor recreation opportunities. Organized and unstructured recreation activities are essential components in maintaining healthy lifestyles and enhancing community cohesion.

Although sports fields and other parks amenities are very well used, strategic investment is required to address gaps, changing demands, and facility renewal. Gaps in facility provision have led to the over-utilization of sports fields and these gaps will continue to grow. Emerging demands for new recreational pursuits are also creating tremendous challenges for the City and its partners. Furthermore, many park amenities are approaching the end of their life span. Modern and accessible facilities are required in order to meet community needs. Current and future recreation demands cannot be met without additional resources.

The *Outdoor Recreation Facilities & Sports Field Provision Plan* provides the City of Hamilton with a sustainable strategy for managing its portfolio of outdoor sports fields and other community-use recreational infrastructure. It is intended that this Study will be used as a guiding document for the City's 10-year capital program, subject to annual capital budget review.

The scope of this report examines facilities such as soccer pitches, baseball diamonds, multi-use fields, cricket pitches, playgrounds, tennis courts, basketball courts, spray pads, skateboard parks, and more. Timing of the Study is to the year 2031, with implementation focused on projects that can be undertaken within the next ten years.

This Study has been informed by extensive analyses of demographic characteristics and participation trends, a comprehensive park observation exercise, municipal benchmarking, and a wide-ranging public and stakeholder consultation program. The process is similar to that employed in the City's 2008 *Use, Renovation and Replacement Study for Hamilton Recreation and Public-Use (Indoor) Facilities*.

Based on these inputs and the comprehensive facility analyses, three options for facility provision have been identified. It is recommended that "Scenario 3 – Strategic Renewal & Filling the Gaps" be implemented. Scenario 3 will allow the City to meet community needs in a planned manner, targeting specific projects to match available funding, while protecting further deterioration of these important community assets. Through its implementation, this scenario recognizes that the City cannot meet all of these needs on its own and requires the pursuit of partnerships and collaborations with outside parties.

To achieve the intended outcomes, an annual funding increase of \$2.2 million is required (\$1.0 million for capital renewal and \$1.2 million for new construction). Cost-savings may be realized by pursuing alternative funding approaches and partnerships, which will be considered as part of the Study's ongoing implementation.

The strategies put forth in this Study are numerous and represent incremental changes to the City's outdoor recreational infrastructure inventory, such as the expansion of soccer field supplies, improved spray pad distribution, ball diamond conversions, and playground upgrades. In addition, several recommendations have been made to improve administrative, design, development, and maintenance practices. All of the Study's recommendations are summarized on the following pages.

Summary of Recommendations

#	City-Wide Recommendations	Lead
1	Implement the recommendations of the Sport Field Management Review (see Attachment IX to this report), completed by the Guelph Turfgrass Institute (2009), and itemized in detail in section 21 of this report.	P.W. - Parks Operations
1a	Use new field construction standards for various classes of fields and closely monitor new field construction projects to insure standards are being met.	P.W. - L.A.S.
1b	Conduct independent testing of construction materials and insure approval of sod used for new fields as well as field rehabilitation.	Construction Services/L.A.S.
1c	Enforce restrictions on use of new fields prior to proper establishment.	P.W. - Parks Operations
1d	Improve field scheduling, user group education and enforcement to reduce excessive use of high profile fields. More evenly distribute field use across the system.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
1e	Classify high use fields to determine drainage characteristics as part of the development of an enhanced field closure policy.	P.W. - Parks Operations
1f	Install properly designed subsurface drainage systems on higher use fields to improve drainage and minimize period that fields are subject to increased wear damage after rainfall events.	P.W. - L.A.S.
1g	Develop a sufficient sports field inventory to permit rest and rehabilitation periods to be incorporated into field scheduling.	P.W. - Parks Operations
1h	Remove old sod or thatch prior to any resodding of fields.	P.W. - Parks Operations
1i	Increase availability of back-up equipment to reduce instances of fields been left unmown for excessive periods of time.	P.W. - Parks Operations
1j	Increase mowing frequency on premier fields.	P.W. - Parks Operations
1k	Increase nitrogen application rates on higher use and sand based fields.	P.W. - Parks Operations
1l	Reduce the amount of phosphorus applied from a 1:2 to a 1:5 phosphorus to nitrogen ratio.	P.W. - Parks Operations
1m	Reduce the amount potassium applied (1:2 potassium to nitrogen ratio).	P.W. - Parks Operations
1n	Investigate the use of alternative, higher quality slow release nitrogen sources.	P.W. - Parks Operations
1o	Provide proper calibration, operator training and back-up equipment to insure proper application of fertilizer.	P.W. - Parks Operations
1p	Provide staff training, regular system inspections and audits of irrigation systems to insure effective use.	P.W. - Parks Operations
1q	Increase frequency and rate of overseeding to combat weed infestation throughout the season on heavily used fields.	P.W. - Parks Operations
1r	Refrain from using fertilizer to burn field lines – investigate alternative lining methods.	P.W. - Parks Operations
1s	Inspect and repair or replace any deteriorating goal standards.	P.W. - Parks Operations
1t	Insure all tractors used on turf areas are properly equipped with turf tires.	P.W. - Parks Operations
2	Ensure that operating (maintenance) budgets are increased annually to reflect new additions to the sports field inventory and recommended changes for improved field management practices.	Corporate Finance
3	Consideration should be given to increasing the annual lifecycle renewal fund within the municipal budget for the repair and/or replacement of existing outdoor recreation assets.	Asset Mgmt.
4	To help mitigate the added costs associated with parks designed/built by developers establish agreements that require developers to contribute to a reserve fund for the long-term maintenance of these special park features.	Development Planning/Corporate finance
5	Establish firm dates for the start and finish of the playing season for outdoor grass rectangular sports fields.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
6	Follow the City's Parks and Open Space Development Manual when developing and redeveloping sports fields and courts for consistency.	P.W. - L.A.S.
7	The integration of full-size sports fields (i.e., fields that can accommodate adults) into new Neighbourhood Parks is discouraged Lit fields should not be permitted within Neighbourhood Parks	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
8	New sports fields and other built recreational infrastructure should not be permitted in floodplains or stormwater management ponds (e.g., Costco/Meadowlands Soccer Pitch).	P.W. - L.A.S.

#	City-Wide Recommendations	Lead
9	Phasing in of sports field lighting at Community Parks is not recommended. Install at time of development.	C.S. Rec. City wide
10	In designing new and redeveloped parks, consideration should be given to opportunities to establish grassed areas for picnicking and informal free play.	P.W. - L.A.S.
11	Continue to implement the City's 2006 <i>Barrier-Free Design Guidelines</i> .	P.W. - L.A.S.
12	Establish an annual reserve fund allocated to accessibility improvements in City-wide and Community Parks. Priorities for capital funding from this reserve include:	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
13	Perform an audit of municipal park infrastructure based on newly release AODA standards(including, but not limited to washrooms)	Asset Mgmt
14	Employ procedures for monitoring usage and demand levels that can be used to confirm future need for new fields and improve field allocation and maximization.	P.W. Parks Operations
15	Regularly review the effectiveness of the rain-out policy and seek improvements for its enforcement (e.g., strict penalties for repeat offenses) and communication with internal (City) and external (user groups) parties.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
16	Initiate an educational program to encourage a greater stewardship role for sports groups in relation to their use and maintenance of community assets.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
17	Through appropriate mechanisms and in collaboration with Public Works, involve user groups and stakeholders in policy and procedure changes that will affect them.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
18	Ensure that any organization that may be displaced by a potential sports field renovation or removal be first informed and provided the opportunity to comment to the City.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
19	Establish a system for monitoring and enforcing field use and restrictions to prevent unauthorized use including appropriate penalties for organizations and individuals that contravene the field use policies.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
20	In collaboration with community sports organizations, establish a Field Allocation Policy that establishes a fair, equitable, and transparent process for the amount of rental time that is granted to users of rectangular sports fields and ball diamonds.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
21	Cap rental levels of rectangular sports fields at current allocation levels in order to stem field quality degradation and protect against excessive damage.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
22	Discourage the use of Class A and B soccer fields for practices in an effort to ensure optimal quality for games.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
23	As part of the Affiliation Policy process, diligently collect additional registration numbers, detailed participant lists, financial statements, and utilization data from sports groups that utilize municipal fields.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
24	Regularly review field rental rates to ensure that the fee structure accounts for an appropriate portion of the true cost to administer, operate, and maintain all fields.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
25	Work with school boards to identify and implement solutions to reducing non-permitted use of sports fields in parks adjacent to schools.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
26	Consider partnerships with school boards for fields improvements or new field development, changes to field maintenance practices, gaining access to unused fields.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
27	As opportunities permit, phase out lower quality fields on school board lands from the City's booking system.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
28	A formal policy for evaluating and responding to User groups and community organizations partnership requests related to funding of value-added amenities should be created. A formal policy to guide the implementation of partnerships and cost-sharing agreements between the City and community organizations should also be developed, along with standard agreement templates.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
29	Install lights, irrigation, sub-drainage, and perimeter fencing on full-size soccer fields at Community Parks, where possible, with a goal of improving a minimum of one field per year.	P.W. - L.A.S.

#	City-Wide Recommendations	Lead
30	Undertake site-specific improvements to improve playability of existing soccer fields (tbd).	P.W. - Parks Operations
31	The degree to which existing school sites are used by the community for organized field sports (e.g., soccer, football, baseball) – along with the ability to adequately accommodate these uses at municipal sites – should be considered when the City is evaluating the acquisition of those sites deemed surplus by the school boards.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
32	Convert under-utilized ball diamonds to full-size soccer fields, as required and in consultation with local community groups.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
33	Discourage the use of the same natural grass fields by both soccer and tackle football/rugby in order to reduce the negative impact on turf quality and scheduling conflicts.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
34	Lower participation sports such as field lacrosse, field hockey, and ultimate frisbee should continue to be scheduled on multi-use fields shared with soccer. Exclusive-use fields for these sports are not recommended.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
35	Additional ball diamonds should only be constructed in instances where they can be accommodated through the expansion, reconfiguration, or redevelopment of an existing Community Park, where justified demand exists, and where the land is not required for alternative recreational uses.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
36	Establish and implement a classification system for ball diamonds to better assess quality and to align amenities with the rental fee structure.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
37	Renewal of many older, high use ball diamonds is required, including conversion into slo-pitch diamonds. Older, municipally-owned diamonds should be assessed by the City to identify needed improvements (to the playing surface, fencing, dugouts, etc.).	P.W. - Parks Operations
38	Consider the removal of under-utilized ball diamonds from the active inventory, with specific consideration being given to the criteria established in this report, including single diamonds in neighbourhood park sites and smaller, poor quality diamonds in particular.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
39	In areas with unmet soccer field or other outdoor recreation facility needs, under-utilized diamonds should be considered for conversion to in-demand facilities.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
40	Consultation with affected user groups should be undertaken prior to deciding on the removal of any diamond from the active inventory; plans should be in place to relocated affected groups well in advance.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
41	The City should work with local cricket groups to: identify solutions to sharing fields; monitor participation; improve organization capacity; ensure adequate utilization of fields; identify long term needs; encourage joint fundraising.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
42	When surplus ball diamonds or other large, under-utilized sports fields are identified for removal from the active inventory, consider the conversion of this land into practice cricket pitches (in addition to other 'in-demand' uses).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
43	Cricket sites should have access to a water source and ancillary buildings (washrooms, storage, etc.).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
44	Between 2009 and 2021, the City's supply of basketball / multi-purpose courts should remain relatively stable. To maintain this balance and serve emerging areas, new courts in high-needs areas should be developed at relatively the same rate that under-utilized courts in low-needs areas are removed. Multi-use court development between 2016 and 2031 should focus primarily on Upper Stoney Creek and Glanbrook.	P.W. - L.A.S.
45	An annual renewal program should be established to improve the condition of public and club Tennis courts, with consideration being given to creating multi-use court templates in areas where ball hockey and basketball courts are also required (in addition to public tennis courts).	P.W. - Parks Operations

#	City-Wide Recommendations	Lead
46	Opportunities to partner with growing and under-served community-based (i.e., low fee) tennis clubs in the expansion and improvement of outdoor tennis courts should be considered as needs arise.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
47	Based on current usage levels and usage trends, no additional bocce courts are required by 2031, indoor or outdoor.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
48	Removal of bocce courts from the active inventory may be considered if and when existing clubs fold.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
49	The development of dedicated buildings for bocce clubs in municipal parks is not recommended.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
50	As washrooms are not recommended for Neighbourhood Parks, those bocce courts that are located in Neighbourhood Parks but do not have access to washroom buildings should continue to operate without them or consider relocating to a Community or City-wide Park.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
51	Continued communication is required between the City and user groups to ensure the safe and reasonable use and maintenance of support buildings.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
52	No additional lawn bowling greens are recommended at this time and monitoring of usage and membership trends at existing clubs sites should be undertaken to better understand capacities and future requirements.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
53	An indoor exclusive-use field is not recommended for lawn bowling.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
54	Formal agreements between the City and lawn bowling clubs should be prepared to help direct roles and responsibilities on City-owned land.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
55	Play structures should continue to be installed through new park development, consistent with the demographic needs of the neighbourhood (i.e., those living or proposed to be living within approximately a 500-metre radius of the park).	P.W. - L.A.S.
56	Continue to place a high priority on annual funding for the City's Playground Replacement and Retrofit Program, which should be undertaken in compliance with CSA standards.	P.W. - Parks Operations
57	Continue to implement accessible elements into new and redeveloped playgrounds to allow children with disabilities to use them.	L.A.S.
58	The establishment of new wading pool sites is not recommended.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
59	Initiate a spray pad renewal program that provides consistent funding to the upgrading of the City's older spray pads and their support infrastructure.	P.W. - Parks Operations
60	Convert those wading pools that are not identified for renewal into spray pads, at the time that significant repairs/reinvestment is required.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
61	Site selection criteria should be established and followed when evaluating potential locations for new skate parks. Further, all skate parks should be designed in consultation.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
62	Identify an appropriate site for a freestyle bike park (dirt) and seek community partners for its development, administration, and operation. This facility would serve as a pilot project.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
63	Continue to implement the City's Off-Leash Policy when evaluating requests for new leash free parks.	P.W. - Parks Operations
64	Continue to work towards the goal of implementing the model of at least one "free running area" and/or dog park per ward, subject to the availability appropriate sites and available funding.	P.W. - Parks Operations
65	When developing and redeveloping Neighbourhood and Community Parks that are within outdoor rink gap areas and/or growth communities, install water service in order to allow for the establishment of volunteer-led natural outdoor ice rinks using Community partnerships for the operation of outdoor natural ice rinks.	P.W. - L.A.S.
66	Encourage partnerships and community funding for the development of artificial outdoor ice rinks in additional locations across the City.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
67	No additional fully-funded municipally-owned tracks are recommended at this time.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide

#	City-Wide Recommendations	Lead
68	The City should continue to implement its Community Gardens Policy and Procedures. Future community garden provision should be established based on community interest and capacity.	P.W. - Parks Operations
69	Identify at least one existing site (e.g., park, agricultural fairgrounds) in each community that is appropriate for hosting large community-based special events (e.g., fairs and festivals).	C.S. - Culture
70	In designing new and redeveloped parks, consideration should be given to opportunities to establish looped hard-surface pathways for residents of all ages and backgrounds, as well as providing continuous connectivity throughout the neighbourhood, where possible.	P.W. - L.A.S.
71	A full inventory of ancillary buildings within parks should be completed, including an audit of their condition, capital improvement requirements, and accessibility upgrades for people with disabilities.	Asset Mgmt.
72	Develop a strategy, in consultation with key user groups, for the renewal, development and disposition of fieldhouses / clubhouses, giving consideration to long-term capital requirements, operating costs, rental rates, usage levels, and partnership (cost-sharing) potential.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
73	Existing municipally-owned Community and City-wide Parks without permanent washroom facilities should be evaluated to determine the need and/or options for washroom provision. Washrooms are not recommended for Neighbourhood Parks.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
74	Municipal investment in ancillary buildings on school or leased land is not recommended unless a long-term lease agreement can be secured.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
75	In designing new and redeveloped parks, consideration should be given to installing benches and shade structures to promote greater usage by residents of all ages.	P.W. - L.A.S.
76	Municipal development, administration, and/or operation of an indoor sports/soccer facility is not recommended at this time.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
77	Direct municipal provision of indoor tennis, bocce, or lawn bowling facilities is not recommended, but could be considered in partnership with local community-based clubs.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide

#	Ancaster Recommendations	Lead
78	Seek opportunities to provide additional fields through new Community Park development/redevelopment in Ancaster. The large majority of new field development should be in the form of full-size (senior) turf fields, with as many being Class A and B fields as possible.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
79	Continue to implement current planned improvements at the new soccer park (landfill site) in Ancaster (2009/10).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
80	Install lights on diamonds at Ancaster Community Centre Park (2 fields).	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
81	Two basketball / multi-use courts should be developed, one east of Wilson Street and one west of Wilson Street (locations to be determined).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
82	The City, in cooperation with the proponent, should undertake a Feasibility Study to identify possible locations, capital, operating, and community implications of the proposed "Field of Hoops" outdoor multi-court complex (currently proposed for Ancaster; location is subject to change).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
83	The City should work with the Ancaster Tennis Club in order to identify funding, operational, and other arrangements specific to their proposals for investments on municipal lands (Village Green Park).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
84	Opportunities to redevelop the lawn bowling green in Village Green Park to accommodate a regulation size green and additional club tennis courts, along with a shared clubhouse (under a cost-sharing agreement), should be explored in partnership with local organizations.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide

#	Ancaster Recommendations	Lead
85	Over the short-term (by 2021), look to install a spray pad east of Highway 403 and another in Village Green Park. Spray pads are most appropriate in Community and City-Wide Parks or where washrooms and sufficient parking exist.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
86	Develop a community-wide skate park in Ancaster (4 th priority area) at a location to be determined. This facility should generally be 10,000 to 12,000 square feet in size and serve intermediate and advanced users.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide

#	Beverly Recommendations	Lead
87	Convert under-utilized ball diamonds to full-size soccer fields, as required and in consultation with local community groups.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
88	At the appropriate time, consider removal of under-utilized basketball courts within either Freelton Community Park or Centennial Heights Park (they have overlapping service areas), with the space being converted into more in-demand recreational amenities or green space.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide

#	Flamborough Recommendations	Lead
89	Add three soccer fields (two scheduled for 2010 and one in a future phase) to Joe Sams Leisure Park, which would bring the total number of soccer fields on the site to 9 (4 with lights). Consider the installation of an artificial turf soccer field at Joe Sams Leisure Park as part of the future construction phase.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
90	Implement current planned improvements at Courtcliffe Park (soccer field development).	P.W. - L.A.S.
91	Should two new ball diamonds be developed at Joe Sams Leisure Park as recommended, the two unlit diamonds in Gatesbury Park should be converted into two Class C soccer fields.	P.W. - L.A.S.
92	As part of a future phase, add two unlit ball diamonds to Joe Sams Leisure Park, which would bring the total number of ball diamonds on the site to 4 (1 with lights). This should be accompanied by the conversion of the two unlit diamonds in Gatesbury Park into two Class C soccer fields.	P.W. - L.A.S.
93	The City should work with the Carlisle Tennis Club in order to identify funding, operational, and other arrangements specific to their proposals for investments on municipal lands (locations to be determined).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide

#	Glanbrook Recommendations	Lead
94	Monitor local soccer demand to determine need for longer-term soccer field expansions at Glanbrook Sports Complex, including the possibility of an artificial turf soccer field.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
95	Implement current planned improvements at Fairgrounds Community Park, Summerlea Park, and Glanbrook Sports Park. This could result in approximately 3 additional fields in the short-term (unlit equivalents).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
96	One basketball / multi-use court should be developed in Binbrook (location to be determined). Additional multi-use court development may be required between 2016 and 2031.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
97	New tennis court development will be required in the short-term (locations tbd).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
98	Over the short-term (by 2021), look to install a spray pad in the Binbrook area. Spray pads are most appropriate in Community and City-Wide Parks or where washrooms and sufficient parking exist.	P.W. - L.A.S.
99	Consider the construction of a neighbourhood-level skate park in the Binbrook area (approximately 2,000 square feet) . Modular construction should be considered in order for future flexibility should local interests change.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide

#	Hamilton Mountain Recommendations	Lead
100	Install multi-use artificial turf fields at Mohawk Sports Park and Billy Sherring Park (possibly in place of Class C or lower quality Class B fields). Consideration should also be given to an artificial turf field at William Connell Park.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
101	Make the 2 new soccer fields at William Schwenger Park available to the public in 2010 (replacements for fields lost at William McCullough Park).	P.W. - L.A.S.
102	Two new dedicated football/rugby fields (one lit, one unlit) are recommended, with a preference of locating them in the Hamilton Mountain area.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
103	Continue with the planned replacement of the Seneca School diamonds at William McCulloch Park.	P.W. - L.A.S.
104	Consider the conversion of under-utilized ball diamonds at Gilkson Park and/or R.A. Riddell Public School to full-size soccer fields (to be confirmed through further monitoring and local consultation).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
105	Install lights on diamonds at Turner Park (8 diamonds); note: lighting and an accessible washroom facility is scheduled for construction at this site in 2009, partially funding through the RInC program.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
106	Install lights on diamonds at Mohawk Sports Park (3 existing diamonds at north end).	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
107	Replace the existing cricket ground at Mohawk Sports Park with a new cricket ground at Heritage Green Sports Park in the short-term.	P.W. - L.A.S.
108	At the appropriate time, consider removal of under-utilized basketball courts within either Rushdale Park or T.B. McQuesten Park, with the space being converted into more in-demand recreational amenities or green space. Also consider the removal of the basketball court at Eleanor Park, which is located close to both Billy Sheering Park and Templemead Park.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
109	Improvements to the quality of tennis courts are required, including at Inch Park or TB McQueston Park (HM), consideration given to creating multi-use court templates. Improvement of the Hill Park Secondary School tennis courts could also be considered should demand levels warrant.	P.W. - L.A.S.
110	New tennis court development will be required in the short-term (locations tbd).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
111	The Sir Allan MacNab and Chedoke bocce clubs – which have small memberships and use facilities located 1.5 kilometres apart – should be amalgamated to make better use of the covered courts at Chedoke Arena. Following this, the bocce courts at Sir Allan MacNab Recreation Centre should be removed from the inventory.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
112	Over the short-term (by 2021), look to install spray pads in Buchanan Park, William Schwenger Park, and the area north of the Lincoln Alexander Parkway, between Upper James Street and Upper Wentworth Street. Spray pads are most appropriate in Community and City-Wide Parks or where washrooms and sufficient parking exist.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
113	Remove the George L. Armstrong Park wading pool and do not replace it with a spray pad.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
114	Develop a community-wide skate park in Hamilton Mountain (2 nd priority area) at a location to be determined (10,000 to 12,000 square feet in size).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
115	Maintain the Mohawk Sports Park outdoor running track as a City-wide facility.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
116	Washrooms be constructed at Turner Park and at the north end of Mohawk Sports Park.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities

#	Lower Hamilton Recommendations	Lead
117	Install a multi-use artificial turf field at a location to be determined, possibly in place of a Class C (or lower quality Class B) field.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
118	If the Ivor Wynne and Brian Timmis Stadium fields are removed from the inventory, they should be replaced by 1 full-size lit soccer field for community use in order to maintain an appropriate distribution of fields in the area.	P.W. - L.A.S.
119	Consider the conversion of under-utilized ball diamonds at Eastwood Park to full-size soccer fields.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
120	Continue with planned improvements to ball diamonds at Rosedale Park.	P.W. - L.A.S.
121	Globe Park diamonds may be removed from the inventory when the adjacent wastewater treatment plan is expanded. No new diamonds are recommended in their place.	P.W. - Parks Operations
122	In the medium-term, replace the existing cricket ground at Cathedral Park with a new cricket ground elsewhere. Seek a location in Lower Hamilton or Lower Stoney Creek (e.g., Confederation Park).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
123	Two basketball / multi-use courts should be developed, generally between Lawrence Road, Ottawa Street, Burlington Street East, and Gage Avenue (locations to be determined).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
124	Consider removal of under-utilized basketball courts within either Carter Park or Corktown Park convert space to more in-demand recreational amenities or green space. Also remove basketball court at either Andrew Warburton Memorial Park or Fairfield Park.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
125	Consider removing public tennis courts at Central Park (3 courts) and replace with in-demand recreation amenities. Consider removing public tennis courts at Globe Park (3 courts).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
126	Remove the Bayview Playground wading pool and do not replace with a spray pad.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
127	Convert the Parkdale Park wading pool into a spray pad when the outdoor pool is redeveloped.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
128	Remove the Woolverton Park wading pool and the R.T. Steele Park wading pool and do not replace them with spray pads.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
129	Consider the construction of a neighbourhood-level skate park in the Gage Avenue area (no larger than 2,000 square feet). Sponsorships and community partnerships should be pursued.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide

#	Lower Stoney Creek Recommendations	Lead
130	Install a multi-use artificial turf field at a location to be determined.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
131	Seek opportunities to provide additional fields through new Community Park development/redevelopment in Lower Stoney Creek.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
132	Implement current planned improvements at Winona Park. This could result in 1 additional field in the short-term (unlit equivalents).	P.W. - L.A.S.
133	In the medium-term, replace the existing cricket ground at Cathedral Park with a new cricket ground elsewhere. Seek a location in Lower Hamilton or Lower Stoney Creek (e.g., Confederation Park).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
134	New tennis court development will be required in the short-term (locations tbd).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
135	Install a spray pad in Winona Park.	P.W. - L.A.S.
136	Remove the Green Acres Park wading pool. Do not replace with a spray pad.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
137	Develop a community-wide skate park in Lower Stoney Creek (1 st priority area) at a location to be determined (10,000 to 12,000 square feet).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
138	Consider a neighbourhood-level skate park in the Winona area (2,000 square feet).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide

#	Upper Stoney Creek Recommendations	Lead
139	Implement current planned improvements at Heritage Green Sports Park (including one artificial turf field and one Class A field in 2010), Maplewood Park, and Summit Park. This could result in approximately 6 additional fields in the short-term (unlit equivalents).	P.W. - L.A.S.
140	Investigate the potential of working closer with key private facilities in growth areas to maximize community access (e.g. Dofasco Recreation Park).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
141	Seek opportunities to provide additional fields through new Community Park development/redevelopment in Upper Stoney Creek. .	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
142	Consider the conversion of under-utilized ball diamonds at Paramount Park to full-size soccer fields (to be confirmed through further monitoring and local consultation).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
143	Continue with the planned changes to Maplewood Park, including the realignment of one diamond and removal of another.	P.W. - L.A.S.
144	Replace the existing cricket ground at Mohawk Sports Park with a new cricket ground at Heritage Green Sports Park in the short-term.	P.W. - L.A.S.
145	Consider removal of the under-utilized basketball court within White Deer Park & convert into more in-demand recreational amenities or green space. Additional multi-use court required between 2016 and 2031.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
146	New tennis court development will be required in the short-term and long-term (locations tbd).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
147	By 2021 install a spray pad in the Paramount Drive area.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
148	Between 2021 and 2031, install 3 spray pads in Community Parks in Upper Stoney Creek.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
149	Develop a community-wide skate park in Upper Stoney Creek (longer-term) at a location to be determined. (10,000 to 12,000 square feet)	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
150	Construct a neighbourhood-level skate park in the Upper Stoney Creek area (2,000 square feet).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide

#	West Hamilton / Dundas Recommendations	Lead
151	Undertake improvements to improve playability of the upper field at Olympic Sports Park.	P.W. - Parks Operations
152	Implement current planned improvements at Churchill Park. This could result in 1 additional field in the short-term (unlit equivalents).	P.W. - L.A.S.
153	Install one artificial turf field at a location to be determined.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
154	Consider the conversion of under-utilized ball diamonds at Alexander Park and Veteran's Park to full-size soccer fields	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
155	Evaluate options in the short-term to improve the playability, safety, and level of service at the cricket pitch in Churchill Park, in consultation with local cricket organizations.	P.W. - Parks Operations
156	Two basketball / multi-use courts should be developed in the Westdale/Ainslie Wood area and downtown Dundas area.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
157	Consider improvements to the Westdale Secondary School (WHD) tennis courts. Acceptable agreements with the School Board and local tennis club needed.	C.S. - Rec. City Wide
158	Remove the Coronation Park wading pool when the outdoor pool is removed from service (if applicable) and do not replace it with a spray pad.	C.S. - Rec. Facilities
159	Develop a community-wide skate park in West Hamilton/Dundas (3 rd priority area), possibly at Cathedral Park (10,000 to 12,000 square feet).	C.S. - Rec. City Wide

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Overview	1
1.2 Study Goal	2
1.3 Context & Key Drivers	4
1.4 Scope	6
1.5 Benefits of Outdoor Recreation	7
1.6 Report Organization	8
1.7 Limitations	10
SECTION 2 RELATIONSHIP OF STUDY DELIVERABLES.....	11
SECTION 3 GUIDING PRINCIPLES.....	12
3.1 Overview	12
3.2 Guiding Principles, Directions and Implications	12
SECTION 4 COMMUNITY PROFILE.....	21
4.1 Overview	21
4.2 Historic and Projected Population Figures	21
4.3 Growth Strategy	24
4.4 Age Composition	25
4.5 Income	30
4.6 Community Diversity	31
4.7 Summary – Profile of Hamilton Communities.....	33
SECTION 5 CONSULTATION SUMMARY	35
5.1 Overview	35
5.2 Household Survey	35
5.3 User Group Survey.....	51
5.4 User Group Focus Groups	63
5.5 Public Information Sessions	67
5.6 Staff & Councillor Interviews	68
SECTION 6 BROAD TRENDS IN PARTICIPATION AND OUTDOOR FACILITY AND PARKS DESIGN	78
6.1 Socio-Demographic Trends.....	78
6.2 Service Provision Trends	83
SECTION 7 ABOUT THE FACILITY PROFILES & NEEDS ASSESSMENT.....	86
7.1 About the Facility Profiles.....	86
7.2 About the Needs Assessments	90
7.3 Current Inventory	99
SECTION 8 SOCCER, FOOTBALL AND MULTI-USE FIELDS	102
8.1 Facility Profiles	102
8.2 Needs Assessment	111
8.3 Recommended Directions	119

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
SECTION 9 BALL DIAMONDS	121
9.1 Facility Profiles	121
9.2 Needs Assessment	125
9.3 Recommended Directions	130
SECTION 10 CRICKET PITCHES	132
10.1 Facility Profiles	132
10.2 Needs Assessment	134
10.3 Recommended Directions	136
SECTION 11 HARD SURFACE COURTS.....	137
11.1 Facility Profiles – Basketball & Multi-purpose Courts.....	137
11.2 Needs Assessment – Basketball & Multi-purpose Courts	139
11.3 Recommended Directions – Basketball & Multi-purpose Courts.....	142
11.4 Facility Profiles – Tennis Courts.....	143
11.5 Needs Assessment – Tennis Courts.....	146
11.6 Recommended Directions – Tennis Courts.....	149
SECTION 12 BOCCE COURTS & LAWN BOWLING GREENS	150
12.1 Facility Profiles – Bocce Courts.....	150
12.2 Needs Assessment – Bocce Courts.....	152
12.3 Recommended Directions – Bocce Courts	153
12.4 Facility Profiles – Lawn Bowling Greens	154
12.5 Needs Assessment – Lawn Bowling Greens	155
12.6 Recommended Directions – Lawn Bowling Greens.....	157
SECTION 13 PLAYGROUNDS	158
13.1 Facility Profiles	158
13.2 Needs Assessment	162
13.3 Recommended Directions	164
SECTION 14 SPRAY PADS & WADING POOLS.....	165
14.1 Facility Profiles	165
14.2 Needs Assessment	170
14.3 Recommended Directions	173
SECTION 15 OTHER OUTDOOR RECREATION AMENITIES	175
15.1 Skateboard Parks.....	175
15.2 Bike Parks	181
15.3 Leash Free Parks.....	182
15.4 Outdoor Ice Rinks.....	185
15.5 Outdoor Running Tracks	188
15.6 Community Garden Plots	189
15.7 Special Event Areas.....	191
15.8 Pathways in Parks.....	192
SECTION 16 SUPPORT BUILDINGS	193

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
SECTION 17 INDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES.....	195
17.1 Indoor Soccer / Turf Sports	195
17.2 Indoor Tennis, Bocce, Lawn Bowling	198
SECTION 18 OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE	199
SECTION 19 DESIGN AND ACCESSIBILITY.....	203
SECTION 20 RECREATION ADMINISTRATION.....	209
SECTION 21 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	213
21.1 Administrative & Operational Recommendations.....	213
21.2 City-Wide Facility Recommendations.....	219
21.3 Community-Specific Facility Recommendations	226
SECTION 22 CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS & IMPLEMENTATION	238
22.1 Capital Budgets and Current Funding Levels.....	238
22.2 Capital Requirements.....	240
22.3 Comparison of Capital Funding Levels & Capital Requirements	246
22.4 Facility Provision Scenarios	247
22.5 Implementation Plan for the Recommended Option (Strategic Renewal & Filling the Gaps)	254
22.6 Partnerships – The Need for a Standardized Framework	260

ATTACHMENT I	Demographic & Facility Mapping
Map 1	Study Areas
Map 2	Demographic Profile
Map 2A	Demographic Profile 2006 Population of Persons 0 to 9 Years of Age, Persons per hectare
Map 2B	Demographic Profile 2006 Population of Persons 10 to 19 Years of Age, Persons per hectare
Map 2C	Demographic Profile 2006 Population of Persons 20 to 49 Years of Age, Persons per hectare
Map 2D	Demographic Profile 2006 Population of Persons 50 to 59 Years of Age, Persons per hectare
Map 2E	Demographic Profile 2006 Population of Persons 60+ Years of Age, Persons per hectare
Map 3	Population Forecast by Community
Map 4	Percentage of Population with Low Income after Tax (2005)
Map 5	Percentage of Population that speaks a non-official language (i.e., other than English & French) most often at home
Map 6	Soccer & Multi-Use Fields
Map 7	Ball Diamonds
Map 8	Other Dedicated Sports Fields (Football & Cricket)
Map 9	Basketball Courts
Map 10	Splash Pads & Wading Pools
Map 11	Bocce Ball & Lawn Bowling
Map 12	Outdoor Ice Rinks
Map 13	Playgrounds
Map 14	Outdoor Running Tracks
Map 15	Skateboard Parks
Map 16	Tennis Courts
Map 17	Leash Free Parks
Map 18	Schools
Map 19	Schools – Current and Conditional Future Projects (HWDSB)
Map 20	Schools – Potential School Closures (HWDSB)
ATTACHMENT II	Public Consultation Summaries
ATTACHMENT III	Community-Specific Demographic Forecasts
ATTACHMENT IV	Listing of Background Documents
ATTACHMENT V	Sports Field Booking Data (2008)
ATTACHMENT VI	Recreation Facility Inventory
ATTACHMENT VII	Facility Provision Levels by Community
ATTACHMENT VIII	Proposed Short-Term Facility/Park Changes (subject to change)
ATTACHMENT IX	Sports Field Management Review & Recommendations
ATTACHMENT X	Comparison of Municipal Field Rental Rates & Allocation Standards

A Note Regarding the Facility Inventory:

With more than 1,000 unique amenities (e.g., playgrounds, sports fields, support buildings, etc.) within its many parks, the City of Hamilton's outdoor recreation facility inventory is complex. Most of these amenities are located on City-owned lands, although others are on school sites or other lands over which the City has influence.

Managing a database of this size is a challenge, and much of this inventory information has been compiled exclusively for this Study. For example, accurate counts of school board and private amenities do not currently exist and the database seldom indicates the quality of amenities or their condition. The City is constantly working to improve its inventory management system through standardization of inventory categories and verification of records.

The inventory data contained within this Study was provided by the City of Hamilton and is current as of May 2009. Since this time, new parks and amenities have been acquired and developed, some of which may not have been fully captured within this Study. Although the complete accuracy of the inventory cannot be guaranteed, other tools (e.g., site visits, aerial photography, booking information, multi-departmental reviews, etc.) have assisted in improving its reliability. In order to capture required revisions, the City is committed to reviewing this Study on a five-year basis.

SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Overview

The purpose of the *Outdoor Recreation Facilities & Sports Field Provision Plan* is to provide the City with a sustainable strategy for managing Hamilton's portfolio of outdoor sports fields and other community-use recreational infrastructure such as (but not limited to) playgrounds, outdoor courts, spray pads, and skateboard parks. This is a long-range Study (to the year 2031), with the implementation plan focusing on projects that can be undertaken within the next ten years.

Hamilton and its many communities have a proud sports heritage. A significant number of Hamilton residents are involved in outdoor organized sport participation, not to mention the many volunteers and spectators. Sports fields accommodate a variety of activities, including league play, recreational programs, school physical education classes, tournaments, and special events. In terms of unscheduled outdoor recreation facilities, the number of users is significantly greater when one considers the sheer number of playgrounds, outdoor aquatic sites, basketball courts, walking trails, and other casual-use amenities available in the City. Pressures on existing recreational facilities and the changing requirements of present user groups have led to the undertaking of this Study.

This Study is not only about options for the development, improvement, or conversion of outdoor recreation facilities in the City of Hamilton, but also about creating and maintaining a sense of community through the provision and design of park assets, which are critical elements in fostering neighbourhood and community life and identity.

This Study is intended to be a companion document to the City of Hamilton's *Use, Renovation and Replacement Study for Hamilton Recreation and Public-Use (Indoor) Facilities* (2008); herein referred to as the "Indoor Recreation Facility Study". Given the direct relationship between indoor and outdoor recreation facilities, a methodology similar to the previous study was utilized. The following passage – excerpted from the Indoor Recreation Facility Study – holds true:

"Recreation services contribute directly to the City's quality of life, as well as personal health and social cohesion. As a result, a key goal of this study is to develop an overall (outdoor) facility strategy that increases benefits to residents of the City of Hamilton. For this reason, it was imperative for the study to consider not just cold, hard data, but also how the preferred facility investment strategy would affect the long-term vitality of the City's communities and the wellbeing of its residents. The study examines not only the physical and financial requirements associated with the City's capital assets, but also the activity and service needs of the community and how these relate to meeting expectations into the future. Although extensive efforts have been taken to understand needs at a local community level, a primary objective of this Study was to develop a framework that could be applied City-wide."

Considerable research, public and stakeholder consultation, and analysis has been required to address the complex and numerous issues affecting outdoor recreational facility provision and management. For example, the development of this Study has involved consultation with several local field sport organizations, as well as major landholders such as school boards and coordinating bodies.

Although explained in greater detail throughout this report, it should be said upfront that the residents of Hamilton are very pleased with the availability, quality, and level of maintenance of the City's outdoor recreation facilities. Furthermore, the Guelph Turfgrass Institute noted that Hamilton's higher quality sports fields were among the best municipal fields they had inspected.

With a changing demographic profile combined with financial constraints, it is important that priorities for improvements and/or additional facilities be justified as logically as possible. This is precisely what this Study sets out to achieve.

Monteith Brown Planning Consultants (MBPC) in association with The JF Group, STLA Inc., and the Guelph Turfgrass Institute were retained by the City of Hamilton to complete this Study with the assistance of an inter-departmental team of municipal staff from the Public Works, Planning and Economic Development, Corporate Services (Finance), and Community Services Departments.

1.2 Study Goal

As established in the Terms of Reference, the goal of the Study is to “create a long range strategy (master plan) for the replacement/renovation of existing and construction of new outdoor recreation facilities and sport fields, that will address the current and future needs of the community while maintaining a realistic, responsible, equitable and cost effective approach to the management of Hamilton's outdoor facility assets.”

The specific objectives of the project are:

- a) To review relevant background materials such as the City's Culture and Recreation Master Plan and assess their implications on future facility provision strategies.
- b) To assess community demographics and recreational trends to gain an understanding of how these factors will influence outdoor facility and service provision now and in the future (25-year timeframe).
- c) To confirm current community usage of each outdoor facility/amenity and highlight usage issues and opportunities identified through review of the data and consultation with the public including users and non-users.
- d) To identify issues related to outdoor facility amenities vs. industry standards and anticipated future requirements as determined by recreational and demographic trends and best practices.
- e) To review and analyze barriers to the use of the City's outdoor facilities and consider a variety of related socio-demographic factors.
- f) To engage the public and key stakeholders in gaining an understanding of outdoor recreation facility needs, expectations, priorities, and options.
- g) To develop a series of Guiding Principles that provides strategic direction to the recommendations of this Study and future decision-making.
- h) To quantify and contextualize current and future sport field and outdoor recreation facility demand on a City-wide and community-specific basis.
- i) To identify and evaluate gaps in service and areas where additional investment is required as a result of deteriorating or outdated infrastructure and amenities.

- j) To establish service standards detailing expectations relative to facility provision, design, and maintenance (in part, through a trends and benchmarking exercise with other municipalities).
- k) To review barriers to using outdoor facilities and sports fields and to identify accessibility issues related to compliance with the *Accessibility For Ontarians With Disabilities Act*.
- l) To undertake a comprehensive needs assessment aimed at identifying current and future needs on a City-wide and community-specific basis; this will be facilitated by the creation and application of a series of measures.
- m) To assess the extent of the City's preparedness to effectively respond to the issue of its aging outdoor recreation infrastructure.
- n) To assess current maintenance practices.
- o) To develop options for disposition/reconfiguration, level of maintenance and capital spending, and timing relative to outdoor recreation facility improvements
- p) To establish a preferred strategy for meeting long term (10-15 year) community needs relative to outdoor sports fields and recreation facilities, in-line with the actual and potential resources of the City and its partners.
- q) To establish a decision-making framework and detailed implementation plan identifying priority projects and associated costing.
- r) To recommend various policy and procedural improvements that will increase the City and community's capacity to meet outdoor sports field and facility demand (including current users, those that currently cannot be adequately accommodated, and future demand created by growth in sport and/or population).
- s) To help position the City to apply for future senior government funding opportunities and to respond to, initiate, and evaluate proposals for partnerships with outside parties.

Based on the overall study goal and objectives, the work program for the project has been divided into two phases. Phase I involved gathering the information needed to complete a comprehensive needs assessment and inform the actions and recommendations to be developed in Phase II. The purpose of Phase II is to develop a long-term sustainable strategy and fiscally sound business case for identifying how the City will plan for new, renovate existing and reposition current outdoor facilities in the coming years. Each phase includes extensive consultation with City staff and officials, as well as stakeholders and the public.

In simple terms, the study process can be depicted by the following graphic:



1.3 Context & Key Drivers

As has been the case for years and years, the City's role in outdoor recreation service delivery involves the provision, booking, and maintenance of outdoor sport facilities (including several on school board property), as well as the provision and maintenance of unorganized use facilities, such as playgrounds, spray pads, hard surface courts, skate parks, etc.

The City also collaborates with outdoor recreation and sport groups to facilitate the growth and development of a variety of affordable activity choices for people of all ages in the City. Volunteer community organizations are the primary provider of organized sport activities, notwithstanding the opportunities provided by school and college/university physical education and athletic programs (most of which utilize non-municipal facilities). Adjustments to these roles are outside the scope of this study.

Specifically, the City Departments that are directly involved in the delivery of outdoor fields and recreation facilities and services (along with their responsibilities within the scope of this Study) include:

- Community Services through the Recreation Division, which is responsible for:
 - the allocation and booking of sports fields, parks spaces, and pavilions;
 - maintenance of park buildings that support sports field users;
 - operation of outdoor aquatic facilities (e.g., wading pools);
 - policy development and rental fee establishment (in conjunction with Public Works);
 - operation of playlot programs;
 - sport liaison services;
 - determining future recreation requirements; and
 - related communications.
- Public Works through the Environmental Services Division (Parks and Cemeteries), which is responsible for:
 - operational, management, and stewardship services for municipal parks and many school grounds adjoining parks; and,
 - services such as general park maintenance, turf management, horticulture, beautification, forestry services, irrigation and drainage, storm water control, etc.
- ...and through the Capital Planning & Implementation Division (Open Space Development & Park Planning; and Construction), which collectively are responsible for:
 - preparation of master plans for park and open space development;
 - production of overall site plans, landscape grading and drainage plans, irrigation plans, planting plans and construction details;
 - provide input on the location and planning of parks and open space in Secondary, Draft and Subdivision plans through comments to the Planning and Economic Development Department;
 - project management, cost estimate and budgeting report preparation for park development;
 - preparation and maintenance of development standards; and
 - construction (tendering) of park development and redevelopment processes.

- Planning and Economic Development through the Planning Division, which is responsible for setting goals and policies for community development, including the acquisition and planning of future parkland.
- Corporate Services through the Finance Division, which is responsible for financial support services and monitoring capital reserves.

Hamiltonians are looking for improved outdoor recreation facilities – for both unstructured and organized recreation – that are accessible to their household (in terms of geographic, physical, and financial accessibility). As noted in the Indoor Recreation Facility Study, Hamiltonians need access to quality recreation facilities in order to maintain healthy lifestyles – strategic investment in the City’s recreation infrastructure is an absolute requirement.

Pressure for outdoor recreation facility investment is generated from three areas of need, all of which are present to varying degrees in Hamilton at the present time:

- New amenities to serve new population growth;
- Repair and replacement of existing older park amenities; and
- Retrofits of existing park amenities to better serve current needs.

Much of the funding for the first item (new growth) is traditionally generated by Development Charges and cash-in-lieu from parkland dedication, while the latter two items will require greater financial support directly from the municipality. With many of the City’s parks and facilities being built in generations ago (often using funding sources such as senior government grants), many facilities are out-of-date or require major rehabilitation. In addition, sport participation has changed considerably over the years, leading to greater activity demands, many of which are land-intensive (such as soccer). Furthermore, recreational preferences, community characteristics, facility designs, desired locations, and public expectations have changed considerably since many of these parks facilities were initially built.

Compounded by the lack of reserve funds for facility replacement, the City is facing tremendous challenges due to over-utilized sports fields and parks, a backlog of accumulated repairs to aging facilities, and emerging demands for new recreational pursuits.

Since 2001, the City has struggled to keep pace with the increasing growth needs of some sports and has lacked a long range plan for the renovation of its current outdoor assets, the repurposing of some facilities and the strategy for locating and constructing new outdoor facilities. The completion of this Study will support the work completed in 2008 on indoor recreation facilities and will allow the City of Hamilton to strategically plan for its future recreation and sports needs in an organized and fiscally responsible manner.

1.4 Scope

The emphasis of the project is on public-use outdoor sports fields (baseball diamonds, soccer pitches, multi-use fields, cricket pitches, etc.). Other facilities to be considered (to a lesser degree) through this study include:

- multi-purpose pads and basketball courts
- tennis courts
- bocce courts
- lawn bowling greens
- outdoor ice rinks
- skateboard parks and BMX/bike parks
- outdoor running tracks
- wading pools and spray pads
- playgrounds
- park buildings used by groups (excluding pavilions)
- off leash dog areas
- community gardens
- special event areas
- indoor facilities that traditionally have an outdoor use (e.g., indoor soccer, bocce, lawn bowling)
- roles and functions of pathways and trails within parks

The following facilities are excluded from the project scope: park pavilions; open space and naturalized areas; heritage park properties; bikeways, pathways and trail systems outside of parks; and Ivor Wynne Stadium (the study recognizes the Stadium's availability to the public, but does not make any recommendations on its future).

The City of Hamilton currently owns, operates, and/or maintains over 300 park properties (and over 300 open space parcels), which contain some 239 diamonds, 197 soccer and/or football fields, and 3 cricket pitches. These sports fields range from low quality, non-regulation size fields to high quality, regulation size fields. In addition, the City maintains approximately 250 playgrounds, 99 basketball/multi-purpose courts, 91 tennis courts, 60+/- outdoor natural ice rinks and 1 artificial ice rink, 51 spray pads, 18 wading pools, 49 bocce courts, 4 lawn bowling greens, 5 outdoor running tracks, 5 off-leash dog areas, and 5 skateboard parks. Several of these assets are owned by school boards, but are maintained and permitted by the City.

In addition, post-secondary institutions and the private sector provide a degree of community access to a variety of outdoor recreational assets. Non-municipal recreational assets have not been assessed as part of this Study, but the number of such facilities has been noted and taken into consideration, where known.

While the intent of this study is to set high-level and long-term direction for the provision of municipal outdoor recreation facilities, there are many significant decisions and areas of evaluation that are not fully addressed within the scope of this study, including (but not necessarily limited to):

- the specific design or detailed components of recommended facilities and facility improvements (although some guidance is provided in this regard);
- specific sites for new facility development (although some options are presented); and

- the operating arrangements, specific partnerships, fee structures, or marketing/promotional initiatives for existing or new facilities and services.

The aforementioned items are expected to be addressed through the City's annual budget process, as well as park master plans, feasibility studies, and/or business plans to be prepared in advance of major capital decisions.

Note: Within the context of this Study, the term "Sports field" refers to the playing field/diamond/ pitch upon which to participate in organized or unorganized baseball (including hardball, slo-pitch, softball, etc.), cricket, field hockey, field lacrosse, football (aussie rules, tackle, touch/flag, etc.), rugby, soccer, ultimate Frisbee, or similar activities.

1.5 Benefits of Outdoor Recreation

Parks and outdoor recreation opportunities contribute to an enormous number of social, personal, economic, and environmental benefits to both individuals and the community.

From a community standpoint, outdoor recreation contributes to the creation of healthy communities as it provides opportunities for people to meet, socialize, develop friendships, and strengthen their sense of community. Recreational participation fosters a strong community spirit, encourages social interaction and cohesion, and helps to create the leaders of tomorrow. Parks and recreation opportunities are major contributors to Hamilton becoming "the best place in Canada to raise a child", as envisioned by the City's Corporate Strategic Plan (2008).

The inclusiveness of outdoor recreation provides opportunities for everyone to participate, regardless of age, ability, or background. As such, certain populations experience greater than average benefits from recreation participation, including women, persons with disabilities, older adults, persons with financial challenges, and newcomers to Canada.

In addition, recreation facilitates volunteerism, community involvement, and shared management and ownership of resources, all of which are vital to the effective and cost efficient delivery of services in Hamilton.

From a personal standpoint, outdoor recreation provides opportunities to improve fitness levels and build healthy individuals. An alarming number of Canadian children and adults are not active enough to achieve optimal growth and health benefits. Youth participation in sports and recreational activities enhances their health during critical years of growth and development – thereby lowering their risk of chronic diseases in adulthood – and help to establish healthy routines that could last a lifetime. Not only is recreational participation preventative health care, but it is also effective in achieving physical, mental and social health, lowering health care costs, and enhancing quality of life and longevity.

With a strong focus on youth, recreation and sport provides an outlet for children and teens to channel their energy into positive, socially acceptable, and beneficial activities. This not only aids in the development of self-esteem and leadership, but also provides positive alternatives to destructive behaviour such as drug abuse and crime.

From an economic standpoint, outdoor recreational tournaments and events are major economic draws that brings thousands of visitors to Hamilton each year, with spin-off benefits being realized by local hotels, restaurants, and other businesses. The economic impact of

recreation also extends to healthy employees, as they incur lower healthcare costs, exhibit reduced absenteeism and turnover, and display increased productivity and morale. Furthermore, recreation services are a motivating factor for business relocation, expansion, and retention in Hamilton.

From an environmental standpoint, outdoor recreation helps to protect and conserve valuable land resources and natural features through the provision of parks and open spaces. Support is growing every day for the application of environmentally-friendly practices and outdoor recreation provides excellent opportunities to put these ideals into practice, particularly through the provision of accessible parks that promote walkability and active modes of transport (both of which lead to decreased air and noise pollution). Lastly, sports and recreation creates valuable connections with nature and the outdoor environment, aspects which are found to be increasingly lacking in our modern world.

1.6 Report Organization

This report contains the findings of both Phase I and II of the *Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan* for the City of Hamilton. The report is organized as follows:

Section 1: Introduction	Provides an overview of the purpose, goals, objectives and scope of the Study and its content.
Section 2: Relationship of Study Deliverables	Identifies the relationship between the Study deliverables, including the Guiding Principles, city-wide needs assessment, community-specific needs assessment, and implementation plan.
Section 3: Guiding Principles	Outlines the high-level principles and directions that guide the Study recommendations and future decisions related to ongoing capital expenditure, expansion or disposition of outdoor recreational facilities.
Section 4: Community Profile	Outlines the socio-demographic characteristics of Hamilton's population at both the City-wide and local community levels, including population, age composition, income, education and ethnicity.
Section 5: Consultation Summary	Summarizes the results of the Phase I consultation program, including analysis of input received from public household surveys, stakeholder focus groups, user-group surveys, Council and staff interviews.
Section 6: Broad Trends in Participation and Outdoor Facility and Parks Design	Discusses key trends in participation, facility design, maintenance, and other aspects affecting current and future use and provision of outdoor recreation facilities (based on national, provincial, and local research).
Section 7: About the Facility Profiles & Needs Assessment	Provides a description of the data and methodology used in analyzing the facilities covered in subsequent sections of the report, as well as an inventory summary.
Section 8: Soccer, Football and Multi-Use Fields	Discusses the supply and demand of soccer and multi-use sports fields (e.g., soccer, football, rugby, lacrosse, etc.) and the identification of current and future needs.
Section 9: Ball Diamonds	Discusses the supply and demand of ball diamonds and the identification of current and future needs.

Section 10: <i>Cricket Pitches</i>	Discusses the supply and demand of cricket pitches and the identification of current and future needs.
Section 11: <i>Hard Surface Courts</i>	Discusses the supply and demand of hard surface courts (e.g., tennis, basketball, multi-purpose) and the identification of current and future needs.
Section 12: <i>Bocce Courts & Lawn Bowling Greens</i>	Discusses the supply and demand of bocce courts and lawn bowling greens and the identification of current and future needs.
Section 13: <i>Playgrounds</i>	Discusses the supply and demand of playgrounds and the identification of current and future needs.
Section 14: <i>Wading Pools & Spray Pads</i>	Discusses the supply and demand of wading pools and spray pads and the identification of current and future needs.
Section 15: <i>Other Outdoor Recreation Amenities</i>	Discusses the supply and demand of other key outdoor recreation amenities (e.g., skateboard parks, off leash dog parks, outdoor rinks, outdoor running tracks, pathways in parks, etc.) and the identification of current and future needs.
Section 16: <i>Support Buildings</i>	Discusses the supply and demand of outdoor recreation support buildings and the identification of current and future needs.
Section 17: <i>Indoor Sports Facilities</i>	Discusses the supply and demand of indoor sports facilities (e.g., indoor soccer, tennis, bocce, lawn bowling, etc.) and the identification of current and future needs.
Section 18: <i>Operations and Maintenance</i>	Identifies challenges and opportunities relating to the maintenance of local sports fields and outdoor recreation facilities.
Section 19: <i>Design and Accessibility</i>	Identifies challenges and opportunities relating to the design and physical accessibility of local sports fields and outdoor recreation facilities.
Section 20: <i>Recreation Administration</i>	Identifies challenges and opportunities relating to the administration of local sports fields and outdoor recreation facilities.
Section 21: <i>Summary of Recommendations</i>	Summarizes the City-wide and community-specific needs assessments contained in Sections 8 to 20.
Section 22: <i>Capital Requirements & Implementation</i>	Describes the City's historic funding levels and identifies the future capital requirements associated with outdoor recreation facilities and sports fields. Includes a schedule of capital plans and other provision scenarios.

1.7 Limitations


This report was prepared by Monteith Brown Planning Consultants Ltd., The JF Group, STLA Inc., and The Guelph Turfgrass Institute (herein referred to as “the Consulting Team”) for the account of the City of Hamilton. The material in this report reflects the Consulting Team’s best judgment in light of the information available to it at the time of preparation. Any use which a third party makes of this report, or any reliance on or decisions to be made based on it, are the responsibility of such third parties. The Consulting Team accepts no responsibility for damages, if any, suffered by a third party as a result of decisions made or actions based on this report.

All financial, condition, and usage data has been provided by the City’s Public Works Department and Recreation Division; the responsibility for verification of this data rests solely with the City of Hamilton. All population data has been provided by the City (largely through the Planning and Economic Development Department) and/or Statistics Canada, unless otherwise noted.

It should also be noted that the inventory data contained within this Study was provided by the City of Hamilton and is current as of May 2009. Since this time, new parks and amenities have been acquired and developed, some of which may not have been fully captured within this Study. Although the complete accuracy of the inventory cannot be guaranteed, other tools (e.g., site visits, aerial photography, booking information, multi-departmental reviews, etc.) have assisted in improving its reliability. In order to capture required revisions, the City is committed to reviewing this Study on a five-year basis.

SECTION 2 RELATIONSHIP OF STUDY DELIVERABLES

The following pyramid graph depicts the relationship of the key Study deliverables – starting from the strategic direction provided by the Guiding Principles at the top. The Guiding Principles are followed by the City-wide Needs Assessment, the Community-specific Needs Assessment, and the Implementation Plan, which identifies specific recommendations.



SECTION 3 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

3.1 Overview

In order to inform recommendations made in the *Outdoor Recreation Facilities & Sports Field Provision Plan*, as well as future decisions related to outdoor recreation facilities, a set of Guiding Principles was developed and presented to the public for review.

A series of seven public meetings were held in April and May 2009 to review, improve upon, and prioritize draft Guiding Principles developed by the consultant in cooperation with staff. The resultant set of Guiding Principles – prioritized based on the input provided through the public meetings – is provided below:

- Principle #1: Exercise Fiscal Accountability
- Principle #2: Build Healthy Communities and Promote Outdoor Activity for Children and Persons of all Ages
- Principle #3: Collaborate with Others and Seek Innovative Solutions
- Principle #4: Invest Strategically in the Redevelopment or Repurposing of Outdoor Recreational Assets
- Principle #5: Ensure Appropriate Provision Levels
- Principle #6: Ensure Appropriate Maintenance Levels
- Principle #7: Engage the Community & Recognize our Differences
- Principle #8: Implement Designs that are Flexible, Accessible & Appropriate

The Guiding Principles are largely complementary and they should be read and interpreted as a set, rather than as separate, isolated statements. Clearly, from a critical path perspective, some principles will need to occur before others can happen, while other may be more difficult to achieve. The Guiding Principles, however, should be interpreted collectively as being the vision and direction to which the City and community aspire. Moreover, the Guiding Principles act as “filters” when undertaking specific studies or park master plans and when establishing priorities for outdoor recreation facility improvements within the context of this Study.

3.2 Guiding Principles, Directions and Implications

The “Guiding Principles” are core directional statements that will advise the recommendations of the Study as well as future decisions related to outdoor recreation facilities and sports fields. Collectively, they should be interpreted as being the vision and direction to which the City and community aspire.

The Guiding Principles have been developed based on data analysis, trends, demographics, and will be further refined following the identification of public needs and preferences, market research, and input from staff, councillors, stakeholders, and the general public. Consideration was also given to the City of Hamilton Council and Corporate Strategic Plans, Public Works Strategic Plan, and Public Use (Indoor) Facilities Study. Attachment II contains a summary of the public input received.

Please note that the term ‘*Outdoor Recreation Assets*’ is used frequently in the Guiding Principles’ Directions. This term refers to all spaces, amenities, facilities, and apparatuses used to participate in organized and unorganized park activities, with the exception of trails, pathways, natural open spaces, and historic sites/buildings.

Principle #1

Exercise Fiscal Accountability

Directions:

- a) The City will ensure that changes to the municipal inventory of outdoor recreation assets within parks are accompanied by a strategy to fund both their development (including land acquisition, if required) and ongoing maintenance.
- b) The City will ensure long-term financial sustainability through the cost-effective and efficient management of resources, the appropriate and reasonable application of user and rental fees, and the maximization of Development Charges and community resources.
- c) The stated desire for additional or enhanced outdoor recreation assets within parks must be balanced with both capital and ongoing annual maintenance costs.

Implications:

User fees and rental rates will be reviewed regularly to ensure they are appropriate, reasonable, and support the subsidized operation of outdoor recreation assets.

Principle #2

Build Healthy Communities and Promote Outdoor Activity for Children and Persons of all Ages

Directions:

- a) The City of Hamilton will provide opportunities for sporting, leisure, cultural, health, wellness, and social activities (both organized and unorganized) in outdoor recreational areas so as to help build healthy communities and improve the quality of life for all.
- b) Connecting outdoor recreation sites with the surrounding community through the use of trails, sidewalks, transit lines, etc. will be strongly encouraged.
- c) The City will work towards eliminating barriers to participation related to age, income, language, culture, transportation or physical abilities.
- d) Relative to outdoor recreation assets, the City will ensure proper administration and promotion of its financial assistance program to ensure that all residents have a reasonable opportunity to participate, regardless of their financial situation.

Implications:

Significant additional investment in outdoor recreational infrastructure will be required to maintain or enhance community health and quality of life.

Children and youth should have the opportunity to play to the level of their capability and interest within an organized and safe minor sport system. In scheduling and allocating time on playing fields, children and youth that are part of affiliated minor sports organizations will receive priority use at subsidized cost.

Active living, wellness, and outdoor physical activity opportunities for children and all individuals will be promoted.

Improvements to equipment, assets, and signage that minimize barriers related to age, income, language, culture or physical abilities will be considered for future capital projects and phased in over time.

Children and youth will continue to have access to free and affordable play opportunities with other children within a reasonable distance from their home where practical (in urban areas), without having to cross major physical barriers.

People of all ages will continue to have the opportunity to “experience the outdoors” as it relates to the parks system – to walk, bike, inline skate, sit, or socialize – within a reasonable distance of their homes (in urban areas).

Principle #3

Collaborate with Others and Seek Innovative Solutions

Directions:

- a) Consultation with major community partners (including the School Boards, post-secondary institutions, conservation authority, waterfront trust, etc.) will be required to ensure that reasonable public access to non-municipal playing fields and other outdoor recreational assets is maintained and enhanced where possible.
- b) The City will support and partner (where possible) with volunteers and community organizations in offering sustainable and affordable sport activities and programs to residents of all ages.
- c) The City will assist community organizations in building the necessary capacity (i.e., knowledge, abilities, skills and behaviours) to fulfil the City's mandate in an efficient, effective, fiscally responsible and responsive manner.
- d) The municipality will act as "co-ordinator" of the recreational services provided within the City of Hamilton and primary provider of outdoor recreational assets.
- e) Sporting events that attract visitors and sponsors from outside the City and create economic benefits will generally be supported in partnership with Tourism Hamilton and participating community organizations. Notwithstanding this, the City must ensure that these events do not unduly restrict access by Hamilton residents to outdoor recreation assets located in parks and that they provide an appropriate financial contribution toward offsetting their direct costs.

Implications:

Access to outdoor recreation opportunities is a shared responsibility, but needs to be led by the City.

The planning, implementation, and development of outdoor recreation assets is done in a collaborative manner, internally within the City and externally within the community.

In order to maintain an accessible distribution of outdoor recreation assets, alternative and innovative provision strategies should be examined in established and densely populated areas.

Opportunities to encourage and support community-led programs that enhance stewardship of existing park assets (e.g., the existing "Adopt-a-Park" program) will be promoted.

For volunteer-operated or maintained assets, policy agreements may need to be developed to ensure accountability and to guide issues related to ownership, maintenance, community access, reporting, funding, and succession planning.

The City's outdoor sports field allocation approach should be reviewed to ensure that outdoor sport fields are being made available to priority users in amounts that are in keeping with appropriate demand standards and usage capacities, including usage by out-of-town organizations as compared to Hamilton residents.

Principle #4

Invest Strategically in the Development, Redevelopment, and Repurposing of Outdoor Recreational Assets

Directions:

- a) In planning and designing outdoor recreation assets, take into account not only current needs, but also anticipated longer-term needs.
- b) The City will commit to allocating appropriate and necessary resources to meet deficiencies in outdoor recreation assets where the level of provision and/or quality falls below established targets.
- c) The City will proactively reinvest in the City's existing outdoor recreation assets by developing and implementing a sustainable planned program of upgrades in accordance with a ten year capital plan.
- d) Logical phasing and orderly development of outdoor recreational assets will be considered in an attempt to reduce capital/financing requirements, benefit existing programming, and improve the safety, comfort, and enjoyment of users during any construction work.
- e) Existing outdoor recreation assets that are not meeting current community and/or City-wide needs (and not expected to meet future needs) may be considered for "re-purposing" to a more appropriate recreational use. Changes in the type of asset provision will be carefully considered in light of geographic distribution, potential gaps, and impacts on the City's ability to address the needs of the broader community.

Implications:

The City's *Outdoor Recreation Facilities & Sport Field Provision Plan* must look at the long-term and unique needs of each community and establish an appropriate implementation plan.

With justification, existing outdoor recreation assets may be altered, re-purposed, or replaced with something that better meets the needs of neighbourhood residents and the overall broader community. These changes must be in compliance with higher-level policies such as the Official Plan.

The installation of lights and irrigation/drainage to playing fields will be considered as one way to maximize value to the community. Fields in Neighbourhood Parks will not be candidates for lighting.

A 10-year Capital Plan with identified annual operating impacts should be maintained to identify anticipated expenditures on outdoor recreational assets.

If the cost of replacing an asset is greater than the cost to renovate, but the new construction includes added benefits or features, these benefits should be taken into account in the analysis.

In deciding whether it is better to renovate or replace an asset, consideration should be given to whether or not effective design is constrained by existing configurations and whether or not the benefit of any renovation or upgrades will be desirable and cost effective to operate and maintain.

Principle #5

Ensure Appropriate Provision Levels

Directions:

- a) Using various mechanisms, the City will acquire and/or secure sufficient parkland to accommodate needed outdoor recreation assets; efforts will be made to locate these assets within the community in which they are required, recognizing that this will not always be possible or feasible.
- b) The City will establish provision targets for outdoor recreation assets (e.g., one facility for every “x” population) to define City-wide and community-specific needs, both current and future.
- c) In addressing deficiencies in the provision of outdoor recreation assets, priority will be given to areas that are currently the most disadvantaged in terms of asset type and existing provision levels and/or maintenance quality.
- d) In communities where the level of provision and quality of outdoor recreation assets are adequate, the City will make efforts to maintain existing levels. Any enhancements will be based upon justified community need and will be consistent with overall City policies and priorities.
- e) The City will seek to accommodate emerging activities and sports within the recreational system, where needs are justified.
- f) To the greatest extent possible, the City will provide an equitable distribution of outdoor recreation assets for all field sport users and all citizens in general. Assets that are typically provided in City-wide Parks and one-of-a-kind City-serving assets may not be equitably distributed, but sited to best meet the greatest community need and/or to reflect a unique feature.

Implications:

The establishment of provision targets for outdoor recreation assets may require adjustments to the City’s capital and annual operating budget.

Areas deemed to be the most disadvantaged (in terms of existing provision and maintenance quality levels) will be given a priority for municipal funds and investment over moderately serviced areas.

Each community in Hamilton may have different needs and hence may be a higher or lower priority for additional investments in outdoor recreational assets.

Opportunities for citizens to engage in new or expanding activities, as well as activities that are now played year-round (such as soccer), will be investigated.

The development of a Parkland Acquisition Strategy is required to identify parkland needs, options, and strategies for accommodating new outdoor recreation assets.

More detailed studies (e.g., feasibility studies, park master plans) are recommended prior to any major construction or renovation project in order to determine the most appropriate mix of space and function.

Principle #6

Ensure Appropriate Maintenance Levels

Directions:

- a) The City will strive to ensure that outdoor recreation assets are maintained in a safe condition (compliant with legislation and liability requirements) that is appropriate for the level of usage they receive.
- b) The use of environmentally-friendly maintenance practices will be promoted.
- c) The City will discourage the over-use of sports fields (to mitigate field deterioration and improve playability) through the use of appropriate mechanisms and practices.
- d) The City will regularly evaluate its grass-cutting schedule and practices to ensure that there is an appropriate balance between user needs and available resources.

Implications:

Outdoor recreation assets will not be built unless the City has a funding plan to adequately maintain them.

Consideration should be given to creating a link between revenue generated from field rentals and the administrative and field maintenance budgets.

The City will monitor the use of sports fields and establish standards and procedures to control against overuse.

Greater compliance with the City's rules regarding field usage (e.g., permitted uses only, prohibition of use during and after inclement weather, etc.) is required to maintain safe field conditions.

Grass cutting is a major aspect of field maintenance and specific activities require specific surface treatments. An evaluation of the City's grass-cutting could result in changes to staff deployment and management, and potentially staff resources. Greater communication with user groups may also be required to enhance their understanding of the rationale for City maintenance practices.

Principle #7

Engage the Community & Recognize our Differences

Directions:

- a) The City will engage the public in decisions affecting outdoor recreation assets located in parks within their community.
- b) The City will respect the different outdoor recreation needs and expectations that may exist between Hamilton's various geographic communities, including (but not limited to) residents in rural and urban areas.
- c) When making decisions relating to capital investment and service delivery, the City will recognize and consider the many ways that outdoor recreation assets located in parks can have a positive impact on community revitalization.
- d) The City will encourage leisure activities and events that build an awareness and understanding of a variety of cultures and foster pride within the community.

Implications:

The mix and design of outdoor recreation assets within neighbourhood parks will represent the unique needs of the local area, to the greatest extent possible.

The City will engage the community and user groups in outdoor sport field and recreation asset planning.

The City should establish policies and procedures to respond to proposals from user groups proposing to take over the operation of outdoor sport fields and recreation assets.

Principle #8

Implement Designs that are Flexible, Accessible & Appropriate

Directions:

- a) Outdoor recreation assets will be built to durable standards and will be designed in such a way as to be repaired or replaced in the most cost effective manner.
- b) To the extent possible and feasible, the City will provide outdoor recreational assets within parks that are safe and accessible to everyone regardless of physical limitations. The City will move towards barrier-free design and compliance with *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act* (“AODA”) standards.
- c) To the degree possible, outdoor recreation assets will be flexibility designed (e.g., multi-use) to accommodate a wide range of sporting, leisure, cultural, health, wellness, and social activities.
- d) Emerging technologies and promising design practices/standards will be examined for their ability to meet long-term needs in the City.
- e) The City will strive to mitigate conflicts and incompatibilities between outdoor recreation assets and surrounding community uses.
- f) The City will take into consideration “Green” design principles that will assist in reducing environmental impacts and in realizing operating cost efficiencies over the long-term.
- g) Outdoor recreation assets will have appropriate signage so that they are easily recognized as belonging to the City of Hamilton.

Implications:

Standards for the design and supply of outdoor recreation assets that are appropriate for each park type (Neighbourhood Parks, Community Parks, and City-wide Parks) will be identified.

Technologies like artificial turf will be considered.

Capital projects should include barrier-free design specifications, in-line with current accessibility targets. The cost of asset construction / refurbishment may increase as a result of AODA compliance.

Funds may need to be allocated to upgrading existing outdoor recreation assets to meet the standards of the AODA.

When providing community-level outdoor recreation assets, consideration will be given to installing components that support their use, such as washrooms, parking, signage, fountains, storage, etc.

Opportunities to enhance walkability and transportation options should also be considered when identifying locations for outdoor recreation assets.

SECTION 4 COMMUNITY PROFILE

4.1 Overview

Hamilton is a community of communities, formed as a single-tier municipality on January 1, 2001 through the amalgamation of the Towns of Ancaster, Dundas and Flamborough, the Township of Glanbrook, and the Cities of Hamilton and Stoney Creek. In order to identify the specific needs of current and future residents, it is essential to understand and integrate important demographic factors such as age composition, population projections, household income and education.


This Study looks at the population characteristics of Hamilton as a whole, as well as those of the communities within to assist in understanding both city-wide and more local needs. For the purposes of this Study, Hamilton is divided into nine (9) communities defined by the geographic areas illustrated on Map 1 (see Attachment I). This approach and the data presented in this section are consistent with the City of Hamilton's *Use, Renovation and Replacement Study for Hamilton (Indoor) Recreation and Public-Use Facilities (2008)*. These planning communities were chosen based on a combination of factors, most important of which is that they are generally bounded by major physical barriers (e.g., escarpment, highways) that can restrict accessibility to recreation areas.

The data provided in this section is based on Statistics Canada Census Data for 2001 and 2006, population forecasts provided by the City of Hamilton, and information from the documents included in the background review.

4.2 Historic and Projected Population Figures


Population forecasts provided by the Province anticipate that Hamilton's population will grow to 660,190 in 2031, representing an increase of approximately 139,600 residents between 2010 and 2031.

The figure to the right identifies the historic growth in the City's population from 1981 to 2006 and the latest growth forecasts between 2006 and 2031 (the projections are subject to change as new data becomes available). The chart shows that Hamilton has seen steady growth over the past 20 years and continued growth is anticipated at an even faster rate.



Source: Statistics Canada Census Data 1981, 1991, 2001, 2006 – excluding undercount; and City of Hamilton, 2007 (GRIDS).

The following figures present the current and forecast population for the communities within Hamilton. The former Cities of Hamilton (Mountain and Lower) and Stoney Creek (Upper and Lower) are the most populated, comprising 75% of the total population of the City of Hamilton. The rural communities of Glanbrook and Beverly have the lowest population and are the only communities with fewer than 20,000 residents.




Population Forecast by Community – City of Hamilton, 2006-2031

Community	Population	Forecast Population**					Change 2006-2031	
	2006*	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031	Total	%
Ancaster	29,230	33,251	37,505	38,935	38,817	39,042	9,812	34%
Beverly	17,675	18,717	18,311	19,628	19,599	19,527	1,852	11%
Flamborough	23,340	23,594	26,513	34,370	37,875	37,771	14,431	62%
Glanbrook	13,729	15,782	21,511	25,757	29,075	28,985	15,256	111%
Hamilton Mountain	151,171	151,817	152,654	161,606	161,176	167,065	15,894	11%
Lower Hamilton	133,855	139,972	137,485	144,436	144,138	155,001	21,146	16%
Lower Stoney Creek	75,585	81,025	89,844	91,182	92,486	95,233	19,648	26%
Upper Stoney Creek	20,470	23,295	29,584	34,943	57,556	72,336	51,866	253%
West Hamilton/ Dundas	39,415	43,927	43,009	44,153	44,047	45,229	5,814	15%
TOTAL Hamilton	504,470	531,381	556,014	595,011	624,770	660,190	155,720	31%


*Source: Adapted from: Statistics Canada, Population of Census Tracts (100% Data), Cat. No. 97-551-X2006007, 2006 Census – undercount excluded.

**Source: City of Hamilton, 2007 (GRIDS).



*Source: Adapted from: Statistics Canada, Population of Census Tracts (100% Data), Cat. No. 97-551-X2006007, 2006 Census – undercount excluded.

**Source: City of Hamilton, 2007 (GRIDS).



*Source: Adapted from: Statistics Canada, Population of Census Tracts (100% Data), Cat. No. 97-551-X2006007, 2006 Census – undercount excluded.

**Source: City of Hamilton, 2007 (GRIDS).

The two communities with the largest populations, Hamilton Mountain and Lower Hamilton, will continue to be the most populated areas. In terms of growth rates, Upper Stoney Creek will undergo significant increases in its population by 2026. Stable growth rates are forecasted for Hamilton Mountain and Lower Hamilton, while Glanbrook and Flamborough's growth rates will begin to slow by 2016. The forecast population by community is illustrated on Map 3 (see Attachment I).



In terms of population density, in 2006 both Lower Hamilton and Hamilton Mountain had levels of 27 persons per hectare (pph), followed by Lower Stoney Creek (15pph), West Hamilton/Dundas (13pph), Ancaster (8pph), and the remaining areas being 3pph or lower.

Current (2009) Estimated Population by Community

Community	2009 Population (estimated)	Community	2009 Population (estimated)
Ancaster	31,643	Lower Hamilton	137,525
Beverly	18,300	Lower Stoney Creek	78,849
Flamborough	23,492	Upper Stoney Creek	22,165
Glanbrook	14,961	West Hamilton/ Dundas	42,122
Hamilton Mountain	151,559	TOTAL Hamilton	520,617


Source: Monteith Brown Planning Consultants (straight line interpolation between unadjusted 2006 Census population and 2011 population estimate (City of Hamilton, 2007 - GRIDS))

4.3 Growth Strategy

In accordance with Provincial planning policy and the *Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe*, Hamilton's growing population will be accommodated through intensification and redevelopment of existing urban areas and, where necessary, new development through urban expansion. The City's Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (GRIDS, 2007) process identified and evaluated a series of urban structure growth options to accommodate the anticipated population and employment growth and development over the next 30 years. GRIDS was one of the key background documents to the City's new Urban Official Plan (currently awaiting ministerial approval).

The following figure illustrates Hamilton's preferred growth option identified through the GRIDS process (which has been implemented through the new Urban Official Plan). The City's future growth is based on an urban structure comprised of a series of nodes and corridors as well as vacant land areas within the existing urban areas and some urban expansions. This model accommodates the planned development of 80,000 new housing units as required to address anticipated population growth to 2031. Of these new housing units, 26,500 new units would occur through residential intensification, 31,900 units on vacant lands within the existing urban boundary and 21,600 units through urban boundary expansion. The populations accommodated by each of these types of housing development will affect the demands on existing outdoor recreation facilities and services as well as the need for additional leisure infrastructure in various locations.

City of Hamilton GRIDS (2007) – Preferred Growth Option



Source: City of Hamilton, 2007.

The growth strategy targets a vibrant, compact, transit-supportive form of development that facilitates the efficient delivery of social services and efficient use of existing infrastructure. Nodes are described as “community hubs” accommodating mixed land use; the location and planned function of these nodes is a key consideration in planning the future of the City’s recreation facilities and potential locations for new facilities. Intensification corridors are also envisaged to contain a range of land uses, including institutional and recreation uses to serve the increased housing densities planned for these areas. In addition to the nodes and corridors, the location of vacant lands within the existing urban area and planned urban expansion areas also need to be carefully considered in relation to future recreation facility provision.

4.4 Age Composition

Age can be a significant factor in determining what kinds of recreation facilities and services are needed – lower age groups tend to partake in more physically active forms of recreation while the propensity to participate in more passive activities tends to increase as a person ages. The older adult (residents 55 years of age or older) population is generally more likely to participate in cultural activities, such as live theatre and art galleries.

Based on the population projections, the percentage of Hamilton’s population age 60 or greater is expected to increase from 20% in 2006 to 31% in 2031, for a total growth of 107,500 in the “seniors” age category. These increases in the older adult/senior population will trigger a greater demand for passive forms of leisure opportunities and passive park spaces. It is anticipated that the majority of the “new seniors” will pursue their leisure interest and will focus on ‘active living’ as opposed to traditional ‘senior activities’. This group will be more active than previous generations and will wish to participate in many of the same activities they did at an earlier age, albeit at a gentler pace. However, demands for traditional senior activities will also continue to increase as the number of seniors over 80 continues to climb.


The following figures illustrate the current and projected age composition of Hamilton’s population by five year cohort.

Population Forecast by Age – City of Hamilton, 2006-2031

Age	2006	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031	Change 2006-2031	
							Total	%
0-9	56,388	56,216	58,926	63,568	66,290	67,056	10,668	19%
10-19	68,441	65,682	61,025	61,905	65,528	71,286	2,845	4%
20-49	212,243	214,051	213,444	221,165	228,467	240,127	27,884	13%
50-59	67,952	78,803	86,222	84,641	76,172	74,742	6,790	10%
60+	99,446	116,627	136,398	163,730	188,312	206,978	107,532	108%
TOTAL	504,470	531,381	556,014	595,011	624,770	660,190	155,720	31%

Totals may not add due to rounding.

Sources: 2006 data adapted from: Statistics Canada, Population of Census Tracts (100% Data), Cat. No. 97-551-X2006007, 2006 Census. Projections: City of Hamilton, 2007 (GRIDS).



Sources: 2006 data adapted from: Statistics Canada, Population of Census Tracts (100% Data), Cat. No. 97-551-X2006007, 2006 Census. Projections: City of Hamilton, 2007 (GRIDS).

Consistent with trends across the Province, Hamilton’s population will continue to age over the next 20-25 years as the ‘baby boom’ generation reaches retirement. The age profile and magnitude of the aging trend of Hamilton’s population closely mirror those of Ontario as a whole.

Age Profile of Population as a Percentage of Total Population, Hamilton and Ontario, 2001 & 2006

Age	HAMILTON			ONTARIO		
	2001*	2006	Change	2001*	2006	Change
0-4 years	5.8%	5.3%	-0.5%	5.9%	5.5%	-0.4%
5-9 years	13.4%	5.8%	-1.0%	13.7%	5.9%	-1.1%
10-14 years		6.6%			6.7%	
15-19 years	6.8%	6.9%	+0.1%	6.7%	6.9%	+0.2%
20-24 years	6.5%	6.8%	+0.3%	6.3%	6.6%	+0.3%
25-29 years		6.0%			6.1%	
30-34 years	29.8%	6.1%	-2.6%	30.8%	6.5%	-2.4%
35-39 years		6.9%			7.3%	
40-44 years		8.2%			8.5%	
45-49 years		8.1%			8.2%	
50-54 years	14.0%	7.2%	+1.3%	14.3%	7.1%	+1.0%
55-59 years		6.3%			6.4%	
60-64 years	9.3%	4.8%	+1.8%	9.3%	4.8%	+1.9%
65-69 years		3.9%			3.8%	
70-74 years	7.7%	3.5%	-0.3%	7.2%	3.3%	-0.1%
75-79 years		3.2%			2.8%	
80-84 years	5.2%	2.5%	+0.5%	4.4%	2.1%	+0.5%
85+	1.4%	1.8%	+0.4%	1.3%	1.6%	+0.3%


SOURCE: Statistics Canada, Census of Population 2001 and 2006 – undercount excluded.

*Note – Population data not provided for all 5-year age cohorts in 2001 census.

Changes in the population of the younger age groups will be much more subtle. The projections anticipate an increase in the number of children (age 5 to 9) and youth (age 10 to 19), but as a percentage of total population this group will decline from 19% to 16%. While the stable numbers in this age group suggest that the volume of children and youth activities in Hamilton will not see significant increases in demand in the future (unless participation rates increase), it is anticipated that new and different recreation facilities will be needed to accommodate a greater diversity of interests among children and youth.

The number of adults age 20-49 in Hamilton will see modest increases, with an overall growth of nearly 28,000 new residents in this age group by 2031, but will decrease as a percentage of total population from 42% to 36%. The bulk of this increase will occur in those between the ages of 30 and 49, while the total number of young adults age 20 to 29 and older adults age 50-54 will remain relatively stable. It is anticipated that the demands for adult recreational programs and activities in Hamilton will increase both in volume and diversity.

The following chart illustrates the age distribution of Hamilton’s current and forecast population among the children (0-9), youth (10-19), adults (20-49), older adults (50-59) and seniors (60+) age categories.




Sources: 2006 data adapted from: Statistics Canada, Population of Census Tracts (100% Data), Cat. No. 97-551-X2006007, 2006 Census – undercount excluded. Projections based on data provided by City of Hamilton (2007 - GRIDS), modified by Monteith Brown Planning Consultants.

Student Projections

The Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board (HWDSB) and Hamilton-Wentworth District Catholic School Board (HWDCSB) prepare detailed projections of student enrolment as part of their ongoing student and school planning initiatives. These forecasts consider a number of different factors and tend to be very accurate predictors of children and youth populations in the years to come. This information is presented in this section not to contradict the data in the previous section, but rather to identify an overall trendline for the youth population.

The following graph shows elementary and secondary school enrolment projections for the HWDSB. Overall, between the current school year (2008/09) and 2018/19, a 13.1% reduction in the number of students (generally ages 4 to 18) is projected (representing 6,557 youth). This decline is most noticeable at the secondary school level (a 21.5% reduction, compared to 8.3% at elementary schools).




Source: Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board, Capital Plan Update 2009 Data Sheets

The HWDSB also provides forecasts by secondary school clusters. All secondary schools are expected to see enrolment decline over the next ten years, with the exception of Saltfleet High School (drawing from the Upper Stoney Creek / Glanbrook communities), for which a 49% increase is projected. Elementary schools in the Saltfleet catchment area are also expected to see an increase (36%); other elementary school areas where increased enrolment is projected include: Westdale – 10% (drawing from the West Hamilton/Dundas and Lower Hamilton communities); Waterdown – 5% (drawing from the Flamborough area); Ancaster – 4% (drawing from the Ancaster and Glanbrook communities); Orchard Park – 3% (drawing from the Lower Stoney Creek area); and Sir Allan MacNab – 3% (drawing from the Hamilton Mountain and Glanbrook communities).

Comparative data for the HWDCSB has not been made available, although it is expected that the Catholic School Board will experience similar negative enrolment trends as the Public School Board (although possibly not the same degree).

Age Composition by Community

The following chart shows the age composition for each of the nine communities within Hamilton based on 2006 Census data obtained from Statistics Canada; more detail can be found in Attachment III. Maps 2 to 2E (see Attachment I) illustrate the geographic distribution of Hamilton's current population for each age category.



Source: Adapted from: Statistics Canada, Population of Census Tracts (100% Data), Cat. No. 97-551-X2006007, 2006 Census – undercount excluded.

As a percentage of population by community, Upper Stoney Creek and Flamborough have proportionally the most children and youth. Of the nearly 125,000 children and youth who live in Hamilton, approximately 30% live in the Hamilton Mountain area and nearly 25% live in Lower Hamilton. The West Hamilton/Dundas, Glanbrook, Lower Hamilton, Lower Stoney Creek and Beverly communities have proportionally fewer children than the city-wide and provincial averages; Glanbrook and Beverly also have the fewest children as a percentage of the Hamilton total (these areas are also the least populated overall). Lower Hamilton, Lower Stoney Creek, West Hamilton/Dundas and Glanbrook have proportionally fewer youth than the city-wide and provincial averages.

Lower Hamilton (46%) and Lower Stoney Creek (45%) have the highest proportion of adults as a percentage of their own population; Beverly (38%), Glanbrook (38%) and Ancaster (38%) have the lowest proportion of adults. As a percentage of the city total, the majority of adults live in Lower Hamilton (29%) and Hamilton Mountain (29%).

Beverly (16%) and Ancaster (15%) have the most 'older adults' age 50-59 as a percentage of their population while the remaining communities generally have similar proportions of adults

ranging from 13-14% of their total population. Hamilton Mountain (28%) and Lower Hamilton (26%) have the greatest number of older adults in the City.

Glanbrook (24%), West Hamilton/Dundas (23%) and Lower Stoney Creek (22%) show proportionately more seniors than other communities, while only 11% of Upper Stoney Creek's population is age of 60 and over compared to nearly 20% for Hamilton as a whole.

In order to anticipate changes to the age composition of each of the 9 communities over the next 25 years, a cohort survival model was developed to produce forecasted age cohorts using the 2006 census age composition by census tract as a base (census undercount excluded). This aging of the existing population was combined with the forecast population numbers by community derived from the GRIDS analysis (2007) by the City to arrive at an age distribution by community for each of the forecast years including 2011, 2016, 2021, 2026 and 2031. These results are summarized at the end of this section and can be found in Attachment III.

4.5 Income

Research suggests that participation in recreational activities is directly influenced by income, with a higher degree of participation associated with higher levels of income and greater barriers to participation associated with lower levels of income.

Based solely on recreation trends related to income, areas with higher incomes generally have greater means of accessing and participating in recreation and also express significantly higher expectations for both the quality and quantity of recreation facilities, compared to the level of accessibility and expectations in lower income communities. Lower-income areas face greater barriers to participation in recreational activities due to costs such as user fees, equipment costs and lack of transportation choices/mobility. While subsidies are often available to assist lower income households in gaining access to recreational facilities and park activities, there are barriers to the use of the subsidies themselves such as the stigma associated with the process of applying for financial assistance as well as the lack of awareness/communication of subsidies available, eligibility, and how to participate. In addition, subsidies typically address only one component of the cost of the program or activity (i.e., user fees) while the total cost is often affected by other factors such as equipment, transportation, etc.

The City's *2005 Social and Health Issues Report* indicates that, compared to Ontario, a substantially higher proportion of the population in the City of Hamilton live below the low income cut-off (18.8% in the City of Hamilton vs. 13.6% in Ontario) and that this is true for all age groups, but is worse for those aged 75 years or older (28.3% in Hamilton vs. 17.7% in Ontario).

The following table illustrates the prevalence of persons with low income status by community. This has been calculated from rounded counts of low income persons or families by community and the total number of persons or families living within those communities. There is significant variation across the City; the prevalence of low-income persons in Lower Hamilton is more than double than anywhere else in the City. Other communities with a high prevalence are Hamilton Mountain, Lower Stoney Creek and West Hamilton/Dundas.

Percentage of Low Income Residents by Community

Area	% of Low Income Residents
Ancaster	4.4%
Beverly	3.7%
Flamborough	4.7%
Glanbrook	3.3%
Hamilton Mountain	12.0%
Lower Hamilton	25.0%
Lower Stoney Creek	12.3%
Upper Stoney Creek	7.8%
West Hamilton/Dundas	12.1%
City of Hamilton	13.8%

Source: Statistics Canada, Census (2006)

Typically the recreational demands in lower-income areas are for unstructured, low cost, drop-in type programs/activities. Low income families also traditionally rely more heavily on the municipality to meet their recreational requirements as they have less ability to pay to join private organizations or clubs. Consideration of free program opportunities is one way to offset the impacts of low income on opportunities for participation. Greater communication of low-cost/free programs, facilities available, and subsidies is also a way to increase participation of lower-income households.

4.6 Community Diversity

Many municipalities in Ontario and particularly the Greater Golden Horseshoe Area are experiencing increased diversity in the ethnic composition of their populations as new Canadians choose the region for its economic and social supports. While research has shown that immigrants in Hamilton generally want to assimilate into traditional Canadian programs, sports and activities, greater program diversity and facility design that is sensitive to the needs of culturally/ethnically diverse populations are increasingly important considerations in providing equal opportunities for participation.

In 2006, 75% of Hamilton residents were Canadian-born (compared to 72% for Ontario) and 25% were immigrants born outside of Canada (compared to 28% for Ontario). In the 5 years since the previous census, Hamilton's foreign-born population has decreased very slightly (by 0.4%).

The following table shows the number of immigrants as a percentage of the population in each of the nine communities. Lower Stoney Creek, Hamilton Mountain and Lower Hamilton have the most residents born outside of Canada in absolute terms by a significant margin. As a percentage of the population, Lower Stoney Creek has the greatest proportion of immigrants (35%), while Flamborough and Beverly have the lowest (13% and 15%, respectively).

Number of Immigrants as a Percent of Total Population by Community (2006)

Community	# of Immigrants	% of Population
Ancaster	6,115	21%
Beverly	2,600	15%
Flamborough	3,075	13%
Glanbrook	2,855	21%
Hamilton Mountain	39,815	26%
Lower Hamilton	31,315	23%
Lower Stoney Creek	26,775	35%
Upper Stoney Creek	4,270	21%
West Hamilton / Dundas	8,720	22%
City of Hamilton Total	125,540	25%

SOURCE: *Statistics Canada, Census (2006)*.

Another ethnic variable to consider is language. As of 2006, 73% of Hamilton's population spoke English as the mother tongue, as compared to the provincial average of 68%. In Hamilton, 25.5% of the population speaks a primary language that is neither English nor French, compared to 27.2% in Ontario.

The census also assesses languages spoken most often at home within households, which is another strong indicator of community diversity. Understanding these statistics also assists with foreseeing language barriers that could emerge at parks and community facilities. The following table displays the total population within each community that speaks a language other than English or French most often at home.

Population Speaking a Non-Official Language at Home

Community	#	%
Ancaster	1,895	7%
Beverly	470	3%
Flamborough	535	2%
Glanbrook	515	3%
Hamilton Mountain	19,530	13%
Lower Hamilton	17,080	13%
Lower Stoney Creek	16,495	22%
Upper Stoney Creek	2,055	10%
West Hamilton/Dundas	3,140	8%
City of Hamilton Total	61,715	12.5%

SOURCE: *Statistics Canada, Census (2006)*.

4.7 Summary – Profile of Hamilton Communities

Based on the preceding information and analysis provided in this section, the 9 communities defined for the purposes of this Study can be characterized as follows:

Ancaster

The community of Ancaster, situated on the west side of the City of Hamilton, has a 2006 population of 29,230. Population projections indicate that Ancaster will grow by 33.6% over the next 25 years, with the strongest growth occurring between 2006 and 2016. Significant growth will be in the 60 years or older age cohort. Declines will occur in the youth population, particularly after 2016. Residents in Ancaster have high average family incomes, as well as the highest levels of education attainment.

Beverly

With a 2006 population of 17,675, the predominantly rural community of Beverly has one of the lowest populations in Hamilton. With no urban settlement areas designated within its boundary, Beverly has a projected growth rate of only 11% over the next 25 years. Most of the growth will occur in the 60 years of age or older cohort. A higher percentage of Beverly residents have trades certificates/diplomas (compared to the City average), while the average family income is the third highest among the nine study areas.

Flamborough

Flamborough has a 2006 population of 23,340. Located on the north end of the City, Flamborough is largely a rural community. The City's population projections suggest that moderate growth will occur in the next 25 years, with the majority of growth between 2011 and 2016 in the Waterdown area, although timing is highly dependent upon transportation and servicing factors. Population growth will stabilize after 2016. Flamborough currently has a young population profile, but this is anticipated to shift after 2016. This community has the second highest average family income in the City of Hamilton matched with high levels of education attainment.

Glanbrook

Glanbrook is a predominantly rural community in Hamilton with a population of 13,729 in 2006. The largest settlement area in this area is Binbrook. Located in the south end of Hamilton, Glanbrook will experience strong growth in the Binbrook area that will result in a doubling of the community's population by 2031. However, population growth will stabilize after 2016. Current age cohort data and future projections both indicate that Glanbrook has and will continue to have an older population profile. It is anticipated that the 60 and older age group will represent that largest portion of the growth in the community over the coming years. Family income levels are slightly above the City average and the area has the highest percentage of residents with trades certificates/diplomas.

Hamilton Mountain

Hamilton Mountain has a 2006 population of 151,171 and is the largest community in this regard. Population forecasts identify a lower growth rate in this community than the other 8 communities. While the growth rate is lower, the total number of additional residents in the community will be significant. Over 16,000 additional residents will locate in Hamilton Mountain with much of this growth occurring in the 60 and older age group. Family income levels are slightly below the City average and the area's education profile is similar to the rest of the City. Of the nine planning communities, Hamilton Mountain has the largest number of immigrants (39,815), which accounts for 26% of its population.

Lower Hamilton

Lower Hamilton has the second largest population (133,855) and will experience moderate growth over the next 25 years, primarily through intensification and redevelopment. Population projections anticipate a growth rate of 16% in this area between 2006 and 2031 with much of the added population being 60 years of age or older. Lower Hamilton has the lowest average family income in the City at \$49,603 and the greatest percentage of residents with less than a high school degree. Of the nine planning communities, Lower Hamilton has the second-largest number foreign born residents (31,315), which translates into 23% of its population.

Lower Stoney Creek

Lower Stoney Creek is a medium sized community with a population of 75,585 and is located on the east side of the City. Population growth of 26% is forecast for this community between 2006 and 2031. The percentage of residents between the ages of 20 and 49 will level off by 2016, but the number of older adults will continue to increase. This area has one of the largest concentrations of foreign-born residents (26,775), accounting for 35% of its population. Family income levels are slightly below the City average, while the area's education profile is similar to the rest of the City.

Upper Stoney Creek

Upper Stoney Creek has a 2006 population of 20,470. This community will have the largest growth rate in the City at 253% over the next 25 years (an average of 10% per year). Rapid growth will occur in the 60 plus age group, with this segment of the population growing by 800%. The growth rate in Upper Stoney Creek will peak in 2026. The income and education levels of residents in Upper Stoney Creek are generally representative of City averages.

West Hamilton/Dundas

The community of West Hamilton/Dundas is an established medium-sized urban community of 39,415 with a projected growth rate of 15% between 2006 and 2031. The older adult population represents the largest portion of the population. Growth in this age group will continue, but peaks in 2026. West Hamilton/Dundas has the highest education attainment in the City with 39% of residents having either a University Diploma or Degree. The high education levels are matched with above-average household incomes.

SECTION 5 CONSULTATION SUMMARY

5.1 Overview

Fundamental to developing the *City of Hamilton Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan* is the comprehensive public consultation program. Phase I included the following consultation elements:

- A random sample household telephone survey (800 responses across the entire City) to gather statistically significant data on participation patterns, outdoor facility needs, barriers to use, willingness to travel, priorities for future facility and park improvements, etc.
- A web-based field user group survey (67 responses received) open to organizations involved in the use or programming of the City's outdoor sports fields to obtain input on past, current and anticipated participation numbers, field usage, needs, priorities and other issues.
- Stakeholder focus groups (7) with key organizations and user groups to obtain more detailed information on outdoor recreation and sports field related issues. The focus groups were divided into Soccer (2 sessions), Baseball (2 sessions), Other Rectangular Field Users (football, lacrosse, cricket, and rugby), Cultural Groups with a focus on operating festivals and special events, and Club focussed user groups (tennis, bocce, lawn bowling, skateboarding).
- Public Information Sessions (7) open to the general public, with the aim of creating awareness about the Study, reviewing the draft Guiding Principles, and identifying localized issues, needs and priorities.
- Key informant interviews with several key agencies (e.g., Public and Separate School Boards), members of City Council, and several City staff from affected departments. Additional external interviews with key service providers and potential partners were also scheduled during Phase II of the Study.

This section provides a summary of the input obtained through the consultation initiatives completed during Phase I of the Study.

5.2 Household Survey

Overview

To assist in the preparation of this Study, a statistically significant household telephone survey of Hamilton residents was undertaken between March 17 and April 6, 2009. This section presents a summary of the principal findings of this survey.

The total number of respondents was 800, which provides a confidence of $\pm 3.5\%$, 19 times out of 20 for a population size representative of the City of Hamilton. The sample was randomly drawn within the census subdivision of the City.

The survey collected information on usage of and attitudes toward various aspects of parks and outdoor recreation in the City. Specific areas of interest included facility usage, evaluation, barriers to participation, and facility needs and preferences.

The survey results have also been reported based on the geographic location of the responding household, as defined by their self-reported postal code (forward sortation area). These areas are generally aligned with the planning communities used in this Study and include:

- Ancaster
- Beverly/Flamborough/Glanbrook (these areas were unable to be separated out as they share a common forward sortation area due to their rural location)
- Hamilton Mountain
- Lower Hamilton
- Lower Stoney Creek
- Upper Stoney Creek
- West Hamilton / Dundas

The sampling error for each of these sub-geographic areas is larger than that of the entire City-wide sample (which is $\pm 3.5\%$, 19 times out of 20) due to the lower number of responses. As a result, the community-specific data must be interpreted with caution, recognizing that – when comparing two or more areas – a larger spread in the data is required in order to maintain statistical reliability. Instances of significant differences (i.e., those with a 95% confidence interval) have been specifically identified in the text.

Key findings from the household survey are identified below. Attachment II contains the full survey data, as well as a copy of the survey.

Participation and Facility Usage

Respondents were asked if anyone in their household had visited a City of Hamilton park in the past 12 months. **70%** of households **had** visited a City park, and **30%** of households **had not** visited a City of Hamilton park in the past 12 months.

The following table shows the percentage of households visiting a City of Hamilton park in the past 12 months for each community within Hamilton:


Community	Margin of Error (+/-)	% using City parks
Ancaster	13.1%	79%
Beverly/Flamborough/Glanbrook	11.5%	68%
Hamilton Mountain	6.4%	73%
Lower Hamilton	7.3%	68%
Lower Stoney Creek	9.8%	63%
Upper Stoney Creek	17.9%	93%
West Hamilton / Dundas	10.0%	73%
City of Hamilton	3.5%	70%

- Households in Upper Stoney Creek were more likely to have visited a park in the past 12 months than households in Lower Stoney Creek.

Respondents whose household's had visited a City of Hamilton park were then asked what outdoor recreation and park facilities their household had *used* during the past 12 months.

- The most common response was **playgrounds**, with **43%** of respondents saying their household had used these facilities.
- **34%** of survey respondents said their household had used **park washrooms** in the past 12 months
- **23%** of survey respondents said their household used shallow water **wading pools**
- **22%** of households said they had used **soccer fields**, and
- **21%** of households said they had used an **outdoor ice rink** in the past 12 months.

Percentage of households using the City's outdoor recreation & park facilities within the past year



- Overall, households who had annual incomes of \$80,000 or more were more likely to have used a City of Hamilton park in the past 12 months than those who made \$60,000 a year or less.

- More specifically, households who used playgrounds and soccer fields were more likely to make at least \$80,000 per year than those who did not, and those who used hardball, softball, or slo-pitch diamonds were more likely to make \$60,000 or less per year.
- Households with children were also more likely to have visited a City park than households without children, including playgrounds, soccer fields, ball diamonds, splash pads, and multi-use courts.

The following table shows the percentages of respondents from each community that used playgrounds, park washrooms, wading pools, soccer fields, and outdoor ice rinks:

Percentage of households using City facilities in the past 12 months						
Community	Margin of Error (+/-)	Park Playgrounds	Park Washrooms	Wading Pools	Soccer Fields	Outdoor Ice Rinks
Ancaster	13.1%	55%	36%	20%	38%	23%
Beverly/Flamborough/Glanbrook	11.5%	40%	29%	12%	23%	13%
Hamilton Mountain	6.4%	51%	30%	28%	23%	23%
Lower Hamilton	7.3%	34%	35%	23%	13%	16%
Lower Stoney Creek	9.8%	43%	46%	26%	23%	14%
Upper Stoney Creek	17.9%	62%	37%	22%	28%	11%
West Hamilton / Dundas	10.0%	33%	33%	17%	24%	40%
City of Hamilton	3.5%	43%	34%	23%	22%	21%

- Households in Upper Stoney Creek and Hamilton Mountain were more likely than households in West Hamilton/Dundas and Lower Hamilton to use playgrounds in the past 12 months.
- Households in Ancaster were more likely than households in Lower Hamilton to use soccer fields in the past 12 months.
- Households in West Hamilton / Dundas were more likely than households in every community other than Ancaster to use outdoor ice rinks in the past 12 months (note: the new artificial ice rink in Dundas Driving Park opened in 2008/09, which may have contributed to this finding).

Respondents were asked to rate the outdoor recreation and park facilities they used using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 meant *poor* and 5 meant *excellent*. Although the number of households participating in each activity varied significantly, the top three average ratings were for *lawn bowling greens* (4.54 out of 5), *outdoor bocce courts* (4.33 out of 5), *splash pads* (4.15 out of 5), *running tracks* (3.91 out of 5), and *outdoor ice rinks* (3.89 out of 5). *Park washrooms* received their poorest ratings. Due to the small response size for some activities, these results should be interpreted with caution.

Outdoor Recreation Facility	# of Households Using Facility	Average Rating (Out of 5)
Lawn bowling greens	14	4.54
Outdoor bocce courts	16	4.33
Splash pads	120	4.15
Running tracks	109	3.91
Outdoor ice rinks	116	3.89
Skateboard or bmx parks	29	3.78
Playgrounds	342	3.75
Softball, harball, or slo-pitch diamonds	119	3.74
Multi-use courts for basketball and ball hockey	99	3.73
Rugby fields	24	3.71
Wading pools (shallow water)	128	3.71
Football fields	98	3.70
Off-leash dog areas	96	3.67
Soccer fields	173	3.62
Tennis courts	63	3.61
Lacrosse fields	8	3.43
Cricket pitches	4	3.33
Park washrooms	192	3.17


Respondents who had used a *City playground, soccer field, softball, hardball, or slo-pitch diamond, splash pad, tennis court, or multi-use court for basketball and ball hockey* were asked further questions pertaining to their use of these facilities.

First, respondents were asked how often members of their household had visited each facility during last year's warm weather months (May to October). The results for each amenity are as follows:

Facility	Average Visits per Week for Households using these Facilities
Playgrounds	1.6
Soccer Fields	1.4
Softball, Hardball, or Slo-pitch Diamonds	1.3
Splash Pads	1.0
Tennis Courts	1.0
Multi-use Courts for Basketball and Ball Hockey	1.0

Respondents were then asked what mode of travel their household uses the most when they visit each park facility. *Walking* was the most popular mode of travel to *playgrounds* (70%) and *multi-use courts* (49%), whereas *driving* was the most popular mode of travel for *soccer fields* (64%), *softball, hardball, or slo-pitch diamonds* (63%), *splash pads* (50%), and *tennis courts* (47%).

Most common modes of transportation to various outdoor recreation facilities



Finally, respondents were asked how many minutes their household would normally be willing to travel to make regular use of each park amenity. Travel time would be measured according to each household's preferred mode of travel (walking, cycling, driving, etc.). The results for each facility are as follows:

Facility	Average Acceptable Travel Time for Households using these Facilities (minutes)
Softball, Hardball, or Slo-pitch Diamonds	15
Soccer Fields	14
Splash Pads	14
Tennis Courts	13
Multi-use Courts for Basketball and Ball Hockey	13
Playgrounds	12

Participants were asked if their household had been able to participate in outdoor recreational activities as often as they would like. **63%** of all respondents said they **were** able to participate as often as they would like, and **37%** of respondents said that they **were not** able to participate as often as they would like.

The following table shows the household responses for each community within Hamilton:

Percentage of households that are able to participate in outdoor recreational activities as often as they would like			
Community	Margin of Error (+/-)	Yes	No
Ancaster	13.1%	66%	34%
Beverly/Flamborough/Glanbrook	11.5%	60%	40%
Hamilton Mountain	6.4%	60%	40%
Lower Hamilton	7.3%	62%	38%
Lower Stoney Creek	9.8%	65%	35%
Upper Stoney Creek	17.9%	61%	39%
West Hamilton / Dundas	10.0%	70%	29%
City of Hamilton	3.5%	63%	37%

The main barrier to participating in parks and outdoor recreation activities was a lack of personal time (22% of all respondents or 56% of those households that are unable to participate as often as they would like); lack of time is the most common barrier in most other municipalities as well. 11% of all participants quoted "health problems/disability/age" as a reason for their reduced participation.

Barriers to Participation in Outdoor Recreation Activities	% of Entire Sample
Lack of personal time / Too busy	22%
Health problems / Disability / Age	11%
Lack of desired facilities or activity	2%
Lack of transportation / Facility is too far away	2%
Lack of Money / Too expensive	1%


Facility Preferences

Respondents were read a series of statements and asked to indicate their level of agreement with each one (using a scale of one to five where one meant *strongly disagree* and five meant *strongly agree*). When results incorporate the percentage of people who rated each statement with a four or a five (i.e. those who agreed or strongly agreed with each statement), the results are as follows:

- **75%** of survey respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that ***“providing outdoor sports fields and recreation amenities for adults is just as important as providing them for children and teens”***
- **70%** of households either agreed or strongly agreed that ***“there are sufficient parks and open spaces in your neighbourhood to suit the needs of your household”***
- **67%** of participants either agreed or strongly agreed that ***“park facilities and amenities that are older and not well used should be removed and replaced with open space or facilities and amenities that are in demand”***
- **60%** of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that ***“most of the City's outdoor park facilities and amenities are well-maintained”***
- **55%** of survey respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that ***“most of the City's outdoor park facilities and amenities are well-designed and laid out”***
- **54%** of households either agreed or strongly agreed that ***“most of the City's outdoor park facilities and amenities are in the right locations”***
- **51%** of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that ***“the needs of local residents should be given priority over tournaments and other occasional sporting events”***
- only **38%** of respondents either agreed or strongly agreed that ***“there is enough parking at most of the City's parks”***

The following chart displays the overall level of agreement for each statement. Individual ratings have been divided into three categories: Disagree (a rating of 1 or 2); Neutral (a rating of 3); and Agree (a rating of 4 or 5).

Respondents' attitudes towards outdoor recreation and parks



Survey participants were asked if they would prefer:

- a small park with only a few outdoor facilities and amenities that is close to your home, or
- a large park with many outdoor facilities and amenities that is farther away from your home.

65% of respondents said they would prefer a **small park** with fewer amenities that is **close** to their home. **24%** of respondents said they would prefer a **large park** with many outdoor facilities that is **farther away** from their home. **8%** of participants were **indifferent**, stating that it would depend on the situation, or that they would prefer a little bit of both.

The following table shows the household responses for each community within Hamilton:

Community	Margin of Error (+/-)	Small park that is close to home	Large park that is further away from home	A little of both / Depends
Ancaster	13.1%	59%	29%	13%
Beverly/Flamborough/Glanbrook	11.5%	74%	25%	1%
Hamilton Mountain	6.4%	68%	23%	8%
Lower Hamilton	7.3%	61%	26%	9%
Lower Stoney Creek	9.8%	61%	29%	8%
Upper Stoney Creek	17.9%	69%	24%	3%
West Hamilton / Dundas	10.0%	65%	18%	10%
City of Hamilton	3.5%	65%	24%	8%

Respondents were asked *how important* seven different types of outdoor facilities in Hamilton were to their household. The facilities included: outdoor soccer fields; softball, slo-pitch, and hardball diamonds; playgrounds; splash pads; tennis courts; basketball courts, and; outdoor recreation and park amenities overall.

Survey participants were asked to rate the importance of these programs and facilities from one to five, where one was the lowest and five was the highest. Average ratings ranged from **2.66 out of 5** to **4.15 out of 5**, indicating a wide range of importance levels for each item.

The following tables show the household responses for each community within Hamilton:

Average Importance of Outdoor Recreation Facilities in Hamilton				
Community	Outdoor Soccer	Softball, Slo-pitch and Hardball	Playgrounds	Splash Pads
	Fields	Diamonds		
Ancaster	3.04	2.63	3.83	2.85
Beverly/Flamborough/Glanbrook	2.97	2.93	3.51	2.86
Hamilton Mountain	3.17	2.97	3.96	3.25
Lower Hamilton	2.70	2.78	3.62	3.14
Lower Stoney Creek	3.31	3.02	3.95	3.14
Upper Stoney Creek	3.00	3.07	4.21	3.04
West Hamilton / Dundas	2.98	2.77	3.68	3.06
City of Hamilton	3.00	2.89	3.81	3.11

Average Importance of Outdoor Recreation Facilities in Hamilton			
Community	Tennis Courts	Basketball Courts	Outdoor Recreation and Park Amenities Overall
			Ancaster
Beverly/Flamborough/Glanbrook	2.54	2.56	4.00
Hamilton Mountain	2.62	3.07	4.14
Lower Hamilton	2.65	2.89	4.11
Lower Stoney Creek	2.84	3.02	4.22
Upper Stoney Creek	2.62	3.00	4.34
West Hamilton / Dundas	2.63	3.09	4.22
City of Hamilton	2.66	2.96	4.15

- Households with children were more likely to give an importance rating of either 4 or 5 (highly satisfied) for outdoor soccer fields, playgrounds, splash pads, basketball courts, and outdoor recreation and park amenities overall than households without children.

Respondents were then asked *how satisfied* their households were with the same seven facilities in Hamilton. Survey participants were asked to rate their level of satisfaction with each of these programs and facilities from one to five, where one was the lowest and five was the highest. Average ratings ranged from **3.10 out of 5** to **3.79 out of 5**, indicating a moderate level of satisfaction for each item.

The following tables show the household responses for each community within Hamilton:


Average Satisfaction of Outdoor Recreation Facilities in Hamilton				
Community	Softball, Slo-pitch and Hardball			Splash Pads
	Outdoor Soccer Fields	Diamonds	Playgrounds	
Ancaster	3.74	3.77	3.77	3.29
Beverly/Flamborough/Glanbrook	3.38	3.64	3.54	3.21
Hamilton Mountain	3.59	3.47	3.84	3.51
Lower Hamilton	3.36	3.35	3.65	3.52
Lower Stoney Creek	3.60	3.50	3.92	3.54
Upper Stoney Creek	3.48	3.57	3.76	3.35
West Hamilton / Dundas	3.61	3.52	4.15	3.92
City of Hamilton	3.54	3.50	3.79	3.51

Average Satisfaction of Outdoor Recreation Facilities in Hamilton			
Community	Tennis Courts	Basketball Courts	Outdoor Recreation and
			Park Amenities Overall
Ancaster	3.54	3.61	3.82
Beverly/Flamborough/Glanbrook	2.61	2.78	3.42
Hamilton Mountain	3.19	3.34	3.87
Lower Hamilton	2.99	3.28	3.64
Lower Stoney Creek	2.95	3.40	3.69
Upper Stoney Creek	3.33	3.53	3.62
West Hamilton / Dundas	3.13	3.04	3.82
City of Hamilton	3.10	3.27	3.73

- Households with children were more likely to give a satisfaction rating of either 4 or 5 (highly satisfied) for outdoor soccer fields, playgrounds, splash pads, and basketball courts, compared to households without children.

A comparison between the importance and satisfaction levels of each program or facility overall is shown in the following graph, using the top two response categories for each question to determine “high” levels of support.

Level of importance versus level of satisfaction of outdoor recreation and parks facilities




The satisfaction ratings for most facility types exceeds the importance ratings with the exception of *playgrounds* and *outdoor recreation and park amenities overall*. This indicates that, for the most part, the expectations of the general public are being met in terms of outdoor soccer, baseball, tennis, basketball, and playground and splash pad service and/or provision. The public’s expectations are not, however, being met for playgrounds and outdoor recreation and park amenities overall. The latter may suggest that the expectations are not being met for facilities and programs other than those mentioned in the chart above.

Respondents were given a list of *outdoor recreation facilities and park amenities* and were asked to state the degree that they would want *additional public funds spent on them*. The intent of this question was to determine which facilities are needed in the City or are in need of improvement. Survey participants were asked to use a scale from one to five, where one meant “DO NOT spend additional money on this facility” and five meant “DEFINITELY spend additional money on this facility”.

When results incorporate the percentage of people who rated each outdoor recreation facility and park amenity with a four or a five (i.e. those who agreed with having additional money spent on the facility), the facilities with the highest rating are as follows: *Natural open space* (74%), *trails in parks* (73%), *playgrounds* (72%), *park washrooms* (72%), *picnic areas* (68%) and *outdoor ice rinks* (55%).

Outdoor recreation facilities for which respondents would like to see additional funds spent



Of note, the 2007 household survey conducted for the City’s Public Facilities (Indoor) Study asked a similar question focused solely on indoor facilities. Spending on indoor sports (soccer) facilities was supported by 31% of residents (the same level of support received in this 2009 survey), spending on indoor racquet facilities was supported by 22% of residents (this was not

asked in 2009), and 8% supported spending indoor bocce courts (similar to the 11% that supported indoor lawn bowling or bocce courts in this 2009 survey).

The following tables show the household responses for each community within Hamilton:

Percentages of Households who Agree with Spending Additional Money on each Park Amenity					
Community	Margin of Error (+/-)	Natural open space in parks	Trails in parks	Playgrounds	Park washrooms
Ancaster	13.1%	80%	80%	77%	77%
Beverly/Flamborough/Glanbrook	11.5%	75%	70%	74%	78%
Hamilton Mountain	6.4%	74%	76%	70%	74%
Lower Hamilton	7.3%	74%	69%	69%	71%
Lower Stoney Creek	9.8%	71%	73%	75%	72%
Upper Stoney Creek	17.9%	79%	69%	69%	59%
West Hamilton / Dundas	10.0%	74%	70%	76%	67%
City of Hamilton	3.5%	74%	73%	72%	72%

Percentages of Households who Agree with Spending Additional Money on each Park Amenity					
Community	Margin of Error (+/-)	Picnic areas	Outdoor ice rinks	Informal play fields	Outdoor grass soccer fields
Ancaster	13.1%	66%	50%	54%	52%
Beverly/Flamborough/Glanbrook	11.5%	75%	60%	45%	57%
Hamilton Mountain	6.4%	66%	55%	51%	48%
Lower Hamilton	7.3%	70%	54%	46%	38%
Lower Stoney Creek	9.8%	71%	55%	35%	44%
Upper Stoney Creek	17.9%	62%	48%	31%	48%
West Hamilton / Dundas	10.0%	70%	55%	51%	45%
City of Hamilton	3.5%	68%	55%	47%	46%

Percentages of Households who Agree with Spending Additional Money on each Park Amenity					
Community	Margin of Error (+/-)	Wading pools	Community garden plots	Hardball, softball or slo-pitch diamonds	Splash pads
Ancaster	13.1%	36%	32%	36%	32%
Beverly/Flamborough/Glanbrook	11.5%	44%	42%	48%	40%
Hamilton Mountain	6.4%	43%	44%	41%	40%
Lower Hamilton	7.3%	46%	48%	41%	48%
Lower Stoney Creek	9.8%	53%	30%	43%	39%
Upper Stoney Creek	17.9%	45%	38%	45%	41%
West Hamilton / Dundas	10.0%	49%	56%	40%	43%
City of Hamilton	3.5%	45%	43%	42%	41%

Percentages of Households who Agree with Spending Additional Money on each Park Amenity					
Community	Margin of Error (+/-)	Off-leash dog areas	Running tracks	Football, rugby, or lacrosse fields	Indoor soccer facilities
Ancaster	13.1%	38%	34%	32%	34%
Beverly/Flamborough/Glanbrook	11.5%	32%	35%	34%	40%
Hamilton Mountain	6.4%	37%	35%	30%	32%
Lower Hamilton	7.3%	37%	33%	34%	24%
Lower Stoney Creek	9.8%	38%	29%	38%	32%
Upper Stoney Creek	17.9%	21%	41%	45%	34%
West Hamilton / Dundas	10.0%	37%	37%	35%	29%
City of Hamilton	3.5%	36%	34%	34%	31%


Percentages of Households who Agree with Spending Additional Money on each Park Amenity					
Community	Margin of Error (+/-)	Tennis courts (outdoor)	Basketball courts (outdoor)	Skateboard and bmx parks	Outdoor artificial turf soccer fields
Ancaster	13.1%	32%	16%	14%	20%
Beverly/Flamborough/Glanbrook	11.5%	22%	27%	27%	29%
Hamilton Mountain	6.4%	27%	27%	18%	17%
Lower Hamilton	7.3%	28%	29%	20%	18%
Lower Stoney Creek	9.8%	30%	28%	23%	23%
Upper Stoney Creek	17.9%	21%	21%	21%	28%
West Hamilton / Dundas	10.0%	32%	22%	24%	14%
City of Hamilton	3.5%	28%	26%	21%	20%

Percentages of Households who Agree with Spending Additional Money on each Park Amenity					
Community	Margin of Error (+/-)	Lawn bowling greens	Indoor lawn bowling or bocce courts	Bocce courts (outdoor)	Cricket pitches
Ancaster	13.1%	9%	9%	5%	4%
Beverly/Flamborough/Glanbrook	11.5%	17%	16%	10%	9%
Hamilton Mountain	6.4%	11%	13%	10%	8%
Lower Hamilton	7.3%	13%	11%	11%	10%
Lower Stoney Creek	9.8%	10%	9%	13%	8%
Upper Stoney Creek	17.9%	0%	3%	7%	3%
West Hamilton / Dundas	10.0%	20%	10%	15%	7%
City of Hamilton	3.5%	13%	11%	11%	8%

- Households with children were more likely to give a rating of four or five (i.e. higher demand) to playgrounds and splash pads than households without children.
- Households in Beverly, Flamborough, and Glanbrook were more likely to place a higher demand on spending for outdoor grass soccer fields than households in Lower Hamilton.
- Households in West Hamilton/Dundas and Lower Hamilton were more likely to place a higher demand on community garden plots than households in Ancaster and Lower Stoney Creek, respectively.

Survey respondents were then asked to identify the two types of facilities that they felt were needed the most in their area. The highest response was **natural open space** (13% of votes), followed by **playgrounds** (11% of votes) and **trails in parks** (10% of votes).

Outdoor recreation facilities that respondents feel are needed the most




Household Survey Demographics

- The average household size for the City of Hamilton is estimated to be 2.5 (2006 Census). The survey average was 2.9 people per household.
 - The average household size was generally higher for households who used City of Hamilton parks, including those who used playgrounds, soccer fields, and hardball, softball or slo-pitch diamonds.
- 26% of surveyed household members were of age 19 and under (compared to 25% in the 2006 Census). 49% were aged 20 to 54 (49% in 2006 Census) and 25% were 55 years and older (26% in 2006 Census).

- Households who had used a City of Hamilton park in the past 12 months, including those who had used playgrounds, soccer fields, and hardball, softball or slo-pitch diamonds, have a significantly higher proportion of children and teens (19 years of age and under) than those who did not.

Percentage of household members by age category



- The average age of all respondents was 49 years.
- 42% of the sample households earn less than \$60,000 per year, 32% earn between \$60,000 and \$100,000 per year, and 26% of the sample households earn more than \$100,000 per year.
- 59% of survey respondents were female, and 41% were male.
- Responses were received from a relatively equal distribution of households, as shown by the postal code data (see table).

Postal Codes	#	%	Canada Post %
L8E	47	6%	6%
L8G	27	3%	4%
L8H	31	4%	6%
L8J	29	4%	3%
L8K	53	7%	7%
L8L	30	4%	6%
L8M	19	2%	3%
L8N	21	3%	4%
L8P	43	5%	6%
L8R	8	1%	2%
L8S	33	4%	4%
L8T	38	5%	4%
L8V	37	5%	5%
L8W	32	4%	4%
L9A	32	4%	5%
L9B	38	5%	3%
L9C	58	7%	7%
L9G	35	4%	4%
L9H	65	8%	6%
L9K	21	3%	1%
L0R (rural)	77	10%	8%
Don't Know	26	3%	-
Total	800	100%	100%

5.3 User Group Survey

To assist in the preparation of this Study, a Sports Field User Group survey was undertaken in March and April, 2009. This section presents a summary of the principal findings of this survey.

The self-administered survey was distributed online and in hard copy to local groups involved in the organized use of outdoor sports fields in Hamilton, including sports such as soccer, baseball, football, cricket, etc. The purpose of the survey was to collect information on:

- Past, current and anticipated enrolment/membership;
- Programs and services offered by the organization;
- Adequacy of facility hours currently made available to the group;
- Factors limiting participation in the activity/program;
- Facilities used, frequency of use, and suggested improvements;
- Rating of location, physical condition, costs, design, maintenance, etc. for facilities used;
- Preferences for future facility provision options and priorities for the future.

A total of 67 surveys were completed, representing a 50% return rate (134 invitations were distributed). As such, the participation data, field usage, and field requests do not include all organizations offering sports programs in Hamilton; although it is believed that these organizations represent more than half of those playing organized sports in the City.

The breakdown of the groups completing the survey is as follows:

- 42 baseball groups – of the 42 baseball groups who responded, 23 were *adult only* leagues, 4 were *both youth and adult* leagues, and 15 were *youth only* leagues
- 16 soccer groups – of the 16 soccer groups, 4 were *adult only*, 5 were *both youth and adult*, and 7 were *youth only* leagues
- 7 football groups
- 1 cricket group
- 1 rugby group

Groups in each sport offered a variety of competitive and recreational programming, and were dispersed across a range of geographic areas within the City of Hamilton.

Generally speaking, the majority of each organization's participants came from within the City of Hamilton, with less than 5 percent of their participants travelling from outside the City. In some cases, however, higher percentages (10-20%) of participants came from outside the City of Hamilton. Four groups identified that more than 30% of their participants travelled from outside of Hamilton to participate in their sport.

Please note that the user group survey has been summarized by the Consultants, but represents the opinions of those completing the survey. Much of this input is opinion-based and should not be construed as being recommendations of the Study. The Consulting Team will use this input to assist in developing recommendations and a strategy for future sport field investment.

A copy of the survey is contained in Attachment II, as is a full listing of those groups responding to the survey.

Registration

Respondents were asked to provide their organizations' registration numbers by age category for the past three years. With the exception of cricket, all sports reflected an increase in participation levels for both age categories since 2006, as shown in the following table. With the exception of four baseball groups, all organizations said they expected their participation numbers to either increase or remain stable over the next five years.

Sport	Sport Participation by Age Group						Total 2008
	4-19 Years			20+ Years			
	2006	2007	2008	2006	2007	2008	
Soccer	9,651	9,839	10,314*	1,833	1,856	2,222	12,536
Baseball	2,838	2,957	3,796*	3,815	3,825	3,966	7,762
Football	1,436	1,388	1,484	450	475	698	2,182
Rugby	47	58	78	64	78	100	178
Cricket	16	9	12	33	28	23	35
Total	13,988	14,251	15,684*	6,195	6,262	7,009	22,693

* Four baseball organizations and three soccer organizations did not provide '4-19 Years' registration numbers for years prior to 2008. After extracting these organizations from the data, the total registration numbers for 4-19 Years Baseball in 2008 is 3,113, and the total registration numbers for 4-19 Years Soccer in 2008 is 10,045.

Note: Table excludes Catholic Youth Organization (24,172) and Ontario Football Alliance (9,021)

Respondents were then asked to identify the number of people on wait lists for their organization, if any. Various teams for baseball, football, and soccer identified that there were potential players on waiting lists for their organizations. In all, there were 84 people on waiting lists for baseball organizations, 20 people on waiting lists for football organizations, and 91 people on waiting lists for soccer organizations.

Evaluation of City Sports Fields

Respondents were asked to provide up to three fields and/or parks that **best meet the needs** of their organization. A variety of answers were given, summarized by each sport in the following tables. Due to the wide variety of responses for baseball, football, and soccer organizations, only fields and parks that were mentioned more than once by these sports have been included.

Baseball	
Sports Field/Park	#
Mohawk Sports Complex	7
Turner Park	5
Heritage Green	4
Ancaster Community Center	3
Globe Park	3
Red Hill	3
Alexander Park	2
Bullock's Corners in Greensville	2
Churchill Park	2
Eastdale	2
Edwards Park	2
Inch Park	2
Kay Drage	2
Martino Field	2
Memorial Park	2
Millgrove Park	2
Veterans Park	2
Waterdown Memorial Park	2

Football	
Sports Field/Park	#
Ivor Wynne Stadium	4
Mohawk Sports Complex	4
Sackville Hill Park	3

Rugby	
Sports Field/Park	#
Mohawk Sports Park	1
Sackville Hill Park	1

Soccer	
Sports Field/Park	#
Sackville Hill Park	4
Joe Sam's Leisure Park	3
Mohawk Sports Complex	3
Brian Timmis Stadium	2
Heritage Green	2
Macassa	2
North Wentworth Community Centre	2

Cricket	
Sports Field/Park	#
Churchill Park	1
Mohawk Sports Park	1
Heritage Green Sports Park	1


Respondents were then asked to list up to three fields and/or parks that **do not meet the needs** of their organization. A variety of responses were given by each organization, with several common themes emerging:

- **Baseball** organizations listed several fields and parks that did not meet their needs. Primary reasons included: the **size** of diamonds, as many of them were too small for adult and/or tournament play; the **lack of lighting** at various diamonds; the **lack of adequate maintenance**; and, the need for **more washrooms** and other amenities.
- The **Cricket** organization identified a general **lack of cricket pitches** to play on. Other comments included the **poor quality** of cricket pitches, such as rough terrain.
- **Football** organizations stated a **lack of parking, lack of seating, and a lack of change rooms** as the main reasons why fields and parks did not meet the needs of their organizations, as well as improper field / end zone dimensions and field conditions.
- The **Rugby** organization noted that other than Mohawk Sports Complex and Sackville Hill Park, there were no other full-sized rugby fields in Hamilton with multi-use goal posts.
- **Soccer** organizations listed a number of fields and parks that did not meet their needs. Primary reasons included: the **quality of fields**, particularly the playing surfaces, slope, flooding and garbage/debris; the **number of fields**, and; a lack of **washroom, storage and parking** facilities at various fields.

Participants were asked to rate the overall maintenance quality of various sports fields that their organization used in the City. Respondents were given a choice of rating the fields as *excellent, good, acceptable, needs improvement, or poor*. Individual responses were then given a numerical value from one to five (where five is excellent and one is poor).

- The highest overall rating was for **rugby fields** (3.33 out of 5), which indicates a moderate, or **acceptable** overall maintenance quality.
- Fields in **City parks**, including **soccer fields, ball diamonds, and football fields** all received **acceptable** ratings.
- **Soccer fields at schools, ball diamonds at schools, football fields at schools, and lacrosse fields** received ratings ranging from **2.00-2.67 out of 5**, indicating that user groups felt these fields were **in need of improvement**.
- **Cricket pitches** received the lowest ranking (**1.50**), indicating a **poor** overall maintenance quality.


Overall maintenance quality of sports fields in the City of Hamilton



Respondents were asked to rate various *sports field amenities* that their organization used. Each amenity was rated as either *excellent*, *good*, *acceptable*, *needs improvement*, or *poor*. Individual responses were then given a numerical value from one to five (where one is excellent and five is poor). Average ratings for each sport, as well as overall averages are shown in the following table.

Amenity	Average Ratings (5 = Excellent, 1 = Poor)					Overall
	Baseball	Cricket	Football	Rugby	Soccer	
Location	4.26	3.00	4.14	5.00	4.13	4.21
Field design (size, configuration)	3.55	3.00	4.14	5.00	3.88	3.70
Goals	3.50	0.00	4.14	4.00	3.00	3.42
Field safety	2.93	2.00	4.14	5.00	3.40	3.18
Overall park condition	3.10	1.00	3.71	4.00	3.25	3.18
Field lighting	2.96	0.00	4.50	4.00	2.92	3.17
Building condition	2.87	1.00	3.50	4.00	3.46	3.08
Field fencing	3.13	2.00	4.17	4.00	2.33	3.07
Field markings	2.76	1.00	4.00	4.00	2.69	2.90
Parking	3.08	1.00	2.14	4.00	2.80	2.89
Park signage	2.75	1.00	2.80	4.00	3.00	2.81
Field condition (grass, infields)	2.63	1.00	4.29	3.00	2.69	2.80
General park lighting (excluding field lighting)	2.57	0.00	3.67	4.00	2.92	2.80
Spectator seating	2.80	1.00	3.00	3.00	2.08	2.63
Washroom facilities	2.51	1.00	3.33	4.00	2.63	2.63
Concessions	2.71	1.00	2.50	0.00	2.57	2.58
Storage	2.88	1.00	2.25	4.00	1.78	2.55
Change facilities	2.59	1.00	2.83	4.00	2.30	2.54
Play seating (benches, dugouts)	2.67	1.00	2.17	3.00	1.86	2.41

Respondents were asked to rate *park maintenance services* relative to City sports fields. Each service was rated as either *excellent*, *good*, *acceptable*, *needs improvement*, or *poor*. Individual responses were then given a numerical value from one to five (where five is excellent and one is poor). Overall average ratings ranged from **2.40 out of 5.00** to **3.27 out of 5.00**, indicating that parks maintenance services are **in need of improvement** or **acceptable**. The **lowest** average rating for all sports was for the **overall quantity of the City's sports fields, compared to other municipalities** (averaging **2.40 out of 5.00**). Average ratings for each sport, as well as overall averages are shown in the following chart.




Participants in the user group survey were asked to rate various *recreation services* relative to City sports fields. Each service was rated as either *excellent*, *good*, *acceptable*, *needs improvement*, or *poor*. Individual responses were then given a numerical value from one to five (where five is excellent and one is poor).

- **Rental rates** and **allocation of playing fields to your group** both had an overall average ranking of **acceptable** (3.40 out of 5 and 3.78 out of 5, respectfully).
- **Permitting and central booking services**, as well as **recreation and liaison support** had an overall rating of **“good”** (4.25 out of 5 and 4.15 out of 5, respectfully).

Average ratings for each sport, as well as overall averages are shown in the following chart.

Average ratings for recreation services relative to City sports fields, by sport




Respondents were asked what, in terms of their sport, is a more pressing issue: the number of fields (quantity) in the City, or the condition/maintenance of fields (quality). **46%** of all user groups said that both quantity issues and quality issues were **equally** as pressing. **27%** of respondents said the issues were **mostly quality**, and **15%** said the issues were **mostly quantity**.

- A relatively equal portion of baseball organizations believed the most pressing issues were either **mostly quality (40%)**, or **equally quality and quantity (43%)**. Only 5% of all baseball organizations participating in the user group survey felt the quantity of fields was a pressing issue.
- The cricket organization stated that their most pressing concern was in regard to the **quality** of sports fields.
- The majority (**57%**) of the football organizations that responded agreed the most pressing issue for their organization was the number of fields, or **quantity**.
- The rugby organization and the majority of the soccer organizations (**63%**) agreed that the most pressing issues pertaining to their groups were related **equally to quantity and quality**.

Responses for each sport are shown in the following chart.

Most pressing issue regarding quality of fields vs. quantity, by sport



User groups were asked how many more hours, if any, their organization required per week in 2009, compared to the amount of hours that were available to them in 2008. From the entries received, it would appear that there was some confusion regarding how to respond to the question (i.e., total hours needed or total “additional” hours needed); some entries have been adjusted to account for these errors.

Baseball

- Approximately **220 additional hours per week** were requested by all responding baseball organizations. This represents an 11% increase over 2008 rentals. Two-thirds of the additional hours were requested for youth.

Cricket

- The one responding cricket organization requested **20 additional hours per week**.

Football

- Approximately **25 additional hours per week** were requested by all responding football organizations. This represents an 11% increase over 2008 rentals.

Rugby

- The one responding rugby organization requested **18 additional hours per week**.

Soccer

- Over **240 additional hours per week** were required by all responding soccer organizations. This represents a 17% increase over 2008 rentals. All of the additional hours were requested by youth and/or mixed (youth/adult) leagues.

User groups who stated that they would need additional hours per week in 2009 were asked if those hours would be used primarily for games, practices, or tournaments. The following table shows the percentages for each use based on the total number of respondents in each sport.


Sport	Total Number of Organizations	% of Total Requiring more Hours for		
		Games	Practices	Tournaments
Baseball	42	52%	29%	17%
Cricket	1	100%	100%	100%
Football	7	57%	29%	14%
Rugby	1	100%	100%	0%
Soccer	16	56%	56%	19%

Respondents were asked if additional outdoor sports fields were required by their organization. **48%** of all respondents said they **did not** require any more sports fields, and **40%** said that they **did** require more sports fields.

- The majority (**57%**) of baseball organizations indicated they **did not** require any more sports fields.
- The cricket organization, rugby organization, and the majority of soccer organizations (**56%**) stated they **did** require more sports fields.

Responses for each sport are shown in the following chart.

Additional sports fields required by each sport



User groups were then asked how many more fields their organization will require over the next five years. Presumably, many of these fields could be shared with other groups; therefore, it is likely that the numbers are generally overstated.

- **33 more diamonds** were requested by all responding **baseball** organizations
- **2 more pitches** were requested by all responding **cricket** organizations
- **7-8 more fields** were requested by all responding **football** organizations
- **2 more fields** were requested by all responding **rugby** organizations, and
- **38 more fields** were requested by all responding **soccer** organizations.

Respondents were asked what level of priority the City and its partners should give to improving the maintenance of various types of existing sports fields. Levels of priority were rated as *high*, *high-medium*, *medium*, *medium-low* and, *low*. Individual responses were then given a numerical value from one to five (where five is high and one is low). Average ratings for each sport, as well as overall averages are shown in the following table.

Field Type	Average Ratings (5 = High Priority, 1 = Low Priority)					Overall
	Baseball	Cricket	Football	Rugby	Soccer	
Soccer fields	3.70	4.00	3.75	0.00	4.44	4.10
Multi-use fields that accommodate sports such as soccer, lacrosse, football, etc.	3.60	4.00	5.00	5.00	3.73	3.96
Football fields	3.88	3.00	4.57	0.00	3.00	3.95
Softball diamonds	4.04	3.00	3.00	0.00	3.00	3.79
Hardball diamonds	4.16	4.00	2.67	0.00	2.75	3.78
T-ball / Rookie ball diamonds	4.08	3.00	3.00	0.00	2.33	3.77
Slo-pitch diamonds	4.00	3.00	3.00	0.00	2.67	3.75
Rugby fields	3.00	3.00	4.00	4.00	2.67	3.15
Lacrosse fields	3.00	3.00	3.50	0.00	3.00	3.08
Cricket pitches	2.86	5.00	3.00	0.00	2.00	2.85

Respondents were asked what level of priority the City and its partners should give to developing various types of existing sports fields. Levels of priority were rated as *high*, *high-medium*, *medium*, *medium-low* and, *low*. Individual responses were then given a numerical value from one to five (where five is high and one is low). Average ratings for each sport, as well as overall averages are shown in the following table.

Field Type	Average Ratings (5 = High Priority, 1 = Low Priority)					Overall
	Baseball	Cricket	Football	Rugby	Soccer	
Multi-use fields that accommodate sports such as soccer, lacrosse, football, etc.	3.73	4.00	5.00	4.00	3.55	3.97
Soccer fields (outdoor)	3.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	4.81	3.97
Multi-sport artificial turf field (outdoor)	2.86	5.00	4.60	5.00	4.00	3.89
Softball diamonds	3.83	3.00	3.33	0.00	2.60	3.58
Slo-pitch diamonds	3.87	3.00	3.33	0.00	2.00	3.55
Football fields	2.75	3.00	4.86	2.00	2.25	3.47
Soccer fields (indoor)	2.40	5.00	2.67	1.00	4.00	3.44
Hardball diamonds	3.61	3.00	3.33	0.00	2.25	3.35
T-ball / Rookie ball diamonds	3.59	3.00	3.33	0.00	1.75	3.30
Rugby fields	2.50	3.00	4.00	4.00	3.00	3.09
Field hockey fields	3.33	3.00	2.50	0.00	3.00	3.00
Cricket pitches	3.00	5.00	2.00	0.00	2.67	2.91
Lacrosse fields	2.50	3.00	3.00	0.00	2.67	2.70
Ultimate frisbee fields	2.00	3.00	1.50	0.00	2.67	2.18

User groups were asked what types of fields and amenities would be required to meet the needs of their organization, should the City provide new or improved sports fields. A number of general themes emerged from the responses for each sport.

Baseball

- Several baseball organizations stated that proper amenities would be needed, including **lighting, washrooms, change rooms, concessions, parking, club houses, stands**, etc.
- The need for additional regulation ball diamonds was mentioned by several groups, particularly the need for regulation-sized **softball** and **slo-pitch** diamonds.
- Improved **field maintenance** was also a key issue.

Cricket

- The development of **regulation-sized cricket pitches** was the main priority for the cricket organization.
- Additionally, amenities such as **washrooms** and running water were noted.

Football

- The need for more **football/multi-use fields** was a common theme among football organizations, including the need for **associated amenities** such as change rooms, parking, fencing, and spectator seating.

Rugby

- The rugby organization also expressed a need for more **multi-use fields** that can be used for rugby, soccer, and football games.


Soccer

- The most prevalent theme among soccer groups was the need for **more fields**. A specific emphasis was placed on providing **turf fields** in order to prevent surface damage from football and rugby clubs.
- The need for **lighting** at new and existing fields was a common theme.
- Some soccer organizations requested more **mini fields** be built for younger participants.

When asked where new facilities should be located, a wide variety of responses were given covering a range of locations across Hamilton.


Participants were asked if their organization would be likely to use an indoor artificial turf facility should the City build one. **57%** of all respondents said they **would** use an artificial turf facility, and **27%** of all respondents said they **would not** be likely to use an artificial turf facility. With regard to cricket, football, and rugby, **all** organizations said they **would** use an artificial facility should the City build one. Responses for each sport are shown in the following chart.

Sport groups likely to use an indoor turf facility



Respondents who said they would use an artificial turf facility were then asked if they were more likely to use a small field that is approximately 200 by 100 feet, or a field that is 300 by 200 feet. **42%** of all respondents said they would prefer a smaller field, while **10%** indicated they would prefer a larger field. **48%** of all user groups said they were unsure of what size field they would be more likely to use. Responses for each sport are shown in the following chart.

Indoor turf facility size preferences



- All user groups who said they would use an indoor turf facility indicated they would use the facility primarily during the winter months, with several teams stating they would use the facility for a few months between September and May. A small portion of respondents said they would use an indoor turf facility during the summer months.
- Those who indicated they would use an indoor turf facility were asked what they believed to be a *reasonable hourly rate* for the use of a 200 by 100 feet facility during

prime time hours in the winter. With the exception of two organizations, all respondents indicated an hourly rate of **less than \$150**. The majority of these respondents stated that **less than \$75** was a reasonable hourly rate during prime time winter hours.

Respondents to the User Group Survey were asked to identify the ways in which their organization would be willing to assist the City in improving the quality and/or supply of indoor or outdoor sports fields. The following themes were drawn from numerous responses:

- Assisting with fundraising efforts and providing capital contributions, where feasible;
- Assisting with the overall maintenance and construction of fields and field amenities (such as seating, fences, lighting, etc.); and
- Coordinating tournaments and managing clubs in order to bring teams and funding into the City.

User groups were asked to provide the level to which they agreed with various statements regarding sports fields in the City of Hamilton. Respondents were asked to select *strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, or strongly disagree*. Individual responses were then given a numerical value from one to five (where five is strongly agree and one is strongly disagree). Average ratings for each sport, as well as overall averages are shown in the following table.

Field Type	Average Ratings (5 = Strongly Agree, 1 = Strongly Disagree)					Overall
	Baseball	Cricket	Football	Rugby	Soccer	
Your organization is aware of the City's guidelines regarding field use after inclement weather.	4.24	5.00	3.83	4.00	4.20	4.20
Your organization knows who to contact at the City regarding field maintenance.	4.00	4.00	3.33	5.00	4.00	3.95
The City should place a greater emphasis on providing fields to serve introductory and recreational-level needs.	3.77	4.00	3.83	3.00	3.80	3.77
Under-utilized fields should be converted to other community park uses.	3.32	3.00	4.50	2.00	3.50	3.45
Unauthorized use of fields by non-permitted groups or individuals is a major problem.	3.14	5.00	4.17	4.00	3.64	3.41
Sports fields should be distributed in a wide range of locations, with each community park having only a few fields.	3.33	4.00	3.50	3.00	2.86	3.24
Sports fields should be designed to be single-use and be dedicated to one sport only.	3.05	2.00	2.40	2.00	3.73	3.13
Sports fields should be designed to be multi-use and be able to be shared by several different sports.	3.08	4.00	3.83	4.00	2.60	3.06
User groups should contribute to the cost of improving existing fields.	2.95	4.00	2.67	4.00	2.73	2.90
The City should place a greater emphasis on providing fields to serve competitive and elite athlete needs.	2.59	3.00	3.50	4.00	3.21	2.85
Sports fields should be concentrated in a small number of locations, with each community park having several fields.	2.59	2.00	2.50	4.00	3.71	2.85
User groups should contribute to the cost of developing new fields.	2.73	4.00	2.50	3.00	2.87	2.77

User groups were asked what the most pressing issue currently facing their organization was. With the exception of baseball, the most prevalent theme for all sports was a **lack of fields** for each of the respective sports, and was mentioned by almost all of the organizations from **cricket, football, rugby and soccer**.

- The most common theme among baseball organizations was the need for **improved maintenance/better field conditions**. **Diamond availability/allocation, participation levels/registration**, and **rental costs for fields** were other common themes for baseball organizations.
- Several soccer organizations commented on the **quality of fields**, as well as the need for more full-sized fields. Year-round facilities and field allocation were also mentioned by various soccer organizations.

User groups were asked what three things could be done by the City, their organization, or others to encourage participation in their sport. Specific themes were prevalent across all sport groups, with the most pressing issue relating to the need for assistance with **advertising and increased awareness** for each of the five sport groups. A common theme among baseball organizations was the need for **higher maintenance standards, upgrades**, and the **overall quality of fields**. Other concerns were put forth by the cricket user group, which noted the need for the **development of cricket fields**, and several soccer fields who mentioned the need for **additional soccer fields** in order to meet current and future demands.

5.4 User Group Focus Groups

In April and May 2009, seven focus group sessions were held with representatives of key organizations and user groups to introduce the Study and gather important input on outdoor recreation and sports field related issues. The focus groups were divided into Soccer (2 sessions), Baseball (2 sessions), Other Rectangular Field Users (football, lacrosse, cricket, and rugby), Cultural Groups with a focus on operating festivals and special events, and Club focussed user groups (tennis, bocce, lawn bowling, skateboarding).

At each session, the consultants gave a brief presentation providing an overview of the study and key background information. The consultants then engaged the participants with a series of questions structured to solicit input and opinions on the Study's potential guiding principles and the allocation, design, maintenance, operations/costs, and supply of the City's outdoor recreation facilities and sports fields. City of Hamilton staff, with the assistance of the Consulting Team, selected key user groups to attend these sessions and distributed invitations. Attendance was limited to approximately 10-15 people per session in order to encourage group discussion and interaction.

The Focus Groups were scheduled early on in the development of the City of Hamilton's Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan so as to create a basis for understanding key issues and perspectives. The intent of the sessions – which were facilitated by the Consulting Team with the assistance of City staff – was to listen to the groups, rather than to present Study findings or options.

Participants offered upon a number of suggestions for improving outdoor recreation facilities and amenities and increasing benefits to the community, such as the following:

Soccer

- Youth are the target market, but opportunities for adults to play (particularly later in the evening) must be provided.
- Need to do a better job maintaining existing fields; irrigation would make a big difference in this regard (but would require more grass cutting).
- Fields with properly and consistently cut grass are difficult to find. More frequent (and consistent) grass cutting schedules was requested, particularly for competitive fields.
- Fields could be fenced in to minimize vandalism and unwanted activities.
- Perhaps the over-use of fields could be mitigated through dedicating fields to sports such as rugby, lacrosse, and football. Multi-use fields are effective only if they are artificial turf.
- Poor design can create maintenance problems later on (e.g. gradients, irrigation). More investment up front could lead to savings in the long-run.
- Improved enforcement and communication of the rain-out policy is required.
- It was suggested that perhaps there should not be any tournaments on 'A' fields until June when fields are not as wet. Further, practices on Class A and B fields should be limited or even prohibited (just use them for games).
- User groups are more than willing to pay reasonable user fees, but some groups feel as though they would not gain anything from paying significantly higher fees – maintenance has not improved in the past when fees have increased. Also, clubs do not feel as though they should have to pay for field improvements through their user fees.
- Many felt that soccer clubs had become too numerous and that the provision of soccer programs would be easier if clubs were amalgamated to form one or more larger organizations.
- Some groups would like more interaction with the City, and more communication of their needs with regards to facilities.
- Although long-term strategies are helpful, short-term improvements to the field supply and maintenance practices are most critical.
- Clubs that are not anchored to a specific community (or that have no home field) have more trouble securing fields because they are more nomadic and are also less likely to take ownership of issues and problems.
- Lights were requested at Billy Sherring Park, as well as the conversion of the ball diamonds at Paramount Park to two mini fields.
- Mount Hamilton Youth Soccer Club does not have enough practice fields
- Washroom maintenance and provision is usually lacking, especially at high traffic parks. Parking is often found to be deficient, which can affect surrounding neighbours;
- Mini fields should be designed so that they can be easily converted to full-sized fields.

- Many felt that there needed to be better access to (and maintenance of) school fields, similar to the arrangement of Ancaster Minor Soccer, which maintains several fields at the high school.

Baseball

- Some representatives felt that registration has levelled off in the Inner City, but growth has been seen in younger age groups in Dundas, for example. Women's softball may be becoming less popular, with many participants shifting over to fastball.
- Programs (and diamond fees) should be affordable, especially to youth – they should be encouraged to play instead of deterred. Nobody should be priced out of playing.
- Some groups felt that there should be more transparency and consistency with regard to ball diamond allocation (i.e., why certain groups are allowed to use certain diamonds).
- If a school site is at risk, effort should be made to ensure that the well-used sites remain in operation and available.
- Changes to the grass cutting schedule were requested.
- Fees go to the Recreation Division, but perhaps more should go toward maintenance. For capital improvements, many groups would be willing to provide in-kind services instead of funding.
- Better crowning of fields was requested. Also, diamonds should not be placed so that the glare from the sun becomes an issue.
- Ball diamonds should be flexibly designed to accommodate a variety of activities and age groups and all fields should be an appropriate size. Sites should possess the needed amenities like shade, washrooms, storage etc. Ball diamonds should be accessibly located within the community.
- Some groups are afraid to concede diamond usage if their numbers decrease in case they need it in the future, so sometimes the proper registration numbers are not disclosed.
- Older fields should be assessed to discern which improvements are needed at which fields (Many diamonds have “minor” problems with them, but left unchecked, these problems can become more significant). Diamonds have been built over a 40 year period and renewal is required.
- Although it was felt that is a sufficient supply of diamonds City-wide and within most communities, some diamonds are too small for adult usage (which is where much of the current demand is).
- Requests were received for more diamonds in Ancaster (4 full diamonds, including 2 with lights), as well as lighting of some diamonds at Turner Park. With the Stoney Creek population growing, the demand for diamonds is expected to increase as well.
- It was suggested that the City could move the unlit diamond at Maplewood Park onto the existing soccer pitch, which does not appear to be well utilized.
- Washrooms are necessary components at ball diamond complexes, and paved parking is ideal.

- Some would like to know of ways to form partnerships with the City to increase the provision of diamonds (also to create home diamonds). Some feel that communications with the City are strained.

Other Field Sports

- Although there was no consensus, many groups felt that fields should be sport-specific (i.e., dedicated, rather than multi-use) as this is better for sport development and more appropriate given that maintenance requirements may differ from activity to activity (e.g., cricket fields need very specific maintenance, while aussie rules football fields require minimal maintenance).
- Support for artificial turf was received from football and lacrosse organizations.
- All fields should be equipped with the appropriate support amenities such as storage. Additional parking, seating, and washrooms are also required at many parks.
- Permit enforcement has become an issue – perhaps more staff members are needed to ensure that regulations are followed consistently.
- There were requests to advance the field opening dates in order to extend the playing season.
- Full-sized fields are preferred as they are far more flexible and able to accommodate a variety of sports and age groups.
- There was a request for the development of a properly-sized cricket pitch and clubhouse at Heritage Green Sports Park (in place of the temporary pitch at Mohawk Sports Park) as this location is near Stoney Creek, where many cricket members live.
- Rugby requested more fields, preferably at Mohawk Sports Park.

Clubs (e.g., Tennis, Lawn Bowling, Bocce), Skateboarding, and Festivals

- Regarding tennis courts, it was mentioned that many courts are in disrepair. The Flamborough club requested a new 4-court complex (this number is necessary for club operation). In addition, a desire was expressed for year-round tennis facilities (i.e., a bubble), particularly in Stoney Creek; it was noted that the locations of the club courts in this area are not conducive to installation of a bubble.
- In relation to lawn bowling, it was noted that the Ancaster green is undersized and there is an interest in moving this facility to another site. Furthermore, it was felt that the City should explore an indoor lawn bowling facility (possibly combined with other components such as indoor soccer or in a disused building), which might encourage more youth membership in the sport.
- Bocce is also interested in winter opportunities and requested 3 to 4 additional courts. Another significant issue for the sport is the inadequate support buildings at many parks (many are too small, lack amenities, and were not built to accommodate members).
- Skateboarding is also interested in winter opportunities and expressed an interest in taking over an old community centre for this purpose. One additional outdoor skateboard park was requested; possible locations identified were on the west mountain, east end, near McMaster, in Cathedral Park, or in Gage Park. Skateboarders are also supportive of the notion of more neighbourhood-level beginner skate zones (e.g., minimal elements required).

- Greater marketing efforts for club sports (e.g., tennis, bocce, lawn bowling) through city distribution channels were requested.
- There was interest in engaging more women and young families in recreational activities.
- The Winona Peach Festival Board and the City have been undertaking several upgrades to Winona Park in recent years, but more work still needs to be done to address matters such as park drainage, parking, future land expansion, and building upgrades.

Please note that the focus group input has been summarized by the Consultants, but represents the opinions of those in attendance. It was not the objective of the sessions to reach consensus on every issue, but rather to encourage debate and problem-solving. Much of this input is opinion-based and should not be construed as being recommendations of the Study. The Consulting Team will use this input – in concert with other information, including additional public input, benchmarking, staff consultation, trends, etc. – to assist in developing recommendations and a strategy for future sport field investment.

A more detailed account of the input by topic area is provided in Attachment II.

5.5 Public Information Sessions

Seven Public Information Sessions were held to raise awareness of the Study with the general public and to identify localized issues, needs, and priorities. Draft Guiding Principles were also reviewed and debated. Dates and locations of the sessions were as follows:

Date	Location	Community
April 21, 2009	Binbrook Agricultural Hall	Glanbrook (Binbrook)
April 22, 2009	Bennetto Recreation Centre	Lower Hamilton
April 23, 2009	Sackville Hill Senior Centre	Hamilton Mountain
April 28, 2009	Dundas Lions Memorial Community Centre	West Hamilton / Dundas
April 29, 2009	Ancaster Old Town Hall	Ancaster
April 30, 2009	Sealy Park Scout Hall	Flamborough (Waterdown)
May 5, 2009	Stoney Creek Municipal Service Centre	Lower Stoney Creek

Input received at the Public Information Sessions was varied. Requests were received for a number of facilities and improvements, including (but not necessarily limited to):

- artificial soccer fields
- an indoor lawn bowling facility
- proper cricket grounds (near the East Mountain, Hamilton East or Stoney Creek)
- improvements to the Beasley Park skateboard facility
- additional diamonds to create an “all ages” baseball facility in Waterdown (possibly at Joe Sams Leisure Park)
- an artificial outdoor skating rink, possibly at Waterdown Memorial Park or Joe Sams Leisure Park
- tennis courts with a clubhouse Waterdown
- skate park and sports fields in Binbrook
- tennis or outdoor skating in Churchill Park

- an outdoor skating rink in Little John Park
- upgrades and an expansion to Winona Park
- lighting at Olympic Sports Park (site-specific by-law prohibits this)
- consideration of municipal acquisition of surplus school lands
- passive parkland and better walking trails
- improved maintenance of sports fields (e.g., Dundas) and tennis courts (e.g., Carlisle)

A more detailed summary of input from the Public Information Sessions is contained in Attachment II.

5.6 Staff & Councillor Interviews

In order to further inform Phase I of the *Outdoor Recreation Facilities & Sports Field Provision Plan*, in Spring 2009 the consultants conducted a series of key informant interviews with City staff, members of Council (13 Councillors and the Mayor), and stakeholders in the community involved in outdoor recreation facility and service provision in Hamilton.

Interviewed were various City Managers, including the General Manager of Community Services, General Manager of Public Works, Manager of Capital Budgets, Director of Recreation, Director of Parks, Director of Culture, and Supervisor of Administration. A series of group interviews were held with other staff members, including Parks Maintenance Supervisors, Area Supervisors, Parks Design Staff, and the Sports Recreation Coordinators. Individual consultation with parks staff also occurred during the facility tours. A meeting was also held with the City's Long-Range Planning Division to ensure that the study is informed by and coordinated with related planning initiatives, and with staff involved in the collection and monitoring of facility usage data to leverage available information available on activity and program registration/participation data.

All members of City Council were also engaged individually in semi-structured interviews as a means of sharing information and gathering input on issues/complaints and ideas expressed by the various sports groups within their ward and by residents, and also to build an understanding of the characteristics, needs and priorities of the communities within Hamilton. Follow-up interviews were conducted by staff in late 2009 to review the Study's draft recommendations; these discussions are not contained in the following summary.

The input from all key informants has been combined and summarized in this section by type of facility/activity/topic area. Please note that the input has been summarized by the Consultants, but represents the opinions of Councillors and staff. This information should not be construed as being recommendations of the Study. The Consulting Team has used this input to assist in developing recommendations and a strategy for future sport field investment.

Soccer Fields

The most consistently raised issue by all councillors and by staff was a lack of soccer fields and complaints received about grass cutting schedules. While it was understood that the grass was cut as often as the budget permitted, there were general queries around whether or not it was possible to adjusting cuttings to correspond with the soccer schedule rather than a public works schedule. There was also a suggestion of changing the schedule so that it is not affected by rain days, but rather if a cutting was not possible due to rain, it would be cut the next possible

day and all other cuttings adjusted accordingly (this is the City's practice, however, it would seem that some residents have had different experiences). This form of scheduling is used by many agencies including schools and garbage collections in order to eliminate the impact of holidays.

The lack of fields can be addressed in a number of ways, with suggestions ranging from lighting and irrigating more fields to increase usage, redeveloping underutilized baseball diamonds to soccer fields, developing artificial turf and consider bubbling for year round use, and adjusting the season and/or schedule of soccer so that all leagues are not played at the same time or even the same time of year.

Generally it is felt there are not enough Class A fields. Class A fields have change rooms associated with them while Class B would have only a washroom. It was recommended that if fields were to be converted to artificial turf it should be Class B fields as they are already in need of improvement while the city is doing a good job on the Class A fields and they should not be removed.

Requests for indoor soccer facilities were frequently mentioned. Partnering opportunities were suggested as one way to reduce costs as well as repurposing single pad arenas such as Eastwood. Suggestions also included putting a dome at Heritage Green Sports Park and/or at Mohawk Sports Park. It was mentioned that Cardinal Newman High School in Stoney Creek is considering artificial turf.

Conflict with other sports groups such as football, rugby, cricket, and baseball was also raised as an issue. Scheduling solutions and more fields or use of specific fields were suggested solutions.

It was noted that Binbrook had 15 acres of open space that could be developed for soccer. Water service needs to be resolved or the site would not be able to be irrigated. It was also noted that Dofasco has another 100 acres of undeveloped land.

Staff have had good success with the Saltfleet soccer organization and have given them exclusive use of five of the Sherwood Park Fields. The end result has been a greater sense of ownership and responsibility – including no longer playing on rain days. In contrast, Mohawk Sports Park is used by all and no one takes ownership or responsibility for the overuse of the fields.

Some concern was raised about the over use of multipurpose fields. Concern was also expressed that different sporting groups use the fields differently, making it difficult to ensure the right sequence in scheduling (e.g., soccer before rugby, not after).

Baseball Diamonds

Generally all were in agreement that baseball numbers were down and that some diamonds could be converted to other uses. Concern, however, was raised about the loss of school sites and the associated baseball diamonds. Until the full impact of school closures and loss of ball diamonds is understood, it was suggested that caution should be exercised on the removal of any more diamonds. Churchill players have been moved to Alexander Park and lights have been recommended for this park. The conflict with soccer players at Eastwood Park was also noted. The closure of Seneca School initially impacted the local ball group but the City will be reorganizing the adjacent park to resolve the number of diamonds.

No councillors raised the need for additional diamonds other than the replacement of lost school diamonds. The lighting of diamonds in Turner Park and the addition of a washroom was recommended, as was the lighting of the back diamond at Olympic Sports Park (it should be noted, however, that there may be a site specific by-law that restricts lighting in this park even though it is a community park).

Not all ball diamonds are booked by the City; some are booked by committees such as in the Flamborough area. It is not clear what rates are charged or how the money is applied. There is also a concern over the desire of the players to only play Monday to Thursday, thus increasing the pressure for more diamonds, although in reality more than sufficient diamonds exist for the number of players.

It was mentioned that Globe Park diamonds may be lost to the expansion of the sewage treatment plant and solutions included lighting Turner Park.

Spray Pads

A frequent suggestion for improvements to the outdoor recreation system was the development of more spray pads in neighbourhood and community parks. The positive feedback received from both staff and councillors on this form of recreational equipment was consistent across the city. Although distribution and determination of priority should be based on age-specific characteristics of the neighbourhood and the ability of the park to accommodate the facility, specific requests for the development or improvements to spray pads included:

- Alexander Park Ward 1
- Woolverton Park Ward 2
- Anywhere in Ward 3
- Anywhere in Ward 5
- Bruce Park Ward 7
- Carpenter Park Ward 8
- William Schwenger Park Ward 8
- Highland Green Park Ward 9
- Anywhere in Ward 10
- Winona Park Ward 11

Note: The parks identified for spray pad requests include both neighbourhood and community parks, not all of which may be appropriate for spray pad installation.

General consensus was that the wading pools are old and need to be replaced with spray pads.

Skateboard & BMX Facilities

Councillors were divided as to whether or not they wanted a skateboarding facility in their community. Everyone agreed that the Turner Park site was excellent but that washrooms should be added.

New locations suggested included William McCulloch Park, Sir Allan MacNab Recreation Centre, and Cathedral Park. It was noted that no requests for skateboarding facilities have been received in Ward 10.

The recent conflict between skateboarders and bikers at the Turner Park skate park has made it clear that a separate facility is needed for the BMX bike users. If there is a need for a BMX facility, ideally it should be near or in the same park as a skateboard park as often the participants are the same group of youth. Staff noted that the youth are currently using the ravines and that a more controlled environment would be better for both the youth and the environment.

Multi-Purpose Courts

There was strong support for the development of multi-purpose courts. They were noted as well used and that more were needed. Suggestions included fixing the pad at Victoria Park and putting in washrooms. Staff have suggested that these facilities not be lit so as to discourage evening usage.

Artificial Outdoor Ice

Strong praise was given for the existing artificial outdoor rink in Dundas and a desire to see more of these facilities was expressed.

Suggestions for locations included Churchill Park Lawn Bowling site with the recommendation that the clubhouse be winterized and a concession stand established. Other sites suggested were Gage Park, Confederation Park (conservation authority already has washrooms and change rooms associated with the outdoor pool), Scott Park as a great activity for seniors, Parkdale Arena, and the new City Hall.

Bocce Courts

There are about 20 bocce organizations City-wide. Some have established in community parks while others are in neighbourhood parks and some on school property. Many of these organizations are more like “mini seniors’ centres” with a strong social aspect to the group. Upgrades are occurring on some of the facilities and the most frequent request is shade, social meeting space, and washrooms.

It was suggested that no improvements occur on sites that are not on City-owned lands, but that some concessions be considered to establishing washrooms in neighbourhood parks if the membership warrants.

There was some concern that, although the bocce groups do a lot, they also put a lot of demands on staff. In addition they expect free reign of the associated buildings year-round. Unfortunately many of the buildings were not designed for year round use and winterizing is expensive. Many want covered buildings and are really looking for multi use buildings – so they can function as social clubs and “mini seniors’ centres”. Both Triesta (Bethune Park) and Chedoke have successful youth programs. The more organized groups are getting Trillium Funding which can help free up municipal dollars. Currently many groups use the buildings without guidelines and many buildings are not built for certain uses. Non-permitted use appears to be rampant. Staff is not sure if it is just a matter of finding a better way to let them know the rules, but they have found some groups are changing locks, bypassing hydro meters, and drinking beer which is contrary to the city’s no alcohol policy for rented facilities.

Facility agreements may be needed – not just for bocce – but for many of the groups utilizing city buildings. The agreements are needed to address everything from liability, risk

management, allocation of resources, damages, loss of revenue, to perception of ownership, control. Different types of agreements would be required (fairly straightforward if only one group is involved), with different provisos that recognize unique one-offs.

Cricket Pitches

Trying to find a park site suitable for cricket was frequently raised. The existing cricket pitches at Churchill Park and Cathedral Park were both felt to be too small, Eastwood Park would cause conflict with the baseball organizations that currently use the park and Mohawk Sports Park is seen as a temporary solution. As cricket is played by many residents that do not have access to cars, it was felt that new cricket pitches should be located in accessible areas within urban communities. Although the waterfront area was seen as a very desirable location there are no 5 acre flat sites. Finding a good suitable solution was seen as a priority by some councillors.

Lawn Bowling Greens

It was noted that the Churchill Park Lawn Bowling had closed partially due to lack of parking within a reasonable distance of the facility. The non-regulation size green in Ancaster was also noted, with a recommendation that – in concert with the tennis club – the courts and greens both be refurbished to reorient the direction of play for tennis and to add courts as well as enlarge the bowling green. If done correctly it would also be possible to bubble the facility and have a year-round centre. Another suggestion was that two clubs join together at the Ancaster Village Green location (if the fields can be expanded to regulation size and the club house upgraded).

It was also noted that the lawn bowling facilities at the hospital will no be longer available to the club beyond 2009, so an alternative location is needed. There is also a big variation in facility quality, but with the closure of the hospital greens there may be an opportunity to consolidate groups in a larger/newer facility.

There is a great deal of autonomy amongst many lawn bowling groups and there may be a need for formal agreements with the City to help direct roles and responsibilities on City-owned land. The City maintains the lawn bowling green in Ancaster (group gives them 60% of their registration fees to offset costs), but the City does very little maintenance to the Dundas lawn bowling courts (City gives them \$500 a month); conformity in this approach is needed.

Off-Leash Dog Parks

All existing leash free parks are very busy. Almost all councillors wanted an off-leash dog park but not all could find sites that would met appropriate criteria. Suggested locations included Reservoir Park, to the back of the Arena in Binbrook, and Highland Garden Park (on the higher land area to the rear).

Playground Equipment

Upgrades have been requested to the playground equipment at Birge Park.

Special Event Sites

There is general support for special events, although some parks appear to be over-utilized and may not be appropriately located. The need to get services to Bayfront Park so it can hold more festivals and special events was noted as a priority. Parking was also noted as an issue to be resolved for the Winona Peach Festival.

Indoor Facilities / Bubbling of Facilities

Several suggestions came forward to bubble existing facilities to turn them into year round uses. Suggestions included Rosedale Tennis, Lawn Bowling, Bocce and Soccer.

One site where both lawn bowling and tennis could be bubbled together would be in Village Green Park behind the former Town of Ancaster municipal building.

Bubbling of artificial turf fields in Heritage Green Sports Park and Mohawk Sports Park was also suggested.

Picnicking

There was general support for increasing the picnicking opportunities throughout the City's community level parks. When promoting picnicking, washrooms, and shade were also requested, as well as play equipment and spray pads to promote family outings.

Parks Security

A number of sites were noted as needing added security. The Gore is perceived as not being safe, as is the children's museum area of Gage Park.

Parks Maintenance

Overall, there was a very positive response to the level of maintenance at parks, with the exception being the quality and quantity of grass cutting of certain fields and the level of maintenance at the "heritage" parks (which are outside the scope of this Study).

Generally, there was concern that the people cutting the grass were not familiar with the requirements of the sport – particularly soccer and cricket. At the heritage parks the issue was a desire for a higher standard of gardens in parks that have national significance.

Councillors also noted that some parks may need to be given extra attention due to their local prominence and heavy usage. Parks such as Gage, Sam Lawrence, the waterfront, Gore and T.B. McQuesten were noted as being in that category. These parks were seen as jewels of the community and should be maintained at a higher standard.

Issues associated with graffiti and vandalism were also raised, though no solutions provided.

On the issue of more naturalized areas, it was noted as that some love them and others hate them, but that all would benefit from more signage or interpretive plaques so at least one understood it was intentional and beneficial.

Class B and C soccer fields are maintained at the same level. There continue to be different arrangements for different groups. Some are maintaining the fields themselves so it makes it difficult to have a consistent fee policy. Generally it was agreed that fees were too low. Also on the issue of fees it was raised a number of times that the fees for field rental go to the Recreation Department for administration while Public Works is responsible for the maintenance of the fields.

Staff does not feel it has the budget to properly look after the field houses that currently exist, let alone add any more to the system. They also noted that they do not have keys to some of the buildings that are still perceived as a clubs' or organizations' own building. Many of the buildings are old and beyond repair and should just be removed while other will need to be replaced. There is confusion between who maintains what within the parks. While pavilions are maintained by the Recreation Department, some washrooms and other buildings are maintained by Parks under Public Works. Coordination between the two departments could be improved in this regard.

There was a general feeling that sports groups need to have a greater sense of "ownership". Different groups are leery of others as old boundaries still exist in their minds.

Maintenance is also impacted by the fact that the majority of fields are not irrigated and that very few fields are dedicated to one sport (most are multi-use). The pesticide ban will create additional challenges.

It was also felt that there were philosophical differences between the Recreation Department and their mandate "to serve as many people as possible" and the Parks Department's mandate "to provide the best possible, safe fields", which can sometimes lead to customer service complaints about double bookings or grass cutting. The Parks Department does not want any teams on fields until mid-May, as many of their staff split time with arenas and indoor facilities in the winter and early spring and cannot prepare the fields for use until this time. The start of the field season is hard to enforce as many sports groups need to begin their practices and schedules and there is considerable unauthorized use of fields.

Another conflict occurs in the Fall as fields end up being used in October and November and this does not provide fields enough time for the turf to regenerate. From a parks maintenance point of view, the prime time to do field work is in mid-September, but they cannot get onto fields as they are in use.

Due to lack of fields there is currently no ability to rest fields for any period of time. Added to the overutilization is a lack of enforcement of non-permitted use (e.g., some schools frequently use City fields without a permit or when raining, sometimes leaving their fields untouched). More enforcement is needed (e.g., outright ban) if violations are discovered.

There may be a need for guidelines for field usage capacities, as currently many fields are overbooked. With more precise parameters that are enforced there would be fewer maintenance issues. Unfortunately, the Recreation Department is trying to accommodate people's needs and those needs are greater than the number of fields available.

Parks (Operations & Maintenance) feels that there is merit in declining some rental requests, particularly those that may damage fields (e.g., baseball tournament organizer asks to park on grass, put up tents). Because field revenues are not linked to maintenance (100% goes to the

Recreation Department to cover administrative costs), the Parks Department is more inclined to take this position.

Parks Design & Construction

General agreement from most staff and councillors is that there is a need for artificial fields. In addition to adding to the amount of play time through the ability to utilize the field earlier and later in the season and on rain days, artificial turf also accommodates other sports without a conflict resulting in the condition of the field (e.g., football, rugby) and there was the hope that maybe there should be one in each community.

Currently Roads (Public Works) personnel oversee part of the park construction process. This was not perceived as ideal as parks design and construction is not their core skill area. It was recommended that Parks Design (landscape architects) see projects through tender and construction. It has also been found that many of the contractors that build fields are road contractors and they do not understand the technical details of building fields. When the City takes the lowest tender, it often means that corners can get cut (e.g., irrigation zones are not properly set-up). Others see developers building the parks as a “win-win” as it means the parks are developed sooner and are developed in accordance with the City’s Development Manual. Also of note, Operations and Maintenance staff are consulted in the design of parks; as they are the ones that ultimately inherit the park after construction, this approach needs to continue and perhaps be enhanced to ensure sufficient input.

Because of the pesticide ban, new fields will need irrigation. The City needs to develop a program where they add irrigation to at least one field per year.

Staff would like to see specifications on projects that are standardized and “prison-grade” for things like trash cans, lights, sprinkler heads, benches, etc. Currently the City may have several different types and end up having to stock dozens of different part types.

The City currently does not have any parking standards for sports fields (nothing official); direction here is required.

Staff from Parks Planning noted that drinking fountains are a major expense and that they should not be in neighbourhood parks.

Planning of Neighbourhood and Community Parks

There was a consistent theme throughout the interviews that Community Parks needed to have washrooms and shade as a basic requirement. Priority for the adding of washrooms appears to be Turner Park (scheduled for tender in Fall 2009) and Meadowlands Park.

Concern was expressed over the inability to provide lighting in some parks that may be smaller than the standard set for community level facilities yet well located for lighting. It was felt that the rigidity of this policy does not permit the necessary flexibility that might result in better use of public resources. The inability to add washrooms to parks where older adults are encouraged to participate in things such as bocce was also noted as an issue.

Service equipment buildings for clubs were also recommended for sites such as Scott Park. Storage for clubs was raised several times and a specific request was made for a facility at Kay Drage Park (there are restrictions on this site due to the clay cap over the former landfill).

An interest in more art in parks, more shade, more “people gathering” locations, and connecting pathways was also raised. Several expressed an interest in seeing public art in all parks but the budget is small. At the time of redevelopment of parks, public art should be a priority with proper installation by qualified persons.

Dundas Driving Park received praise from all and there were numerous requests for a park like that in other communities.

Overall, it was felt that there is a shortage of community parks, particularly in the Lower Stoney Creek area. The City traditionally has purchased community level parkland and utilized the dedication parkland for neighbourhood parks.

Parking is not sufficient at most parks and in particular the community level parks.

Several felt there was a need for another major sports park capable of hosting major events to reduce the number of times local programming is bumped.

Staff would like to see a policy for public contributions / partnership requests; e.g., community wants a playground, a group wants a soccer field, an association wants a commemorative plaque, etc. Is there a certain percentage of money that should be required before a request is acted upon? And how do you guard against a group then wanting exclusive access?

The Planning Department’s 2006 Report on Parkland Dedication identified what should go into parks; 2ha minimum for neighbourhood parks (but if development only generates 1.2ha, for example, City pays the 0.8ha difference).

Some of the community level parks (such as Dundurn Park), are used for car shows, tobogganing, picnicking. Some are concerned that these activities destroy the heritage features of the site (e.g., compaction of the soil) and render future archaeological exploration difficult. Cultural staff would like Dundurn Park designated as a heritage park and not as a community park. They would also like to have control of the community uses in the parks they are responsible for as they believe there is a question about how a heritage park should be operated.

At some of the heritage sites (which are outside the scope of this study) facility bookings are unclear as to who books what aspect of the park. An example is that a pavilion may be booked for a family picnic but it turns into a 300 person event. There does not seem to be a process in place to filter who should be in what space as there are liability and health issues. The national historic sites are not being maintained to as elevated a standard as they should be.

School Closures

Particularly within the older parts of the City, the closure and disposal of school sites is having an impact on the outdoor open space and recreational facilities. Past practices of treating school sites as public land and locating ball diamonds and play equipment on school board lands is now leaving some neighbourhoods without these facilities as schools are closed and sold for development. The City’s limited financial resources do not permit them to buy all surplus school sites.

The Seneca School closing and loss of its ball diamonds was frequently mentioned, although the City will be addressing the loss of the diamonds through a redevelopment of and adjacent municipal park.

Some felt that by developing this Study, the City would at least know where they cannot afford to lose any more outdoor amenities or parkland.

The problem with the school closures is magnified by the fact that the City has been building school / park campuses for years, which means the schools end up providing less land and what they do provide they do not maintain to the same standard as the City. By not providing the land base the schools would normally need, the schools put extra use on City fields. When the school is then closed the land that the school was providing is lost as are any facilities that the community was using. It is understood that Council is making a motion that the province step in and help provide funding for buying schools back. Also of note, a recent direction from the Economic Development and Planning Committee to Real Estate staff was to establish a fund for the purchase of surplus school lands with the partial severance of residential lots to produce return revenues.

Any reciprocal use agreements with the school board for outdoor fields seem to have also gone by the wayside and any arrangements that do exist now are mostly one-offs. In growth areas, many new schools are trying to use parking in neighbourhood parks. The Planning Department does not want to get away from school/park complexes. From a planning perspective and from achieving the biggest visual return and sense of a hub, the campus complex makes sense but there needs to be better guarantees that the community asset will remain.

SECTION 6 BROAD TRENDS IN PARTICIPATION AND OUTDOOR FACILITY AND PARKS DESIGN

Effective planning for current and future residents of the City of Hamilton requires the identification of existing and emerging trends that could potentially affect outdoor recreation facility and activity needs. Understanding trends related to demographics, participation, facility provision, and design can assist with anticipating shifts in the demand for recreation opportunities. This section summarizes major trends based largely on information collected from provincial and national research. The implications of these trends to the City of Hamilton have also been identified based on information collected to date.

6.1 *Socio-Demographic Trends*

Lack of Personal Time

“Lack of time” as a barrier to participation is largely a result of the evolving employment and family structures in Canada. Commuting, home-based occupations, night shifts, and weekend work are placing even greater pressures on prime-time leisure hours (e.g., 6pm to 10pm weekdays and all day on weekends). Similarly, the changing face of the Canadian family, with many lone-parent families, is putting significant constraints on recreation and leisure participation. This is an important demographic group to consider, as the 2006 Statistics Canada Census data revealed that 15.9% of all Census families are lone-parent (17.8% in Hamilton). The average Canadian has only 6 hours of free time a day and is presented with an unprecedented range of opportunities in the marketplace (e.g., television, Internet, video games, etc.) which are consuming more time. Not surprisingly, the 65+ age group has the greatest amount of free time and those in the 25-44 have the least (3 hours). This supports the notion that casual and unstructured activities, as well as events and programs for older adults, will offer a significant opportunity for growth. The City will continue to design its parks and recreation offerings to accommodate non-programmed and multi-use spaces (e.g., trails, open space, informal play and gathering areas, playgrounds, skateboard parks, etc.) and drop-in programming.

Local Context – As in most communities, a lack of personal time was the primary barrier to outdoor recreational participation in Hamilton (22% of respondents to the household survey). Parks and resources that support casual and unstructured activities are expected to be in high demand in Hamilton in the coming years, as these best respond to the ‘time crunch’ being felt by all age groups. Extended hours and accessible locations are also keys to encouraging participation. Furthermore, because there is strong demand for prime time hours, there is growing demand for indoor facilities (e.g., soccer) that are not affected by the weather and related interruptions.

Increased Community Diversity

Ethnic diversity in communities is increasing, and subsequently recreation and leisure needs are evolving. Many cultures see recreation and leisure as a family event and are more inclined to do activities together. This growing diversity also creates the need for a wider range of activities and facilities, such as cricket, picnicking, badminton, etc.

Local Context – When compared with the provincial averages, the City of Hamilton has slightly lower percentages of its population that are immigrants. However, some communities (i.e., Lower Stoney Creek) have a greater percentage of immigrants than the provincial average. Overall, nearly 43,000 Hamilton residents have immigrated to Canada since 1991 (representing 8.5% of the City’s current population). The City should continue to be cognizant of the needs of these groups in these communities to integrate their preferences for activities and cultural expression with those of the entire City. Increased demand for picnic shelters, outdoor kitchenettes, cricket pitches, special event areas, and informal play areas can be expected as a result.

Aging Population

Members of the Baby Boomer demographic are quickly reaching retirement age, resulting in a significant ‘greying’ of the population and greater demand for programs and activities aimed at older adults. This generation may be shifting away from traditional seniors’ activities and towards more active recreation, seeking quality wellness and active living opportunities. The ‘new senior’ will typically be wealthier and more physically active than those in previous generations; activities of interest will include swimming, yoga, Pilates, fitness, walking, and even more rigorous activities, such as hockey. There will still be a group of seniors that reflect the historical interests for seniors, such as curling, card playing, and cultural activities, but this will represent a small portion of the total senior population. Between 2006 and 2026, the number of Canadian seniors is expected to increase from 4.3 million to 9.8 million¹.

Local Context – The percentage of the City of Hamilton’s population that is over the age of 60 is expected to grow from 20% to 31% by 2031, while the percentages comprised by all other age groups will either remain static or decrease. The City of Hamilton can expect an extra 107,532 residents over the age of 60 by the end of the planning period in 2031. As a result, there will be greater demand for services for this age group (based more on ability than age), as well as facilities. In relation to outdoor recreation facilities, an aging population will mean greater pressure to create senior-friendly parks (e.g., more benches and sitting areas, shade, paved pathways, etc.) and could translate into continued demand for traditional adult sports such as slo-pitch, lawn bowling, and even adult soccer. There will also be a growing interest in locating parks in close proximity to seniors’ residences and with appropriate trail linkages (e.g., Joe Sams Leisure Park).

Increased Inactivity and Obesity

The proportion of obese children has increased threefold in the past 25 years, and less than half of all Canadian children are active enough to achieve optimal growth and development². A 2004 survey by the Canadian federal government found that 6.8 million Canadians between the ages of 20 and 64 are overweight and an additional 4.5 million are obese³. From a municipal perspective, the alarming rates of childhood and youth obesity provide a strong basis for ongoing support of programs which foster improved levels of activity. Health risks of obesity

¹ CBC News. (2007). Boomers to reshape what it means to be a senior. Available online at www.cbc.ca).

²Health Canada and the Public Health Agency of Canada. (2006). It’s Your Health. Available from: <http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/hl-vs/iyh-vsv/life-vie/obes-eng.php>. Accessed: June 25, 2008.

³ Starky, S. (2005). The Obesity Epidemic in Canada. Parliamentary Information and Research Service. July 15, 2005

include Type 2 diabetes, stroke, mental health problems (e.g., depression, low self-esteem), high blood pressure and stroke⁴.

Local Context – The City of Hamilton has a number of programs geared towards increasing the levels of physical activity of its residents of all ages. For example, the Healthy Living Hamilton organization is a coalition (comprised of private health groups, the City, and the Ministry of Health Promotion) that focuses on the promotion of “healthy eating, physical activity, tobacco-free living and stress management.”⁵ Its programs include ‘Feel the Power Feel the Fit’ (a club which helps women that live and/or work in Hamilton fit physical activity into their day), ‘Hamilton Walks’ (which was created in partnership with City of Hamilton Public Health Services and promotes walking as a form of recreation, transportation, and healthy physical activity), and ‘Woman Alive!’ (a free 10 week physical activity/health education program for women on a limited income). The City also promotes the ‘Active Recess’ program in its schools, which promotes physical activity in school-aged children. *KidSport Hamilton* is the local chapter of *KidSport Ontario* and helps provide underserved children and youth gain access to recreation programs by subsidizing registration fees and providing equipment grants. Local agencies and community organizations (such as Hamilton Conservation) also play a significant role in non-structured recreation, although often at a cost to the participants. In all, the City and its partners are working to promote healthy lifestyles among its residents and the provision of parks and outdoor recreation opportunities – both organized and unorganized – plays a very big part in achieving this objective.

Income and Affordability

Level of income can be a significant barrier to participation in leisure pursuits, particularly in organized, structured environments. Municipalities are facing increasing pressure to offer affordable recreation programs and subsidies to promote participation among all user groups. In general, older adults have more disposable income to spend on leisure pursuits, while young families, youth, and economically disadvantaged individuals may find it difficult to afford to pursue a healthy lifestyle through participation in recreation. Statistics Canada has identified that the richest 10% of the Canadian population have seen a 14% increase in their income, while the poorest 10% have seen an income increase of less than 1%. The term ‘working poor’ has been put forward in recent years to describe the financial situation of many Canadians who have a job but do not have any additional funds beyond paying for life necessities (due to increasing cost of living).

Local Context – The City of Hamilton’s median income for all private households in 2005 was \$5,143 below the provincial average of \$60,455 (Statistics Canada, 2006). As such, financial assistance policies and low cost / no cost programming options are an absolute requirement. For example, the City of Hamilton currently offers financial assistance for child care to eligible families, as well as Ontario Early Years Centres and Ontario Works Employment Assistance centres, among other opportunities. The City also offers free access to its summer playlot programs and many of its parks facilities are free of charge, including spray pads, basketball courts, public tennis courts, playgrounds, skate parks, off-leash areas, trails, etc. Furthermore, rental fees for sports fields are highly subsidized as the rates do not cover costs associated with field maintenance.

⁴ Health Canada and the Public Health Agency of Canada. (2006). *It’s Your Health*. Available from: <http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/hl-vs/iyh-vsv/life-vie/obes-eng.php>. Accessed: June 25, 2008.

⁵ Healthy Living Hamilton. (2005-2009). *Our Vision*. Available from: <http://doitwell.ca/pages/About+Us/Our+Vision.html>. Accessed: May 12, 2009.

In terms of outdoor recreation, all sports leagues are operated by the volunteer and private sectors, many of which have informal financial assistance programs that promote participation regardless of household financial situations. Due to the current economic climate, many of these organizations have witnessed a noticeable increase in the number of subsidy requests. Opportunities to break down financial barriers may need to be explored further with the municipality and associated agencies.

Growth Patterns and Residential Intensification

The *Places to Grow Act* (2005) is a provincial initiative that ensures that “growth plans reflect the needs, strengths and opportunities of the communities involved, and promotes growth that balances the needs of the economy with the environment.” The rapid expansion of urban areas across the province, particularly in the Greater Golden Horseshoe, has necessitated the consideration of managing future growth through intensification of our existing footprint. Increased densities in existing urban areas can place significant pressure on older facilities, many of which were not built to sustain higher levels of use (nor are some built to modern standards). Furthermore, land is at a premium in intensifying areas and it will become increasingly difficult to acquire sufficient parkland to serve a growing population.

Local Context: While the population density in many of the City of Hamilton’s communities may make it difficult to acquire new land in built-up areas, the City has an opportunity to explore placemaking and other methods of providing recreation space. Projected growth and future intensification plans will be key elements in the planning of outdoor recreation and sports field facilities, particularly in growing greenfield areas such as Upper Stoney Creek. To the degree possible, this study should consider the impact of residential intensification on the number and type of existing and future facilities.

Neighbourhood-based Facility Planning

The successful management of growth and intensification may require any number of planning strategies, including a direct focus on the needs of individual neighbourhoods as they relate to the municipality as a whole. The goal of neighbourhood planning is “to build social capital, which is the ability of the neighbourhood to organize itself to identify problems and solve them in partnership with elected officials, businesses, and public agencies.”⁶ Neighbourhood planning can provide an impetus for community building by fostering an identity and making it easier for residents to come together to undertake community/neighbourhood development activities. On the level of facility planning, neighbourhood level considerations must include the history of the community, demographics, housing options that are applicable to the residents (existing and future), safety, and education and recreation opportunities.

Local Context – For this study, the City of Hamilton has been divided into nine primary study areas, each of which has unique recreation needs based on population makeup, location, main land use (e.g., urban or rural), and existing facilities. The specific needs of each neighbourhood (e.g., sub-areas within each community) should be considered when conducting both short and long term planning exercises. In some areas, it may be necessary to provide additional recreation opportunities – as well as maintaining public infrastructure for community use (e.g. older surplus schools) – and consideration will have to be given to the sustainability of ‘walk-to’ facilities. The geographic distribution of existing outdoor facilities and parks will need to be

⁶ Colombo, L. & Balizer, K. (2005). Introduction to Neighborhood Planning. Available at: http://www.neighborhoodplanning.org/topic1_intro.htm.

examined to determine if the needs of the City as a whole, as well as local level needs, are being met.

Changes to the School Supply

A new report from People for Education (May 2009) shows that 146 schools are closing or recommended to close in Ontario; a total of 40 new schools will be built to replace them. A further 16 schools closed in 2008. Over 100 more are undergoing accommodation reviews.

This report found that since 1997/98, there has been a 15% decline in average enrolment in Ontario elementary schools. Since 2002, average enrolment in secondary schools has seen a 14% decline. This decline is a phenomenon across the country, the result of reduced birth rate and immigration rates that do not offset the general aging of the population.

Local Context – As noted, the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board (HWDSB) and Hamilton-Wentworth District Catholic School Board (HWDCSB) are both dealing with declining student enrolment figures, which is requiring them to consolidate and close several schools over a period of time. At the same time, residential growth in new areas is also generating demand for some new schools. The net result is an overall decline in the number of elementary and secondary schools, along with strategic investment in some of the Boards' older and better utilized schools.

Information provided by HWDSB indicates that they have closed 42 schools since 1998 (some have been replaced or consolidated). 19 more schools (mostly elementary schools) will soon be under review, with closure being a likely possibility (note: the names of these schools have yet to be publicly released). In addition, more school closures (including high school sites) could be forthcoming in the future as the enrolment peak (currently around grade 10/11) works its way through the system. The HWDCSB is not projecting nearly as many school closures, but has recently announced some consolidations and is planning for a small number of new and replacement schools in the future.

From an outdoor recreation perspective, the end result is the potential loss of valued neighbourhood and community sites, many of which are well utilized by residents for organized and unorganized recreation outside of school hours. Many of these sites contain booked sports fields and playgrounds, several of which may have been funded and/or maintained by the City.

While the City will have the option of purchasing many of these surplus sites, the cost to do so may be prohibitive as they are sold at current market rates. Furthermore, some sites may be too small to accommodate additional sports fields (which is one of the City's greatest pressures) and most will not likely be able to be lit due to adjacent residential areas.

On the other hand, several new schools are slated to be built, some as replacements to existing schools (or consolidations of two schools), and others to serve new growth in areas such as Binbrook (Glanbrook), Winona (Lower Stoney Creek), Waterdown (Flamborough), and Ancaster. Several of these schools may include outdoor sports fields that could be used by the local community. Furthermore, renewal and redevelopment of some older schools may also offer opportunities to improve recreational facilities.

6.2 Service Provision Trends

Partnerships

In response to emerging consumer demands and shifting economic conditions, many communities are pursuing partnership approaches that dramatically differ from traditional service delivery mechanisms. Partnerships, alliances, and collaborative relationships of varying types are required in today's economy to effectively and efficiently provide for the leisure needs of citizens. There is growing interest in public-private partnerships (P3s) including arrangements wherein municipalities share formal operating or cost sharing relationships with community organizations and/or school boards. A 2006 survey that investigated the level of support amongst Canadians for P3s, found that 9 out of 10 Canadians believe that federal, provincial and municipal governments are not keeping pace with demand for new or improved public infrastructure services⁷. Furthermore, 72% agreed that P3s should be used in the recreation sector to improve or create new facilities and programs. The challenge is to create relationships that provide mutual benefit to those involved in the partnerships while protecting the interests of those affected by them.

Local Context – The City has numerous formal and informal agreements pertaining to outdoor sports fields and recreation facilities, ranging from the school board (informal use and maintenance agreement for several sports fields and playgrounds) to fundraising collaborations (e.g., Rotary Club rink in Dundas Driving Park) to maintenance agreements with lawn bowling clubs and more. Although many of these partnerships that the City has with the community and other service providers are working well, some are showing strain and the lack of formal agreements – and an inability to utilize a consistent approach across the board – are matters that will require more attention in the future.

Volunteerism

Volunteers are essential to community engagement and the operation of most leisure programs, including organized sports, special events, and programs for children. The 2007 *National Survey of Giving, Volunteering and Participating* indicated that volunteerism is rising slightly (5.7% increase in the total number of volunteers, from 11.8 million in 2004 to 12.5 million in 2007), but our experience in several other communities suggests that many leisure organizations still struggle to find volunteers. One key result of this study was that 17% of the volunteer hours in Canada are in the sports and recreation sector (which includes organizations and activities related to amateur sports and recreation and social clubs), which suggests that there is a wealth of opportunity for volunteerism within this sector. However, while approximately 46% of Canadians (15 years or older) volunteered in 2007, it should be noted that 12% of Canadians contributed 78% of the total volunteer hours in 2007. Volunteers contributed an average of 119 hours (annually) to sports and recreation organizations. When asked about early life experiences and their impact upon the individual's decision to volunteer later in life, 52% of all volunteers reported participating in a team sport.

Local Context – *Volunteer Hamilton* was established in 1963 and provides residents with a database of volunteer opportunities that is searchable by community, job type, area of interest and youth specific jobs. As the City's population ages, its voluntary organizations will need to

⁷The Canadian Council for Public Private Partnership (2006). Trends in Canadian Support for Public Private Partnerships. Available online at: www.pppcouncil.ca

reach out to new volunteers to fill vacated positions. It is hoped that the provincially mandated high school volunteer hours will help fill these gaps and instill lifelong interest in volunteering.

Pesticide Legislation

On April 22, 2009, the Province of Ontario enacted a cosmetic pesticides ban, which prohibits the use of pesticides for cosmetic purposes in parks and school yards. Sports fields are allowed a short-term exception from the ban to host national or international level sports competitions (with appropriate approvals). Further, pesticides can be used to maintain specialty turf such as lawn bowling greens, cricket pitches, and lawn tennis courts, if certain conditions are met.

Local Context – The City of Hamilton was one of the first municipalities to introduce a Pesticide Use Policy. The provincial cosmetic pesticides ban will now supersede any municipal legislation, but the City's commitment to the elimination of pesticide use is commendable and should continue. Nevertheless, the City faces a number of new challenges given the recent province-wide pesticide ban, including changes to its horticultural practices (such as integrated pest management and integrated plant health care programs), as well as how City fields are lined, both of which will have cost implications.

Environmental Stewardship

The importance of environmental protection and conservation is increasingly being recognized by society and, as people become more aware of the benefits of environmental protection, demand for passive settings and trails that connect people to nature is increasing. Municipalities are placing a greater emphasis on the development of passive park space (e.g., woodlots, prairie grasslands, flower gardens, civic gathering spaces, trails, etc.), often ensuring that a portion of new active parks remains in a more natural state. Naturalized park spaces (whether by 'maintaining' a site in its natural state or 'returning' a site to its natural state) are becoming more popular and are consistent with many of the principles related to environmental stewardship. Naturalization typically involves reduced grass cutting and pesticide use, as well as the planting of native species, which should be accompanied by a public education program to create awareness in the community of the environmental benefits of this approach.

Local Context – The City of Hamilton takes great pride in its initiatives in the areas of waste diversion, energy conservation, green transportation, and greener spaces. The City has an Office of Energy Initiatives, which oversees the City's energy conservation policies as part of the Public Works department. As well, the City planted 2,100 street trees through a planting program.

Increased Interest in Casual and Unprogrammed Activities

Many organized sports are experiencing stable to declining participation in many organized sports (with some exceptions, e.g., soccer), although greater gender equity is lessening the impact of this backwards trend. Less than 30% of Canadians above the age of 15 participate regularly in one or more sports, a considerable decline from the early 1990s when the proportion was closer to one half⁸. As such, informal, drop-in, and self-scheduled activities have emerged as increasingly attractive options for many, particularly youth.

⁸ Statistics Canada. The Daily Study: Participation in sports. February 7, 2008. Based on the 2005 General Social Survey. www.statcan.ca/daily/english/080207/d080207b.htm.

Local Context – The City of Hamilton offers a wide range of drop-in activities at its indoor recreation facilities (such as sports, fitness, family activities, teen-specific programs, passive activities, and after-school care). Parks, by their nature, are largely designed to accommodate unprogrammed activities such as those that occur on playgrounds, spray pads, many hard surface courts, pathways, and open space. The exception is sports fields, which are rented facilities for which a fee applies. Unauthorized and non-permitted usage of sports fields has been noted a problem, but one which the City is unable to consistently monitor and enforce. Hamilton offers very few no-fee sports fields available for open public use (i.e., first come, first serve) and those that it does tend to be small, low quality, neighbourhood-level ball diamonds.

Grassroots Participation

What Sport Can Do, The True Sport Report released by the Canadian Centre for Ethics in Sport in 2008, focuses upon the benefits of community (i.e., grassroots) sport. The report suggests that at the community level, the goal should be participation in fun and inclusive activities that promote healthy lifestyles. According to the report, “92% of Canadians believe that community-based sport can have a positive influence in the lives of youth” (p.2). Physical, intellectual, social and emotional development are all cited as positive benefits of community sport.

Local Context – The City of Hamilton and many affiliated organizations provide this level of service for a number of programs. This is a key element of recreation provision, as municipalities are the only bodies resourced to provide this level of service on an inclusive, community-wide scale. Introductory level programs allow residents to sample a number of different activities before seeking a provider of advanced level instruction. Care must be taken to continue offering basic level programming and field time to organizations with similar mandates.

Increased Specialization

While grassroots participation is seen as the primary goal of municipal and many volunteer led programs, there is a growing trend towards specialization. For example, the emergence of soccer academies (both not-for-profit and for-profit) for elite athlete training has provided those athletes that exhibit exceptional skill the opportunity to further hone their talents with similarly skilled peers. This idea has been prevalent through the existence of select and competitive teams that draw the best players from the house league pool to compete in tournaments or in other leagues, but the academy idea (based on European-style player development) allows for higher intensity and competition training that focuses on each player above the whole team.

Local Context – The Soccer Academy Alliance Canada (SAAC) is an administrative association that regulates its members academies and schools of excellence. The SAAC currently includes one academy in the City of Hamilton (Dribble, Pass and Shoot Soccer Academy), as well as a number in the GTA. As soccer academies are not affiliated with the Ontario Soccer Association, their registration data is not publicly reported.

SECTION 7 ABOUT THE FACILITY PROFILES & NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Sections 8 to 17 include an in-depth examination of sports fields and outdoor recreation facilities. Specifically, these sections contain information related to Facility Profiles and Needs Assessments:

Facility Profiles

- Supply
- Distribution
- Physical Condition
- Trends, Best Practices, and Benchmarking
- Utilization
- Other Observations

Needs Assessments

- City-wide Needs Assessment
- Community-specific Needs Assessment
- Recommended Directions

7.1 About the Facility Profiles

Hamilton has a wide range of types of outdoor public-use recreation facilities. All City-owned and/or maintained sports fields and outdoor recreation facilities included in the scope of this study are identified on a series of maps contained within this report. The City-owned facilities included in the scope of this study have been grouped into one or more of the following facility categories:

Soccer, Football and Multi-use Fields include rectangular sports fields that are used exclusively for soccer, exclusively for football, or shared between soccer and other sports such as football (tackle, touch, aussie rules), rugby, lacrosse, field hockey, and ultimate frisbee. The size, condition, and amenities of these fields vary significantly; a classification system consisting of Classes A, B, and C has been established to differentiate between the various types of fields. Included in this category are fields that are contained with City parks, as well as other fields under municipal influence (e.g., fields on non-municipal properties that are maintained and/or booked by the City). Nearly all available soccer and multi-use fields are booked for organized play, either by the City, school boards, or private clubs.

Ball Diamonds include fields that are used for baseball, hardball, softball, slo-pitch, t-ball, and fastball. The size, condition, and amenities of these fields vary significantly; the City has not formally adopted a classification system to differentiate between the various types of fields, but one has been proposed through this study. Included in this category are diamonds that are contained with City parks, as well as other diamonds under municipal influence (e.g., diamonds on non-municipal properties that are maintained and/or booked by

the City). Most ball diamonds are booked for organized play, either by the City, school boards, or private clubs; however, some lower quality fields are available for informal (non-organized) use.

Cricket Pitches include oval-shaped sports fields that are used exclusively for cricket activities. At present, the size, condition, and amenities of these fields varies significantly across the City.

Hard Surface Courts include outdoor rectangular courts that are used for tennis (public or club activity), basketball, and/or street hockey; some courts are sport-specific, while others are multi-purpose. The design, size, and amenities of these facilities vary significantly across the City. Most courts are situated on City property; however, several schools also offer opportunities for these activities (not all of which may be accounted for in this Study). The private sector is also a major provider of higher-level tennis opportunities; the private supply has not be extensively inventoried as part of this Study.

Bocce Courts & Lawn Bowling Greens include outdoor facilities that accommodate organized bocce (on narrow sand lanes, typically provided in groups of two or more) and organized lawn bowling (on square grass greens). Most (but not all) bocce and lawn bowling facilities have associated support structures for storage, washrooms, and clubhouse space. Access to these facilities is gained through memberships with the associated clubs, and responsibilities for maintenance (i.e., the City or club) vary from location to location.

Playgrounds include sites containing traditional play equipment (e.g., slides, swings, teeters, climbers, etc.) and/or creative play structures. The size, design, features, and surfaces of playground sites vary significantly across the City. Included in this category are playgrounds that are contained with City parks, as well as other playgrounds under municipal influence (e.g., playgrounds on non-municipal properties, such as schools, that are maintained by the City).

Spray Pads & Wading Pools refer to outdoor aquatic facilities that cater primarily to children; they are typically open during July and August (some have slightly extended seasons) and charge no admission fee. Wading pools are small and shallow concrete bowls or tanks that are lifeguarded and are typically drained daily. Spray pads (also referred to as splash pads or waterplay facilities) consist of one or more water features – such as spouts, jets, sprayers, etc. (some of which may be user activated) – that have no standing water and presently have no lifeguarding requirement. An assessment of outdoor pools (but not wading pools) was undertaken as part of the City's 2008 Public Use Facilities Study.

Other Outdoor Recreation Amenities include a wide range of outdoor amenities typically found in City parks, including skateboard parks, bike parks, off-leash dog areas, outdoor ice rinks, community garden plots, outdoor running tracks, free play areas (informal playing fields), special event grounds, and pathways (but excluding trails outside of parks). Although there are exceptions, the use of most of these facilities is unorganized (i.e., not league or structured play) and most are able to be used free of charge (with the exception of City-wide running tracks, garden plots, and special event grounds).

Support Buildings include structures overseen by the City's Recreation Division and contain washrooms, field/club houses, office/meeting space, and/or storage intended to support the use of parks and/or sports fields. The size, condition, and amenities of these buildings vary significantly across the City. Some buildings are available for public access

and use, while others are available only to specific organizations. The City does not have complete information on these buildings, but is working towards establishing a more comprehensive inventory and condition assessment. Excluded are stand-alone buildings that support park maintenance, as well as pavilions and shelters. Other indoor public use structures (e.g., community centres, halls, indoor pools, etc.) are also excluded as these have been addressed in the City's 2008 Public Use Facilities Study.

Indoor Sports Facilities refer to indoor facilities that traditionally have an outdoor use, such as indoor soccer, bocce, lawn bowling, and tennis. Presently, the City does not offer any such indoor sports facilities (with the exception of the Chedoke bocce courts, which are covered but not fully enclosed, and the club tennis courts in Gage Park, which are bubbled in the winter). The City's future involvement in the provision of such facilities is considered as part of this Study. Excluded from this analysis are ice arenas, community centres, swimming pools, gymnasiums (see the City's 2008 study for Indoor Public Use Recreation Facilities).

For each facility type, information and opinion is expressed relating to trends and best practices in the provision and use of those facilities, the City's current inventory and facility provision and distribution levels, and a review of the capacity, usage, and condition of these facilities (where applicable). The review of the existing supply, capacity and usage of each facility by type is pertinent in determining the current and future needs of recreational facilities in a community.

In terms of the geographic distribution of facilities – which is a key consideration in undertaking the community-specific needs assessments – service radii have been applied to neighbourhood and community level facilities (e.g., playgrounds, basketball courts, spray pads, etc.) to identify significant gaps or overlaps in provision. These service radii are not to be interpreted rigidly, but rather serve as one consideration in identifying needs and priorities. If two or more facilities are located within the same service area, this does not necessarily mean that one facility should be removed (as local demand may be sufficient to support both facilities; this is often the case in the denser populated areas such as Lower Hamilton and Hamilton Mountain). At the very least, however, when service areas overlap, consideration may be given to re-purposing one facility at the time that a park is redeveloped. These service radii can also be of use when developing new parks as they show the distribution of nearby park amenities and their general service area.

Similarly, the capacity/usage review (undertaken through an analysis of rental data and findings established through the Study's observation project) is but one element in a full analysis, and it must be completed in order to determine:

- if the facility inventory is meeting current needs in the community;
- the full capacity of facilities and the extent to which they are being utilized;
- if the facility type should remain (or become) a core component in the City's parks system;
- whether there are enough facilities of various types (or an oversupply) to meet future needs;
- whether the City should look to other potential uses for existing facilities (i.e., conversion); and,
- whether there is pent-up demand in activities in the various facility types.

Data Sources & Notes – Facility Profiles:

- i) Identification of facility inventory supplies and locations was the responsibility of the City of Hamilton and were captured/compiled from databases (3).
- ii) All facility booking data contained in this report was provided by the City of Hamilton Recreation Division. The sports field utilization data is based on 2008 bookings (through the Class registration system); usage data was not available for all sports fields as many are scheduled by school boards and community organizations. In reviewing this data, there are a number of items to consider:
 - The rental data only applies to those fields booked by the City of Hamilton. Similar data is not available for fields booked directly by schools, local organizations, volunteers, or other providers. This is particularly the case for several ball diamonds.
 - While this data is a good indicator of rentals, “rentals” are not synonymous with “utilization”. Many fields (especially soccer fields adjacent to schools) receive a large amount of unauthorized and non-permitted usage that is not logged in the City’s facility reservation system. As such, it is likely that actual usage levels are greater than the stated bookings.
 - The availability of fields changes slightly from year to year based on redevelopment projects, field condition, booking practices, etc.
 - Some fields may be used for activities other than sports, such as festivals or events. These rentals are not included in the following data.
 - Many of the under-utilized fields (ball diamonds in particular) are small fields with limitations (e.g., they are not appropriate for teen or adult play) and are often located at single field neighbourhood parks that are not conducive to league play. Some of these diamonds may be left available for unorganized community use.
 - In most cases, lighted fields and diamonds receive a greater amount of rentals than do unlighted sports fields due to their ability to accommodate night play and their higher standard of design and upkeep.

In addition to the sports field rental data, information on wading pool and playlot utilization has also been provided to the Consultants.

Usage data for unstructured outdoor recreation facilities is based on data collected through the Observation Project specifically undertaken for this Study. The Observation Project was intended to identify usage levels of selected unscheduled outdoor recreation facilities in parks and consisted of the following:

- Beginning in late May and continuing through to the middle of August 2009, 70 parks in the City of Hamilton were observed on an average of 6 different occasions to record information on usage.
- Parks were selected if they contained spray pads, tennis courts, and/or skate parks. In addition, these 70 parks contain over one-half of the City’s basketball and multi-purpose courts, one-quarter of the City’s playgrounds, and several sports fields and other outdoor recreation amenities.

- Data was collected on the number and characteristics of users of all available park amenities. The time of day and weather conditions were also documented.
 - Efforts were made to visit each park 6 times, once each during a weekday morning, weekday afternoon, weekday evening, weekend morning, weekend afternoon, and weekend evening.
- iii) Participation / registration data for sports field users was collected through the user group survey and supplemented by the City of Hamilton Recreation Division; this data is not normally collected by the City. Efforts were made to identify all major user groups, however, participation levels for occasional renters was not estimated. Given that much of the data was self-reported or estimated, its accuracy cannot be determined, but is deemed to be reasonable for use in this Study.
- v) Any physical accessibility evaluations were conducted by the consulting team and were based purely on visual observations.
- vi) The following acronyms are used in many of the subsequent tables to describe the geographic territory within which facilities are located.
- | | |
|-----|----------------------|
| ANC | Ancaster |
| BEV | Beverly |
| FLA | Flamborough |
| GLA | Glanbrook |
| HM | Hamilton Mountain |
| LH | Lower Hamilton |
| LSC | Lower Stoney Creek |
| USC | Upper Stoney Creek |
| WHD | West Hamilton/Dundas |
- vii) Stakeholder / User group Surveys and Workshops, Public Meetings, and Random Sample Household Surveys were all used to solicit information and opinion on usage, participation, preferences, demands, opportunities, priorities, and strategies. This input has been critical in understanding local needs and expectations, both City-wide and across Hamilton's various communities.
- viii) 2006 demographic data was compiled using information from the 2006 Census and does not include allowances for census undercount. Population forecasts were provided by the City's Planning and Economic Development Department and were generally consistent with the 2007 GRIDS projections.

7.2 About the Needs Assessments

City-wide Needs Assessment

The purpose of the City-wide needs assessment is to establish overall direction for overall facility provision through the development of generally accepted targets. In creating these targets and associated strategies, emphasis was given to public input, benchmarking, participation and demographic trends, as well as the City's 2002 Parks, Culture and Recreation Master Plan and the methodology established in the City of Hamilton's *Use, Renovation and Replacement Study for Hamilton Recreation and Public-Use (Indoor) Facilities* (2008).

These targets represent long-term goals that may not be realized for some years to come. They are not intended to be strictly adhered to at the local level as each community may have different needs based on its unique profile – further analysis at the community level is contained later in this section.

In addition to those directions outlined in the Guiding Principles (Section 3), the following are some of the overall strategies utilized in creating the needs assessment framework:

- i) **Reinvesting in existing infrastructure** through capital construction or improved maintenance practices (where community need is still evident) should generally be a higher priority than building new infrastructure.
- ii) Changes should only be recommended if they bring “**increased benefits**” to a community.
- iii) Facilities that attract **greater intensities of use** will be located at community parks, wherever possible (as opposed to neighbourhood parks), such as lit sports fields and special event sites.
- iv) While a grass sports field can, in theory, accommodate around-the-clock use, the resultant wear and tear would create unreasonable safety concerns due to the deterioration of the turf. As such, **field capacities and allocation policies** that balance turf maintenance and community access are required to better manage the supply and future usage.
- v) Based on public input and a preliminary review of the City’s outdoor recreational infrastructure, the **highest priorities** for future investment (e.g., upgrades, expansions, new development) will be sports fields (soccer fields in particular), playgrounds, pathways within parks, and park support buildings (washrooms in particular).
- vi) Strong consideration should be given to **re-purposing or converting** facilities instead of continuing with current uses that are inconsistent with existing or emerging local community needs.
- vii) Needs have been identified primarily based on **demand**, not specifically on the City’s ability to meet these needs (although financial implications cannot be fully ignored). Opportunities and funding to accommodate all required sports fields and recreation facilities may not be evident at this time, but options and alternatives (including working with the community and other partners) are considered through this Study’s Implementation Plan.
- viii) The **geographic accessibility and distribution** of certain features is a key factor in determining overall needs, particularly those amenities for which there is an expectation that they be provided within reasonable walking distance (i.e., at the neighbourhood level), such as playgrounds.
- ix) Site-specific **Park Master Plans** may be required prior to any significant facility expansion, re-purposing, or development.
- x) The **specific needs of each community** must be accounted for – different targets may apply to different areas (see the next sub-section). While efforts should be made to

accommodate most sports within their community of need, some activities may have a City-wide draw and cannot be provided in every community.

Some key trends affecting nearly all facility types that were considered as part of the City-wide needs assessment include the following:

- a) The City's population is **growing, aging, and becoming more ethnically diverse**. Activity profiles are also changing; e.g., the seniors of tomorrow are expected to be more active than current and past generations.
- b) Financially, there is a widening **gap between the "haves" and the "have nots"** – there are areas in Hamilton where this is more apparent than others.
- c) There is concern over high rates of **physical inactivity** and weight problems, particularly in children and youth.
- d) There is growing interest in **unstructured, informal, and self-scheduled activities**, often at the expense of organized recreation. Furthermore, activity patterns are changing and there is increased demand for sports and activities that were not contemplated by past generations (e.g., skateboard parks, cricket pitches, off-leash dog parks, etc.).
- e) The City's outdoor recreational **infrastructure is aging** and much of it is not designed to modern standards; considerable investment is required.
- f) Local **school boards are closing**, consolidating, and redeveloping several schools (often on smaller sites). With many outdoor recreational amenities being located on school grounds – several of which are actively and intensively used by the local community – this presents a number of challenges and opportunities. Particularly within the older parts of the City, the closure and disposal of school sites (many of which served as neighbourhood parks or sports field locations) is having an impact on the outdoor open space and recreational facilities. The City's limited financial resources do not permit them to buy all surplus school sites.
- g) There is a growing realization that the City cannot meet all local needs by itself. This is leading to the development of **creative partnerships** that share the burden of risks and responsibilities for the overall benefit of the community.
- h) Due to historic land use and development patterns, **park shortages** are evident in many older neighbourhoods and opportunities to resolve these shortages are few and costly. A lack of parkland in some areas means that certain facility needs may not be able to be accommodated locally, while greater pressure will be placed on establishing partnerships with other providers.
- i) Comments from the internal and external consultation program suggest that the City's **maintenance budget** is not sufficient for the optimal care of its sports fields and outdoor recreational amenities. Ongoing fiscal restraints and unfunded inventory creep increases the underfunding of sports field maintenance programs lowering turf quality and facility capacity. There is a feeling that this has left the City scrambling to keep up – repairing turf here and there – but inevitably falling farther behind.

- j) The City faces a number of new challenges given the recent province-wide **pesticide ban**, including changes to its horticultural practices (such as integrated pest management and integrated plant health care programs), as well as how City fields are lined, both of which will have cost implications.
- k) Through recent provincial legislation (e.g., *Places to Grow Act*) and subsequent changes to the City's Growth Management Strategy and Official Plan, Hamilton can expect **greater residential population densities** in established communities as a result of intensification. This will place greater pressure on existing parks as the amount of new parkland may not be able to keep up with residential activity due to a lack of available land and funds within intensifying areas.

Community-Specific Needs Assessment

The purpose of the community-specific needs assessment is to identify the degree to which each identified community in the City of Hamilton (of which there are nine) requires additional or improved outdoor recreation facilities and sports fields. At its core, it is an analysis of the ideal facility distribution and provision model, based on the unique characteristics of each community – this is in keeping with Guiding Principle #5 (Ensure Appropriate Service Levels). The outcome of this assessment will provide an indication of overall needs in each community and build a foundation for identifying specific strategies (e.g., which facilities require re-investment, re-purposing, etc.). In some situations, Hamilton has an oversupply of actual facilities and a reduction in this supply could lead to improved resource allocation and maintenance for those remaining in the inventory.

The establishment of facility profiles and a prioritization matrix that quantifies and weighs the inputted data are foundational pieces in the community-specific needs assessment; this framework will allow the City and Consultants to rigorously and objectively examine and prioritize potential investment. In this way, the preferred distribution of facilities amongst the City's many communities can be determined by better understanding the needs, characteristics, and number of its residents.

While this exercise is extremely useful in identifying areas of need and over-supply, it is not without its limitations. First and foremost, it bears noting that the findings of this analysis represent ideal provision ratios that may never be fully realized due to one reason or another (such as lack of land or appropriate locations). Nevertheless, these standards remain appropriate targets that should be worked towards as opportunities are presented and funding permits. Furthermore, for many facility types, needs are quantified in fractions. As it is not possible to provide half a facility, these figures must be evaluated with care. Generally, if an area is growing and has reached a demand level of 0.7 to 0.8 of a facility, then it could be considered for further investment.

The community-specific needs assessment does not assess the quality and condition of the existing supply – detailed and site-specific assessments of this sort are beyond the scope of this Study – but rather it seeks to identify total facility needs both current and future.

Note: This assessment has not yet been vetted through a financial forecast; therefore, its affordability and impact on municipal budgets is unknown at this stage. The recommended provision levels allow for improved service and facility quality, with recommendations based upon trends, demographics, distribution, and public input. The financial analysis is currently underway.

The following targets have been established for the future provision of municipal outdoor recreation facilities across the City of Hamilton. The recommended provision targets may differ from community to community due to specific local supply and demand factors. The recommended provision targets should be applied City-wide, but should only be applied on a community-basis in cases where they are physically achievable and desired. For analytical purposes, both City-wide provision and local opportunities / preferences have influenced the final recommendations over the pure application of provision targets. Please see the facility-specific sections that follow (Sections 8-15 of this report) for a more detailed analysis and recommendations relative to each facility type.

Also of note, overall supply ratios to population are generally not applicable for long-term planning for demographically-dependent facilities given the aging trend. Every effort should be made to maintain accurate registration and waiting list figures for organizations utilizing the City's sports fields in order to understand usage levels and to project future demand.

Outdoor Sports Field Provision Targets – City-wide

	Current City-wide Provision Level	Recommended Provision Target*	These facilities may be provided in areas where...
Soccer and Multi-use Fields <i>Supply = 204.5 ULE**</i>	1 field (ULE**) for every 109 registered participants (all ages) (1 field for every 2,546 residents)	1 field (ULE**) for every 100 registered participants (all ages) (currently equivalent to 1 field for every 2,328 residents)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • local soccer participation rates are high • public demand is high (survey) • foreign-born populations are higher (sport of choice)
Football Fields <i>Supply = 6.5 ULE**</i>	1 field (ULE**) for every 230 registered participants (tackle and rugby) (1 field for every 80,095 residents)	1 field (ULE**) for every 150 registered participants (tackle football and rugby) (currently equivalent to 1 field for every 52,062 residents)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • local football participation rates are high • soccer use does not permit scheduling
Ball Diamonds <i>Supply = 261.5 ULE**</i>	1 diamond (ULE**) for every 62 registered participants (youth and adult) (1 diamond for every 1,991 residents)	1 diamond (ULE**) for every 75 registered participants (currently equivalent to 1 diamond for every 2,416 residents)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • local ball participation rates are high • public demand is high (survey)
Cricket Pitches <i>Supply = 3</i>	1 field for every 173,539 residents	Demand should be monitored in conjunction with user groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • local cricket participation rates are high • foreign-born populations are higher

* includes all facilities under municipal influence (e.g., those owned by City, as well as those maintained and/or permitted by the City under a formal or informal agreement)

** ULE – Unlit Equivalents. Each lighted field is equivalent to 1.5 unlit fields due to its ability to accommodate extended play during evening hours.

Other Outdoor Recreation Facility Provision Targets – City-wide

	Current City-wide Provision Level	Recommended Provision Target*	These facilities may be provided in areas where...
Multi-purpose / Basketball Courts <i>Supply = 84 FCE**</i>	1 court (FCE**) for every 795 residents (ages 10-19)	1 court (FCE**) for every 750 residents (ages 10-19)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • population densities are higher • there are greater concentrations of youth ages 10-19 • public demand is high (survey)
Tennis Courts <i>Supply = 91</i>	1 court (public and club) for every 5,721 residents	1 court (public and club) for every 6,500 residents;	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • local tennis (club) participation rates are high • public demand is high (survey)
Bocce Courts <i>Supply = 49</i>	1 court for every 2,121 residents (ages 55-74)	Not Applicable (additional facilities are not recommended); Demand should be monitored	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • foreign-born populations are higher • there are greater concentrations of seniors ages 60+
Lawn Bowling Greens <i>Supply = 4</i>	1 green for every 25,980 residents (ages 55-74)	Not Applicable (additional facilities are not recommended); Demand should be monitored	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there are greater concentrations of seniors ages 60+
Playgrounds <i>Supply = 249</i>	1 playground location for every 354 residents (ages 0-14)	1 playground location within 500-metres of every residential area without crossing a major barrier (railways, waterways, major highways, escarpment)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this is a neighbourhood-level facility; distance from residential areas is the most significant determinant
Spray Pads <i>Supply = 51</i>	1 spray pad for every 1,728 residents (ages 0-14)	1 spray pad for every 1,100 residents (ages 0-9)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there are greater concentrations of children ages 0-9 • incomes are lower • population densities are higher
Wading Pools <i>Supply = 18</i>	1 wading pool for every 4,895 residents (ages 0-14)	Not Applicable (additional wading pools are not recommended)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • access to outdoor pools is poor • public demand is high (survey)
Skateboard Parks <i>Supply = 5</i>	1 facility for every 13,357 residents (ages 10-19)	1 community-level facility for every 7,500 residents (ages 10-19) 1 neighbourhood-level facility for every 15,000 residents (ages 10-19)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there are greater concentrations of youth ages 10-19 • sufficient parkland and buffering from adjacent uses is available • there is transit, high visibility, and street presence

	Current City-wide Provision Level	Recommended Provision Target*	These facilities may be provided in areas where...
Bike Parks (dirt) <i>Supply = 0</i>	no municipal facilities	A pilot project is recommended; Demand should be monitored	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> there are greater concentrations of youth ages 10-19 sufficient parkland and buffering from adjacent uses is available
Off-leash Dog Areas <i>Supply = 7</i>	1 dog park or free running area for every 74,374 residents	1 dog park and/or free running area for every City ward (as per existing policy)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> population densities are higher sufficient parkland and buffering from adjacent uses is available
Outdoor Ice Rinks - Natural <i>Supply = 60</i>	1 natural ice rink for every 8,677 residents	Install water service in parks, where appropriate; Volunteer support required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> community and volunteer support is high
Outdoor Ice Rinks - Artificial <i>Supply = 1</i>	1 artificial ice rink for every 520,617 residents	Partnerships required for artificial ice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> community support is high strong partnerships exists access to indoor rinks is poor
Outdoor Running Tracks <i>Supply = 5 (various qualities)</i>	1 track for every 104,123 residents	Not Applicable (additional City-wide facilities are not recommended); partnerships with schools required for community-level facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> access to high school tracks and trails is poor demand is evident strong partnerships exists
Community Garden Plots <i>Supply = 10</i>	1 location (municipal) for every 173,539 residents	No set target; Partnerships and volunteer support required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> incomes are lower foreign-born populations are higher
Special Event Areas	n/a	One or more parks in each community should be capable of hosting special events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> sufficient parkland and buffering from adjacent uses is available
Pathways in Parks	n/a	No set target (varies by park site)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> all areas, particularly where population densities are higher
Indoor Sports Facilities <i>Supply = 0</i>	no municipal facilities	1 private or public facility for every 1,000 regular peak-season participants (estimated); municipal provision may be dependent upon other several factors, including partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> this is a City-wide facility; community-specific factors are not the most significant determinant
Support Buildings <i>Supply = n/a</i>	total number of buildings unknown	No set target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> provided as necessary

* includes all facilities under municipal influence (e.g., those owned by City, as well as those maintained and/or permitted by the City under a formal or informal agreement)

** FCE – Full Court Equivalents. Each half court is considered to be 0.5 of a full court.

Assessment of the aforementioned facility profiles at the community-level requires the collection and analysis of substantial data. The following table identifies the relevant socio-demographic data on a community-by-community basis using 2006 Census Canada data (except where otherwise noted).

Demographic Profiles – 2006 data, Statistics Canada

	Population ages 5 to 19	Population ages 55-74	Population Density (pph)	Low Income Cut-off (%)	Foreign-born Population (%)	Comments
Ancaster	6,580 (22.5%)	5,285 (18.1%)	8.04	4.4%	21%	Higher than average percentages of youth and young adults. Higher than average income.
Beverly	3,745 (21.2%)	4,010 (22.7%)	0.40	3.7%	15%	Rural area with low densities and a smaller population base. Higher than average percentage of adults and residents of higher income. Lower than average percentage of foreign-born residents.
Flamborough	5,600 (24.0%)	3,650 (15.6%)	1.97	4.7%	13%	Rural area with low densities and a smaller population base (but growing). Higher than average percentage of youth and residents of higher income. Lower percentage of older adults and foreign-born residents.
Glanbrook	2,568 (18.7%)	3,319 (24.2%)	0.51	3.3%	21%	Rural area with low densities and a smaller population base (but growing). Higher than average percentage of older adults and residents of higher income.
Hamilton Mountain	30,927 (20.5%)	27,036 (17.9%)	27.19	12.0%	26%	High density area that is generally representative of City-wide population averages.
Lower Hamilton	22,860 (17.1%)	23,160 (17.3%)	27.37	25.0%	23%	Lower than average percentage of youth and higher than average percentage of young adults. High density area with a lower than average income.
Lower Stoney Creek	13,640 (18.0%)	16,395 (21.7%)	15.37	12.3%	35%	Higher than average percentage of foreign-born residents and older adults.
Upper Stoney Creek	5,085 (24.8%)	2,710 (13.2%)	2.78	7.8%	21%	Youngest and fastest growing of the nine Hamilton communities. Lower than average percentage of older adults.
West Hamilton/ Dundas	6,870 (17.4%)	7,850 (19.9%)	12.86	12.1%	22%	Lower than average percentage of youth and young adults.
Total – City-wide	97,875 (19.4%)	93,415 (18.5%)	4.48	13.8%	25%	

pph = persons per hectare

Utilization data, based on data captured from the household survey, observation project and other sources (where available), is contained in the following table. Although usage rates could be affected by a number of factors (e.g., quality of supply, accessibility, program mix, pricing, etc.), these sources are the best available measure to assess current utilization.

Community-specific Usage Identified through the Household Survey, Observation Project, and Utilization Data (where available)

Facility type	Greater than Average Use			Less than Average Use		
	Household Survey (past 12 months)	Observation Project	Utilization Data	Household Survey (past 12 months)	Observation Project	Utilization Data
Soccer fields (outdoor)	ANC		ANC	LH		BEV FLA
Ball Diamonds	USC		ANC LH	LH WHD		FLA GLA WHD
Wading Pools	HM	WHD	HM	BEV FLA GLA	LH HM	ANC
Spray Pads	HM	FLA		--	--	
Playgrounds	ANC HM USC	--		LH WHD	BEV	
Basketball Courts	USC	HM WHD		--	BEV FLA	
Tennis Courts	ANC	USC		--	BEV FLA GLA	
Skateboard Parks	--			--		
Lawn Bowling Greens	WHD			--		
Bocce Courts	LSC			--		
Off-leash Dog Areas	ANC			--		
Outdoor Ice Rinks	WHD			LH LSC		
Outdoor Running Tracks	HM			BEV FLA GLA		
Park Washrooms	LSC			--		

Notes:

Household Survey data comparisons are significant +/- 5%, 9 times out of 10.

Insufficient data to analyze Football, Rugby and Lacrosse Fields; Cricket Pitches; Informal Play Fields; Community Garden Plots; Picnic Areas.

Utilization and demand are generally below average in Lower Hamilton due to several factors, such as the greater number of residents with low incomes, various ethnic backgrounds, greater transportation challenges, etc.

Through a detailed assessment of the socio-demographic and utilization data (see previous tables), a demand profile for each facility type can be established on a community by community basis, encompassing the unique demands in each area. By utilizing the recommended

provision targets, the current and future supply and distribution of each facility type are examined in the following sections.

7.3 Current Inventory

The City of Hamilton owns, maintains, and/or manages well over 600 parks and open space sites in cooperation with community partners, such as the local school boards. Approximately half of these locations are naturalized open space parcels, utility corridors, or undeveloped lands that do not contain any outdoor recreation amenities, aside from some trails, benches, or similar infrastructure. This leaves approximately 315 parks that contain one or more sports field, playground, spray pad, basketball court, or other outdoor recreational structure.

Within these 315 or so properties, there are approximately 440 sports fields, 250 playgrounds, 185 hard surface courts, and 190 other features (e.g., spray pads, ice rinks, outdoor running tracks, skate parks, etc.), for a total of about 1,050 unique amenities. These facilities are located on City lands or lands over which the City has influence, such as several school sites owned by the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board. There are no municipal indoor soccer, tennis, or lawn bowling venues in the City, although there is one partially enclosed bocce facility at the Chedoke Twin Pad Arena.

Please note that the inventory data in this section (unless otherwise mentioned) does not include private facilities over which the City has no control, nor does it include school facilities that are not maintained or booked by the municipality. A comprehensive inventory of private and school facilities in Hamilton does not exist, although efforts have been made to identify some of the more significant non-municipal providers. As mentioned, the inventory includes several school grounds (typically adjacent to parks) through which the City has a long-standing agreement for grounds maintenance or facility booking. Schools lacking such an arrangement (i.e., some public schools, most separate schools, and all private schools) are not included in the inventory, but may be identified separately.

Furthermore, some additional interpretation may be required when assessing particular facility types. For example, the dimensions of Class C soccer fields can vary significantly (from a small mini pitch to a large full-size pitch), while some soccer fields may overlap with ball diamond outfields, making it impossible to schedule two games simultaneously. It also bears noting that the facilities listed in the inventory may not all be in usable condition and are not used for organized play; this is particularly the case for some lower quality ball diamonds. Comprehensive assessments of the quality and condition of outdoor recreation amenities is beyond the scope of this Study.

The inventory data that is described in this section was provided by the City of Hamilton (Public Works Department) and is current as of May 2009. Managing a database of this size is a challenge, and much of this inventory information has been compiled exclusively for this Study. As such, accuracy of the data is not guaranteed; however, site visits, reviews of aerial photography, and comparisons with booking information has assisted in improving the reliability of the inventory data to a point that it is useful for this Study.

The following tables illustrate the inventory data contained in the City's database, and includes both City facilities and those under municipal influence. This data is also illustrated graphically on a series of maps in Attachment I and in more detailed table form in Attachment VI (along with a listing of notable non-municipal facilities; excluding HWDCSB fields, which are unknown).

Legend:

ANC = Ancaster GLA = Glanbrook LSC = Lower Stoney Creek
 BEV = Beverly HM = Hamilton Mountain USC = Upper Stoney Creek
 FLA = Flamborough LH = Lower Hamilton WHD = West Hamilton/Dundas

Soccer Class A: lit, irrigated, field house, bleachers, regulation size

Soccer Class B: some amenities, e.g., lit, irrigated, regulation to intermediate size

Soccer Class C: non-lit, no spectator seating, no change rooms, regulation to mini size

		Total Supply (City facilities and those under Municipal Influence, including some schools)									
Facility Type		ANC	BEV	FLA	GLA	HM	LH	LSC	USC	WHD	TOTAL
2009 Population (estimated)		31,643	18,300	23,492	14,961	151,559	137,525	78,849	22,165	42,122	520,617
Parkland	Total Parkland (ha)	149.6	216.2	238.1	75.0	614.7	549.8	618.0	167.9	149.0	2,778.3
	Active Parkland (ha)	90.3	215.3	130.8	81.8	341.1	455.8	210.7	103.9	79.9	1,709.7
	Open Space (ha)	61.8	0.0	106.4	0.0	189.8	105.8	366.6	54.3	64.5	949.2
Soccer	Total Soccer/Multi-use Fields (ULE)	21.0	6.0	21.0	11.5	60.5	13.0	36.0	19.0	16.5	204.5
	Soccer - Artificial (Lit)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
	Soccer - Class A (Lit)	0	0	2	0	6	1	1	5	1	17
	Soccer - Class B (Lit)	2	0	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	8
	Soccer - Class B (Unlit)	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3	6
	Soccer - Class C (Unlit)	18	6	15	10	47	10	33	10	12	161
Ball Diamonds	Total Ball Diamonds (ULE)	13.5	30.0	18.0	10.0	73.5	47.5	31.0	16.0	22.0	261.5
	Hardball - Premier (Lit)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	Hardball (Lit)	2	1	1	2	2	2	0	2	2	14
	Hardball (Unlit)	1	0	1	0	12	5	2	0	1	22
	Softball (Lit)	1	11	5	1	0	3	4	2	2	29
	Softball (Unlit)	6	10	7	0	53	25	17	10	11	139
	Tball (Lit)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Tball (Unlit)	2	2	1	4	4	10	6	0	4	33
Football	Total Football Fields (ULE)	0.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.5	0.0	1.0	0.0	6.5
	Football Fields - dedicated (Lit)	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
	Football Fields - dedicated (Unlit)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	2
Basketball	Total Basketball Courts (FCE)	4.5	6.5	4.5	0	24	25	13.5	3	3	84
	Multi-Purpose Courts	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
	Basketball Courts (Full)	2	1	3	0	18	20	12	2	1	59
	Basketball Courts (Half)	1	9	3	0	6	2	3	2	4	30
	Basketball Courts with Hockey Nets	2	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	7
Tennis	Total Tennis Courts (public & club)	6	8	5	1	16	32	9	4	10	91
	Total Tennis Courts (public only)	3	3	3	1	12	12	2	4	5	45
	Tennis Courts - Public (Lit)	0	3	1	0	8	8	0	4	4	28
	Tennis Courts - Public (Unlit)	3	0	2	1	4	4	2	0	1	17
	Tennis Courts - Club (Lit)	3	5	2	0	4	20	7	0	5	46
Other	Cricket Pitches	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	3
	Playground Locations	18	17	16	6	65	60	37	11	19	249
	Spray Pads	0	0	1	0	22	21	5	0	2	51
	Wading Pools	1	0	0	0	3	10	1	0	3	18
	Skateboard Parks	0	0	1	0	2	2	0	0	0	5
	Bocce Courts	0	0	0	0	24	4	21	0	0	49
	Lawnbowling Greens	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	4
	Outdoor Running Tracks (municipal)	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	5
	Outdoor Rinks (Natural/Variable)	6	4	1	0	25	16	4	1	3	60
Outdoor Rinks (Artificial)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	

Notes: ULE = Unlit Equivalents - Each lit field is considered equivalent to 1.5 unlit fields due to increased access during evening hours.

FCE = Full Court Equivalents - Each half basketball court is considered equivalent to 0.5 full courts.

Many soccer fields are considered multi-use fields, capable of accommodating football, rugby, lacrosse, etc.

The inventory data includes several school grounds and facilities for which the City has a long-standing agreement for maintenance or booking.

Population figures have been estimated for 2010 based on City of Hamilton GRIDS data.

Source: City of Hamilton, 2009 (Current as of May 2009)

		Facilities Per Capita (City facilities and those under Municipal Influence, including some schools)									
Facility Type		ANC	BEV	FLA	GLA	HM	LH	LSC	USC	WHD	TOTAL
2009 Population (estimated)		31,643	18,300	23,492	14,961	151,559	137,525	78,849	22,165	42,122	520,617
Parkland	Total Parkland (ha)	4.7	11.8	10.1	5.0	4.1	4.0	7.8	7.6	3.5	5.3
	Active Parkland (ha)	2.9	11.8	5.6	5.5	2.3	3.3	2.7	4.7	1.9	3.3
	Open Space (ha)	2.0	0.0	4.5	0.0	1.3	0.8	4.6	2.4	1.5	1.8
Soccer	Total Soccer/Multi-use Fields (ULE)	1,507	3,050	1,119	1,301	2,505	10,579	2,190	1,167	2,553	2,546
	Soccer - Artificial (Lit)	--	--	--	--	--	137,525	--	--	--	520,617
	Soccer - Class A (Lit)	--	--	11,746	--	25,260	137,525	78,849	4,433	42,122	30,625
	Soccer - Class B (Lit)	15,821	--	11,746	14,961	151,559	--	78,849	22,165	--	65,077
	Soccer - Class B (Unlit)	--	--	--	--	50,520	--	--	--	14,041	86,769
	Soccer - Class C (Unlit)	1,758	3,050	1,566	1,496	3,225	13,753	2,389	2,217	3,510	3,234
Ball Diamonds	Total Ball Diamonds (ULE)	2,344	610	1,305	1,496	2,062	2,895	2,544	1,385	1,915	1,991
	Hardball - Premier (Lit)	--	--	--	--	151,559	--	--	--	--	520,617
	Hardball (Lit)	15,821	18,300	23,492	7,480	75,779	68,763	--	11,083	21,061	37,187
	Hardball (Unlit)	31,643	--	23,492	--	12,630	27,505	39,425	--	42,122	23,664
	Softball (Lit)	31,643	1,664	4,698	14,961	--	45,842	19,712	11,083	21,061	17,952
	Softball (Unlit)	5,274	1,830	3,356	--	2,860	5,501	4,638	2,217	3,829	3,745
	Tball (Lit)	--	--	--	14,961	--	--	--	--	--	520,617
Tball (Unlit)	15,821	9,150	23,492	3,740	37,890	13,753	13,142	--	10,531	15,776	
Football	Total Football Fields (ULE)	--	6,100	--	--	151,559	91,683	--	22,165	--	80,095
	Football Fields - dedicated (Lit)	--	9,150	--	--	--	137,525	--	--	--	173,539
	Football Fields - dedicated (Unlit)	--	--	--	--	151,559	--	--	22,165	--	260,308
Basketball	Total Basketball Courts (FCE)	7,032	2,815	5,221	--	6,315	5,501	5,841	7,388	14,041	6,198
	Multi-Purpose Courts	--	--	--	--	151,559	68,763	--	--	--	173,539
	Basketball Courts (Full)	15,821	18,300	7,831	--	8,420	6,876	6,571	11,083	42,122	8,824
	Basketball Courts (Half)	31,643	2,033	7,831	--	25,260	68,763	26,283	11,083	10,531	17,354
	Basketball Courts with Hockey Nets	15,821	18,300	--	--	75,779	68,763	--	--	--	74,374
Tennis	Total Tennis Courts (public & club)	5,274	2,288	4,698	14,961	9,472	4,298	8,761	5,541	4,212	5,721
	Total Tennis Courts (public only)	10,548	6,100	7,831	14,961	12,630	11,460	39,425	5,541	8,424	11,569
	Tennis Courts - Public (Lit)	--	6,100	23,492	--	18,945	17,191	--	5,541	10,531	18,593
	Tennis Courts - Public (Unlit)	10,548	--	11,746	14,961	37,890	34,381	39,425	--	42,122	30,625
	Tennis Courts - Club (Lit)	10,548	3,660	11,746	--	37,890	6,876	11,264	--	8,424	11,318
Other	Cricket Pitches	--	--	--	--	151,559	137,525	--	--	42,122	173,539
	Playground Locations	1,758	1,076	1,468	2,493	2,332	2,292	2,131	2,015	2,217	2,091
	Spray Pads	--	--	23,492	--	6,889	6,549	15,770	--	21,061	10,208
	Wading Pools	31,643	--	--	--	50,520	13,753	78,849	--	14,041	28,923
	Skateboard Parks	--	--	23,492	--	75,779	68,763	--	--	--	104,123
	Bocce Courts	--	--	--	--	6,315	34,381	3,755	--	--	10,625
	Lawnbowling Greens	31,643	--	--	--	--	68,763	--	--	42,122	130,154
	Outdoor Running Tracks (municipal)	--	--	--	--	50,520	68,763	--	--	--	104,123
	Outdoor Rinks (Natural/Variable)	5,274	4,575	23,492	--	6,062	8,595	19,712	22,165	14,041	8,677
	Outdoor Rinks (Artificial)	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	42,122	520,617

Notes: Unlit Equivalents - Each lit field is considered equivalent to 1.5 unlit fields due to increased access during evening hours.

FCE = Full Court Equivalents - Each half basketball court is considered equivalent to 0.5 full courts.

Many soccer fields are considered multi-use fields, capable of accommodating football, rugby, lacrosse, etc.

The inventory data includes several school grounds and facilities for which the City has a long-standing agreement for maintenance or booking.

Population figures have been estimated for 2010 based on City of Hamilton GRIDS data.

Source: City of Hamilton, 2009 (Current as of May 2009)

SECTION 8 SOCCER, FOOTBALL AND MULTI-USE FIELDS

This section contains an assessment of City-wide and community-specific soccer and multi-use field needs, consistent with the methodology established in Section 7. Key data relevant to this assessment is also provided.

8.1 Facility Profiles

a) Supply

There are a total of 192 soccer and multi-use fields, as well as 5 dedicated football fields, under municipal influence in the City of Hamilton. With 25 soccer fields and 3 football fields being lit, this is equivalent to 204.5 unlit soccer fields and 6.5 unlit football fields (each lit field is considered the same as 1.5 unlit fields due to extended play opportunities).



Note: Soccer and football (as well as lacrosse, field hockey, ultimate frisbee, and aussie rules) are discussed together in this section because many of the City's rectangular sports fields are multi-use, meaning that they accommodate more than one of these sports. For example, a number of the City's 204.5 soccer fields are used for football practices and/or games. At the same time, many fields are configured for only one sport or level of play and scheduling practices can limit usage to one sport (i.e., dedicated, exclusive-use fields); an example of this is the 6.5 fields that are dedicated for football use only.

Through new park development, expansion, and reconfiguration, the City and its partners have plans to add 13 more soccer fields (equivalent of 14.5 unlit fields) at approximately 10 parks across the City over the next 10 years.

84% of the existing soccer and multi-use fields are in City parks, with the remainder being located largely on school grounds (several of these are booked and maintained by the City, but the municipality does not control community access over the long-term; furthermore, school fields are often of poorer quality due to the heavy utilization from school programs and recess activity).

A classification system exists for local soccer and multi-use fields (see below); football fields are not subject to this classification. 9% of fields are Class A and 7% are Class B. 84% of the inventory consists of Class C fields, many of which are substandard in size and condition.

- Class A – lit, irrigated, field house, bleachers, regulation size
- Class B – some amenities, i.e. lit, irrigated, regulation to intermediate size
- Class C – unlit, no spectator seating, no change rooms, regulation to mini size



Hamilton's current provision rate is one soccer / multi-use field for every 2,546 residents, or one for every 109 registered participants (including both youth and adults, but excluding school teams/leagues). By far, the poorest per capita supply can be found in Lower Hamilton (1 per 10,579 population), while Flamborough, Upper Stoney Creek, Glanbrook, and Ancaster have the most favourable per capita ratios (1 field for less than 2,000 residents).

Hamilton's current provision rate is one dedicated football field for every 80,095 residents, or one for every 306 registered participants (excluding school teams/leagues). With only four of nine communities having dedicated football fields, there is great variation across the City. For example, the provision level in Beverly is much higher than anywhere else; they are currently providing one field per 6,100 residents (a total of 3 fields). Conversely, Ancaster, Flamborough, Glanbrook, Lower Stoney Creek, and West Hamilton/Dundas have no exclusive use football fields, although many municipal multi-use and school fields are used for this purpose.

b) Distribution

Most frequently, soccer and football participants are driving (or being driven) to practices and games, rather than walking. Nearly two-thirds of those using soccer fields for organized and unorganized play drive to them; household survey respondents were willing to travel 14 minutes to make regular use of soccer fields (this is generally equivalent to 7 to 10 kilometres, but can vary dramatically based on mode of travel, road networks, and other factors).

Using a 1.5km radius for soccer field sites, no major gaps in supply were identified, aside from a small gap in the Winona area that is to be addressed through the development of a field through the expansion of Winona Park in 2010.

This service radius represents a reasonable walking or biking distance for most older children, youth, and adults and is generally met by the provision of Neighbourhood Parks, particularly within the City's growth areas. Several Neighbourhood Parks contain Class C soccer fields and/or open space for informal play. Community Parks, however, are typically dispersed at greater distances within the City due to their larger land base and intensity of use (e.g., multi-field complexes with lit fields). Due to the organized nature of the sport (i.e., 10-15 players per team, scheduled games against other teams from across the community, city or beyond), most

activities simply cannot be at locations within walking distance of most participants and this is a large reason why Community Parks are the focus of soccer field development.

Therefore, although field distribution is one consideration, it is more important that a sufficient number of fields are located within a community (whether at Neighbourhood or Community Parks) so as to properly serve youth organizations, particularly those with established boundaries. Like any recreational facility, there is a desire for major sports parks to be located on or near a trail and transit line to enhance accessibility and to promote the use of alternative transportation.



A geographic radius has not been applied to football field sites as the demand is less uniform across the City and due to the fact that many multi-use fields exist to accommodate the sport. A community by community assessment of field supply can be found on the following pages.

c) Trends, Best Practices, and Benchmarking

Due to its low equipment costs, international appeal, and high fitness quotient, soccer has become a very popular sport amongst today's younger generations. With the 'soccer explosion' beginning in the mid-1990s, there is beginning to be a corresponding increased interest in adult soccer opportunities, which is also being fuelled by the high participation rates of various ethnic communities and growing interest in female sport activities. As the youth of today grow into adulthood, increased demand for adult soccer teams can be expected. Since the Ontario Soccer Association began tracking 'mini soccer' in the 1980s, nearly one-third of those participants have played in senior recreation leagues. Further, with the emergence of "lifelong players", the demand for better quality fields to help reduce injury risks can be expected to increase.

Using outdoor registration data for the Hamilton & District Soccer Association (HDSA) provided by the Ontario Soccer Association (OSA), a number of observations can be made. Note that HDSA includes the majority – but not all – organized players in the City.

- Registration in HDSA has grown by 53% between 1998 and 2007. This represents faster growth than the OSA (27%) and the City's population (7%) during this time period. Interest in soccer remains high in Hamilton.
- Participation in adult soccer is growing faster than youth soccer. Between 1998 and 2007, adult registration in HDSA grew by 115% and youth registration grew by 44%. Currently, adult outdoor soccer registration accounts for about one-fifth of all registered players.
- The average annual increase in soccer registration is declining, suggesting that interest in the sport may be reaching a peak. Between 1997 and 1998, registration grew by 10%; between 2006 and 2007, registration grew by 2%.
- In terms of indoor soccer, the number of indoor players registered with HDSA is small compared to outdoor (approximately 6% or one indoor player for every 17 outdoor players) and has fluctuated considerably over the years. In comparison, the OSA has seen its indoor registration grow by 140% between 1997/1998 and 2006/2007, with about one indoor player for every 4.5 outdoor players. For indoor soccer, there is a 60/40 split between youth and adult players in the OSA.



Furthermore, of the 16 soccer groups responding to the user group survey, three-quarters of the organizations expect their participation numbers to increase over the next five years. From those groups that submitted registration data, soccer participation increased by 7% between 2006 and 2008, with the most marked growth coming at the adult level and competitive soccer programs. Based on the user group survey responses, football has also witnessed steady growth recently, suggesting that the sport remains popular with a segment of the population; unlike soccer, however, football's growth potential at the adult level is more limited.

In terms of soccer field supply, Hamilton rates are comparable to many other communities, most of which have also been pressured to increase and improve their supply of sports fields. The benchmark average is one field for every 2,790 residents; Hamilton's provision level is better than this average, with one field for every 2,546 residents. This data is presented for comparative purposes only and should be interpreted with caution; each community may have unique demand levels and population characteristics (registration data is a good indicator and is explored further below).

Sports field supplies for football, lacrosse and rugby vary considerably amongst the benchmarked communities. The benchmark average is one such field (dedicated or shared) for every 98,315 residents. With 6.5 dedicated football fields, resulting in an average of one field for every 80,095 residents, Hamilton is currently better than this provision level. As indicated earlier, there are no municipal fields exclusively used for lacrosse or rugby.

Soccer, Football, Lacrosse & Rugby Fields Per Capita – Benchmarking Exercise

Municipality	Soccer fields (unlit equivalents)		Football/Lacrosse/Rugby (unlit equiv.)	
	Supply (approx.)	Provision Ratio	Supply (approx.)	Provision Ratio
St. Catharines	66.5	2,008	2	66,783
Oakville	83	1,912	5	31,740
Burlington	45	3,656	n/a	n/a
Richmond Hill	48	3,801	0	n/a
Vaughan	143	1,814	0	n/a
Markham	112.5	2,565	n/a	n/a
London	101.5	3,504	3	118,558
Brampton	147	3,075	8.5	53,181
Mississauga	226.5	3,179	5.5	130,909
AVERAGE		2,790		98,315
Hamilton	204.5	2,546	6.5	80,095

Data collected between 2004 and 2009 and is subject to change. Includes municipal facilities and facilities under municipal influence. Each lit field is considered to be equivalent to 1.5 unlit fields.

Source: Monteith Brown Planning Consultants, 2009

d) Utilization & Physical Condition

Research conducted for this Study found that there are 22,367 players registered with 43 soccer organizations that rent City fields. In reality, this number could be slightly higher as data was not available for all groups (most of which are smaller groups); however, the youth figures are very similar to those reported by HDSA in 2007, with only adult users being under-represented. Data excludes school and CYO leagues, as well as tournament/event participants. This data does not include other sports (e.g., football – 1,989 players; ultimate frisbee – 600 players; rugby – 178 players; field hockey – 36 players; or aussie rules – 35 players) which often use soccer fields for practices and games.

86% of soccer registrants are children and youth (19,267) and 14% are adults (3,100). Nearly 40% more residents are registered in soccer than baseball. The youth participation rate is approximately 20% for soccer and 8% for baseball, while baseball attracts 2.5 times more adults than does soccer.

In Hamilton, Class A and B fields are used intensively for league play during the week and for tournaments on weekends, while most Class C soccer fields are used intensively Monday through Thursday night. The ability of existing fields to accommodate greater usage is compromised by the City's mandate to maintain safe field conditions.

The supply-demand inequity has led to over-usage and damage to the City's Class A/B fields, as many fields are used beyond their sustainable capacities due to increasing user demand and insufficient supply of field facilities. This overuse constrains maintenance and field regeneration periods and can lead to unsafe playing conditions and decreased playability, which increases the risk and decreases customer satisfaction.⁹

⁹ City of Hamilton Sports Field Management Strategy (2008).

To better understand the capacity of existing fields, guidelines on field utilization have been reviewed. The Sports Turf Association (STA) has spent a great deal of time and effort developing guidelines for field use and have developed a field classification system based on soil physical particle size distribution which is the factor that has the most influence on resilience to wear. The classification system includes five categories of fields with recommended permitted use.

Note: “Hours of use” limits are more a function of acceptable playing quality (generally defined by users) and other management factors. For example, the particle size distribution will indicate which fields can handle more hours during wet seasons based on drainage (i.e., sand-based fields). If fertility levels are kept at the same levels as the soil based fields, they will tolerate fewer hours of use because they require more nitrogen than a soil-based field requires to grow at the rate necessary to handle the increased use.

Soccer Field Capacity Categories

Category	Description	Usage	Relevance to Hamilton
Category 1	sand rootzone field	90 days 5 hrs/day 450 hrs/season	
Category 2	< 25% silt + clay with constructed subsurface drainage system and irrigation	110 days 5 hrs/day 550 hrs/season	Hamilton has one such field (Sherwood Park)
Category 3	up to 40% silt + clay with constructed subsurface drainage system)	140 days 5 hrs/day 700 hrs/season	This is the City's specification for new Class A Soccer Fields (equivalent to about 35 hours per week); approximately one-half of the City's Class A fields meet this standard
Category 4	> 40% silt + clay with constructed drainage system	180 days 2.5 hrs/day 450 hrs/season	This is the City's specification for new Class B Soccer Fields (equivalent to about 17.5 hours per week)
Category 5	minimal construction (surface grading)	180 days 2.5 hrs/day 450 hrs/season	This is the City's specification for new Class C Soccer Fields (equivalent to about 17.5 hours per week)

Source: Athletic Field Construction Manual. 2008. (R.W. Sheard, Editor). Sports Turf Association, Inc. Guelph, ON
 Note: These guidelines are based on usage by 15-18 year olds and would be subject to some adjustment for age of participants, number of days of consecutive play, and weather conditions. In addition, they assume a fairly intensive level of field maintenance.

Depending on their soil type and construction, the City of Hamilton's Class A and B fields may fall into any of Categories 2-4 (with most being in categories 3 and 4), whereas Class C fields would likely fall in Category 5. Work is currently underway to more closely assess the condition of the City's high use fields.

It is important to note that these hours of use – originally deemed acceptable according the STA – are based on the ability to re-establish turf into damaged fields in the spring and fall with the use of traditional herbicides. Unfortunately, this is no longer permitted under the new provincial pesticide ban and the STA recommendations require revision.

In an ideal scenario, most fields would not exceed 200 hours of use, while high input fields where some wear is acceptable can get up into the 300 hours of use (scheduled and

unscheduled). Only when spring and fall maintenance can be provided should field use be extended beyond normal operating dates.

The following tables illustrate average soccer and multi-use field rental levels from 2008.

Annual Soccer and Multi-use Fields Rental Amounts, by usage level (2008)

Usage Levels	Estimated % of inventory
450 or more hours	20%
300 to 449 hours	18%
200 to 299 hours	27%
less than 200 hours	35%

Source: City of Hamilton, 2009

Note: Rental data is not available for all fields within the inventory
Excludes unscheduled use, which can also impact field conditions

Annual Soccer and Multi-use Fields Rental Amounts, by field type (2008)

Field Type	Average Annual Rental Amount
Class A Fields	500 hours
Class B Fields	400 hours
Class C Fields	275 hours
All Field Types	300 hours

Source: City of Hamilton, 2009

Note: Rental data is not available for all fields within the inventory
Excludes unscheduled use, which can also impact field conditions

Given our current understanding of the physical composition and maintenance levels of Hamilton’s soccer fields, their average level of use, and the generic capacity calculations developed by the Sports Turf Association, an average of 300 hours per field per year may be a reasonable long-term target for soccer and multi-use field rentals in Hamilton. This should not be a hard cap, but rather one that is used as a target when scheduling fields and planning for improvements to the supply. We are not aware of any municipality in Ontario that sets strict limits for annual field use (i.e., the absolute prohibition of field use beyond a certain number of hours accrued over the season). The following recommendation relative to field limits is found in Section 20 of this report:

In collaboration with Public Works, rental levels of rectangular sports fields should be capped at current allocation levels on an aggregate level in order to stem field quality degradation and protect against excessive damage, which can further erode field availability for future years. In 2008 Class A fields were permitted an average of 500 hours each, Class B fields 400 hours each, and Class C fields 275 hours each. These allocations should be used as an annual maximum in the current year (2010), with a reduction in usage (primarily for Class A and B fields) targeted for future years as new fields become available. Greater system-wide usage should not be permitted until the sum of new fields added to inventory allow for field quality to be maintained at a consistent level year after year, as determined by the City’s Public Works and Recreation Administration Divisions¹⁰. Implementation of this policy must be

¹⁰ At present, the City has indicated that this range would be an average of 280-320 hours annually for each Class A field and 300-350 hours annually for each Class B field. These figures may be subject to change based on further analysis.

accompanied by an Allocation Policy and a system for monitoring and enforcement. Field use limits not related to required maintenance, off-season and night closure times are not applicable to artificial turf fields.

The attached "Sports Field Management Review & Recommendations" Report (see Attachment IX) prepared by the Guelph Turfgrass Institute contains a more detailed examination of Hamilton's sports field characteristics and management practices. (see also Section 18 of this report)

In order to gauge the degree to which the City's fields are being used, the following table identifies the "permitted" (i.e., rented) usage of soccer fields booked by the City in 2008. In 2008, the average field was rented for nearly 300 hours. Over a 17-week season (some organizations operate longer seasons, however, 14-17 weeks is typical for a minor soccer season), this translates into an average of 17.5 hours per week per field, which is at the top end of what a Category 4 or 5 field can sustain under ideal conditions; as noted above, this capacity target may no longer be appropriate given the maintenance limitations imposed by the provincial pesticide ban.

This information leads to three key findings:

- 1) **As a whole, the City's soccer and multi-use fields are at capacity. On a park-by-park basis, there are some fields that are over-utilized and some that may be under-utilized due to their poor quality (or that simply appear to be under-utilized in the City's booking system, which does not capture unauthorized use).** The City may wish to undertake further study to determine why certain fields were not booked as frequently as others.
- 2) **Unauthorized (non-permitted use) – which is not captured in these figures – is placing a strain on the City's soccer and multi-use fields and putting them at risk for further deterioration and the creation of unsafe playing conditions.** Parks and Operations Department staff estimates that there is an additional 15% usage from unscheduled usage (e.g., there are many schools that take their physical education classes and sports teams to City fields). Several soccer organizations have also indicated that unauthorized use of fields is a problem.
- 3) **The Provincial pesticide ban will place greater strain on sports fields and consideration should be given to reducing usage at high use fields in order to maintain appropriate field quality.**

As this section deals primarily with the supply of fields (physical infrastructure) and not how the fields are maintained or allocated, recommendations related to these topics can be found in Section 18 (Operations and Maintenance) and Section 20 (Recreation Administration).

Soccer, Football and Multi-Use Fields - 2008 Reported Bookings by City

(Note: Data excludes unauthorized / non-permitted use)

Area	Number of Fields*	Total Hours Rented (2008)	Average Hours Rented per Field	Frequently Booked Fields (hours/yr); more than 450 hrs/yr	Infrequently Booked Fields (hours/yr); less than 100 hrs/yr (all area Class C fields)
ANC	12 (of 20) fields are booked by City	5,166	430	Ancaster CC , 1 Class B and 1 Class C (647 hrs, 491 hrs) Costco Pitch , Class B (539 hrs) James Smith , 1 Class C (453 hrs)	--
BEV	4 (of 8) fields are booked by City	660	165	--	--
FLA	17 (of 19) fields are booked by City	3,564	210		Rockcliffe (28 hrs) North Wentworth , field 2 (73 hrs)
GLA	7 (of 7) fields are booked by City	1,572	225	Glanbrook Sports , 1 Class B (468 hrs)	Glanbrook Sports , field 7 (8 hrs)
HM	56 (of 59) fields are booked by City	17,427	311	R.A. Riddell School , 3 Class C (778 hrs, 778 hrs, 664 hrs) Mohawk Sports , 4 Class A and 2 Class B (701 hrs, 650 hrs, 637 hrs, 491 hrs, 479 hrs, 471 hrs) Sir Allan MacNab , 1 Class C (577 hrs)	Hill Park High School (83 hrs)
LH	14 (of 14) fields are booked by City	3,400	243	Ivor Wynne , 1 Class A (781 hrs) HAAA Grounds , 1 Class A (781 hrs) Woodlands , 1 Class C (475 hrs)	CP Lands/Corktown , field 3 (4 hrs) Montgomery (7 hrs)
LSC	36 (of 36) fields are booked by City	11,988	333	Sam Manson , 6 Class C (751 hrs, 710 hrs, 710 hrs, 710 hrs, 683 hrs, 683 hrs) Sherwood , 1 Class A and 1 Class B (522 hrs, 501 hrs)	Glendale (75 hrs)
USC	12 (of 17) fields are booked by City	3,787	316	Heritage Green , 3 Class A (677 hrs, 588 hrs, 472 hrs) Saltfleet H.S. , 1 Class B (495 hrs)	--
WHD	15 (of 17) fields are booked by City	3,991	266	Churchill , 4 Class B (532 hrs, 509 hrs, 509 hrs, 458 hrs) Olympic Sports , 1 Class A (452 hrs)	Couldry (97 hrs) Sanctuary , 2 fields (97 hrs, 97 hrs)
TOTAL	173*	51,554	298		

* does not include public fields booked by providers other than the City, used under exclusive agreement, or left available for unorganized play

Source: City of Hamilton, CLASS Reports, March 2009

8.2 Needs Assessment

a) City-wide Needs Assessment

Soccer and Multi-use Fields

Earlier, it was established that the City's soccer field inventory is currently at capacity, suggesting that the City does not have a surplus field inventory and may, in fact, require additional fields to meet current demands. Certainly, the public and stakeholder consultation program found considerable support for the expansion and improvement of soccer field supplies and quality; 46% of household survey respondents support additional spending on outdoor grass soccer fields, ranking them 8th out of 26 facility types. Additionally, 34% support additional spending on football, rugby or lacrosse fields, ranking them 15th out of 26 facility types. The City is in a deficit situation when it comes to soccer fields.

According to the soccer organizations responding to the user group survey, the lack of fields is presently a bigger issue than the condition of existing fields, although both are significant issues for most organizations. Over 240 additional hours per week were requested by all soccer organizations responding to the user group survey; this represents a 17% increase over 2008 rentals and a stated demand for approximately 14 more fields. All of the additional hours were requested by youth and/or mixed (youth/adult) leagues, for both practices and games.

56% of soccer organizations responding to the user group survey indicated they require more fields. 55 additional fields (including 15 by the Dundas Youth Soccer Club, 11 by the Flamborough Soccer Club, 6 by the Hamilton Sparta Soccer Club, 5 by the Ancaster Soccer Club, 4 by the Saltfleet Go Ahead Soccer Club, 4 by the West Hamilton Youth Soccer Club, 2 by the local rugby club, and others) were requested by all responding soccer organizations, although it is believed that these fields could be shared amongst some users, thereby reducing the overall requirement. There was significant support for the development of outdoor artificial turf multi-use fields, as well as more field lighting and fields with irrigation.

Traditionally, projection of most recreation facility needs is done on a per capita basis; however, this approach does not account for City-wide socio-demographic differences, nor is it ideal for long-range planning when the community's age composition is forecasted to change significantly, as it is in Hamilton. In order to control for several of these factors, participant-based targets that are market-driven have been used to identify sports field needs in the City.

Using information from 13 other communities (see following table), we see that the average youth participation rate is nearly 20%, meaning that 1 out of every 5 people ages 5 to 19 is registered in a soccer activity; incidentally, this is Hamilton's ratio as well. For the benchmarked communities, this translates into the average provision of 1 soccer field for every 84 youth participants. While this is a measure of actual provision, many municipalities are under strain to provide additional fields, meaning that the desired provision ratio is likely less than this. These provision levels are generally sufficient to accommodate a weekday playing schedule, provide sufficient field regeneration time, and meet the needs of secondary field users (such as football, lacrosse, etc.).

The City of Hamilton is currently operating at a ratio around 1 field for every 94 youth participants (1:109 when adult players are included), meaning that, while soccer demand is similar to these comparable communities, the local field supply is lagging behind.

Adult soccer is excluded from the following table as the data is more difficult to collect and verify in many communities, and youth often receive priority for field allocation. Included in these field inventories, however, are fields used by adults.

Soccer Participation Rates – Benchmarking Exercise (YOUTH ONLY)

Municipality	Permitted Fields	Population (ages 5-19)	Minor Soccer Players	Youth Participation Rate	Per Capita Field Ratio (ages 5-19)	Youth Participants per Field
Milton (2006)	38	9,965	2,660	26.7%	262	70*
Halton Hills (2006)	39	12,460	3,187	25.6%	319	82*
Clarington (2005)	48	19,277	5,015	26.0%	402	104*
Ajax (2008)	56	22,527	5,508	24.5%	402	98*
Waterloo (2006)	47	18,620	4,549	24.4%	396	97*
Cambridge (2005)	60	24,505	3,800	15.5%	408	63*
Guelph (2008)	76.5	22,441	5,179	23.1%	293	68*
Oakville (2005)	84	30,302	10,100	33.3%	361	120*
Richmond Hill (2005)	48	34,060	4,455	13.1%	710	93*
Kitchener (2005)	64	39,175	4,500	11.5%	612	70*
Markham (2008)	112.5	54,455	6,922	12.7%	484	62*
Vaughan (2007)	145	54,482	8,172	15.0%	376	56*
London (2008)	101.5	65,444	13,100	20.0%	645	129*
AVERAGE	--	--	--	19.0%	443	84*
Hamilton (2009)	204.5	95,278	19,267	20.2%	466	94*

* Excludes adults

Notes:

Players include those in minor ball organizations only (age 19 and under).

Each lighted field has been counted as 1.5 fields to ensure equal comparisons.

Allocated fields include municipal, school and other fields under agreement; fields may be allocated to youth and/or adults.

Source: Monteith Brown Planning Consultants, 2009

Based on the identified demand factors and standards in comparable communities, a provision target of 1 field per 85 registered youth participants would be reasonable, which is slightly more aggressive than the current level of provision and would bring Hamilton closer in line with similar communities. Although adult demand currently represents a small portion (14%) of field users, demand at the adult level is expected to grow faster than demand at the youth level. Therefore, a blended provision target that includes both youth and adult participants is recommended. Based on the current player ratio, **a provision target of 1 field (unlit equivalent) per 100 registered participants (both youth and adult) is recommended.** As mentioned, built into this target are the needs secondary field users (e.g., football, lacrosse, etc.); while these sports should still be permitted to use multi-use fields (where appropriate), their registration figures should not be counted in the 1:100 ratio.

For ease of future application, this ratio of one field per 100 players is generally equal to one field per 2,300 to 2,500 residents (all ages). Although the City's population is aging, **the increased uptake of soccer by adults is predicted to largely offset any declining registration at the youth level.** As such, the per capita target range (one per 2,400 to 2,500) is a reasonable substitute for determining City-wide needs into the future in the event that reliable registration data is unavailable (but should not be used for identifying community-specific needs). The participant-based standard will continue to be used in the context of this Study.

The following table applies this target (1 field per 100 registered participants) against population forecasts. Historical data from the Ontario Soccer Association (Hamilton District) suggests that youth outdoor participation rates are levelling off; therefore, a constant 20% youth participation rate has been assumed.

Adult soccer, on the other hand, currently captures approximately 1.2% of the 20-54 population and its popularity is increasing. Projecting the number of adult players (currently estimated to be 3,100) is an imprecise task as it is complicated by several factors, such as opportunity (number, availability, and quality of fields), existence and management of leagues, ethnicity of the population (the sport is traditionally more popular with some cultures), and the growing number of adults that grew up playing the sport. As a point of departure, it is assumed that the adult participation rate will increase by 6% a year, which is generally reflective of recent trends reported by the OSA (1998-2007); like youth soccer, however, the growth in adult soccer will likely stabilize at some point in the future and this should be taken into account. The following table illustrates the current and forecasted demand for soccer and multi-use fields City-wide.

Forecasted Needs – Soccer and Multi-use Fields (2009-2031)

	2009	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031
Youth Population (5-19)	95,278	93,546	90,108	93,403	99,104	105,977
Adult Population (20-54)	252,981	256,050	257,066	260,327	264,348	277,389
Estimated # of Youth Players	19,267	18,709	18,022	18,681	19,821	21,195
Estimated # of Adult Players*	3,100	3,452	4,638	5,445	5,529	5,802
Total Number of Players (estimated)	22,367	22,162	22,660	24,126	25,350	26,998
Fields Required (at 1:100) – unlit equivalents	223.7	221.6	226.6	241.3	253.5	270.0
Existing Fields – unlit equivalents	204.5					
Surplus (Deficit)	(19.2)	(17.1)	(22.1)	(36.8)	(49.0)	(65.5)

* assumes a 6% increase annually in the adult participation rate between 2009 and 2016; declining to 3%/year between 2016 and 2021, and reduced to 0% beyond 2021.

All field supply and demand numbers are "unlit equivalents" (1 lit field = 1.5 unlit equivalents; 1 lit artificial field = 3 unlit equivalents).

Based on the recommended target, there is currently a City-wide deficit of 19 soccer and multi-use fields (unlit equivalents; demand is greatest for full-size soccer fields). This deficit will decline very slightly by 2011, but increase to 22 fields by 2016 and then ultimately to 65.5 fields by 2031, representing a need to increase the soccer field inventory by 32% between now and 2031.

Fortunately, through new park development, expansion, and reconfiguration, the City and its partners have plans to add 13 more fields (equivalent of 14.5 unlit fields) at approximately 10 parks across the City over the next 10 years. These planned additions should be sufficient to address much of the current shortfall, but there will be a need for approximately 51 more fields (unlit equivalents) by 2031; securing sufficient land for these amenities will be a key priority for the City. Although long-term strategies are helpful, the planned short-term improvements to the field supply and maintenance practices are critical.

Several strategies should be employed to address this short and long-term sports field shortfall, including:

- expansions at existing parks;
- use of new parkland dedications;
- acquisition of parkland;
- establishment of community access agreements with non-municipal field providers;
- conversion of under-utilized facilities to soccer;
- installation of lights (which allows for extended play opportunities) and irrigation (which can assist field maintenance efforts); and
- installation of artificial turf.

While all strategies are important, artificial turf should be given strong consideration in the City of Hamilton. The playing capacity of an artificial turf field is virtually unlimited as it can accommodate play in most weather conditions (snow and extreme cold excluded) and does not require rest periods like natural grass fields. As a result, 1 artificial turf field is generally equivalent to 3 unlit fields during peak season.

Artificial turf fields are beneficial because they:

- Improve the sustainability and quality of existing grass fields by moving some users over to artificial fields, thereby reducing the chronic over-use and damage to grass fields.
- Less costly to maintain when compared to traditional grass fields.
- Reduce the number of grass fields required, freeing up park space for other uses.
- Reduce City costs to maintain and restore over-used fields.
- Reduce costly land requirements that would be needed to provide an equivalent number of grass fields.
- Reduce usage and the resultant community friction that can result from the use of small, neighbourhood fields.
- Accommodate several sports (including football) over an extended season without the need to limit usage.
- Attract tournaments.

As the technology improves and becomes more affordable, artificial turf fields are being investigated and developed by many municipalities (e.g., Mississauga, Toronto, Brampton, etc.), universities, and even school boards. Several communities were successful in receiving Federal/Provincial government funding for new artificial fields through the 2009 RInC program.

For this study, requests for the installation of artificial turf came from all directions, including field user groups, City officials, and staff. In fact, funding was very recently awarded to Redeemer College to replace their natural grass soccer field with two artificial turf fields and to install lights, bleachers and fencing, in partnership with the Ancaster Soccer Club. McMaster University also has artificial turf, as does the City's Ivor Wynne Stadium. If existing fields are to be converted to artificial turf, Class B or C fields are good candidates as they are already in need of improvement.

Football and Other Rectangular Field Sports

A similar analysis is more difficult to undertake for football / rugby fields due to the degree to which these sports use multi-use fields. While football has 9% of the number of registrants that soccer has, it remains an important sport locally and the City boasts several strong organizations. There are at least 1,989 participants listed with tackle and touch football organizations renting City fields (excluding school and CYO leagues); two-thirds of which are youth. An additional 178 players are registered in rugby, 35 in aussie rules football, 36 in field hockey and 600 in ultimate frisbee.

According to the football organizations responding to the user group survey, the lack of fields is presently a bigger issue than the condition of existing fields. Approximately 25 additional hours per week were requested by all football organizations responding to the user group survey; this represents an 11% increase over 2008 rentals. 43% of football organizations responding to the user group survey indicated they require more fields. 7 to 8 additional fields (5 by the Hamilton Touch Football Association and 2-3 by Hamilton Wentworth Minor Football) were requested by all responding football organizations. Most groups indicated that they could share fields with other groups (they do not require exclusive use fields, particularly for practices); other sport users do not necessarily share this view.

One of the primary concerns regarding football is the impact of the activity on turf quality, particularly on fields that are shared with soccer. The wear patterns and intensity of use for tackle football often result in a grass surface that is unplayable for soccer, which depends on an even playing surface; this is not as large of an issue for touch football. As a result, it can be challenging to share the same field between soccer and football teams. Traditionally, the seasons for these two sports are often different, with soccer being played in the spring and summer and football being played in the fall. This is changing, however, as the tackle football season for many leagues now begins at the same time as soccer. While there are generally no major turf issues for lacrosse, field hockey, touch football, and ultimate frisbee groups that use multi-use fields, efforts should be made to limit the amount of hours that tackle football, aussie rules and rugby organizations rent on fields that are also used by soccer.

Ideally, dedicated use fields for football and rugby would be provided at a ratio of one field for every 150 participants. Currently, there are approximately 1,500 players registered in tackle and aussie rules football and rugby (excluding school leagues, which rely largely on school fields). Based on a provision target of 1 dedicated use field for every 150 players, this would result in a need for 10 fields (unlit equivalents), 3.5 more than are presently available.

New football fields should be lit to enable evening play. In order to provide 3.5 additional football/rugby fields, it is recommended that 2 new fields be developed (one lit and one unlit, totalling 2.5 unlit equivalents).

In addition, a portion of rental time should be made available to football at future artificial turf fields. As the length of a football field is longer than a Class A soccer field, the cost to install artificial turf capable of accommodating football is greater. Artificial turf is being recommended through this study primarily to serve soccer, but it is also recognized that other sports can make use of these fields. Not all artificial turf fields in Hamilton need to be designed for football game use. If the booking schedule and allocation process allow for it, football organizations should be able to use artificial turf fields of any size for practices (but not for games). Nevertheless, some of the City's future artificial turf fields should be designed so that they can accommodate football

games. With this will come expectations for ancillary buildings and associated infrastructure, as well as financial support from user groups.

Ivor Wynne Stadium is outside the scope of this Study, but it is important to note that this facility provides the City's only municipal artificial turf field and also has significant seating capacity, making it a popular venue for high profile games and events. The successful bid for the 2015 Pan Am Games is expected to bring about the replacement of Ivor Wynne Stadium with a new multi-use stadium at another location.

b) Community-specific Needs Assessment

Soccer and Multi-use Fields

Soccer and Multi-use Field Supplies by Community

	Current Number of Soccer & Multi-use Fields (ULE)*	Current Per Capita Field Ratio (total population)
ANC	21	1,507
BEV	6	3,050
FLA	21	1,119
GLA	11.5	1,301
HM	60.5	2,505
LH	13	10,579
LSC	36	2,190
USC	19	1,169
WHD	16.5	2,553
Total	204.5	2,584

Although the greatest need for new soccer fields would appear to be in Lower Hamilton due to its low per capita supply (one field for every 10,579 residents), the absence of available and affordable land creates significant challenges for new field development. Careful evaluation of ball diamond use and conversion to soccer fields is one possibility. Lower Hamilton's sports field infrastructure may also benefit from the 2015 Pan Am Games. It should be noted that Lower Hamilton's youth participation rate is the lowest in the City; this could be due to any number of reasons, including a lack of fields, financial barriers, transportation barriers, a shortage of organized soccer leagues, or a lack of interest.

The quality of soccer programs and facilities would appear to be a significant determinant in local participation rates. Furthermore, the ability and willingness of residents to travel outside of their immediate community is evident; coupled with the fact that the boundaries of most organizations do not coincide with those used in this Study, makes it impossible to precisely identify the total number of sport participants in each community. Nevertheless, estimates of local soccer participation have been created that are appropriate for the purposes of this high-level Study.

What is known is that 20% of Hamilton's youth population (ages 5 to 19) participates in organized soccer. From the household survey data, we are also reasonably confident that participation rates are higher than average in Ancaster (which has a younger age profile and several fields in proximity) and lower than average in Lower Hamilton (where few soccer leagues and fields exist). Lower Hamilton, although served by a few leagues, currently lacks a

minor soccer organization similar to those available in other areas of the City; this is one factor that contributes to the lack of soccer participation in this community. Input received through this Study suggests that there is support to more fully develop soccer programs in the area (in partnership with established clubs), should additional soccer facilities be developed.

The Glanbrook, West Hamilton/Dundas, and Lower / Upper Stoney Creek leagues also draw a higher than average proportion of the youth population. In terms of the existing supply, the fields in Ancaster accommodate a much higher level of use, as do fields in Lower / Upper Stoney Creek, and Hamilton Mountain. Fields in Beverly, Flamborough, and Glanbrook are not used as intensely as those in other areas, suggesting that there may be some additional capacity within the existing inventory.

Similar to the assessment of hockey and skating in the Indoor Recreation Facility Study, not all areas of Hamilton have the same participation outdoor sports rates. Whether influenced by income, transportation, availability, or preference, participation rates for soccer vary widely across the City – from as low as 3% of all children and youth in Lower Hamilton to as high as 36% in Ancaster. As most sports fields require two or more acres of land, equitable geographic distribution is not always possible.

Needs are presently the greatest (by priority order) in the following areas and several options have been suggested:

- Ancaster – The planned development of the new soccer park (landfill site) and the artificial turf fields at Redeemer College will meet many short-term needs. An additional artificial turf field is recommended at a site to be determined.
- Lower Stoney Creek – One new field is being added to Winona Park; however, more fields will be required in the short-term, including an artificial turf field (at a location to be determined).
- West Hamilton/Dundas – One new field is being added to Churchill Park; however, more fields will be required in the short-term (such as conversion of under-utilized ball diamonds at Veteran's Park), including an artificial turf field at a location to be determined.
- Flamborough – Planned improvements to Joe Sams Leisure Park and Courtcliffe Park should be sufficient to meet short-term needs. The installation of an artificial turf field could also be considered over the longer-term at Joe Sams Leisure Park. Changes to Gatesbury Park (converting the ball diamonds to soccer fields) are also recommended.
- Upper Stoney Creek – Planned expansions at Heritage Green Sports (including one Class A field and one artificial turf field, to be undertaken in 2010), Maplewood, and Summit Parks will meet most short-term needs; however, future growth will necessitate further field development (such as conversion of the under-utilized ball diamond at Paramount Park) and partnership creation.

Although overall deficiencies have been noted in only five communities, this is not to say that the remaining communities do not require improvements to their soccer and multi-use field inventories, rather that the sheer number of fields is most deficient in these identified areas.

For the other communities, the following is suggested:

- Hamilton Mountain – While the area generally has a sufficient number of soccer fields, there is a need for targeted development, including additional fields in the Gilkson area, replacement of the 2 fields lost at William McCulloch Park (to be replaced at William

Schwenger Park in 2010), and the development of two artificial turf fields for this high population area (Billy Sherring Park and Mohawk Sports Park). Replacement of selected fields with artificial turf.

- Glanbrook – Expansion potential exists at the Glanbrook Sports Complex (including consideration of an artificial turf field over the longer-term), which should be sufficient to meet long-term needs in the Binbrook area.
- Lower Hamilton – Currently, there are enough fields to meet needs; however, it is believed that participation rates are constricted by the lack of soccer organizations and plans are underway to expand local opportunities. Conversion of under-utilized ball diamonds (e.g., Eastwood Park and other locations) is recommended in order to allow greater opportunities for local soccer activity.
- Beverly – No additional field needs are projected.

Over the longer-term, population growth will drive field needs, meaning that Upper Stoney Creek will by far be the area requiring most attention, with Ancaster, Flamborough, and Glanbrook requiring more limited investment. Again, it bears noting that the ability of residents to travel from one area to another is evident; therefore, it is not necessary for the distribution of sports fields to be perfectly balanced.

Soccer and Multi-use Field Demand Factors by Community
(H = High demand; M = Medium demand; L = Low demand)

	Current Per Capita Field Ratio (total population)	Participation Rates	Field Usage Levels	Public Demand (Household Survey)	Group Demand (Requests)	Demographic Profile	Short-term Field Needs Outlook (2009-2021)	Long-term Field Needs Outlook (2022-2031)
ANC	1:1,507	H	H	H	H	H	H	M
BEV	1:3,050	--	L	--	--	--	L	L
FLA	1:1,119	--	L	--	H	H	M	M
GLA	1:1,301	H	L	--	--	--	L	M
HM	1:2,505	--	H	--	--	--	L-M	L
LH	1:10,579	L	--	L	--	--	L-M	L
LSC	1:2,190	H	H	--	--	--	H	L
USC	1:1,169	H	H	--	--	H	M	H
WHD	1:2,553	H	--	--	H	--	M	L

Demographic Profile – above average proportion of population is youth.

Football and Other Rectangular Field Sports

Demand for football and rugby fields is likely greater in some areas and lesser in others due to existence of programs and traditional participation factors; many of the area’s football organizations draw from a City-wide population base. At present, Mohawk Sports Park is a central facility that is heavily used for both football and rugby and any new fields should be located centrally to enable access from a large number of residents. Two new dedicated football/rugby fields have been recommended. A preference is to consider locating these at one site in the Hamilton Mountain area; further consultation is required to identify an appropriate site to meet short and long-term needs. The Hamilton Wentworth Minor Football Association has expressed a willingness to assist the City on the development of these fields and should be considered for a potential partnership.

8.3 Recommended Directions

- Develop 65.5 additional soccer and multi-use fields (unlit equivalents) by 2031, for a total supply of 270 fields. These fields would be suitable for accommodating soccer, field lacrosse, field hockey, touch football, and ultimate frisbee.

The large majority of new field development should be in the form of full-size (senior) turf fields, with as many being Class A and B fields as possible. Full-size fields (consistent with the City's standard dimensions) are emphasized over mini fields because of their ability to accommodate a range of age groups and their flexibility (mini fields with portable nets can be created over full fields to serve younger players), although it is recognized that some mini fields may be constructed due to space limitations at certain sites. Furthermore, multi-field complexes are generally preferred over a more distributed provision model and dedicated (exclusive) use fields are preferred over fields shared with other sports.

This goal should be achieved through the following mix of strategies:

- Develop new grass/turf sports fields through parkland dedication, land acquisition, and existing park expansion, with an emphasis on locations within Community Parks.
 - Implement current planned improvements at: the new soccer park (landfill site) in Ancaster (ANC); Joe Sams Leisure Park, 2 fields in 2010 and 1 field in future phase (FLA); Courtcliffe Park (FLA); Fairgrounds Community Park (GLA); Glanbrook Sports Park (GLA); Winona Park (LSC); Heritage Green Sports Park in 2010 (USC); Maplewood Park (USC); Summit Park (USC); Summerlea Park (GLA); and Churchill Park (WHD). This could result in a minimum of 14.5 additional fields in the short-term (unlit equivalents) after subtracting for the loss of fields at North Wentworth Community Park (FLA).
 - Monitor local soccer demand to determine need for longer-term soccer field expansions at Glanbrook Sports Complex (GLA).
 - Investigate the potential of working closer with key private facilities in growth areas to maximize community access (e.g. Dofasco Recreation Park).
 - Seek opportunities to provide additional fields through new Community Park development/redevelopment in Ancaster, Lower Stoney Creek, and Upper Stoney Creek.
 - If the Ivor Wynne and Brian Timmis Stadium (LH) fields are removed from the inventory, they should be replaced by 1 full-size lit soccer field for community use in order to maintain an appropriate distribution of fields in the area.
- To facilitate extended and higher intensity of use and to save the wear and tear on grass fields, install six to eight (6-8) multi-use artificial turf fields at new sites or in place of Class C (or lower quality Class B) fields. Each lit artificial field is generally equivalent to 3 unlit fields. Up to four (4) of these fields should be large enough to accommodate football end zones. Possible locations to be considered include (but may not be limited to) the following; sites should be well distributed and must be capable of accommodating high levels of use, field lighting, support infrastructure (e.g., parking lots, washrooms, etc.):

- Heritage Green Sports Park (USC); this is planned for 2010
 - Lower Hamilton, location tbd (LH)
 - Mohawk Sports Park (HM)
 - Billy Sherring Park (HM)
 - William Connell Park (HM)
 - Lower Stoney Creek, location tbd (LSC)
 - West Hamilton / Dundas, location tbd (WHD)
 - Joe Sams Leisure Park (FLA), as a longer-term option
 - Glanbrook Sports Park (GLA), as a longer-term option
- Install lights, irrigation, sub-drainage, and perimeter fencing on full-size soccer fields at Community Parks, where possible, with a goal of improving a minimum of one field per year. Proper designs (e.g., fields with appropriate amenities, soil conditions, parking, and buffering from adjacent properties) allow the City to meet the needs of a wide range of users and conduct proper maintenance (particularly given the pesticide ban). Each lit field is generally equivalent to 1.5 unlit fields. Possibilities for lighting should be studied further, with an emphasis placed on Class B fields that are currently unlit.
 - Convert under-utilized ball diamonds to full-size soccer fields, as required and in consultation with local community groups. These options are discussed in more detail under the Ball Diamond recommendations of this report.
 - Undertake site-specific improvements to improve playability of existing soccer fields at Olympic Sports Park (upper field) (WHD).
 - Discourage the use of the same natural grass fields by both soccer and tackle football/rugby in order to reduce the negative impact on turf quality and scheduling conflicts. Some shared use may be permitted where impacts can be sufficiently mitigated (evaluated on a case-by-case basis). Tackle football and rugby rentals should be encouraged on multi-use artificial turf fields (when available) and dedicated-use fields (for tackle football and/or rugby).
 - Two new dedicated football/rugby fields (one lit, one unlit) are recommended, with a preference of locating them in the Hamilton Mountain area. Further consultation is required to identify an appropriate site to meet short and long-term needs, as well as to determine partnership potential with local user groups.
 - Lower participation sports such as field lacrosse, field hockey, and ultimate frisbee should continue to be scheduled on multi-use fields shared with soccer. Exclusive-use fields for these sports are not recommended.
 - The degree to which existing school sites are used by the community for organized field sports (e.g., soccer, football, baseball) – along with the ability to adequately accommodate these uses at municipal sites – should be considered when the City is evaluating the acquisition of those sites deemed surplus by the school boards.

Note: *Recommendations for sports field design, maintenance, and management are contained in subsequent sections of this report.*

SECTION 9 BALL DIAMONDS

This section contains an assessment of City-wide and community-specific ball diamond needs, consistent with the methodology established in Section 7. Key data relevant to this assessment is also provided.

Note: The term “baseball” refers to all sports that take place on diamonds, including softball, slo-pitch, hardball, fastball, etc.

9.1 Facility Profiles

a) Supply



There are a total of 239 ball diamonds under municipal influence in the City of Hamilton. With 45 diamonds being lit, this is equivalent to 261.5 unlit diamonds (each lit diamond is considered the same as 1.5 unlit diamonds due to extended play opportunities).

The City does not have a comprehensive classification system for its ball diamonds, although past attempts have been made. For the purposes of this study, it is understood that the City has:

- 37 hardball diamonds (1 premier/lit; 14 lit; and 22 unlit);
- 168 softball diamonds (29 lit and 139 unlit); and
- 34 t-ball diamonds (1 lit and 33 unlit).

Through new park development, expansion, and reconfiguration, the City and its partners have plans to add 1 more ball diamond and lighting to 4 existing diamonds (equivalent of 3 unlit diamonds) at two parks across the City over the next few years (additions and upgrades at Rosedale Park – completed in late 2009 – and installation of lighting at Ancaster Community Centre Park). Some diamonds are also proposed to be removed from the inventory due to their surplus declaration, neighbourhood conflicts, or property loss (e.g., Maplewood Park, Seneca School – to be replaced at William McCulloch Park) and others have been recommended for replacement with soccer fields (see previous section).

92% of the existing ball diamonds are in City parks (a higher ratio than soccer and multi-use fields), with the remainder being located largely on school grounds (several of these are booked and maintained by the City, but the municipality does not control community access over the long-term; furthermore, school diamonds are often of poorer quality due to the heavy utilization from school programs and recess activity).



Hamilton's current provision rate is one ball diamond (unlit equivalent) for every 1,991 residents, or one for every 62 registered participants (including both youth and adults, but excluding school teams/leagues). The poorest per capita supply ratios can be found in Lower Hamilton, Lower Stoney Creek, and Ancaster, while Beverly has the most favourable per capita ratio. The variation in per capita supplies by community is not nearly as wide as it is for soccer fields (Beverly and Lower Hamilton have nearly four to five times as many ball diamonds as soccer fields).

b) Distribution

Most frequently, baseball participants are driving (or being driven) to practices and games, rather than walking. Like soccer, nearly two-thirds of those using ball diamonds for organized and unorganized play drive to them; household survey respondents were willing to travel 15 minutes to make regular use of ball diamonds.

As such, distributing diamonds so that they are within walking distance of most areas is not essential, nor would this allow for the provision of multi-field complexes with lit diamonds. What is important, however, is that a sufficient number of diamonds are located within a community so as to properly serve youth organizations, particularly those with established boundaries.

Using a 1.5km radius for ball diamond sites, no major gaps in supply were identified. A community by community assessment of diamond supplies can be found on the following pages.

c) Trends, Best Practices, and Benchmarking

Provincially, baseball leagues (including softball, hardball, fastball, and slo-pitch) have generally seen a participation decline since 1992 in Ontario, partly at the expense of soccer's growing popularity. Baseball Canada has taken significant steps in addressing this decline by introducing new programs (e.g., Winterball) and enhancing communication with its member organizations. Nationally, softball has seen a similar decline, however, it appears to be stabilizing as the sport is a popular option for adult recreational leagues and women are increasingly finding the game more attractive, especially on a competitive level. Given these

overall declines in ball registration, it is becoming common practice to convert surplus ball diamonds to other field sport uses (e.g. soccer, football, etc.) or other open space amenities, where possible.

The facility benchmarking data (see below) illustrates that Hamilton is providing more ball diamonds per capita than 8 of the 9 comparable communities (with only St. Catharines being the exception). This is likely due to more recent sports field development trends (not nearly as many ball diamonds are being built as there used to be, particularly now that soccer has grown in popularity), as several of these communities have seen more recent population growth than Hamilton. The benchmarking average is one ball diamond per 3,279 residents, compared to 1,991 residents in Hamilton.

Municipality	Ball diamonds (unlit equivalents)	
	Supply (approx.)	Per capita
St. Catharines	100.5	1,329
Oakville	68.5	2,317
Burlington	77	2,136
Richmond Hill	62	2,943
Vaughan	85	3,051
Markham	80	3,607
London	87.5	4,065
Brampton	137.5	3,288
Mississauga	130	5,538
AVERAGE		3,279
Hamilton	261.5	1,991

Data collected between 2004 and 2009 and is subject to change
 Includes municipal facilities and facilities under municipal influence
 Each lit field is considered to be equivalent to 1.5 unlit fields
 Source: Monteith Brown Planning Consultants, 2009

d) Utilization & Physical Condition

Research conducted for this Study found that there are 16,151 players registered with 80 baseball organizations that rent City diamonds (including school fields that are booked by the City). This number could be slightly higher as data was not available for all groups (most of which are smaller groups). Of this number, 49% are children and youth (7,875) and 51% are adults (8,276). Data excludes school and CYO leagues, as well as tournament/event participants.

The condition of grass surfaces and incidences of unauthorized use are not critical issues for baseball as they are for soccer. For these reasons, there is no need to be concerned with the overuse of ball diamonds or their optimal capacities. The most frequently noted diamond quality issues raised by users related to the quality of infields and their maintenance practices and the lack of ancillary infrastructure (e.g., lighting, fencing, parking, washrooms, etc.).

The following table breaks down the highest and lowest use diamonds in Hamilton in 2008, according to booking records. Ancaster's ball diamonds were booked an average of 563 hours

each, significantly more than the next community (Lower Hamilton at 340 hours each). Average rental frequencies were lowest in Glanbrook, West Hamilton/Dundas, Upper Stoney Creek, and Flamborough. 28 diamonds were rented less than 100 hours last year; several of these are smaller, lower quality diamonds that could be considered for improvement (if demand exists) or re-purposing to more 'in-demand' uses. It should also be noted that some of these booking figures may be inflated, as some groups have acknowledged over-booking (to accommodate rain-outs, extra practices, etc.), a luxury that many other sport field users do not have.

Ball Diamonds - 2008 Reported Bookings by City

Area	Number of Diamonds	Total Hours Rented (2008)*	Average Hours Rented per Field	Frequently Booked Fields (hours/yr)	Infrequently Booked Fields (hours/yr)
ANC	9 (of 12) diamonds are booked by City	5,064	563	Ancaster CC , 2 lit and 2 unlit (994 hrs, 776 hrs, 518 hrs, 481 hrs) James Smith , unlit (749 hrs) Scenic Woods , unlit (738 hrs)	Meadowlands (85 hrs)
BEV	2 (of 24) diamonds are booked by City	616	308	--	--
FLA	13 (of 15) diamonds are booked by City	2,239	172	--	Carlisle Memorial , 2 unlit fields (24 hrs, 53 hrs) Belmont (58 hrs) Flamborough Centre , lit (74 hrs)
GLA	6 (of 8) diamonds are booked by City	833	139	--	Woodburn , 3 t-ball (25 hrs, 30 hrs, 64 hrs)
HM	60 (of 72) diamonds are booked by City	15,429	257	Mohawk Sports , 2 lit - Bernie Arbour (806 hrs), Diamond 2 (555 hrs), Gilkson , unlit (745 hrs)	Bruce , 2 unlit (30 hrs, 52 hrs) Huntington , 2 unlit (34 hrs, 64 hrs) Inch , diamonds 3 & 4 (2 hrs, 77 hrs) Templemead (89 hrs)
LH	34 (of 45) diamonds are booked by City	11,559	340	Rosedale , 5 unlit (696 hrs, 696 hrs, 689 hrs, 689 hrs, 653 hrs) Gage , 2 unlit (621 hrs, 560 hrs) Montgomery , 2 unlit (602 hrs, 602 hrs) Globe , 1 lit (493 hrs) Mahoney , lit (451 hrs)	Eastwood (6 hrs) Globe , diamond 4 (8 hrs) Beach Strip (12 hrs) Highland Gardens , 2 diamonds (48 hrs, 11 hrs) Roxborough (78 hrs)

Area	Number of Diamonds	Total Hours Rented (2008)*	Average Hours Rented per Field	Frequently Booked Fields (hours/yr)	Infrequently Booked Fields (hours/yr)
LSC	23 (of 29) diamonds are booked by City	4,616	201	Stoney Creek Little League , 1 lit and 1 unlit (528 hrs, 508 hrs) Winona , lit (487 hrs)	John Knox , 3 diamonds (66 hrs, 66 hrs, 66 hrs) Waterford (72 hrs) Ferris (86 hrs) Hillcrest , diamond 1 (92 hrs) Lake Avenue (96 hrs)
USC	13 (of 14) diamonds are booked by City	1,970	152	Heritage Green , 2 lit (495 hrs, 403 hrs)	Valley , diamond 2 (5 hrs) Stoneywood (36 hrs) Taplestown Men's Club , 2 diamonds (38 hrs, 40 hrs) Maplewood , diamond 2 (50 hrs) Taplestown Park (68 hrs) Cline (81 hrs) Albion Estates , 2 diamonds (83 hrs, 83 hrs)
WHD	18 (of 20) diamonds are booked by City	2,722	151	--	Volunteer (5 hrs) Alexander , 3 diamonds (5 hrs, 34 hrs, 37 hrs) Veterans (86 hrs) Edwards (87 hrs)
TOTAL	178*	45,045	253		

* does not include 61 public diamonds booked by providers other than the City, used under exclusive agreement, or left available for unorganized play

Source: City of Hamilton, CLASS Reports, March 2009

9.2 Needs Assessment

a) City-wide Needs Assessment

If the experiences in other municipalities are any indication, it is likely that there is ample capacity within the system to accommodate current user needs. In fact, the City has recognized this trend and has recently converted several small and under-utilized ball diamonds into other facilities (e.g., soccer fields) and this approach is expected to continue. Future changes in baseball registration will need to be considered by the City with respect to construction and maintenance of diamonds. At the same time, it is recognized that many of the City's ball diamonds are too small and are not in proper condition to accommodate play by adults, which is one area where demand is generally steady. Baseball organizations have indicated that the condition of existing diamonds is presently a bigger issue than the number of diamonds.

In terms of overall public opinion, 42% support additional spending on ball diamonds, ranking them 11th out of 26 facility types. 75% of household survey respondents agreed that "providing outdoor sports fields and recreation amenities for adults is just as important as providing them for children and teens".

Of the 42 baseball groups that responded to the user group survey, one-half of the organizations expect their participation numbers to increase over the next five years, although caution should be shown given anticipated demographic trends. From those groups that submitted registration data, participation in baseball activities increased by 6% between 2006 and 2008, with the most marked growth coming at the youth level.

Approximately 220 additional hours per week were requested by all baseball organizations responding to the user group survey; this represents an 11% increase over 2008 rentals. Two-thirds of the additional hours were requested for youth, mostly for games (although regulation-sized softball and slo-pitch diamonds were the most requested). 31% of baseball organizations responding to the user group survey indicated they require more diamonds. A total of 33 additional diamonds (including 3 by the Hamilton New Media Slo-pitch League, 3 by the Hamilton Cardinals Baseball Association, and others) were requested by all responding baseball organizations. This section contains an examination of the merits of these requests through a wide range of inputs.

Unlike soccer where there are significantly more youth playing the sport than adults, baseball is more balanced. In Hamilton, approximately 51% of current players are adults and in some other communities, we have seen this figure to be as high as 70%. Based on this even split and the participation rates documented below, it would appear that Hamilton is home to several well managed minor ball associations and there is strong local interest in the sport (although soccer clearly remains the summer team sport of choice among Hamilton's youth).

Using information from 11 other communities (see table below), we see that the average youth participation rate is 5%, meaning that approximately 1 out of every 20 youth ages 5 to 19 is registered in a baseball activity. Hamilton's youth participation rate is higher at 8% (1 out of every 12 youth), which may be indicative of its lower proportion of foreign-born residents when compared to the other communities. For the benchmarked communities, this translates into the average provision of 1 ball diamond for every 26 youth participants, similar to Hamilton's ratio of one per 30 diamond youth participants. While this is a measure of actual provision, many municipalities have more than a sufficient number of ball diamonds, and excess capacity exists in several communities.

Note: Adult ball participation is excluded from this table as the data is more difficult to collect and verify in many communities. Included in these inventories, however, are diamonds used by adults.

Baseball Participation Rates – Benchmarking Exercise (youth only)

Municipality	Permitted Diamonds	Population (ages 5-19)	Minor Ball Players	Youth Participation Rate	Per Capita Diamond Ratio (ages 5-19)	Youth Participants per Diamond
Milton (2006)	37	9,965	567	5.7%	269	15
Halton Hills (2006)	33.5	12,460	1,180	9.5%	372	35
Clarington (2005)	49	19,277	1,043	5.4%	393	21
Ajax (2007)	27	22,527	645	2.9%	834	24
St. Catharines (2003)	100.5	23,535	2,048	8.7%	234	20
Oshawa (2003)	77.5	29,555	1,469	5.0%	381	19
Oakville (2005)	68.5	30,302	1,750	5.8%	442	26
Richmond Hill (2005)	62	34,060	965	2.8%	549	16
Markham (2008)	80	54,455	2,323	4.3%	681	29
Vaughan (2008)	85	54,482	2,549	4.7%	641	30
London (2008)	87.5	66,425	3,561	5.4%	759	41
AVERAGE	--	--	--	5.1%	505	26
Hamilton (2009)	261.5	95,278	7,785	8.3%	364	30

Notes:

Players include those in minor ball organizations only (age 19 and under).

Each lighted field has been counted as 1.5 fields to ensure equal comparisons.

Allocated fields include municipal, school and other fields under agreement; fields may be allocated to youth and/or adults.

Source: Monteith Brown Planning Consultants, 2009

From this comparison, it would appear that a good share of the youth population is attracted to baseball and that the City provides diamonds at a rate that is similar to participation in other communities. When adult players are taken into account (7,875 youth players + 8,276 adult players = 16,151), the diamond to player ratio becomes 1:62.

Adult demand currently represents a significant portion of diamond users; therefore, a blended provision target that includes both youth and adult participants should be considered. A provision target of 1 diamond (unlit equivalent) per 75 registered participants (both youth and adult) is recommended. This target is based on the assertion that there is a slight over-supply of diamonds City-wide (many of which are of poor quality), which is consistent with stakeholder input that valued diamond quality over diamond quantity. Furthermore, in our experience, this target is a generous one that recognizes the recent fluctuations in ball registration and allows for a degree of under-capacity that can be filled over time as the population increases and/or participation rates increase.

For ease of future application, this ratio of one diamond per 75 players is presently equal to one diamond per 2,400 residents (all ages), which is nearly identical to the recommended per capita provision of number of soccer and multi-use fields. The continued use of a per capita target range for ball diamonds is not recommended as the City's aging population, coupled with no significant gains in the participation rate, mean that diamond needs will not grow as quickly as the population (unlike soccer, which is expected to see additional increases at the adult levels). The participant-based standard will continue to be used in the context of this Study.

The following table applies this target (1 diamond per 75 registered participants) against population forecasts. Constant 8% youth and 3% adult participation rates have been assumed.

Forecasted Needs – Ball Diamonds (2009-2031)

	2009	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031
Youth Population (5-19)	95,278	93,546	90,108	93,403	99,104	105,977
Adult Population (20-54)	252,981	256,050	257,066	260,327	264,348	277,389
Estimated # of Youth Players	7,875	7,732	7,448	7,720	8,191	8,759
Estimated # of Adult Players	8,276	8,376	8,410	8,516	8,648	9,074
Total Number of Players (estimated)	16,151	16,108	15,857	16,236	16,839	17,834
Diamonds Required (at 1:75) – unlit equivalents	215.3	214.8	211.4	216.5	224.5	237.8
Existing Diamonds – unlit equivalents	261.5					
Surplus (Deficit)	46.2	46.7	50.1	45.0	37.0	23.7

All supply and demand numbers are “unlit equivalents” (1 lit diamond = 1.5 unlit equivalents).

Based on the recommended target, there is currently a City-wide surplus of 46 ball diamonds (unlit equivalents); the City has 261.5 diamonds (unlit equivalents), but only requires 215.5 based on current participation rates. This surplus will remain relatively unchanged by 2021 (generally due to a balance created by growth in the number of adult players and a decline in the number of youth players), after which population increases will reduce the surplus to 24 diamonds by 2031.

The City currently has plans to add 3 new diamonds (unlit equivalents) to the inventory over the next 10 years as part of previous commitments. It is possible, however, that several diamonds could be lost at Globe Park (7.5 unlit equivalents), Maplewood Park (1), and other sites that are to be considered for conversion to soccer, including (but not limited to) Gatesbury Park (2), Eastwood Park (4), Paramount Park (1), Alexander Park (3), and Veteran’s Park (1). If fully implemented, the net result would be the reduction of the inventory by approximately 16.5 diamonds, which represents over 60% of the long-term (2031) surplus. Additional monitoring of ball diamond usage is required prior to removing these fields from the inventory in place of soccer fields.

When considering which diamonds should be removed from the active inventory, the following criteria should be considered during the decision-making process:

- Does the diamond attract considerably below-average utilization / rental rates?
- Is the quality of the diamond and its support amenities poor and unsuited for the desired level of play?
- Is the diamond in a location that frequently causes conflicts with neighbouring land uses?
- Is the diamond suitable for conversion to other ‘in demand’ recreational uses?
- Can the affected user groups be reasonably relocated to an alternate site?

Until the full impact of school closures and the associated loss of ball diamonds is known, caution should be exercised on the removal of any diamonds beyond those identified in this Study, although it is clear that additional removals would be required to achieve the recommended provision target. Furthermore, consultation with affected user groups should be

undertaken prior to deciding on the removal of any diamond and plans should be in place to relocated affected groups well in advance.

In the short-term, new diamond construction should only be considered in instances where:

- it can be accommodated through the expansion, reconfiguration, or redevelopment of an existing Community Park;
- justified demand exists; and
- the land is not required for alternative recreational uses.

Over the longer-term (i.e., beyond 2021), limited new diamond construction could be considered in areas of significant population growth, such as the Upper Stoney Creek area.

At present, there are more ball diamonds in the City than soccer fields, despite the fact that there are 40% more soccer players and that soccer fields are affected more by over-use. The recommended provision target does not fully reconcile these factors, but the strategic reduction of active ball diamonds will bring the number of diamonds more in balance with soccer fields.

Consultation with stakeholders yielded several different perspectives with regard to current pressures and priorities. Although many groups requested additional diamonds to accommodate their needs, it is believed that this is grounded in the desire for the groups to have more favourable rental times, diamonds that are closer to their immediate community, and more exclusive use of certain fields. One consistent theme, however, was the need to improve the existing inventory. In particular, this means expanding some under-sized diamonds and adding lights to accommodate adult and night play, as well as rectifying long-time deficiencies at existing parks (e.g., slope of playing surface, parking, washroom amenities, etc.).

Also of note, ball organizations were more likely than other sports field user groups to indicate that diamonds should be distributed in a wide range of locations, rather than concentrated at fewer sites. While it is recommended that efforts be made to reduce the number of single diamond sites – while focusing investment on multi-diamond parks – some smaller parks may remain viable for continued baseball use.

b) Community-specific Needs Assessment

Ball Diamond Supplies by Community

	Current Number of Ball Diamonds (ULE)*	Current Per Capita Diamond Ratio (total population)
ANC	13.5	1:2,344
BEV	30.0	1:610
FLA	18.0	1:1,305
GLA	10.0	1:1,496
HM	73.5	1:2,062
LH	47.5	1:2,895
LSC	31.0	1:2,544
USC	16.0	1:1,385
WHD	22.0	1:1,915
Total	261.5	1:1,991

The most favourable ball diamond provision rate is in Beverly, where there is one baseball diamond for every 610 residents. The next best provision rates are in Flamborough (1:1,305) and Upper Stoney Creek (1:1,385). The lowest provision rates are in Lower Hamilton (1:2,896), Lower Stoney Creek (1:2,544), and Ancaster (1:2,344). Although equitable geographic distribution is not always achievable (nor desired, particularly given the ability of residents to travel from one area to another to access quality diamonds), the spread of diamonds throughout the City is excellent.

Due to the City-wide surplus of ball diamonds, few communities are in need of additional diamonds at present. If any community is lacking, it would be Ancaster; however, it is anticipated that plans to light fields at Ancaster Community Centre Park should be sufficient for meeting needs. In lieu of developing new diamonds, the City should focus its efforts on improving existing ball sites and maximizing usage at these locations, which includes (but is not limited to) installing lighting at strategic locations. Another example is the consolidation of diamonds, which is recommended in the Flamborough area (moving the two diamonds at Gatesbury Park to Joe Sams Leisure Park, and replacing these diamonds with soccer fields).

Over the longer-term, population growth may create the need for a limited number of new diamonds, particularly in Upper Stoney Creek, which is forecasted to accommodate approximately 30,000 more residents.

Ball Diamond Demand Factors by Community
(H = High demand; M = Medium demand; L = Low demand)

	Current Per Capita Diamond Ratio (total population)	Participation Rates (estimated)	Field Usage Levels	Public Demand (Household Survey)	Group Demand (Requests)	Demographic Profile	Short-term Needs Outlook (2009-2021)	Long-term Needs Outlook (2022-2031)
ANC	1:2,344	H	H	--	H	H	M	L
BEV	1:610	L	--	L	--	--	L	L
FLA	1:1,305	H	L	--	H	H	L	L
GLA	1:1,496	H	L	--	--	--	L	L
HM	1:2,062	H	--	--	H	--	L	L
LH	1:2,895	L	H	L	--	--	L	L
LSC	1:2,544	L	--	--	H	--	L	L
USC	1:1,385	L	L	H	--	H	L	M
WHD	1:1,915	H	L	--	H	--	L	L

Demographic Profile – above average proportion of population is youth.

9.3 Recommended Directions

- Additional ball diamonds should only be constructed in instances where they can be accommodated through the expansion, reconfiguration, or redevelopment of an existing Community Park, where justified demand exists, and where the land is not required for alternative recreational uses. The City is currently undertaking improvements to ball diamonds at Rosedale Park (LH) and the replacement of the Seneca School diamonds at William McCulloch Park (HM).
- As part of a future phase, add two unlit ball diamonds to Joe Sams Leisure Park, which would bring the total number of ball diamonds on the site to 4 (1 with lights). This should

be accompanied by the conversion of the two ball diamonds at Gatesbury Park into two Class C soccer fields.

- Install lights on selected diamonds at Community Parks. Each lit field is generally equivalent to 1.5 unlit fields. Candidate sites for lighting installation include:
 - Ancaster Community Centre Park, 2 fields – currently proposed (ANC)
 - Turner Park, 8 diamonds (HM); note: lighting and an accessible washroom facility is scheduled for construction at this site in 2009, partially funding through the RInC program
 - Mohawk Sports Park, 3 diamonds at north end (HM)
- Consider the removal of under-utilized ball diamonds from the active inventory, with specific consideration being given to the criteria established in this report, including single diamonds in neighbourhood park sites and smaller, poor quality diamonds in particular. One example is the proposed change to Maplewood Park (USC), which includes the realignment of one diamond and removal of another.
- In areas with unmet soccer field or other outdoor recreation facility needs, under-utilized diamonds should be considered for conversion to in-demand facilities. Prior to conversion, monitoring of usage by ball organizations is required as are appropriate plans for relocating the remaining participants to alternate locations. These diamonds should be replaced with in-demand facilities, many of which are identified through this report. Until the impact of school closures and the associated loss of ball diamonds are known, caution should be exercised on the removal of any municipally-owned diamonds. Options for consideration include (but may not be limited to):
 - Gatesbury Park (FLA); to be converted to soccer fields, with the diamonds being replaced at Joe Sams Leisure Park
 - Gilkson Park and/or R.A. Riddell School (HM)
 - Eastwood Park (LH)
 - Paramount Park (USC)
 - Alexander Park (WHD)
 - Veteran's Park (WHD)
- Establish and implement a classification system for ball diamonds to better assess quality and to align amenities with the rental fee structure.
- Renewal of many older, high use ball diamonds is required, including conversion into slo-pitch diamonds. Older, municipally-owned diamonds should be assessed by the City to identify needed improvements (to the playing surface, fencing, dugouts, etc.).
- Consultation with affected user groups should be undertaken prior to deciding on the removal of any diamond from the active inventory; plans should be in place to relocated affected groups well in advance.

Note: *Recommendations for ball diamond design, maintenance, and management are contained in subsequent sections of this report.*

SECTION 10 CRICKET PITCHES

This section contains an assessment of City-wide and community-specific cricket pitch needs, consistent with the methodology established in Section 7. Key data relevant to this assessment is also provided.

10.1 Facility Profiles

a) Supply

Within the City of Hamilton, there are 3 City-maintained cricket pitches: Hamilton Mountain (Mohawk Sports Park); Lower Hamilton (Cathedral Park), and West Hamilton/Dundas (Churchill Park). The pitches at Mohawk Sports Park and Cathedral Park are sub-standard temporary facilities.

b) Distribution

The distribution of cricket pitches is affected by the small number of facilities in the City. Two of the pitches are located close together (Cathedral and Churchill Parks) and there are no easily accessible facilities in the east end, particularly the Lower Stoney Creek area.

c) Trends, Best Practices, and Benchmarking

The sport of cricket is attempting to develop a stronger presence in many communities. This is causing many communities to re-evaluate the sport's priority related to other, more traditional activities.

Cricket is very much a world game. The International Cricket Council (ICC) was founded in 1909 and has ten full member countries and 94 associate and affiliate member countries from all over the globe, including Canada.

Cricket is a sport that has not traditionally had a strong following in Canada, but that is increasing in population as a result of immigration of residents from areas with cricketing backgrounds (e.g., Caribbean, East Indian, Pakistani, West Indian, etc.). Immigrants from these countries have brought with them a passion for the game and a desire for facilities at which to participate and maintain their traditions.

Immigration has played such a large role in increasing cricket's profile in Canada that national participation in the sport increased by 73% between 2007 and 2008 (according to data reported by the International Cricket Council). Most notably, in 2008 in Canada ranked second out the ICC's 94 Associate and Affiliate members in terms of total cricket participants with over 33,000 having played the sport or being introduced to it; this places Canada as at least the 30th largest cricket-playing nation in the world).

As the following benchmarking table shows, several larger and more ethnically diverse municipalities are providing cricket pitches and are seeking opportunities to develop more as the sport becomes more established. The average amongst the benchmarked communities is one cricket pitch for every 143,000 residents, which is slightly better than Hamilton's current level of

provision. This ratio changes to one pitch for every 76,900 residents when only Mississauga, Markham and Brampton are examined (each of these communities have foreign-born populations that account for nearly 50% of their population, compared to 25% in Hamilton).

Cricket Pitches Per Capita – Benchmarking Exercise

Municipality	Cricket pitches	
	Supply (approx.)	Per capita
St. Catharines	0	n/a
Oakville	0	n/a
Burlington	0	n/a
Richmond Hill	0	n/a
Vaughan	0	n/a
Markham	3	96,194
London	0	n/a
Brampton	10	45,204
Mississauga	6	120,000
AVERAGE – all communities	--	142,889
AVERAGE – only communities with municipal facilities		76,875
Hamilton	3	173,539

Data collected between 2004 and 2009 and is subject to change
Includes municipal facilities and facilities under municipal influence
Source: Monteith Brown Planning Consultants, 2009

d) Utilization & Physical Condition

Participation in cricket is much less than in more mainstream sports, but trends suggest that it is a sport on the rise. Presently, there are 85 participants listed with the two cricket organizations in the City; 86% of these participants are adults. Cricket organizations identified plans to add divisions for youth (ages 8-18) and also girls' and women's teams. Although club representatives feel that there are many opportunities for new program development, it is not easy to estimate the number of new participants these programs will attract. Expanded marketing and program development would likely increase participation in the sport, but, to date, there have been relatively limited attempts to expand programming into non-traditional markets.

The current number of participants is somewhat misleading if it is used as the sole determinant for projecting demand. There is believed to be considerable pent-up demand for cricket, caused partially by the inferior quality of the City's three grounds, each of which has severe limitations:

- Churchill Park – Probably the City's best cricket ground, this facility is located at the north end of the park. There is street parking only at this location, which inhibits use. Like all of the City's cricket pitches, it is slightly undersized. Cricket has been played at this location for several decades.
- Mohawk Sports Park – Built as a temporary cricket ground on land proposed for a ball diamond, this facility is a safety risk to those using adjacent diamonds. The uneven surface is also an issue at this location.

- **Cathedral Park** – Situated on a remnant parcel of land at the Highway 403/Main Street interchange, there is limited parking at this location. The slope and irregular shape of this site – which was not designed for use as a cricket facility – makes it less than ideal for game play. This is the least used pitch in the City.

While local cricket clubs have identified the need for more facilities, they have indicated that the condition of existing pitches is presently a bigger issue than the overall number of pitches.

The majority of cricket activity occurs on weekends. This is a traditional usage pattern caused not only by the availability of participants, but also because cricket is as much a social/family event as it is a sport activity. As a result, the prime time use period of a cricket facility is concentrated in a very narrow time period.

Cricket Pitches - 2008 Reported Bookings by City

Area	Number of Pitches	Total Hours Rented (2008)*	Average Hours Rented per Field	Most Rented Fields (hours/yr)	Least Rented Fields (hours/yr)
TOTAL	2*	511	255	Churchill (385 hrs)	Mohawk Sports (126 hrs)

* does not include 1 public pitch booked by providers other than the City, used under exclusive agreement, or left available for unorganized play

Source: City of Hamilton, CLASS Reports, March 2009

10.2 Needs Assessment

a) City-wide Needs Assessment

As mentioned, cricket is a sport that appeals to many newcomers to Canada, particularly those from areas such as the Caribbean, East and South Asia, Arab states, and parts of Africa (not to mention those from more traditional immigrant-producing nations such as Scotland and Ireland). In 2006, approximately 13% of Hamilton’s population (over 63,000 people) reported these regions as their ethnic origin.

The City’s ethnic composition is gradually changing, with more immigrants residing in Hamilton; this trend is expected to continue. 25% of the City’s population was born outside of Canada – this will be growing (and more and more children will be of non-traditional ethnicities); nearly 43,000 Hamilton residents have immigrated to Canada since 1991 (representing 8.5% of the City’s current population).

Despite the demographic trends that paint a favourable picture for cricket, the household survey yielded little support for investment in the sport. Only 8% support additional spending on cricket pitches, ranking them 26th out of 26 facility types. This is largely due to the small number of current participants (1% of Hamilton’s households participated in cricket in the past twelve months) and the likely under-representation of newer immigrants in the survey process.

Through the workshops and public meetings, a case has been made that there is a growing interest in cricket participation and that – as the sport is introduced to more children and second and third generation newcomers – more and more people will gravitate to the sport.

A consistent message was provided that the lack of quality cricket grounds in Hamilton, coupled with their poor design and condition, are constricting the number of participants and, hence, limiting the ability for local clubs to highlight the degree of interest in the sport.

Although trends indicate a growing demand for cricket locally and regionally, there is simply not enough research to develop an appropriate per capita or market-driven provision target at this time. The degree to which the current supply is limiting participation is difficult to determine because of the way in which the sport operates and the poor quality of two existing facilities.

The growth of cricket in Hamilton will depend upon the efforts of the volunteer organizations involved in the sport. Before initiating an extensive facility development program, the City should work with cricket groups to better assess their capabilities and needs. The City, in consultation with cricket organizations, should also confirm the need for additional facilities through careful monitoring of growth of the sport, participation levels, use of existing facilities, the supply of regional facilities, and requests for additional facility development. When planning new or replacement pitches, the City should also discuss with the cricket organizations the possibility of joint fundraising and other initiatives that would help to offset the costs of support amenities, such as washrooms, storage buildings, and clubhouse space (if appropriate).

Because we cannot conclusively confirm the potential for expanded cricket participation, we do not recommend building additional cricket grounds beyond those required for current programs. Nevertheless, a convincing case has been made that 2 of the 3 existing cricket grounds are of sub-standard quality and not appropriate for long-term use. Strategies are required to address these deficiencies, while maintaining the City's overall commitment to provide 3 cricket grounds.

Specifically, requests were received from cricket organizations for modifications to existing fields to improve their safety and playability and for the establishment of two additional cricket grounds (regulation-sized; e.g., 65-metres). Having proper cricket grounds, it was argued, would raise the sports' profile and aid in its development. It was also suggested that opportunities be evaluated to convert under-utilized ball diamonds into practice cricket pitches; these would not need to be full size as they would just be used for practice and introduction to the sport to younger players.

Consequently, we recommend that the City replace the temporary Mohawk Sports Park cricket pitch at another location in the short-term (Heritage Green Sports Park) and also relocate the pitch at Cathedral Park over the medium-term. In the long-term, additional grounds may be required, but the City should not consider investing in additional facilities for expanded programming until the cricket organizations demonstrate a willingness and ability to increase cricket participation.

Improving the supply of cricket facilities in Hamilton will not be an easy task, largely because of the significant land base required for a proper cricket ground. A site must be approximately 2 to 3 hectares to accommodate the oval shaped field (with a radius of approximately 65 metres), an adequate buffer area around its perimeter, and parking. The land mass required for one cricket ground is generally equivalent to that required for two full size soccer fields.

Given the large land base required and the high demand for other land-intensive activities such as soccer, maximization of existing and future cricket facilities is imperative. The City's cricket clubs must be prepared to share facilities amongst themselves and be open to the possibility of sharing with sports, such as soccer. While it is understood that cricket organizations prefer turf conditions and park designs that may differ slightly from other field users, a park with joint use cricket/soccer fields would maximize facility use while reducing the overall capital construction and maintenance costs associated with separate sports field sites. Given that many soccer leagues focus their schedule on weekday evenings and cricket prefers weekend times, a joint complex

would work well with existing schedules. Under this scenario, coordinated scheduling and maintenance is a must.

Lastly, it bears noting that, in the past, representatives of various clubs have contacted different City staff, requesting facilities, identifying cricket related issues and concerns, and providing suggestions for improvements. A more unified voice representing all local cricket interests would assist the City in formulating a more appropriate response to the question of future needs. Cricket organizations must work together to maximize general development of the sport.

b) Community-specific Needs Assessment

Demand for cricket grounds is greater in some areas and lesser in others due to existence of organizations and demographic factors. Specifically, Lower Hamilton, Hamilton Mountain, and Lower Stoney Creek are the areas where the majority of residents from cricket-playing nations reside. While an equitable distribution of cricket facilities is not essential, efforts should be made to locate grounds in proximity to these three communities. This is consistent with input from local clubs, which expressed an interest in a cricket ground location (with a clubhouse facility) in the Upper Mountain or Stoney Creek area, with a lower preference being for a site in Lower Hamilton.

10.3 Recommended Directions

- Replace the existing cricket ground at Mohawk Sports Park with a new cricket ground at Heritage Green Sports Park in the short-term.
- In the medium-term, replace the existing cricket ground at Cathedral Park with a new cricket ground elsewhere. Seek a location in Lower Hamilton or Lower Stoney Creek (e.g., Confederation Park).
- Evaluate options in the short-term to improve the playability, safety, and level of service at the cricket pitch in Churchill Park, in consultation with local cricket organizations.
- Cricket sites should have access to a water source and ancillary buildings (washrooms, storage, etc.). Cricket grounds need not be situated within larger parks along with other sports fields, but could be located in more isolated single-use parks, if the site is appropriate for such a use. Development of a clubhouse for cricket users may be considered should sufficient funds be contributed from non-municipal sources (e.g., cost-sharing agreement).
- The City should work with local cricket groups to:
 - identify solutions to enable the sharing of fields (e.g., amalgamation);
 - monitor participation levels and facility usage;
 - improve their organizational capacity;
 - ensure adequate weekday/night utilization prior to expansion of additional fields;
 - identify longer term needs and strategies; and
 - encourage joint fundraising to offset the costs associated with support buildings.
- When surplus ball diamonds or other large, under-utilized sports fields are identified for removal from the active inventory, consider the conversion of this land into practice cricket pitches (in addition to other 'in-demand' uses).

SECTION 11 HARD SURFACE COURTS

This section contains an assessment of City-wide and community-specific multi-use, basketball, and tennis court needs, consistent with the methodology established in Section 7. Key data relevant to this assessment is also provided.

11.1 Facility Profiles – Basketball & Multi-purpose Courts

a) Supply

The City maintains a total of 59 full courts (2 hoops), 7 full courts with hockey nets, 30 half courts (1 hoop), and 3 multi-purpose courts (containing 2 hoops, hockey nets, and tennis markings; can also be used for outdoor ice skating in the winter). With only a few exceptions, this inventory excludes basketball nets located on school properties.

In total, these 99 facilities contain a total of 168 basketball hoops; using a full court equivalent (FCE), this translates in to a total of 84 FCEs. The use of a full court equivalent ratio allows for easier comparison of supplies from one community to the next.

b) Distribution

Basketball courts are considered a neighbourhood-level facility in that most court users should be able to reasonably walk to them if they live in an urban community. As such, a 1-kilometre serve radius has been established for the purpose of analyzing gaps and overlaps in supply.

At 1.0 km, there are several gaps in distribution. Seven sizeable gaps exist in:

- Ancaster (2)
 - significant gaps exist to both the east and west of Wilson Street
- Glanbrook (1)
 - there are no municipal basketball courts in Binbrook
- Lower Hamilton (2)
 - generally between Lawrence Road, Ottawa Street, Burlington Street East, and Gage Avenue; courts at 2 separate locations would be required to fill this gap
- West Hamilton / Dundas (2)
 - there are no municipal basketball courts in the Westdale/Ainslie Wood areas
 - there are no municipal basketball courts in the downtown Dundas area

At 1.0 km, there are several overlaps in distribution. Seven sizeable overlaps exist in:

- Ancaster (1)
 - Harmony Park and Moorland Park
- Beverly (1)
 - Freelon Community Park and Centennial Heights Park
- Hamilton Mountain (2)
 - Rushdale Park and T.B. McQuesten Park
 - Eleanor Park is located close to both Billy Sheering Park and Templemead Park
- Lower Hamilton (2)
 - Carter Park and Corktown Park
 - Andrew Warburton Memorial Park and Fairfield Park
- Upper Stoney Creek (1)
 - White Deer Park is located close to both Eringate Park and Cline Park

There may be merit in addressing some (if not all) of these gaps and overlaps; this topic is analyzed further in the community-specific assessment that follows.

c) Trends, Best Practices, and Benchmarking

Basketball is a popular sport amongst teens and outdoor courts provide opportunities for unstructured play. In fact, basketball ranks behind only soccer in terms of number of teens (ages 12-17) participating (compared to ice hockey, football, tennis, golf, and baseball).¹¹

Basketball is a growth sport and demand for outdoor courts has been found to be extremely popular in many urban areas, particularly as they are easily incorporated into neighbourhood-level parks, thus allowing easy access (by foot or bicycle) and opportunity for spontaneous, informal play. Half courts (single hoop) are more easily inserted into small parks where space is limited; further, they do not typically attract the same intensity of use found on larger full court designs, thereby reducing potential conflicts with neighbouring residential areas.

Many municipalities are beginning to construct multi-purpose courts rather than the dedicated basketball or tennis courts traditionally incorporated into park design. Multi-purpose courts are beneficial from the standpoint that they can accommodate a wide range of neighbourhood interests, spanning all four seasons. For example, multi-purpose courts may offer a venue for basketball, tennis, ball hockey, and/or outdoor skating.

Like bocce courts, spray pads, and skate parks, basketball courts appeal primarily to one specific demographic – in this case, teenagers. While the approach for the needs assessment focuses on this age group, the benchmarking data below examines court ratios in comparison to total populations. As the following table illustrates, Hamilton’s provision level of one basketball court (full court equivalent) for every 6,200 residents is better than most communities, lagging behind only Vaughan, St. Catharines, and Richmond Hill.

Municipality	Basketball Courts (full court equivalents)	
	Supply (approx.)	Per capita
St. Catharines	30.5	4,379
Oakville	6	26,450
Burlington	n/a	n/a
Richmond Hill	32.5	5,614
Vaughan	83	3,125
Markham	9.5	30,377
London	31	11,473
Brampton	20	22,602
Mississauga	66.5	10,827
AVERAGE		9,162
Hamilton	84	6,198

Data collected between 2004 and 2009 and is subject to change
 Includes municipal facilities and facilities under municipal influence
 Source: Monteith Brown Planning Consultants, 2009

¹¹ Print Measurement Bureau. *Tennis Participation Tracking 2002/2003 to 2006/2007*. 2008.

d) Utilization & Physical Condition

Data from the Observation Project suggests that basketball courts are used, on average, 35% of the time, with an average of 4 players when in use. Usage was greatest in the evening. 91% of court users were male and 85% were youth.

Of the courts observed, 73% were in Lower Hamilton or Hamilton Mountain. Usage was relatively consistent from one community to the next, although no users were observed at the 5 courts visited in Beverly and Flamborough. Courts with no usage observed included:

- Freelton Community Park (BEV)
- Lynden Legion Park (BEV)
- Sealy Park (FLA)
- Waterdown Park (FLA)
- Mountview Park (HM)

Conversely, the highest-use courts during the Observation Project (in use for two-thirds of the visits) included:

- Bennetto Recreation Centre (LH)
- North Central Community Park (LH)
- Rosedale Park (LH)
- Father Sean O'Sullivan Memorial Park (LSC)
- Lawfield Park (HM)
- Rushdale Park (HM)
- Shawinigan Park (HM)

Observation Project Results – Basketball / Multi-purpose Courts

Plan Area	Amenities Observed*	% in use at time of visit	Total Users
ANC	2	33%	17
BEV	2	0%	0
FLA	3	0%	0
HM	18	44%	172
LH	17	35%	163
LSC	4	27%	28
WHD	2	50%	16
Total	48	35%	396

* Average of six visits per amenity; summer 2009.

Information on the physical condition of basketball and multi-purpose courts is not available.

11.2 Needs Assessment – Basketball & Multi-purpose Courts

a) City-wide Needs Assessment

Basketball courts are neighbourhood-level facilities (although they are often provided at community parks). Their geographic distribution is the most important element when assessing the City's current and future requirements, particularly when considering youth as the primary users. It should be noted that the City's supply is supplemented by hoops located at most

schools, which can also be accessed by youth during their leisure time; some of these are already included in the municipal inventory due to maintenance agreements.

The City's youth (10-19) population is expected to decline by 9% by 2016 and will then increase back to its present level just beyond 2026. **If participation rates remain steady (as expected for basketball), this will mean that the City is currently at a peak demand level for facilities aimed at serving the teenage demographic.**

The household survey found that 26% support additional spending on outdoor basketball courts, ranking them 19th out of 26 facility types. A small number of requests for new courts were received through the public input process, and most facilities are not used to capacity. This suggests that demand for additional courts is moderate to low. The City's current supply translates into an average of 1 court for every 795 teens.

Given the level of satisfaction with the current provision level, a target of one basketball or multi-purpose court (full court equivalent; i.e., two hoops) for every 750 youth (ages 10-19) is recommended. Application of the provision target suggests that the City is currently deficient by 5 courts (10 hoops), but that this under-supply will turn into a surplus of 1 court by 2021. With an increasing youth population forecasted for the 2021 to 2031 period, a demand for several new courts is anticipated at that time.

Forecasted Needs – Basketball & Multi-purpose Court (2009-2031)

	2009	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031
Teen Population (10-19)	66,786	65,682	61,025	61,905	65,528	71,286
Basketball & Multi-purpose Courts Required (at 1:750 teens)	89	88	81	83	87	95
Existing Courts	84					
Surplus (Deficit)	(5)	(4)	3	1	(3)	(11)

There was strong support for the development of more multi-purpose courts and courts with hockey nets as they are well used and can be used for multiple activities, possibly including outdoor skating in the winter. New basketball courts should be designed as multi-purpose courts, where possible, and not be lit so as to discourage evening usage (and the noise concerns that can result).

During the preparation of this Study, a proposal was received for the development of a "Field of Hoops" – an outdoor multi-court complex for hosting leagues and tournaments (multi-season). This complex (a minimum of 8 courts) would represent a new level of service in the City and is unlike anything typically provided in other Ontario municipalities. At present, most organized basketball uses indoor gymnasiums and is played during the fall and winter.

The goals for the proposed multi-court project are: (1) to make organized basketball a year-round sport by initiating a summertime outdoor league to serve the estimated 10,000-plus Hamilton youth and adults that play indoors; (2) to attract tourism revenue through providing a venue for spring/summer tournaments; and (3) to accommodate other sports, such as volleyball, where appropriate.

The location for the multi-court project suggested by the proponent is the Meadowlands (Costco) Soccer Pitch in Ancaster, which may become surplus to the Ancaster Youth Soccer

Club's needs given recent field expansions in the area. This location has good visibility, local access, and plenty of nearby parking; however, this site also serves as a stormwater management area for the adjacent commercial development and is prone to flooding. Due to this site being a stormwater facility, alternate locations should be examined if this project moves forward.

The proposed multi-court complex is intended to serve organized activities, unlike the unorganized/semi-structured activities that make use of the existing basketball and multi-purpose courts in City parks. As such, it is an entirely different type of facility; one that cannot be directly compared to community requirements for traditional outdoor courts. This is an interesting proposal that has the potential to service a significant number of residents, but the costs and operating arrangements require more definition in order to properly consider its merits. It is recommended that a feasibility study be initiated by the City (in cooperation with the proponent) to identify possible locations, capital, operating, and community implications.

b) Community-specific Needs Assessment

Basketball court supplies were compared against current (2009) estimates of the 10-19 age group in each community. While the recommended target of one court per 750 teenagers is not meant to be stringently applied to each community, it does provide one measure – that when combined with an analysis of distribution – helps to identify areas of under and over supply.

Beverly is the most notable community that provides more courts per capita than average, nearly twice as many as the target. Notable communities that provide fewer courts per capita than average include: Glanbrook (0 courts), West Hamilton/Dundas, Upper Stoney Creek, and Ancaster.

Basketball & Multi-purpose Court Supplies by Community

	Current Number of Basketball / Multi-purpose Courts*	Current Per Capita Provision Ratio (10-19)
ANC	4.5	1:1,047
BEV	6.5	1:399
FLA	4.5	1:841
GLA	0	0:1,882
HM	24	1:862
LH	25	1:612
LSC	13.5	1:699
USC	3	1:1,205
WHD	3	1:1,596
Total	84	1:795

* FCE = Full Court Equivalents (where one half court/single hoop equals 0.5 full courts). Includes multi-purpose courts and courts with hockey nets.

Public requests were received for the installation of multi-purpose basketball courts in Somerset Park (ANC) and Fishers Mill Park (WHD), both of which are in gap areas; these and other municipal sites should be evaluated for their ability to incorporate a multi-purpose court. Sites that cannot offer proper noise attenuation and visibility in relation to the proposed basketball court should not be selected.

In addition to further evaluating the ability to modify existing parks sites to install or remove/convert basketball courts in gaps and overlap areas (respectively), future court development will be required over the long-term in areas where the youth population is expected to increase, particularly Upper Stoney Creek, Lower Hamilton, and Glanbrook.

Basketball & Multi-purpose Court Demand Factors by Community
(H = High demand; M = Medium demand; L = Low demand)

	Current Per Capita Provision Ratio (10-19)	Usage Levels (estimated)	Public Demand (Household Survey)	Demographic Profile	Comparison to City-wide Provision Level	Short-term Needs Outlook (2009-2021)	Long-term Needs Outlook (2022-2031)
ANC	1:1,047	--	--	--	--	M	L
BEV	1:399	L	--	--	L	L	L
FLA	1:841	L	--	H	--	M	L
GLA	0:1,882	n/a	--	--	H	H	M
HM	1:862	H	--	--	--	M	L
LH	1:612	--	--	L	--	L	M
LSC	1:699	--	--	--	--	L	L
USC	1:1,205	--	H	H	H	H	H
WHD	1:1,596	H	--	L	H	M	L

Demographic Profile – above average proportion of population is youth (ages 10-19).

11.3 Recommended Directions – Basketball & Multi-purpose Courts

- Between 2009 and 2021, the City’s supply of basketball / multi-purpose courts should remain relatively stable. To maintain this balance and serve emerging areas, new courts in high-needs areas should be developed at relatively the same rate that under-utilized courts in low-needs areas are removed. Multi-use court development between 2016 and 2031 should focus primarily on Upper Stoney Creek and Glanbrook (Binbrook).
- Improvements to the distribution of basketball courts are required. New court development should focus on addressing the needs of new growth areas, as well as existing gap areas, and be in the form of unlit multi-purpose courts. Courts should be located in visible areas within parks, with appropriate buffers from adjacent residential properties. Current gap areas include:
 - Ancaster (2)
 - both east and west of Wilson Street
 - Glanbrook (1)
 - there are no municipal basketball courts in Binbrook
 - Lower Hamilton (2)
 - generally between Lawrence Road, Ottawa Street, Burlington Street East, and Gage Avenue; courts at 2 separate locations would be required to fill this gap
 - West Hamilton / Dundas (2)
 - there are no municipal basketball courts in the Westdale/Ainslie Wood area
 - there are no municipal basketball courts in the downtown Dundas area

Note: should school properties within these areas have proper basketball hoops, municipal investment in new basketball infrastructure may not be required.

- Removal of under-utilized basketball courts with overlapping service areas should be evaluated, with the space being converted into more in-demand recreational amenities or green space. Current areas of sizeable overlap include:
 - Beverly (1)
 - Freelton Community Park and Centennial Heights Park
 - Hamilton Mountain (2)
 - Rushdale Park and T.B. McQuesten Park
 - Eleanor Park is located close to both Billy Sheering Park and Templemead Park
 - Lower Hamilton (2)
 - Carter Park and Corktown Park
 - Andrew Warburton Memorial Park and Fairfield Park
 - Upper Stoney Creek (1)
 - White Deer Park is located close to both Eringate Park and Cline Park

- The City, in cooperation with the proponent, should undertake a Feasibility Study to identify possible locations, capital, operating, and community implications of the proposed “Field of Hoops” outdoor multi-court complex.

11.4 Facility Profiles – Tennis Courts

a) Supply

The City provides and/or maintains a total of 91 tennis courts. Of these, 46 are “club courts”, meaning that they are run by non-profit organizations that fund operations through memberships; some limited public access may be permitted at these locations. The remaining 45 courts are open to the public free-of-charge; 28 of these courts have lights for evening play.

b) Distribution

A 2.0-kilometre radius was established to evaluate the distribution of tennis courts (both public and club). Similar to sports fields, there is value in co-locating multiple courts at one location to facilitate both club and community use; as such, the radius is larger than basketball courts, despite tennis generally being considered a neighbourhood-level facility. Furthermore, the household survey found that driving is the most common mode of transportation for tennis court users, which provides further support for this service radius.

At 2.0 km, there are no significant gaps in distribution, but there are two areas with overlapping service radii for public tennis courts:

- Hamilton Mountain (1)
 - Hill Park Secondary School (4 public courts) is near Inch Park (2 public courts) and Lawfield Park (2 public courts)
- Lower Hamilton (1)
 - Central Park (2 public courts) is near Bennetto Recreation Centre (2 public courts) and Victoria Park (3 public courts)

Given the significantly higher densities in both Hamilton Mountain and Lower Hamilton, the radius technique may not be as applicable and supply per capita may be more appropriate in these communities as noted below. When overlap, under-utilization, and/or poor condition are combined, redevelopment to a more appropriate use should be considered. There may be merit in addressing some (if not all) of these gaps and overlaps; this topic is analyzed further in the community-specific assessment that follows.

c) Trends, Best Practices, and Benchmarking

Interest in tennis has varied considerably in the past. After peaking in the 1970s, participation in tennis slowly declined, but a passionate base of players remained. Although not a major growth sport, a recent study¹² prepared for Tennis Canada indicates that tennis participation has increased modestly in Ontario between 2003 and 2007, from 5.0% to 5.8% (as a percentage of the entire population). It was also concluded that tennis is proportionately more popular amongst 12-24 year olds, but the number of 35-64 year old tennis players is on the rise. Furthermore, among Canadians aged 12-64, participation in tennis surpasses baseball and football. Among 12-17 year olds, participation in tennis surpasses golf and baseball.

Increasing participation levels in the Baby Boom demographic – who are more active than previous generations – suggest that growing interest in tennis could be sustained, at least in the short term. Experience also suggests that the interest in tennis varies greatly between municipalities and can be influenced by the existing level of service and ethnic composition.

Benchmarking from several communities reveals that:

- Most municipalities are building only a very small number of tennis courts, if at all.
- Generally, new courts being developed are located in community parks and are being built in groupings of two or more. This lends itself to greater use, potential club development, better instructional opportunities and it also provides opportunities for future redevelopment to multi-purpose facilities.
- Many courts deemed as ‘surplus’ are being converted into multi-purpose pads that can accommodate ball hockey, basketball, skateboarding, etc.
- The average provision level is one court (public or club) per 4,200 population; in Hamilton, this ratio is 1: 6,000, which is the poorest provision level among the comparator communities.
- Most communities have established provision targets in the range of one court for every 3,000 to 6,000 population; in most cases, these standards are lower than their current level of provision, suggesting that demand for courts is slowly waning.
- There is a considerable range in the ratio of public to club courts, with some communities not offering club courts (London), to others having more club than public courts (e.g., Milton, Burlington, Markham).
- On average, 45% of all tennis courts have lights; 80% of Hamilton’s courts are lit.

¹² Print Measurement Bureau. *Tennis Participation Tracking 2002/2003 to 2006/2007*. 2008.

Tennis Court Supplies – Benchmarked Communities

	Population	Number of Public Tennis Courts	Number of Municipal Club Courts	Total Number of Tennis Courts	# of Municipal Tennis Courts that are Lit	Per Capita Service Level (Total Courts)	Recommended Service Level
Milton	77,818	5	11	16	80%	4,864	1 : 6,000
St. Catharines	133,565	35	0	35	55%	3,816	1 : 5,000
Burlington	164,400	15	20	35	25%	4,697	n/a
Oakville	165,600	59	14	73	15%	2,268	1 : 4,000
Richmond Hill	182,465	68	3	71	65%	2,570	1 : 3,000
Kitchener	204,500	56	3	59	35%	3,466	n/a
Markham	288,583	26	33	59	80%	4,891	1 : 5,000
London	355,675	66	0	66	5%	5,389	1 : 6,000
Mississauga	720,000	67	67	134	60%	5,373	1 : 5,000
AVERAGE					45%	4,184	
Hamilton	520,617	45	46	91	81%	5,721	

Source: Monteith Brown Planning Consultants, 2009

d) Utilization & Physical Condition

On average, the tennis courts that were visited for the observation project were found to be in use 36% of the time. The 38 public courts that were observed were found to be in use 29% of the time, while the 29 club courts were used 42% of the time; this sampling represents nearly all of the City's public courts, and two-thirds of its club courts. Usage was greatest on evenings. Of the users, 57% were male and 75% were adults or seniors. Only on 1% of the visits were people seen waiting to use an occupied court.

Courts in Beverly, Flamborough, and Glanbrook – the City's three most rural communities – were all used less than 20% of the time. Conversely, courts in Upper Stoney Creek, West Hamilton/Dundas, and Lower Hamilton were used more than 40% of the time, on average.

Observation Project Results – Tennis Courts

Plan Area	Amenities Observed*	Public Courts % in use at time of visit	Club Courts % in use at time of visit	Total Users (public & club)
ANC	3 public	33%	--	12
BEV	3 public	6%	--	2
FLA	3 public	11%	--	5
GLA	1 public	17%	--	2
HM	12 public, 4 club	31%	21%	88
LH	9 public, 20 club	33%	47%	209
LSC	2 public	25%	--	12
USC	4 public	54%	--	34
WHD	1 public, 5 club	50%	43%	62
Total	38 public, 29 club	29%	42%	426

* Average of six visits per amenity; summer 2009.

The six highest use courts were all public courts:

- Sir Allan MacNab Recreation Centre (HM),
- Lawfield Park (ANC),
- Hamilton Amateur Athletic Association (LH),
- Valley Park (USC), and
- Little John Park (WHD).

The lowest use courts were observed to be those in:

- Inch Park (HM),
- Lynden Legion Park (BEV), and
- Sealy Park (FLA).

In terms of tennis court condition, some of the City's public courts are in need of repair and it is believed that the quality of the court has a large impact on their level of utilization. The courts at Inch Park and Hill Park Secondary School are a good example of facilities that require capital improvement and that received lower than average usage possibly as a result. Also of note, the 3 tennis courts in Globe Park are overgrown with weeds – but remain in the inventory – and may eventually be lost to the expansion of the adjacent wastewater treatment plant.

11.5 Needs Assessment – Tennis Courts

a) City-wide Needs Assessment

From the household survey, only 32% indicate that tennis courts are important to their household, ranking behind playgrounds, spray pads, basketball and multi-purpose courts, and sports fields. 28% support additional spending on outdoor tennis courts, ranking them 18th out of 26 facility types.

Although trends suggest that there may be some modest increases being seen in tennis participation, the low priority given to tennis courts through the household survey – coupled with the low utilization rates observed – suggests that the City as a whole has more tennis courts than it currently needs. A provision target of 1 tennis court for every 6,500 residents is recommended; this target blends both public and club courts as both are used and provided at generally the same rate.

Forecasted Needs – Tennis Courts (2009-2031)

	2009	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031
Total Population (all ages)	520,617	531,380	556,016	595,010	624,769	660,189
Tennis Courts Required (at 1:6,500)	80	82	86	92	96	102
Existing Tennis Courts	91					
Surplus (Deficit)	11	9	5	(1)	(5)	(11)

Application of this target suggests that the City presently has a surplus of 11 tennis courts; this includes the unused tennis courts at Globe Park (therefore, the effective surplus is really 8 courts). Removal of under-utilized, poor quality tennis courts in areas with sufficient supplies should be considered, as well as the possible conversion of these facilities to ‘in-demand’ recreation amenities. This is discussed further in the next section.

A small number of requests for new tennis courts were received through the public input program, including suggestions for additional public courts in West Hamilton/Dundas and club courts in Flamborough and Ancaster. A desire was also expressed for year-round tennis facilities (i.e., a bubble), particularly in Stoney Creek.

Future tennis court development will be required to meet needs in growing areas of the City. In fact, a minimum of 11 new courts are projected to be required by 2031 to serve the estimated 140,000 new residents; this figure could be higher if some existing courts are removed from the inventory. The predominant form of new tennis court provision should be club courts (if volunteers are in place). However, it is critical that an adequate distribution of publicly accessible courts be maintained, which may require the City to continue a balanced approach of public and club court provision in growing areas. For high-level planning for community-based tennis clubs, a target of one court for every 75 to 100 members is reasonable.

b) Community-specific Needs Assessment

Beverly has the highest tennis court provision rate by a large margin. Other strong provision levels are found in West Hamilton/Dundas, Lower Hamilton and Flamborough. Glanbrook has the lowest provision rate (one tennis court for the entire population of 14,961 residents). Low provision levels are also found in Hamilton Mountain and Lower Stoney Creek.

Tennis Courts Supplies by Community – Public & Club

	Number of Public Tennis Courts	Number of Club Tennis Courts	Total Number of Tennis Courts (Public & Club)	Current Per Capita Provision Ratio (total population)
ANC	3	3	6	1:5,274
BEV	3	5	8	1:2,288
FLA	3	2	5	1:4,698
GLA	1	0	1	1:14,961
HM	12	4	16	1:9,472
LH	12	20	32	1:4,298
LSC	2	7	9	1:8,761
USC	4	0	4	1:5,541
WHD	5	5	10	1:4,212
Total	45	46	91	1:5,721

Public tennis courts are open to public play. Club tennis courts require memberships.

In addition to the per capita target, consideration of geographic distribution is very important in order to ensure an equitable level of community-wide accessibility. No major gaps were identified, although new courts will be required in some communities to serve new population growth, particularly in Upper Stoney Creek.

Removal of the following courts – due to poor condition, low utilization, and neighbourhood over-supply – should be considered:

- Globe Park (LH) – 3 courts (may be lost to expansion from adjacent waste water treatment plant)
- Central Park (LH) – 3 courts

Tennis Court Demand Factors by Community

(H = High demand; M = Medium demand; L = Low demand)

	Current Per Capita Provision Ratio (total population)	Usage Levels (estimated)	Public Demand (Household Survey)	Demographic Profile	Comparison to City-wide Provision Level	Short-term Needs Outlook (2009-2021)	Long-term Needs Outlook (2022-2031)
ANC	1:5,274	--	H	--	--	M	L
BEV	1:2,288	L	--	L	L	L	L
FLA	1:4,698	L	--	--	L	M	L
GLA	1:14,961	L	--	L	H	M	L
HM	1:9,472	--	--	--	H	L	L
LH	1:4,298	H	--	H	L	L	L
LSC	1:8,761	--	--	--	H	M	L
USC	1:5,541	H	--	H	--	M	M
WHD	1:4,212	--	--	--	--	L	L

Two proposals have recently been received to increase the number and quality of club courts in the City.

- (1) The Ancaster Tennis Club (approximately 400 members) has proposed the redevelopment and expansion of tennis facilities in Village Green Park (reorienting the three existing courts and adding two more). This proposal can be undertaken in partnership with the local tennis club with additional funding from the club.
- (2) The Carlisle Tennis Club (approximately 300 members) has proposed the redevelopment and expansion of tennis facilities in the Flamborough community. Specifically, suggestions included: improvements to the two existing club courts; expansion of a third public court that is under-sized; the construction of two additional club courts; and the development of a clubhouse. Given the membership base of this group and the potential for growth, the basic tenets of this proposal can be supported if an appropriate location can be secured for new court development (additional courts cannot be supported at Palomino Ranch Park) and a partnership agreement can be established with the Club.

11.6 Recommended Directions – Tennis Courts

- Improvements to the quality of tennis courts are required, including at Inch Park or TB McQueston Park (HM), with consideration given to creating multi-use court templates that can accommodate tennis, ball hockey and/or basketball. Improvement of the Hill Park Secondary School tennis courts could also be considered should demand levels warrant, pending rehabilitation of the courts at Inch Park or TB McQueston Park. Improvements to the Westdale Secondary School (WHD) tennis courts may also be considered. Acceptable agreements with the School Board and local tennis clubs addressing cost sharing, membership growth, and long-term access must be put into place before improvements on school sites proceed.
- An annual renewal program should be established to improve the condition of public and club courts, with consideration being given to creating multi-use court templates in areas where ball hockey and basketball courts are also required (in addition to public tennis courts).
- Opportunities to partner with growing and under-served community-based (i.e., low fee) tennis clubs in the expansion and improvement of outdoor tennis courts should be considered as needs arise. In the short-term, the City should work with the Ancaster and Carlisle Tennis Clubs in order to identify funding, operational, and other arrangements specific to their proposals for investments on municipal lands.
- New court development should focus on addressing the needs of new growth areas, with particular attention being given to Glanbrook, Hamilton Mountain, Upper Stoney Creek, and Lower Stoney Creek in the short-term, and Upper Stoney Creek as well in the long-term. The predominant form of new tennis court provision should be club courts (if volunteers are in place). However, it is critical that an adequate distribution of publicly accessible courts be maintained; this may require the City to continue a balanced approach of public and club court provision in growing areas.
- Removal of the following public tennis courts – due to poor condition, low utilization, and neighbourhood over-supply – should be considered, with in-demand recreation amenities taking their place:
 - Globe Park (LH) – 3 courts (may be lost to expansion from adjacent waste water treatment plant)
 - Central Park (LH) – 3 courts

SECTION 12 BOCCE COURTS & LAWN BOWLING GREENS

This section contains an assessment of City-wide and community-specific bocce court and lawn bowling green needs, consistent with the methodology established in Section 7. Key data relevant to this assessment is also provided.

12.1 Facility Profiles – Bocce Courts

a) Supply

The City of Hamilton provides 49 bocce at 19 different park sites. There are two to four bocce courts at each site and all sites are outdoor, with the exception of the 4 courts at Chedoke Arena (which have a roof and are enclosed on two sides).

b) Distribution

Although the sport is open to people of all ages and backgrounds, bocce has traditionally been a sport played by older Italian males. Because of this, demand for the sport was greatest in Lower Hamilton, Lower Stoney Creek, and Hamilton Mountain, where all of the City's bocce courts are located.

A service radius is not applied to bocce courts as they are considered specialized facilities that – due to the existence of facilities and various demographic factors – are provided in some areas and not provided in others. With that being said, there are several; bocce court sites that are located within 1 to 2- kilometres of each other, particularly in Lower Stoney Creek.

c) Trends, Best Practices, and Benchmarking

Participation data for bocce is not available locally, but no evidence has been provided to suggest that bocce is a growth sport. Although efforts continue to be made to expand the sport to younger generations (there are successful youth programs at Bethune Park and Chedoke), it remains an activity that is dominated by older men, particularly those of Italian descent. Unfortunately, this creates a “club-like” atmosphere (bocce is a very ‘social’ sport and one that typically operates through club memberships) that can inhibit interest by newcomers.

The City of Hamilton provides more than twice the number of bocce courts per capita when compared to other municipalities (the City's average is one court per 10,625 population, while the benchmarking average is one per 24,900 persons). The one example among the sample communities is the City of Vaughan – where the dominant ethnic origin is Italian – with an average of one court for every 4,053 residents. Many communities are gradually phasing out outdoor bocce courts due either to low numbers, lack of easily accessible washrooms, or the desire for an indoor year-round facility. Two of the comparison communities (Vaughan and Markham) have recently built indoor bocce facilities. Scarborough and Etobicoke (now in the City of Toronto) are two other communities where bocce is popular.

Municipality	Outdoor Bocce Courts	
	Supply (approx.)	Per capita
St. Catharines	0	n/a
Oakville	3	52,900
Burlington	2	82,250
Richmond Hill	6	30,411
Vaughan	64	4,052
Markham	4	72,146
London	0	n/a
Brampton	12	37,670
Mississauga	18	40,000
AVERAGE – all communities		24,907
AVERAGE – only communities with municipal facilities		20,419
Hamilton	49	10,625

Data collected between 2004 and 2009 and is subject to change
Includes municipal facilities and facilities under municipal influence
Source: Monteith Brown Planning Consultants, 2009

d) Utilization & Physical Condition

Participation data from local bocce clubs is not available. Data from the Observation Project – which examined usage at 45% of the City’s bocce courts – found that the courts were in use 27% of the time; usage was greatest on evenings and no morning usage was reported. Of the users, 94% were male and 100% were adults/seniors. The highest use courts were observed to be those in Templemead Park (HM) at 40%, while the courts at Sir Allan MacNab were not observed to be in use on any visit.

Observation Project Results – Bocce Courts

Plan Area	Amenities Observed*	% in use at time of visit	Total Users
HM	10	25%	68
LH	4	25%	26
LSC	8	31%	67
Total	22	27%	161

* Average of six visits per amenity; summer 2009.

Bocce Courts in the City of Hamilton are maintained through the voluntary efforts of the user groups. The volunteers are responsible for court clean up, grading and minor repairs. Major repairs and improvements are referred to the City via complaints from the user groups. The City cuts perimeter grass along fence lines and mow interior field grass (should it exist). Materials are delivered at the request of the user group. The City also undertakes some minor fence repairs. In most instances, limited maintenance activities are carried out on an as required basis.

12.2 Needs Assessment – Bocce Courts

a) City-wide Needs Assessment

During the Study's public consultation program, there were no requests received for expansion of outdoor bocce opportunities. In fact, only 11% of household survey respondents support additional spending on outdoor bocce courts, ranking them 25th out of 26 facility types. A request was received, however, for the provision of winter bocce opportunities through the construction of a 3 to 4 court indoor venue.

Presently, the City is providing 49 bocce courts for an average of one court for every 10,625 residents, or one for every 2,120 persons between the ages of 55 and 74 (the sport's primary demographic). This age group is expected to increase by 60% between now and 2031, from nearly 104,000 persons to over 166,000. With such significant growth forecasted for this age group, there may be modest opportunities for growth in the sport if it can better establish itself with the next generation of older adults. With that being said, it is believed that there is considerable capacity within the current inventory of outdoor courts – even if some courts are removed – so even if participation increases, the existing supply should be sufficient.

Given its limited market and questionable long-term viability, a provision target is not recommended for bocce courts. No additional bocce courts are recommended at this time. Monitoring of usage and membership trends at existing bocce sites is required to determine if additional courts will be required to serve this growing demographic, but based on current circumstances it is highly doubtful that any additional outdoor bocce courts will be required by 2031. There is also insufficient justification for the development of an indoor bocce court facility or the enclosure of existing outdoor courts.

The primary issue affecting bocce is the support buildings at many parks. Bocce groups feel that these are inadequate (i.e., they are too small, lack amenities, etc.). It is recognized, however, that these buildings were not designed to be used in the way that bocce groups wish to use them, that is as dedicated clubhouses for their members.

The development of dedicated buildings for bocce clubs in municipal parks is not recommended. Continued access to space within existing shared fieldhouses for bocce storage and offices should be permitted. This space is required for seasonal use and should not be winterized for use as meeting space during the winter; City staff should also retain keys to these facilities within public parks. Continued communication is required between the City and user groups to ensure the safe and reasonable use and maintenance of support buildings.

As washrooms are not recommended for Neighbourhood Parks, those bocce courts that are located in Neighbourhood Parks but do not have access to washroom buildings should continue to operate without them or consider relocating to a Community or City-wide Park. Furthermore, expenditure of money on non-municipal lands is not recommended (e.g., washrooms should not be added to the bocce courts at Sir Allan MacNab as these are on school property and long-term access cannot be guaranteed).

b) Community-specific Needs Assessment

There are 24 bocce courts in Hamilton Mountain, 21 in Lower Stoney Creek, and 4 in Lower Hamilton. Not surprisingly, Hamilton Mountain and Lower Stoney Creek have large Italian populations and it is likely that demand for the sport is highest in these areas.

No additional bocce courts are recommended. Removal of select bocce courts may be considered in instances where a club folds.

Bocce Court Supplies by Community

	Current Number of Bocce Courts	Current Per Capita Provision Ratio (total population)
ANC	0	0:31,643
BEV	0	0:18,300
FLA	0	0:23,492
GLA	0	0:14,961
HM	24	1:6,315
LH	4	1:34,381
LSC	21	1:3,755
USC	0	0:22,165
WHD	0	0:42,122
Total	49	1:10,625

12.3 Recommended Directions – Bocce Courts

- Based on current usage levels and usage trends, no additional bocce courts are required by 2031, indoor or outdoor. Monitoring of usage and membership trends at existing bocce sites is recommended to better understand changing participation patterns.
- Removal of bocce courts from the active inventory may be considered if and when existing clubs fold.
- The development of dedicated buildings for bocce clubs in municipal parks is not recommended. Continued access to space within existing shared fieldhouses for bocce storage and offices should be permitted. This space is required for seasonal use and should not be winterized for use as meeting space during the winter; City staff should also retain keys to these facilities within public parks.
- As washrooms are not recommended for Neighbourhood Parks, those bocce courts that are located in Neighbourhood Parks but do not have access to washroom buildings should continue to operate without them or consider relocating to a Community or City-wide Park. Furthermore, expenditure of money on non-municipal lands is not recommended (e.g., washrooms should not be added to the bocce courts at Sir Allan MacNab as these are on school property and long-term access cannot be guaranteed).
- Continued communication is required between the City and user groups to ensure the safe and reasonable use and maintenance of support buildings.

- The Sir Allan MacNab and Chedoke bocce clubs – which have small memberships and use facilities located 1.5 kilometres apart – should be amalgamated to make better use of the covered courts at Chedoke Arena. Following this, the bocce courts at Sir Allan MacNab Recreation Centre should be removed from the inventory.

12.4 Facility Profiles – Lawn Bowling Greens

a) Supply

The City of Hamilton provides a total of 4 lawn bowling greens at 3 locations: 2 at Gage Park (LH); 1 at Village Green Park (ANC); and 1 at Dundas Driving Park (WHD). Prior to the local club folding, a fifth municipal lawn bowling facility was available prior to 2009; this land is now being used for mini soccer fields. A non-municipal green is also available at the Centre for Mountain Health Services; however, this facility will not be available beyond 2009.

All lawn bowling greens are operated and maintained by the individual clubs (with some municipal financial assistance), with the exception of the Village Green Park in Ancaster, which is maintained by the City (with some club assistance).

b) Distribution

A service radius is not applied to lawn bowling greens as they are considered specialized facilities that – due to the existence of facilities and various demographic factors – are provided in some areas and not provided in others.

c) Trends, Best Practices, and Benchmarking

Like bocce, lawn bowling is a sport that appeals to an older demographic and, despite the overall aging of the population, participation in lawn bowling is on the decline. Recently, many clubs have been trying to increase membership at the youth levels and some gains have been realized; the sport can be played by all ages and most levels of ability.

The average provision in the comparator municipalities is one green for every 388,000 persons; Hamilton's provision rate is one green per 130,000 population. Only one-third of the benchmarked communities were involved in the provision of lawn bowling greens; clubs may exist in the other communities, but there is no municipal involvement.

Municipality	Lawn Bowling Greens	
	Supply (approx.)	Per capita
St. Catharines	0	n/a
Oakville	0	n/a
Burlington	2	82,250
Richmond Hill	0	n/a
Vaughan	0	n/a
Markham	0	n/a
London	0	n/a
Brampton	1	452,039
Mississauga	4	180,000
AVERAGE – all communities		387,841
AVERAGE – only communities with municipal facilities		190,934
Hamilton	4	130,154

Data collected between 2004 and 2009 and is subject to change
Includes municipal facilities and facilities under municipal influence
Source: Monteith Brown Planning Consultants, 2009

d) Utilization & Physical Condition

Participation data from local lawn bowling clubs is not available. Data from the Observation Project – which examined usage at two of the City’s three lawn bowling sites – found that the facilities were in use 22% of the time. Of the users, 44% were male and 56% were female; all users were adults or seniors. Usage was greatest on weekday afternoons, and evenings and weekend afternoons.

Observation Project Results – Lawn Bowling Greens

Plan Area	Amenities Observed*	% in use at time of visit	Total Users
LH	2	17%	38
WHD	1	33%	42
Total	3	22%	

* Average of six visits per amenity; summer 2009.

12.5 Needs Assessment – Lawn Bowling Greens

a) City-wide Needs Assessment

13% of household survey respondents support additional spending on lawn bowling greens, ranking them 23rd out of 26 facility types. A request was received for an indoor lawn bowling facility (possibly combined with other components such as indoor soccer or in a disused building), which might encourage more youth membership in the sport.

Presently, the City is providing 4 lawn bowling greens for an average of one for every 130,154 residents, or one for every 41,520 persons between the ages of 55 and 74 (the sport’s primary

demographic). This age group is expected to increase by 60% between now and 2031, from nearly 104,000 persons to over 166,000. With such significant growth forecasted for this age group, there may be modest opportunities for growth in the sport if it can better establish itself with the next generation of older adults.

The future outlook for lawn bowling is somewhat brighter than bocce, if only because its demographic market appears to be larger. Unlike bocce, lawn bowling has a broader following among women, which made up half of the users observed during park visits. It remains, however, a niche sport with an uncertain future.

Given its limited market and uncertain future participation, a provision target is not recommended for lawn bowling greens. No additional greens are recommended at this time and monitoring of usage and membership trends at existing clubs sites should be undertaken to better understand capacities and future requirements. There is also insufficient justification for the development of a municipal indoor lawn bowling facility; however, opportunities may exist for the sport to be accommodated through the use of shared space should an indoor turf facility be developed.

Each of the three existing lawn bowling clubs has been in existence for a number of years. With the impending loss of the Mount Hamilton Lawn Bowling facility at the hospital site, many users of this facility will likely seek membership elsewhere, which could boost participation in the Ancaster, Dundas and Roselawn clubs.

The lawn bowling facility at Village Green Park in Ancaster is undersized (i.e., not regulation), which – according to the club – is inhibiting their play and ability to host events. This park also contains three club tennis courts and a small soccer field (Class C). The potential to expand the lawn bowling green on this site should be explored, along with changes to the number and orientation of the tennis courts (as proposed by the local tennis club). A shared clubhouse between lawn bowling and tennis would serve many advantages, and fundraising for these improvements could also be a shared responsibility. The alternative to expanding the lawn bowling green at this location is to seek an alternate site for its relocation; this site would not likely be in the core of Ancaster, making it a less preferred option.

There is a great deal of autonomy amongst the various lawn bowling clubs using land and facilities at public parks; however, City involvement with each club is not consistent. Formal agreements between the City and clubs should be prepared to help direct roles and responsibilities on City-owned land.

b) Community-specific Needs Assessment

The City's lawn bowling greens are located in Ancaster, Lower Hamilton, and West Hamilton/Dundas.

No additional lawn bowling greens are recommended at this time, nor are any removals anticipated. Improvements have been recommended for the Ancaster (Village Green Park) site.

Lawn Bowling Green Supplies by Community

	Current Number of Lawn Bowling Greens	Current Per Capita Provision Ratio (total population)
ANC	1	1:31,643
BEV	0	0:18,300
FLA	0	0:23,492
GLA	0	0:14,961
HM	0	0:151,559
LH	2	1:68,763
LSC	0	0:78,849
USC	0	0:22,165
WHD	1	1:42,122
Total	4	1:130,154

12.6 Recommended Directions – Lawn Bowling Greens

- No additional lawn bowling greens are recommended at this time and monitoring of usage and membership trends at existing clubs sites should be undertaken to better understand capacities and future requirements.
- An indoor exclusive-use field is not recommended for lawn bowling.
- Opportunities to redevelop the lawn bowling green in Village Green Park (Ancaster) to accommodate a regulation size green and additional club tennis courts, along with a shared clubhouse (under a cost-sharing agreement), should be explored in partnership with local organizations.
- Formal agreements between the City and lawn bowling clubs should be prepared to help direct roles and responsibilities on City-owned land.

SECTION 13 PLAYGROUNDS

This section contains an assessment of City-wide and community-specific playground needs, consistent with the methodology established in Section 7. Key data relevant to this assessment is also provided.

13.1 Facility Profiles

a) Supply

Playgrounds are a common recreational amenity in most City parks; there are 249 parks that contain one or more playground features (e.g., creative play structures, traditional equipment, or swings). Playgrounds can be found in every type of active park and some even serve adjacent elementary schools. Some municipally-installed playgrounds are located on school-owned lands; however, this policy is being rethought by the City.

These 249 sites contain a total of 254 creative play structures, 635 pieces of traditional play equipment (e.g., slides, teeter totters, climbers, etc.), and 228 swing sets (containing 53 accessible swings), for a total of over 1,100 unique components.

b) Distribution

Most communities use a distance measurement rather than a per capita catchment to evaluate the supply of playgrounds. In urban areas, 500-metres is deemed to be a suitable service radius for playgrounds; this radius should be unimpeded by major barriers such as rail lines, waterways, highways/major roads, or valleys/escarpment. This is generally equivalent to a 5 to 8 minute walk for most people (of those using playgrounds, 70% typically walk to them). The household survey found that Hamiltonians are willing to travel up to 12 minutes to make regular use of playgrounds (approximately 800-metres); however, this is generally considered to be at the high end of acceptability.

At 500-metres, there are no significant gaps in playground distribution in the Hamilton's urban area. Although some small gaps exist, they are not large enough to warrant the installation of equipment (and certainly not the acquisition of land). Additional playgrounds will, however, be required to serve new growth areas, many of which are at the periphery of the existing urban area.

It also bears noting that proximity to one's home is not the only determinant in playground and park use. In a recent study published in the *Canadian Journal of Public Health*¹³, it was found that approximately one-half of study participants frequented the park closest to their starting destination (home or daycare facility), and the majority travelled more than 4km to get to the park. For those who chose to travel a significant distance to attend their park of choice, park location was not as important as the amenities they desired. Parents' main reasons for choosing parks were: water attractions, shade swings, and cleanliness.

¹³ Tucker, P., Gilliland, J., Irwin, J. 2007 'Splashpads, swings, and shade: parents' preferences for neighbourhood parks' *Canadian Journal of Public Health* 98(3), 198-202¹⁴ Gilliland, J., Holmes, M., Tucker, P., Irwin, J. 2006 'Environmental equity is child's play: Mapping public provision of recreation opportunities in urban neighbourhoods' *Vulnerable Children & Youth Studies* 1(3): 256-268

c) Trends, Best Practices, and Benchmarking

Quality playgrounds are an essential amenity in all residential neighbourhoods as they provide for unstructured play, physical activity, and socialization from a very early age. The following two passages from recent research articles summarize the role that easily accessible parks and playgrounds serve:

“For young people in particular, easy access to opportunities for recreation is an important determinant of physical activity – a modifiable behaviour – as they have greater transportation challenges than adults. Previous research has shown that children from socially disadvantaged environments (households and neighbourhoods) are more vulnerable to obesity and obesity-related health problems.”¹⁴

“Children’s ability to play outdoors fosters their participation in physical activity. In fact, being outdoors is essential for children’s physical activity because this is where free play and gross motor activity is most likely to take place. Recent research suggests that the presence or absence of neighbourhood recreational facilities, such as parks, impacts children’s levels of physical activity.”¹⁵

Play equipment and play structures are the most basic element of most any neighbourhood park as they generate a great deal of use amongst pre-school and school-age children. The design of playgrounds has changed significantly in a generations’-time, with traditional features such as the stand-alone slide and climber giving way to creative play structures that combine several elements, often through a design that is accessible to persons with disabilities. Replacement of many older play elements became mandatory a number of years ago due to changing safety standards.

The Canadian Standards Association (CSA) issued the 4th edition of the Children’s Playspaces and Equipment standard in 2007, which serves to prevent injuries through proper design and maintenance of children’s play equipment. This standard applies to public playspaces and equipment designed for children between the ages of 1.5 years and 12 years, and the most recent edition includes a section on designing playspaces for individuals with disabilities. The provision of accessible playgrounds (and other park elements for that matter) is a growing trend that will coincide with municipalities achieving compliance with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA). The AODA requires municipalities to develop, implement and enforce accessibility standards across all areas of life to ensure access for all, with full compliance required by either 2010 or 2012 dependent upon type and size of organization.

In terms of overall playground supply, Hamilton compares favourably with the comparator communities; its provision ratio is 2,091 playgrounds per capita, compared to the average of 2,234. The unique age characteristics, population density, and park development practices in each community have a large impact on the need for and provision of play structures.

¹⁴ Gilliland, J., Holmes, M., Tucker, P., Irwin, J. 2006 'Environmental equity is child's play: Mapping public provision of recreation opportunities in urban neighbourhoods' *Vulnerable Children & Youth Studies* 1(3): 256-268

¹⁵ Tucker, P., Gilliland, J., Irwin, J. 2007 'Splashpads, swings, and shade: parents' preferences for neighbourhood parks' *Canadian Journal of Public Health* 98(3), 198-202¹⁶ Harnik, Peter and Coleen Gentles. *Coming to a City Near You: Skate Parks!* Trust for Public Land (2009)

Municipality	Playground Structures/Locations	
	Supply (approx.)	Per capita
St. Catharines	64	2,087
Oakville	105	1,511
Burlington	n/a	n/a
Richmond Hill	86	2,122
Vaughan	147	1,764
Markham	159	1,815
London	111	3,204
Brampton	219	2,064
Mississauga	253	2,846
AVERAGE		2,234
Hamilton	249	2,091

Data collected between 2004 and 2009 and is subject to change
Includes municipal facilities and facilities under municipal influence
Source: Monteith Brown Planning Consultants, 2009

d) Utilization & Physical Condition

The household survey revealed that 30% of Hamilton's households visited a City playground within the past 12 months, nearly twice as many as had visited a City soccer field. In terms of frequency, playgrounds are visited on average 1.6 times per week by each household, greater than sports fields, spray pads and courts.

Because playground use occurs on an unorganized, drop-in basis (i.e., there are no registrations, hence there are not real measures of use), the observation project that was undertaken for this Study provides some valuable insight into how various playgrounds across the City were used. On average, the play structures that were visited were found to be in use 81% of the time with an average of 8 people using these playgrounds on each visit. Usage was greatest on weekday evenings. Several parks were observed to be in use during each one of the park visits.

The highest use play structures were observed to be those in West Hamilton/Dundas (94%) and Ancaster (92%). Play structures in Beverly were by far the least used of any other community. This data should be interpreted with caution; however, as 74% of the playgrounds studied were located in Hamilton Mountain and Lower Hamilton, which means that the data from other communities is less reliable due to the small sample size.

Observation Project Results – Play Structures

Plan Area	Playgrounds Observed*	% in use at time of visit	Total Users
ANC	2	92%	84
BEV	2	17%	7
FLA	3	50%	74
GLA	1	83%	18
HM	26	87%	965
LH	22	82%	977
LSC	5	80%	159
USC	1	83%	16
WHD	3	94%	172
Total	65	81%	2,472

* Average of six visits per amenity; summer 2009.

Although not a direct measure of playground use, the City offers “playlot” – also known as “Supie” – programs at approximately 80 sites each summer (the number and location changes slightly from year to year). These are free drop-in programs for children 5 to 12 years of age, where playlot leaders organize games, sports, crafts and special events. These programs operate at park/school grounds in many communities across the City (not including Ancaster, Beverly, Flamborough, or Glanbrook) and utilize various park areas, including playgrounds. Because this program is targeted at young children, an analysis of its uptake is useful in identifying areas which may have higher playground needs. Data in the following table indicates that Hamilton Mountain and Lower Hamilton generate the greatest interest in the playlot program, followed by West Hamilton/Dundas and Lower Stoney Creek; demand is lower in Upper Stoney Creek.

Plan Area	# of Playlots (approx.)	2007	2008
		Average per site per week	
Hamilton Mountain	34	96	98
Lower Hamilton	24	83	85
Lower Stoney Creek	16	52	46
Upper Stoney Creek	4	24	19
West Hamilton / Dundas	4	44	64
Entire City Totals	82	5,943	5,975

Most playlot programs are available Mon. 1-4 p.m. & Tues.-Fri. 9-12 noon & 1-4 p.m.

The condition of each of the City’s playgrounds has not been evaluated as part of this Study; however, the City runs a CSA retrofit and playground replacement program in which playgrounds are inspected for compliance with standards. Those deemed to not be up to standard are updated or replaced. Continued funding for this program should remain a high municipal priority as it is critical to ensuring safe play areas for children.

13.2 Needs Assessment

a) City-wide Needs Assessment

As mentioned earlier, the recommended provision target for playgrounds is a distribution-based one. Where possible, playgrounds should be provided within 500-metres of all residential areas in urban Hamilton; this radius should be unimpeded by major barriers such as rail lines, waterways, highways/major roads, or valleys/escarpment. In rural areas, the need for playgrounds is not as significant; however, the 500-metre target should be applied to nearby settlement areas. This radius can also be applied to playgrounds on school properties, as many of these amenities were funded by the City and are available for public use. There are no major gaps in playground distribution in the City at this time, although new development will create a need for new playgrounds.

69% of Hamilton's households indicate that playgrounds are important to them, ranking them ahead of spray pads, sports fields and courts. When asked about priorities for municipal spending, playgrounds (72%) ranked only behind natural open space and trails in parks (i.e., 3rd out of 26 facility types). Although application of the 500-metre radius does not identify any major gaps, continued funding of the playground replacement program would be appropriate given the high priority that residents place on these amenities.

With playgrounds being focal elements in many parks, it is expected that there will be very few instances in which complete removal of a playground is considered appropriate. The removal of playground equipment requires the consideration of several factors (e.g., proximity to other playground sites, quality of existing equipment, demographic profile of the immediate neighbourhood, overall park safety, etc.). While there are several areas within the City that have overlapping playground service areas, reduction of these overlaps will not be pursued through this Study.

In terms of accessible playground designs, the City works to ensure that all of its new playgrounds are developed with a degree of accessibility that allows children with disabilities to use them; this approach is a reasonable one and should continue to be followed. Examples include accessible swings, play structures with ramps, curb cuts on playgrounds, rubber safety surfaces, etc. The City does not offer any fully barrier-free playgrounds, the cost of which can be considerable. It is noteworthy, however, that a significant barrier-free project is under development at Marydale Park (near the Binbrook Conservation Area), which will include several indoor and outdoor recreational and educational programs; the City of Hamilton has lent financial support to this project.

Hamilton's Barrier-Free Design Guidelines (2006) establishes that play equipment be designed to be used by children of varying abilities and disabilities, be on an accessible route and located on a firm, level, rapid-drying surface. With nearly 250 playground locations and over 1,000 play elements, full implementation of this guideline will take considerable time and effort. Requests were received through the Study's public input process to provide the community with more information on accessible playground locations and for the City to undertake a full accessibility audit of its parks; this and other recommendations around accessibility are discussed in Section 19.

b) Community-specific Needs Assessment

There is little variation in provision levels for playgrounds. The best provision rates are found in Beverly, Ancaster, Flamborough, and Upper Stoney Creek. All other provision levels are below the City average of 1:2,091 – which includes Glanbrook, Hamilton Mountain, Lower Hamilton, Lower Stoney Creek and West Hamilton/Dundas.

Playground Supplies by Community

	Current Number of Playground Locations	Current Per Capita Provision Ratio (total population)	Current Per Capita Provision Ratio (ages 0-9)
ANC	18	1:1,758	1:186
BEV	17	1:1,076	1:106
FLA	16	1:1,468	1:177
GLA	6	1:2,493	1:251
HM	65	1:2,332	1:255
LH	60	1:2,292	1:253
LSC	37	1:2,131	1:226
USC	11	1:2,015	1:240
WHD	19	1:2,217	1:212
Total	249	1:2,091	1:226

As identified through the household survey, residents in Ancaster, Hamilton Mountain, and Upper Stoney Creek were more likely than others to have used playgrounds in the past twelve months. Conversely, households in Lower Hamilton and West Hamilton/Dundas were less likely to have visited playgrounds.

Playground equipment should continue to be installed through new park development (and replaced on an as-needed basis). Upper Stoney Creek will be the community in the greatest need of new playground installations due to the overall population growth the area is forecasted to achieve by 2031.

Playground Demand Factors by Community

(H = High demand; M = Medium demand; L = Low demand)

	Current Per Capita Provision Ratio (total population)	Usage Levels (estimated)	Public Demand (Household Survey)	Demographic Profile	Short-term Needs Outlook (2009-2021)	Long-term Needs Outlook (2022-2031)
ANC	1:1,758	--	H	--	L	L
BEV	1:1,076	L	--	--	L	L
FLA	1:1,468	--	--	H	L	M
GLA	1:2,493	--	--	--	L	M
HM	1:2,332	H	H	--	M	L
LH	1:2,292	--	L	L	L	L
LSC	1:2,131	--	--	--	L	M
USC	1:2,015	--	H	H	M	H
WHD	1:2,217	--	L	L	L	M

Demographic Profile – above average proportion of population is children.

13.3 Recommended Directions

- Play structures should continue to be installed through new park development, consistent with the demographic needs of the neighbourhood (i.e., those living or proposed to be living within approximately a 500-metre radius of the park).
- Continue to place a high priority on annual funding for the City's Playground Replacement and Retrofit Program, which should be undertaken in compliance with CSA standards. The focus for investment/reinvestment should be on playgrounds on municipally-owned lands.
- Continue to implement accessible elements into new and redeveloped playgrounds to allow children with disabilities to use them. The development of full barrier-free playgrounds is not traditionally a municipal service level, but the City's involvement in future projects should be considered where substantial community/corporate support exists (financial and otherwise), with a goal of establishing one barrier-free playground in each community (there are a total of nine 'communities' defined in this Study).

See also recommendations under Section 19: Design and Accessibility.

SECTION 14 SPRAY PADS & WADING POOLS

This section contains an assessment of City-wide and community-specific wading pool and spray pad needs, consistent with the methodology established in Section 7. Key data relevant to this assessment is also provided.

14.1 Facility Profiles

a) Supply

There are 51 spray pads (waterplay facilities) and 18 wading pools in City parks. Six parks contain both facility types.

Most spray pads are operational by June/July (depending on seasonal weather conditions) and are turned off for the winter season the first week of September. All spray pads are programmed by timer to operate from 10:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. The City is undertaking to install motion sensors on spray pads in the interest of water conservation. Spray pads do not require lifeguards as they have no standing water.

Several of the wading pools are located at the same site as outdoor pools. Wading pools are lifeguarded and are filled and drained daily. Their operating season is the same as outdoor pools and most spray pads.

Outdoor pools are outside the scope of this Study and were addressed in the City of Hamilton Public Use Facility Study (Indoor Facilities) as they are most often associated with community centre sites.

b) Distribution

Spray pads are well used by pre-school and school-aged children, generally under the age of 12. Wading pools have a more limited market as they are not generally used by children over the age of 7 (older children prefer outdoor pools, if available). The ability to walk to spray pads and/or wading pools is desired by many residents; therefore, a 1.0-kilometre service radius has been established to evaluate their geographic distribution.

At 1km, there are several gaps in spray pad distribution, including:

- Ancaster (2)
 - there are no spray pads in Ancaster; 2 spray pads (one west of the Highway 403 and one east of Highway 403) would be required for appropriate distribution; there is a wading pool at Ancaster Lions Outdoor Pool site
- Glanbrook (1)
 - Binbrook area (note: there is a spray pad at Binbrook Conservation Area; however, due to the admission fee, this facility does not provide the same level of access as a municipal spray pad)
- Hamilton Mountain (2)
 - north of the Lincoln Alexander Parkway, between Upper James Street and Upper Wentworth Street

- in the Buchanan area between the Escarpment, Upper James Street, Mohawk Road West, and Upper Paradise Road
- Lower Stoney Creek (1)
 - between Barton Street East and the Escarpment, from Grays Road to Fruitland Road (e.g., Winona Park)
- Upper Stoney Creek (1)
 - there are no spray pads in the Paramount Drive area
- West Hamilton / Dundas (1)
 - there are no spray pads in the Ainslie Woods area (although there is a wading pool at Alexander Park; if removed, consideration should be given to replacing it with a spray pad)

At 1km, there are several overlaps in spray pad distribution, including:

- Hamilton Mountain (3)
 - spray pads at Shawinigan and Gourley Parks also serve the area covered by Gilkson Park
 - the area served by spray pads at Billy Sherring Park, Eleanor Park, and Templemead Park are also served by several spray pads in the surrounding area
 - the area served by spray pads at Berrisfield Park, Lisgar Park, and Lawfield Park are also served by several spray pads in the surrounding area
- Lower Hamilton (5)
 - spray pads at Fairfield Park and Andy Warburton Memorial Park share generally the same service area
 - spray pads at Lucy Day Park and Powell Park share generally the same service area
 - spray pads at Beasley, Central, McLaren, and J.C. Beemer Parks share generally the same service area
 - spray pads at Pier 4 Park and Eastwood Park share generally the same service area
- Lower Stoney Creek (1)
 - spray pads at Veevers and Glendale Parks also serve the area covered by Father Sean O'Sullivan Park

The geographic distribution mapping is not easily applied to rural areas; service gaps may exist in rural communities within Flamborough (e.g., Carlisle) and Glanbrook (e.g., Binbrook). In the case of Binbrook, because of the significant population growth forecasted for this community, a spray pad will likely be required.

As discussed later in this section, no additional wading pools are recommended; any gaps in service should be addressed through existing or recommended spray pad facilities.

At 1km, there are several areas where wading pools overlap with other wading pools or spray pads, including:

- Hamilton Mountain (1)
 - the service area of the George L. Armstrong Playground wading pool (which has been out of service for some time) overlaps with the service area of the Inch Park wading pool
- Lower Hamilton (4+)
 - the service area of the R.T. Steele Park wading pool (which is closed) overlaps with the service area of the Andrew Warburton Memorial Park wading pool
 - the service areas of the Myrtle Park, Woolverton Park (which is closed), J.C. Beemer Park, and Powell Park wading pools all overlap; one or more of these facilities could be removed without unduly restricting local access
 - the wading pools at Bayview Playground and Parkdale Park overlap with spray pad service areas (both wading pools are currently closed)
- Lower Stoney Creek (1)

- the wading pool at Green Acres Park overlaps with a spray pad service area
- West Hamilton / Dundas (1)
 - the wading pool at Coronation Park overlaps with a spray pad service area

There may be merit in addressing some (if not all) of these gaps and overlaps; this topic is analyzed further in the community-specific assessment that follows.

c) Trends, Best Practices, and Benchmarking

Trends in municipal service delivery suggest that investment in outdoor pool construction is giving way to the provision of more cost-effective waterplay (e.g., spray pad) templates. Spray pad facilities generally require a smaller capital investment in construction, depending upon the size and design, and can be used by a more diverse age group. However, the real savings are achieved by a drastic reduction in staffing costs (no lifeguards are required and minimal rotating staff are necessary to test and treat water, etc.) as there is no standing water. Water can be treated on-site and recycled, metered and discharged into the sanitary sewer, or collected as 'grey water' and used for other municipal operations (e.g., irrigation). Furthermore, spray pads can be built at a variety of scales and are logical candidates for insertion into older parks where space is limited. Spray pads have gained popularity in recent years, largely because of the limited amount of standing water (particularly when compared to wading pools), which facilitates the prevention of a major source of West Nile Virus. The lack of standing water at a facility that is primarily used by young children is also beneficial in that it results in lower drowning risks.

The City of Hamilton is currently providing wading pools at a rate of one per 29,000 persons (total population) and spray pads at a rate of one per 10,200 persons – both of these ratios are approximately three times better than the benchmarking average. In fact, Hamilton provides more spray pads per capita than any comparator municipality and trails only London in terms of wading pool provision. Most municipalities (including London) have made strategic decisions to not build any more wading pools and are venturing to replace them with spray pads or close them completely when capital renewal costs become too expensive.

Municipality	Wading Pools		Spray Pads	
	Supply (approx.)	Per capita	Supply (approx.)	Per capita
St. Catharines	7	19,081	2	66,783
Oakville	0	n/a	11	14,427
Burlington	1	164,500	3	54,833
Richmond Hill	0	n/a	10	18,247
Vaughan	2	129,680	18	14,409
Markham	0	n/a	15	19,239
London	18	19,760	9	39,519
Brampton	1	452,039	3	150,680
Mississauga	1	720,000	18	40,000
AVERAGE*		90,496		30,504
Hamilton	18	28,923	51	10,208

* Average includes the population of all communities, including those without facilities.

Data collected between 2004 and 2009 and is subject to change
 Includes municipal facilities and facilities under municipal influence
 Source: Monteith Brown Planning Consultants, 2009

d) Utilization & Physical Condition

Wading pools were found to be in use 26% of the time and spray pads 40% of the time during the observation project visits; note: actual percentages may be greater than reported as some visits were undertaken before the facilities opened for the season. The sample included nearly each one of the City's spray pads, but only two-fifths of the City's wading pools.

For the spray pads, 71% of users were children, 3% were youth, and 26% were adults or seniors (accompanying children); a similar ratio was observed for wading pools (although there were no teens/youth). On average, 6 users were noted at each visit to a spray pad, while 18 users were recorded per wading pool visit; this is likely due to capacity issues as some locations (most of the City's spray pads are smaller than the wading pools). Usage was greatest on weekday evenings.

The highest use spray pad was observed to be at Waterdown Memorial Park (FLA) at 67% and the highest use wading pool was observed in the Dundas Driving Park (WHD) at 50%. The lowest use spray pads were observed to be those in Lower Hamilton (several sites), while wading pools in Andrew Warburton Memorial Park (LH) and J.C. Beemer Park (LH) were not observed to be in use during any visits. Spray pad and wading pool usage was clearly lower in Lower Hamilton.

Observation Project Results – Spray Pads

Plan Area	Amenities Observed*	% in use at time of visit	Total Users
FLA	1	67%	56
HM	22	42%	253
LH	21	35%	309
LSC	4	48%	43
WHD	2	42%	53
Total	50	40%	714

* Average of six visits per amenity; summer 2009.

Observation Project Results – Wading Pools

Plan Area	Amenities Observed*	% in use at time of visit	Total Users
HM	2	31%	20
LH	4	17%	50
WHD	1	50%	130
Total	7	26%	200

* Average of six visits per amenity; summer 2009.

With wading pools being staffed facilities, data on past utilization exists. The following table illustrates estimated attendance (annual totals) for the City's various wading pool sites. Like the observation project data, Dundas Driving Park was found to be the highest use wading pool site. The table also identifies several wading pools that remain in the active inventory but have recently been closed (e.g., George Armstrong Park, Woolverton Park, R.T. Steele Park, Bayview Playground, and Parkdale Park).

Wading Pool Attendance – 2006-08

Wading Pool	Plan Area	# Months of Operation (approx.)	2006	2007	2008	Average (2006-08)
Dundas Driving Park	WHD	3	14,231	14,914	8,716	12,620
Huntington Park	HM	2	n/a	2,769	3,254	3,012
Gage Park	LH	2	3,444	2,017	1,807	2,423
Inch Park	HM	2	844**	1,339*	1,625	1,269
Powell Park**	LH	2	1,309	836	1,443	1,196
Green Acres Park	LSC	2	1,227	934	1,365	1,175
Andrew Warburton Park**	LH	2	920	1,177	1,116	1,071
J.C. Beemer Park**	LH	2	1,026	849	709	861
Alexander Park**	WHD	2	859	699	712	757
Myrtle Park**	LH	2	813	432	966	737
Coronation Park	WHD	2	1,178	485	316	660
Kinsmen Park**	LH	2	322	582	627	510
Ancaster Lions Park	ANC	3	closed	272*	705	489
George Armstrong Park**	HM	2	610	closed	closed	n/a
Woolverton Park	LH	--	closed	closed	closed	n/a
Parkdale Park	LH	--	closed	closed	closed	n/a
Bayview Playground	LSC	--	closed	closed	closed	n/a
RT Steele Park	LH	--	closed	closed	closed	n/a
Total			26,783	27,305	23,361	25,816

* closed part of season

** closed weekends

Assessments of the physical condition of spray pads were provided by the City. The Belview Park spray pad is considered to be in 'critical' condition and in need of repair or replacement, while spray pads at Carter, Highview, Lucy Day, and McLaren Parks are in 'poor' condition; each of these facilities are at least 17 years old.

Spray Pad Condition

NAME	Plan Area	Spray Pad Installation Date	Spray Pad Condition
Belview Park	LH	1990	Critical
Carter Park	LH	1990	Poor
Highview Park	HM	1991	Poor
Lucy Day Park	LH	1989	Poor
McLaren Park	LH	1992	Poor
Andrew Warburton Memorial Park	LH	1998	Fair
Beasley Park	LH	1995	Fair
Berrisfield Park	HM	1998	Fair
Billy Sherring Park	HM	2001	Fair
Broughton Park East	HM	1998	Fair
Central Park	LH	1998	Fair
Eastmount	HM	Unknown	Fair
Eastwood Park	LH	1997	Fair
Eleanor Park	HM	1999	Fair
Gage Park	LH	1999	Fair
Gilkson Park	HM	mid-90s	Fair
Glendale Park	LSC	1998	Fair
Gourley Park	HM	1998	Fair

NAME	Plan Area	Spray Pad Installation Date	Spray Pad Condition
Hamilton Amateur Athletic Assoc.	LH	1999	Fair
Huntington Park	HM	1993	Fair
J.C. Beemer Park	LH	1999	Fair
Kennedy East Park	HM	1993	Fair
Lisgar Park	HM	1996	Fair
Macassa Park	HM	1998	Fair
Montgomery Park	LH	1993	Fair
Mount Lion's Club Park	HM	1993	Fair
Mountview Park	HM	1993	Fair
Powell Park	LH	1997	Fair
Rosedale Park	LH	1995	Fair
Roxborough Park	LH	1999	Fair
Sam Manson Park	LSC	1993	Fair
Shawinigan Park	HM	1997	Fair
St. Christopher's Park	LH	1996	Fair
Templemead Park	HM	unknown	Fair
Veevers Park	LSC	2001	Fair
Victoria Park	LH	1999	Fair
William McCulloch Park	HM	1998	Fair
Woodward Park	LH	1995	Fair
Allison Neighbourhood Park	HM	2007	Good
Churchill Park	WHD	2007	Good
Elmar Park	HM	1991	Good
Father Sean O'Sullivan Memorial Park	LSC	1992	Good
Henry & Beatrice Warden Park	LSC	2006	Good
Pier 4 Park	LH	1993	Good
Rushdale Park	HM	1989	Good
Trenholme Park	HM	1992	Good
Waterdown Memorial Park	FLA	2006	Good

14.2 Needs Assessment

a) City-wide Needs Assessment

Spray pads received relatively high satisfaction ratings from the household survey, particularly in comparison to wading pools, which did not fare as well. Slightly more households drive to spray pads than the number that walk to them. 46% indicate that spray pads are important to their household, ranking behind playgrounds, but ahead of sports fields and courts. 41% support additional spending on spray pads, ranking them 12th out of 26 facility types. In comparison, slightly more (45%) support additional spending on wading pools, a response that is likely linked to the poorer satisfaction rating.

Wading pools and outdoor swimming pools are important community resources, but they do have a number of significant limitations. In particular, the short season, susceptibility to changing weather, and high operational costs all reduce the desirability of building any new wading pools. As such, no new wading pools are recommended.

The City's Indoor Recreation Facility Study (2008) did not recommend the development of any new outdoor pools prior to 2021, but did suggest the redevelopment of several sites and the

closure of a small number as well. For those pools that are to be removed from the inventory, replacement with spray pads was recommended, where appropriate; the same approach holds true for wading pools and is consistent with the approach being employed by most other large municipalities. While spray pads will not replace the experience provided by wading pools, outdoor pools, indoor pools and backyard pools also offer venues for several of these activities, particularly those municipal pools that offer leisure elements and beach entry (features that are recommended in the redevelopment of several facilities in Hamilton).

While geographic distribution of spray pads is an important consideration, overall supply is another factor that requires examination. A provision target of one spray pad for every 1,100 children (ages 0-9) is recommended, which is consistent with the City's current provision level.

Forecasted Needs – Spray Pads (2009-2031)

	2009	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031
Child Population (0-9)	56,285	56,216	58,926	63,568	66,290	67,056
Spray Pads Required (at 1:1,100 children)	51	51	54	58	60	61
Existing Spray Pads	51					
Surplus (Deficit)	0	0	(3)	(7)	(9)	(10)

Based on the provision target, the City will require seven additional spray pad locations by 2021, and three more for the ten-year period beyond this. As identified through the analysis of geographic distribution, there are several existing and emerging areas that could benefit from the installation of spray pads. Like playgrounds, there will be few instances where a spray pad is removed from service simply because of its proximity to another existing spray pad; however, consideration could be given to removing those spray pads that are older and/or smaller should a newer and larger spray pad be proposed for a nearby park.

Also of note, the City has identified a short-term strategy for spray pad development in their long-term capital budget. New spray pads are proposed for the following locations, some of which are within gap areas and/or parks suitable for wading pool conversions:

- Hampton Park (HM), 2009
- Parkdale Park (LH), 2010
- William Schwenger Park (HM), 2011
- Winona Park (LSC), 2011
- Buchanan Park (HM), 2013

In the past, the City has replaced some wading pools with spray pads, but continues to maintain several locations that offer both types of features. The City's 2008 Public Use (Indoor) Facilities Study recommended the complete removal of two outdoor pools, one of which (Chedoke) was identified as a good candidate for spray pad replacement; 5 other outdoor pools were recommended for upgrades or redevelopment, which could offer opportunities for wading pool or spray pad changes (including Inch Park; Parkdale – as noted above; and Green Acres; all of which have wading pools).

In terms of location, spray pads are most appropriate in Community and City-Wide Parks that are adjacent to staffed facilities, such as community centres or outdoor pools. In addition, spray pads should be provided in parks that have access to washrooms or community centres and parking; shade is also desired.

Furthermore, many of the City's spray pads are small and simple, and do not include designs that would fully engage a child's imagination. Greater variety in scale and design is recommended as new spray pads are developed in the City.

Lastly, the City uses fresh (potable) water for all of its spray pads and this practice should continue (if recirculated water is to be used, it is recommended that the water be filtered, chemically treated, retained in a storage tank, and exposed to ultraviolet light radiation – such systems require considerable capital investment).

b) Community-specific Needs Assessment

There are four communities within Hamilton that do not currently have spray pads – Ancaster, Beverly, Glanbrook (excluding the spray pad at the Binbrook Conservation Area, for which a park admission fee is required), and Upper Stoney Creek. Spray pad provision in Lower Stoney Creek – although resulting in a reasonable per capita supply – is heavily weighted to the western portion of this plan area, with gaps in the east. Lower Hamilton and Hamilton Mountain have the best ratios of spray pads to children. Four Hamilton communities do not have wading pools: Beverly, Flamborough, Glanbrook, and Upper Stoney Creek.

Spray Pad & Wading Pool Supplies by Community

	Current Number of Spray Pads	Current Per Capita Provision Ratio (ages 0-9)	Current Number of Wading Pools	Current Per Capita Provision Ratio (ages 0-9)
ANC	0	0:3,353	1	1:3,353
BEV	0	0:1,795	0	0: 1,795
FLA	1	1:2,835	0	0:2,835
GLA	0	0:1,505	0	0: 1,505
HM	22	1:754	3	1:5,530
LH	21	1:722	10	1:1,515
LSC	5	1:1,676	1	1:8,378
USC	0	0:2,642	0	0: 2,642
WHD	2	1:2,017	3	1:1,344
Total	51	1:1,104	18	1:3,127

Several opportunities exist to concert wading pools to spray pads and to install spray pads in under-served areas. Like most facility types, Upper Stoney Creek's forecasted population growth will necessitate the most long-term demand for new spray pads. At present, Ancaster, Upper Stoney Creek, Flamborough, and Glanbrook (in priority order) are in the most need of spray pad facilities on a per capita basis (children ages 0-9).

Spray Pad Demand Factors by Community
(H = High demand; M = Medium demand; L = Low demand)

	Current Per Capita Provision Ratio (ages 0-9)	Usage Levels (estimated)	Public Demand (Household Survey)	Demographic Profile	Comparison to City-wide Provision Level	Short-term Needs Outlook (2009-2021)	Long-term Needs Outlook (2022-2031)
ANC	0:3,353	--	--	--	H	M	L
BEV	0:1,795	--	--	L	--	L	L
FLA	1:2,835	H	--	H	--	M	L
GLA	0:1,505	--	--	--	--	M	L
HM	1:754	--	H	--	L	L	L
LH	1:722	L	--	--	L	L	L
LSC	1:1,676	--	--	--	--	L	L
USC	0:2,642	--	--	H	H	M	H
WHD	1:2,017	--	--	L	--	L	L

Demographic Profile – above average proportion of population is children.

14.3 Recommended Directions

- The establishment of new wading pool sites is not recommended.
- Remove the following wading pools (most of which are presently closed) and do not replace them with spray pads:
 - George L. Armstrong Park (HM); on school board property
 - Woolverton Park (LH)
 - Coronation Park (WHD) (when the outdoor pool is removed from service, if applicable)
 - R.T. Steele Park (LH)
 - Green Acres Park (LSC) (when the outdoor pool is redeveloped, if applicable)
 - Bayview Playground (LH)
- Convert the following wading pools to spray pads:
 - Parkdale Park (LH) (when the outdoor pool is redeveloped, if applicable; keep facility closed until such time)
 - Other wading pools not identified for renewal, at the time that significant repairs/reinvestment is required
- Initiate a spray pad renewal program that provides consistent funding to the upgrading of the City's older spray pads and their support infrastructure.
- Over the short-term (by 2021), identify opportunities to install 7-8 spray pads where Community Parks (or other appropriate park types with washrooms and sufficient parking) exist in the following gap areas:
 - Ancaster (2)
 - east of Highway 403
 - Village Green Park
 - Glanbrook (1)
 - Binbrook area

- Hamilton Mountain (2-3)
 - north of the Lincoln Alexander Parkway, between Upper James Street and Upper Wentworth Street
 - William Schwenger Park
 - Buchanan Park
 - Lower Stoney Creek (1)
 - Winona Park (to improve distribution in the eastern portion of this community)
 - Upper Stoney Creek (1)
 - Paramount Drive area
- For the period between 2021 and 2031, spray pad installation should largely be focused on Community Parks in Upper Stoney Creek (a minimum of 3 spray pads).

SECTION 15 OTHER OUTDOOR RECREATION AMENITIES

This section contains an assessment of City-wide and community-specific key outdoor recreation amenity needs (e.g., skateboard parks, off leash dog parks, outdoor rinks, outdoor running tracks, pathways in parks, etc.), consistent with the methodology established in Section 7. Key data relevant to this assessment is also provided.

15.1 Skateboard Parks

The City provides skateboard parks at 5 locations:

- Turner Park (HM); the City's newest and largest facility
- Mohawk Sports Park (HM); a half pipe ramp only (for more advanced users)
- Beasley Park (LH); a converted wading pool
- Parkdale Park (LH)
- Waterdown Memorial Park (FLA)

Although there were multiple private indoor skateboard facilities in the City at one time, only one is currently in operation (a 3,500 square foot facility in Lower Stoney Creek). Private facilities are typically membership-based or pay per use and used by older, more advanced skaters. In addition, the Spring Valley Arena in Ancaster has been used as a seasonal (summer) venue for skateboarding in the past. In the past, the Kiwanis Boys and Girls Club has also partnered with the City for the provision of a portable skate park that was moved around to lower income areas of Hamilton.

Although intended for the exclusive use of skateboarders, the City's skate parks also attract some bmx/trick bikers. Not only do bikes conflict with skateboards when using the same space, bikes can also damage the concrete and create unsafe conditions for skaters. An assessment of the need for dedicated bike parks is contained in the following section.

From the accounts of staff and municipal officials, it would appear that the Turner Park skate park – located adjacent to the new Family YMCA and police station – is a huge success. This park opened in 2009 and the City's largest, with a design that appeals to all levels of skill. The park is highly visible, on a transit route, and is always busy.

All skate parks, with the exception of the Turner Park facility, were evaluated as part of the observation project. Out of the 24 total visits to 4 sites, the parks were found to be in use 23 times for an average of 92% – the highest usage rate of any observed recreation amenity. On average, 10 users were observed per facility per visit, with 91% being male and 79% youth.

Observation Project Results – Skate Parks

Plan Area	Amenities Observed*	% in use at time of visit	Total Users
FLA	1	100%	89
HM	1	100%	43
LH	2	92%	112
Total	4	96%	244

* Average of six visits per amenity; summer 2009.

There is a great deal of research that speaks to the benefits of public skateboard parks and that addresses the negative perceptions often raised by non-skaters. A recent article by the Trust of Public Land found that “a successful skate park can lure troublesome youth off street corners, burn away energy and aggression, teach motor skills, stimulate motivation, reward practice, instil pride, eliminate boredom, and even become a morale booster for parents and the entire community.”¹⁶ A citywide survey undertaken in Las Vegas, which has a skate park in each of its 10 districts, found that graffiti was more prevalent in city parks that did not have skate facilities than those that did. Furthermore, although its injury rate is high, the U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission has found that skateboarding results in fewer injuries per participant than basketball, football, and bicycling.

Over the past several years, skateboarding has become a mainstream activity that has demonstrated sustained longevity and is a popular pursuit among children, youth, and to a lesser extent, young adults. Skate parks are increasingly being viewed as positive venues that respond to the interests of a number of youth. The unstructured, unscheduled, and low cost nature of the sport also adds to its appeal.

Skate parks also help to fill a void in youth recreational activity, primarily for males. While female participation in field sports is increasing, many males are not as drawn to traditional sports as they once were, particularly as they get older. Many skateboarders take up the activity at a young age and continue into adulthood, albeit at a different pace and intensity.

Across Ontario, the municipal provision of skate parks is becoming more widespread as demand has increased. Several examples of successful skateboard parks exist in Ontario. Youth consultation is a key element in the successful design of these parks to ensure that the target market will benefit from, and make use of, the facility. There is also logic in providing smaller-scale facilities at a neighbourhood level (e.g., beginner zones with elementary features) as they generally appeal to a demographic that is limited in its ability to travel to more centralized facilities.

The average amongst the benchmarking communities is one skate park for every 108,600 residents, which is very similar to Hamilton’s current provision level of one per 104,100 residents. There is evidence, however, that this ratio is improving, as many municipalities are in the midst of building skate parks. Skateboarding is no longer just tolerated or accepted in most municipalities, it is now being encouraged and skate park elements are being designed into many new parks in several communities. London and Mississauga are considered leaders in this area and both have a well developed and distributed hierarchy of skate parks.

¹⁶ Harnik, Peter and Coleen Gentles. *Coming to a City Near You: Skate Parks!* Trust for Public Land (2009)

Municipality	Skateboard parks	
	Supply (approx.)	Per capita
St. Catharines	1	133,565
Oakville	1	158,700
Burlington	1	164,500
Richmond Hill	1	182,465
Vaughan	1	259,359
Markham	1	288,583
London	7	50,811
Brampton	5	90,408
Mississauga	7	102,857
AVERAGE		108,595
Hamilton	5	104,123

Data collected between 2004 and 2009 and is subject to change
Includes municipal facilities and facilities under municipal influence
Source: Monteith Brown Planning Consultants, 2009

The household survey noted a low level of interest in skateboarding (21% supported additional spending on skateboard and BMX parks); however, the average age of survey respondents (age 49) likely skewed the results, as did negative perceptions around skateboarding.

To provide some balance to the discussion, the Hamilton Skateboarding Assembly (HSA) was consulted for this study. The HSA feels that skateboarding and the significance of the sport is overlooked, but was pleased with the municipal support that they do receive. The group is interested in seeing additional parks and is supportive of beginner skate zones at other parks to allow novice skateboarders the opportunity to learn prior to attempting to skate at the larger parks. One of the local concerns is the lack of proper facilities for bike riders (e.g., separate from skateboard users), which is leading to conflicts at some existing parks. From a maintenance perspective, vandalism is also a concern (particularly in parks that are not visible from the street). There was also interest in exploring opportunities for skateboarding in the winter, possibly through the re-use of an old recreation centre.

Skateboard parks, while relatively new to the recreational landscape, are well used in Hamilton. A proper geographic distribution is critical to enabling users – who are largely (but not exclusively) male teens – to access skate parks, as many use public transit or their skateboards to get to them. As such, a 2.0-kilometre service radius has been applied to assist in identifying major gaps, which are as follows:

- Ancaster (1)
- Hamilton Mountain (1)
- Lower Stoney Creek (1)
- West Hamilton / Dundas (1)

The geographic distribution mapping is not easily applied to rural areas; service gaps may exist in rural communities within Beverly, Flamborough, and Glanbrook, however, at the present time there are lower populations in these areas, making them lower priorities.

As previously stated, skate parks are frequented most often by youth, suggesting that the application of an age-specific provision target is the most appropriate to gauge the actual needs of the community. Our experience in other municipalities suggests that they are supplying one skate park per 100,000 total residents; translating this to Hamilton's youth population, this is equivalent to 1:13,000 youth (ages 10 to 19). Given the increasing interest in the sport and the levels of usage seen at the City's facilities, a more aggressive provision target of 1 community-level skate park per 7,500 youth is recommended. Spatial distribution of these facilities is also key given the fact that youth have limited transportation opportunities.

A hierarchy of skate park types is recommended, consisting of: (1) community-level parks; and (2) neighbourhood-level parks. Community-level skate parks will be larger and serve higher skill levels, while neighbourhood-level skate parks will be smaller and serve introductory skill levels. The Turner Park skate park, while counted among the community-level facilities, is very large and serves as a City-wide skate park. Future community-level skate parks should be in the range of 10,000 to 12,000 square feet (and be located in Community or City-wide Parks), while neighbourhood-level parks should be no more than 2,000 square feet in size (and may be located in Neighbourhood Parks).

The need for community-level parks will be determined through the use of the recommended provision target.

Forecasted Needs – Community-level Skate Parks (2009-2031)

	2009	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031
Teen Population (10-19)	66,786	65,682	61,025	61,905	65,528	71,286
Skate Parks Required (at 1:7,500 teens)	9	9	8	8	9	10
Existing Skate Parks	5					
Surplus (Deficit)	(4)	(4)	(3)	(3)	(4)	(5)

It is recommended that the City develop three to four additional community-wide skate parks by 2021 (ideally sooner) in order to provide a more equitable distribution of opportunities. One to two additional community-wide skate parks will be required by 2031, bringing the City's total to 10 skate parks. The new community-wide facilities need not be as large as the Turner Park skate park, but they should provide intermediate and advanced levels of challenge and a variety of elements.

In terms of distribution, there are several major gaps that should be targeted for community-level skate park provision. Priorities for new community-level skate park development are (in order):

1. Lower Stoney Creek
2. Hamilton Mountain
3. West Hamilton/Dundas
4. Ancaster
5. Upper Stoney Creek (longer-term)

The need for neighbourhood-level parks will also be determined through the use of the recommended provision target, which is one for every 15,000 youth (ages 10-19, although it is recognized that a slightly younger clientele will be drawn to these facilities). The City should continue to provide more community-level skate parks than neighbourhood-level ones.

Forecasted Needs – Neighbourhood-level Skate Parks (2009-2031)

	2009	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031
Teen Population (10-19)	66,786	65,682	61,025	61,905	65,528	71,286
Skate Parks Required (at 1:15,000 teens)	4	4	4	4	4	5
Existing Skate Parks	0					
Surplus (Deficit)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)	(5)

The City should consider constructing neighbourhood-level skate parks in smaller gap areas where there is an insufficient number of youth to support a community-level park. These smaller skate parks would include a more limited number of features (e.g., fun boxes, rails, etc., but no bowls or advanced elements that would attract older teens) that would allow beginner skaters to be introduced to the activity at a facility that is appropriately-sized for their skill level. Neighbourhood skate parks would generally be no more than 2,000ft² in size. Modular construction should be considered in order for future flexibility should local interests change. These types of features are intended to attract youth living in close proximity to their location and do not require off-street parking; as such these facilities could be accommodated in Neighbourhood Parks.

At present, one smaller gap that would be appropriate for the development of a neighbourhood-level skate park is in Lower Hamilton (the area around Gage Avenue). Continued population growth in communities such as Glanbrook (Binbrook area), Lower Stoney Creek (Winona area), and Upper Stoney Creek may also necessitate the future development of neighbourhood-level skateboard facilities. In total, the City should seek opportunities in partnership with local businesses and community groups to establish 4 to 5 neighbourhood-level skate parks by 2031, with most of these being developed within the next five to ten years.

The identification of proper sites for skate parks can be challenging as there is a need to mitigate noise and deter inappropriate behaviours at these facilities. The following are some of the more substantial considerations:

- Space is very important in that the park should be sufficiently sized to provide a large buffer area from neighbouring properties as well as having enough space to construct the facility without displacing or crowding other users. Because skate parks tend to attract older children and teens, neither large nor small skate facilities should not be placed directly adjacent to playgrounds or spray pads.
- Visibility is critical to protect the users while they are participating, as well as allowing neighbours and police to monitor activity at the facilities at all hours. Security lighting is also critical to support visibility, but full lighting of the facility is not recommended so as not to encourage after-hours usage.
- Access to transportation, especially transit, allows users to travel to a location and will maximize the use of the facility.
- Parking must also be in place to support users who would travel by car to this facility.
- Access to washrooms and water fountains is critical for health and safety reasons.
- Unsupervised skate parks with signs that post rules and the risks associated with the park's use provide more protection from liability than supervised facilities, and are more cost efficient to operate.

- Lights, seats, observation areas, public transportation, and consultation with skaters (both in the design and ongoing operation) are requirements for a successful skate park. All of these elements are in place at the City's Turner Park skate facility and have all contributed to its success. The more input skaters have in a park's creation and management, the better they take care of it; this has been the experience at Beasley Skate Park, where local skaters have undertaken repairs on their accord.

Distancing skate parks in isolated locations is not the answer. Locations adjacent to recreation centres or within community parks provide many of these required elements, including access to other activities, and are generally preferred as potential sites for new skate parks.

Although additional research is required prior to choosing specific sites for skate parks recommended in this Study, some potential candidate sites for either neighbourhood or community-level skate parks that were identified through the consultation program included: Gage Park and Scott Park (LH), Cathedral Park and near McMaster (WHD), Sir Allan MacNab Recreation Centre (HM), and Winona Park (LSC). Many City Councillors were in support of more skate parks as long as appropriate locations could be secured.

Recommendations – Skate Parks

- Develop three to four additional community-wide skate parks by 2021 and one to two more by 2031 to provide greater opportunities and a more equitable distribution. The new community-wide facilities should generally be 10,000 to 12,000 square feet in size, provide intermediate and advanced levels of challenge and a variety of elements, and be located in Community or City-wide Parks. Priorities for new community skate park development are (in order):
 - Lower Stoney Creek
 - Hamilton Mountain
 - West Hamilton/Dundas (e.g., Cathedral Park)
 - Ancaster
 - Upper Stoney Creek (longer-term)
- Construct four to five neighbourhood-level skate parks in smaller gap areas where there is an insufficient number of youth to support a community-level park. These parks would generally be no larger than 2,000ft² in size and contain a limited number of features for beginner skaters in the immediate area. Modular construction should be considered in order for future flexibility should local interests change. These facilities may be located in Neighbourhood Parks (with the support of surrounding residents) or Community Parks. Potential candidate areas for neighbourhood-level parks include Lower Hamilton (Gage Avenue area), Glanbrook (Binbrook area), Lower Stoney Creek (Winona area), and Upper Stoney Creek. Sponsorships and community partnerships should be pursued for these initiatives.
- Site selection criteria should be established and followed when evaluating potential locations for new skate parks. Further, all skate parks should be designed in consultation with skateboard representatives and the surrounding community.

15.2 Bike Parks

There are currently no municipally provided bike parks in the City of Hamilton. Bikes are prohibited from using the city's skate parks and natural areas.

There are several different forms of bike parks:

- 1) BMX racers compete on a dirt track that features jumps and other obstacles to test the bike handling skills of the riders.
- 2) Freestyle utilizes a similar BMX bike, but offers a different style of riding.
- 3) 'Trail style' makes use of more natural open space, combined with a number of built jumps (often called dirt jumping) while 'park style' utilizes skatepark facilities along with skateboarders and inline skaters.

BMX (bicycle motocross) – along with freestyle biking – has witnessed rapid growth since the 1980s, culminating in its debut at the 2008 Beijing Olympics, with both men's and women's events run on a course constructed specifically for the sport. There are currently a number of BMX and bike parks in Canada, many of which are located in Ontario (e.g., Milton, Chatham, Kingston, Sauguen Shores, Mississauga, Owen Sound, Collingwood, Halton Hills, etc.).

As a fairly new level of service, there are no applicable market-driven standards which are appropriate to apply as service level targets; however, it is safe to say that a large proportion of enthusiasts tend to be youth and the population in that age segment must be a factor in future provision. While not yet a common practice, municipal provision of bike parks is becoming more frequent. There is increased demand for purpose-built facilities (as opposed to the use of skate parks, which is not permitted as they were not designed for bikes), in addition to the desire to reduce riding in inappropriate and ecologically sensitive locations and the ad-hoc construction of bike facilities. The result is that parks and recreation departments are often under pressure from landowners and sport participants alike to provide authorized, safe facilities.

There is understood to be significant local demand for a bike park (which is different from a Velodrome), as there have been requests for a safe and challenging course with a series of hills, jumps and grades for youth and beginner riders. Recently, a conflict between skateboarders and bikers at the Turner Park skate park has made it clear that a separate facility is needed for the freestyle bike users. Furthermore, staff noted that some youth are currently using ravines and a more controlled environment would be better for both the youth and the environment.

It is recommended that the City undertake a process to identify an appropriate site for a bike park and seek community partners for its development and operation. This facility would serve as a pilot project and its long-term would be conditional upon its successful short-term operation and community support. Future projects and demand would be evaluated based on the pilot project.

Site selection and design should occur in consultation with members of the local biking community. Consideration should be given to locating the bike park near or in the same park as a skateboard park, as often the participants are the same group of youth.

Recommendations – Bike Parks

- Identify an appropriate site for a freestyle bike park (dirt) and seek community partners for its development, administration, and operation. This facility would serve as a pilot project and its long-term viability would be conditional upon its successful short-term operation and community support. Future projects and demand would be evaluated based on the pilot project.

15.3 Leash Free Parks

The City of Hamilton recognizes two types of leash free parks, namely "free running areas" and "dog parks". Presently, the City has 2 dog parks (both located on Dartnall Road, one owned by the Hamilton SPCA and one owned by the City) and 5 free running areas (located at Little John Park, Chegwin Park, Cinema Park, Warren Park, and Hill Street Park). As identified in the City's Leash-Free Policy (2003), the following definitions apply to these two types of leash free parks:

Dog Parks are fenced facilities where residents have the opportunity to exercise their dogs off-leash within a controlled environment without being in contravention of municipal by-laws.

Free Running Areas are designated areas within the existing parkland and open space infrastructure, which have been set-aside for residents to exercise their dogs off-leash without being in contravention of municipal by-laws. These areas are governed by time restrictions and seasonal restrictions, and are not fenced.

With municipal by-laws regulating the use of leashes, leash free parks provide pet owners with the opportunity to exercise and socialize their dogs in a controlled area. Leash free parks also facilitate interaction between pet owners. In many communities, leash free parks are created in cooperation with an affiliated organization that is willing to take responsibility for their operation and/or enforcement. Spatial distribution is also a consideration as these parks are largely drive-to types of facilities; however, leash free parks would also benefit from proximity to a major trail route.

Leash free parks should not be viewed as being facilities strictly for pets, but also a venue for exercise and social interaction for residents with a common interest. The safety of other park users, buffer zones from residential and environmentally sensitive areas and the provision of amenities (e.g., benches, fountains, waste containers, etc.) should be considered in the design of leash free parks.

The benchmarking review found that most municipalities are currently providing at least one dedicated off-leash dog park; the average per capita ratio is one for every 113,000 residents. If Hamilton's 2 dog parks and 5 free running areas are combined, the City's current provision level is better than the average (approximately 1:74,400).

Municipality	Off-leash Dog Parks	
	Supply (approx.)	Per capita
St. Catharines	1	133,565
Oakville	5	31,740
Burlington	2	82,250
Richmond Hill	1	182,465
Vaughan	1	259,359
Markham	1	288,583
London	3	118,558
Brampton	3	150,680
Mississauga	7	102,857
AVERAGE		113,120
Hamilton	7	74,374

Data collected between 2004 and 2009 and is subject to change
Includes municipal facilities and facilities under municipal influence
Source: Monteith Brown Planning Consultants, 2009

Hamilton’s approach of providing two different types of leash free parks is fairly unique. Most municipalities have chosen to develop dog parks (dedicated and fenced areas), rather than free running areas (unfenced areas within existing parks, with time restrictions for use), although there are some exceptions (e.g., Guelph currently offers both types). The concern with free running areas is the shared use aspect; not only is off-leash access to these areas limited to non-peak times of the day (typically 6 am to 9 am and 8 pm to 11 pm during the warmer weather months), but the sharing of space can cause maintenance and safety concerns. Nevertheless, the sites that have been chosen by the City for free running areas appear to be working well, due largely to their isolated nature; some of the parks are undeveloped or wooded lots, while only two (Little John and Hill Street Parks) contain any recreation amenities (e.g., playgrounds; but no sports fields). No changes are recommended to existing leash free parks.

The City’s Leash-Free Policy contains criteria for site selection, funding, and management. Evaluation of potential sites is undertaken based on the regimented criteria set forth in this Policy. The main principles of the policy are:

- Self sustainability of the facilities
- Maintaining public and animal safety
- Minimization of environmental impacts
- Community partnerships to support the creation of the parks
- Partnerships to support the ongoing operation of the dog park facilities
- A more equitable distribution of facilities across the City to improve accessibility
- Funding model to support park development and restorative works
- Performance measures to monitor and evaluate facility conditions and operation

Furthermore, the Policy establishes a goal of one “free running area” per ward, with additional areas being provided on an as-required or as-requested basis, subject to the availability of funding. The development of all new “dog parks” is done on a cost share basis, whereby the City pays for 50% of the upstart development cost and the volunteer committee pays the additional 50% of development costs.

The City's leash free parks are well utilized and public input suggests that there is a desire for more areas to be established in Hamilton. Many users travel from across the City to use the leash free parks on the West End and Mountain. The City's Off-Leash Program has received considerable public support from those that frequently use the locations and requests for new sites are regularly received and evaluated; many potential sites, however, cannot meet the established criteria and cannot be supported for the establishment of a leash free area. 36% of household survey respondents support additional spending on leash free parks, ranking them 13th out of 26 facility types. While there is good support for the addition of new leash free parks, the primary challenge is finding appropriate sites for them in proximity to potential users.

In terms of distribution, most of the City's free running areas are grouped together in and around the West Hamilton/Dundas area. In fact, three such areas are within about 1 kilometre of each other (Chegwin Park, Warren Park, and Little John Park). Using a 2.0km radius to assess the distribution of leash free parks, it is apparent that several major gaps exist, including in Flamborough (Waterdown), Hamilton Mountain (2), Lower Hamilton (2), and Lower Stoney Creek (1-2). Over time as more leash free parks are established, it would be reasonable to reduce this service radius to a level that allows for greater 'walk-to' access.

Demand for leash free parks is most notable in denser urban environments where private backyards are smaller and apartment buildings are more prevalent. As such, while there may be gaps in the rural areas, the provision of off-leash areas in rural communities is not a priority.

Based on the foregoing, it is recommended that the City continue to work towards its goal of establishing at least one "free running area" per ward (of which there are 15), subject to the availability appropriate sites. While dedicated dog parks are preferred over unfenced free running areas with time restrictions, the latter approach is likely the only option in some of the City's established communities. The City's Off-Leash Policy is an excellent tool for evaluating potential sites and establishing the framework for the development of new leash free parks. The provision of more fenced dog parks should be a priority for Hamilton; however, it is recommended that the City continue to require that significant community partnerships be in place prior to developing new dog parks.

Recommendations – Off-Leash Dog Areas

- Continue to implement the City's Off-Leash Policy when evaluating requests for new leash free parks.
- Continue to work towards the goal of implementing the model of at least one "free running area" and/or dog park per ward, subject to the availability appropriate sites and available funding. Based on the current supply, 11 wards currently do not have immediate access to leash free parks. The provision of more fenced dog parks should be a priority for Hamilton; however, it is recommended that the City continue to require that significant community partnerships be in place prior to developing any new dog parks.

15.4 Outdoor Ice Rinks

The City of Hamilton – through support by community volunteers (Neighbourhood Ice Rink Committees) – currently provides nearly 60 outdoor natural ice rinks. The number of natural rinks can fluctuate on an annual basis; additional park sites may have the required infrastructure for outdoor rinks, but are not included in the inventory if they have not been used for this purpose in the past. All of the outdoor rinks are established on land that is used for other purposes in the summertime, whether it is multi-use courts for basketball and ball hockey, ball diamond infields, sports fields or open space areas.

To help support and encourage the natural outdoor rinks, the City pays a fixed sum of money to the Ice Rink Committees for every day of skating. The City also assists with site preparation, snow removal after large snowfalls, and the provision of a water supply, storage shed, and basic equipment.

In addition, there is one outdoor artificial ice rink in City parks; located at Dundas Driving Park, this rink opened in 2008/09 and was funded by the Dundas Rotary Club. The Hamilton Waterfront Trust is also in the midst of building an NHL-size artificial outdoor skating rink on Pier 8 in Lower Hamilton.

Historically, Canadians have had an affinity for outdoor skating rinks and there is substantial demand in many communities for these facilities. Unfortunately, with warming temperatures observed in recent years, natural outdoor rinks are becoming less effective as they are severely impacted by weather conditions. In addition, most outdoor rinks in Ontario (as is the case in Hamilton) are maintained and operated by volunteers, and support can vary from year to year.

These factors have led some communities to develop artificial outdoor ice rinks (which contain refrigeration systems that mitigate the effects of warmer weather conditions). Although artificial rinks are typically able to operate for a longer season, their costs are substantially higher than those of natural rinks. While outdoor skating venues may alleviate some minor pressures on indoor arena demand (e.g., public skating and pickup shinny opportunities), they should not be considered replacements for arenas. More importantly, they create a focal point for neighbourhood socialization and interaction. Outdoor skating is an important and popular winter activity that allows families to participate in a free recreation activity together.

Given the large number of existing outdoor rink sites and the neighbourhood-level volunteerism that is often required to operate them, a 1-kilometre service radius has been established for the purposes of analyzing their distribution. It is recognized that – like many other facility types – residents may be willing to travel farther to access higher quality outdoor rinks (e.g., artificial ice, those with enhanced amenities, those located at destination parks, etc.).

Based on a 1-kilometre service radius for neighbourhood rinks, there are several gaps in distribution. Sizeable gaps exist in:

- Flamborough (1)
 - there are no outdoor rinks in the Carlisle area
- Glanbrook (1)
 - there are no outdoor rinks in the Binbrook area
- Hamilton Mountain (1)
 - north of the Lincoln Alexander Parkway, between Upper James Street and Upper Wentworth Street

- Lower Hamilton (2)
 - there are no outdoor rinks in the Barton Street and Victoria Avenue area
 - near King Street East between Kenilworth Avenue South and Parkdale Avenue South
- Lower Stoney Creek (2)
 - between Barton Street East and the Escarpment, from Grays Road to Fruitland Road; 2 outdoor rinks would likely be required to fill this gap
- Upper Stoney Creek (1)
 - there are no outdoor rinks in the Paramount Drive area

At 1-kilometre, there are also several overlaps in distribution; however, since outdoor rinks are volunteer led, it is not recommended that any of them be discontinued simply because there may be another rink nearby.

The benchmarking exercise reveals that Hamilton has the best per capita supply of outdoor ice rinks amongst the comparable communities, with one rink being provided for every 8,700 residents, more than twice the average provision in the other municipalities.

Municipality	Outdoor ice rinks (natural & artificial)	
	Supply (approx.)	Per capita
St. Catharines	n/a	n/a
Oakville	9 natural + 0 artificial	17,633
Burlington	n/a	n/a
Richmond Hill	2 natural + 1 artificial skate path	60,822
Vaughan	2 natural + 9 artificial	23,578
Markham	3 natural + 0 artificial (1 artificial rink to be built in 2010/11)	96,194
London	n/a (unknown number of natural rinks; 2 artificial rinks and 1 artificial skate path)	n/a
Brampton	2 artificial (1 is a skate path)	226,020
Mississauga	51 natural + 3 artificial	13,585
AVERAGE		17,745
Hamilton	60 (59 natural + 1 artificial)	8,677

Data collected between 2004 and 2009 and is subject to change
 Includes municipal facilities and facilities under municipal influence
 Source: Monteith Brown Planning Consultants, 2009

There was considerable interest in outdoor rinks generated through the public consultation program. In the household survey, 55% supported additional spending on outdoor ice rinks, ranking them 6th out of 26 facility types. Strong praise was given for the existing artificial outdoor rink in Dundas and a particular desire to see more of these facilities was expressed.

Specific suggestions were received for artificial ice rinks to be built in Waterdown (Memorial Park or Joe Sams), West Hamilton (Churchill Park), Lower Hamilton (along the waterfront, Gage Park, Confederation Park, Scott Park, Parkdale Park, and/or the new City Hall), Lower Stoney Creek, and Hamilton Mountain. There were also a small number of requests for natural ice rinks (volunteer led); their provision requires a municipal water connection, an element that is incorporated into all Community Parks and some Neighbourhood Parks.

The cost to construct artificial ice rinks is significant. Through the development of the Rotary Club Rink at Dundas Driving Park, the City has established a process by which it will consider their provision, a process that requires the bulk of the funding to come from community sources. While there is little doubt that artificial rinks would be successful in other areas of the City, municipal funding mechanisms make it very difficult for the City to play a major role in their provision. Partnerships such as the one at Dundas Driving Park will continue to be required in order for additional public outdoor artificial skating rinks to be developed.

In addition to financial support, appropriate support infrastructure must also be in place, including water service, parking, washrooms, change rooms, and a service building. For this reason, locating artificial rinks at parks sites with other civic buildings (such as arenas, which have much of the required equipment) is the preferred strategy.

Outdoor skating rinks are provided in all Hamilton communities with the exception of Glanbrook, much of which is rural and does not have municipal water service (a requirement for outdoor rinks). Hamilton Mountain has the largest number of outdoor rinks (25), followed by Lower Hamilton (16). The best provision levels relative to population can be found in Ancaster and Beverly.

Outdoor Rink Supplies by Community

	Current Number of Outdoor Rink Locations	Current Per Capita Provision Ratio (total population)
ANC	6	1:5,274
BEV	4	1:4,575
FLA	1	1:23,492
GLA	0	0:14,961
HM	25	1:6,062
LH	16	1:8,595
LSC	4	1:19,712
USC	1	1:22,165
WHD*	3	1:14,041
Total	60	1:8,677

* All outdoor rinks are natural/variable and operated by volunteers, with the exception of the artificial outdoor rink in Dundas Driving Park (WHD).

Recommendations – Outdoor Ice Rinks

- When developing and redeveloping Neighbourhood and Community Parks that are within outdoor rink gap areas and/or growth communities (i.e., approximately 1-kilometre from the nearest 'rink-ready' park'; urban residential areas only), install water service in order to allow for the establishment of volunteer-led natural outdoor ice rinks (note: park must be within a serviced urban area). Community partnerships for the operation of outdoor natural ice rinks should be encouraged.
- Encourage partnerships and community funding for the development of artificial outdoor ice rinks in additional locations across the City.

15.5 Outdoor Running Tracks

There are five outdoor running tracks within municipal parks, including 3 in Hamilton Mountain (Bobby Kerr Park, Mohawk Sports Park, and Sackville Hill Memorial Park) and 2 in Lower Hamilton (HAAA Grounds and JC Beemer Park). The type of construction, quality of the tracks, and the way in which they are used vary considerably. For example:

- The track at Mohawk Sports Park is the City's only municipal all-weather track and field venue. This facility is a City-wide track and access is restricted to permit holders only, but despite being a newer surface is already seeing significant signs of wear.
- The asphalt track at Bobby Kerr Park is also well used, is not fenced, and is open to the general public.
- Conversely, the track at Sackville Hill Memorial Park is fenced, but surfaced with gravel and is overgrown with weeds;
- The asphalt track at JC Beemer Park is smaller than regulation and serves as more of a walking loop.
- The track at the HAAA Grounds is more square than oval (but was very well used as witnessed through the observation project).

Several other outdoor running tracks are located on school grounds and non-municipal sites (e.g., McMaster University recently developed a City level track and field facility, although community access is limited; Dofasco Sports Park has an asphalt track).

Running tracks are typically oval and have several lanes in which to run. In this regard, they serve several purposes: they may provide City-wide venues for running and athletic training and they may also accommodate special events and track and field meets for local students and out-of-town competitors. Due to interscholastic athletics programs, there will also be a strong link between tracks and high schools. City-wide and regional events are more likely to use higher quality venues than those that are typically provided at the secondary school level (e.g., McMaster University and Mohawk Sports Park). Due to a Province-wide traditional reliance on school track facilities, inventory data for benchmarking against other municipalities is not easily accessible.

Running tracks can also provide safe running/walking opportunities for residents of all ages, as can pathways within parks. Asphalt pathways can often be a cheaper alternative to running track construction if the intent is simply to provide a venue for local joggers and walkers. Although tracks allow users to more easily measure the distance they have walked or jogged, adding signage or distance markers to trails or other routes can accomplish a similar outcome.

Indoor running/walking tracks are the most popular due to their ability to accommodate year-round access, as noted in Hamilton's Indoor Recreation Study. Should community and competitive demands warrant, the City may consider developing an indoor track in a future indoor recreation facility.

Participation in track activities is generally steady across the Province, with the bulk of its popularity emerging at the high school and post-secondary levels. Most municipalities tend to have one central track location that hosts local and regional competitions (many of which are school-based) and that can be used for more elite training. Hamilton has such a facility at the Mohawk Sports Park, which is a rentable facility. This track is generally centrally located within

the broader City, although users in Lower Hamilton may face the greatest access challenges due to transportation barriers.

In 2008, the Mohawk Sports Park track was rented for just over 800 hours, with approximately 50% of this being for the Hamilton Olympic Club and 50% for local schools. This is an average of 31 hours a week over a span of 6 months (this represents an average of approximately 16 hours per week for the Olympic Club, which would include both training and meets). Although improvements are needed at Mohawk Sports Park, no evidence was presented in the course of this Study to suggest that Hamilton requires a second City-wide track facility.

No additional municipally-owned City-wide competition-quality tracks or community-level tracks are recommended. Municipal participation in joint projects with local schools and post-secondary institutions for the development of new community-level outdoor running track facilities may be considered and evaluated on a case-by-case basis, particularly in urban areas without proper community access to alternate facilities. Community-level running tracks would offer considerable public access and could also be used for local competitions.

There was moderate public support for additional spending on outdoor running tracks and improvements may be required to some existing tracks, particularly the track at Mohawk Sports Park. Continued investment in park pathways and trails is also critical to providing sufficient infrastructure to serve the unorganized walking, running, and cycling needs of Hamilton residents.

Recommendations – Outdoor Running Tracks

- No additional fully funded municipally-owned tracks are recommended at this time. Municipal participation in joint projects with local schools and post-secondary institutions for the development of new community-level outdoor running track facilities may be considered and evaluated on a case-by-case basis.
- Maintain the Mohawk Sports Park outdoor running track as a City-wide facility, appropriate for community training and competitions. Achieving this objective may require the initiation of a regular maintenance program.

15.6 Community Garden Plots

A community garden is a piece of land that is planted and gardened by a group of community members. While not a new feature in most communities, more and more municipalities are allocating space in parks for garden plots. These gardens encourage social interaction, horticultural education and awareness of the benefits of healthy diets, while they can also create enhanced safety due to the presence of gardeners during the early morning and evening hours. Community gardens can be administered by a municipality, a local organization or an interested group of citizens and may include flowers, fruit, vegetables and/or herbs.

There are 3 municipal community gardens in the City (Olympic Park – WHD, Churchill Park – WHD, and Victoria Park – LH, with the latter being developed in 2010) and 7 non-municipal (non-profit) public community gardens (Green Venture, North Hamilton Community Health Center (NHCHC) Keith Neighbourhood Garden, Today's Family Community Garden, Athens Street Community Garden, NHCHC Paradise Community Garden, Jamesville Community

Gardeners, and West Highland Baptist Church Victory Garden & Plots) – 3 in LH, 3 in HM, and 1 in LSC.

The City of Hamilton's Public Works Department administers the City's Community Gardens Program. The garden plots are available at low cost and gardeners are expected to maintain and harvest their areas. No pesticides are permitted and gardeners are responsible for cleaning their plot at the end of the season. Some sites have a water supply which allows for early morning irrigation.

In Hamilton, like most communities, the collection of community gardens is loosely organized, with not only the City offering garden plots, but also non-profit groups and potentially some churches, apartment complexes, and other landholders. This makes benchmarking against supplies in other communities difficult.

The Hamilton Community Garden Network is a recently formed coalition of interested people (including representatives from the City), coming from a variety of organizations, most of whom are directly involved in community gardening. The group has the following mandate (source: <http://www.naturallyhamilton.ca>):

- To work collaboratively to support and promote individuals and communities in developing and maintaining community gardens in Hamilton from the perspective of improving food security and increasing community involvement.
- To maintain a Network of potential and current community gardens.
- To advocate for the development, and long term security of community gardens.
- To evaluate the process of the Network.
- To assist in ongoing research in the area of community gardens.

Community gardens are needed most in areas with vulnerable populations (e.g., low income) and high residential densities (i.e., areas that are least likely to have access to backyard gardens), primarily Lower Hamilton, Lower Stoney Creek, West Hamilton/Dundas, and areas within Hamilton Mountain. Community gardens also fit well with the aging population forecasted for Hamilton, as older residents may be more inclined to participate in such activities.

Gardening is one of the most popular forms of leisure activity in Canada and interest in urban agriculture is on the rise as the population becomes older, the demand for home-grown produce increases, the number and size of personal backyards shrink, and as the financial climate worsens.¹⁷ Furthermore, as local interest in food security and poverty reduction strategies expand, demand for community gardens is increasing. Through the household survey, 43% support additional spending on community garden plots, ranking them 10th out of 26 facility types.

The Hamilton Community Garden Network has suggested that the City adopt a more pro-active policy by agreeing to ensure that each ward has a community garden. The Network also encourages local groups to advocate for community gardens to be installed each time a park is redeveloped.

¹⁷ Pedro, K. (2009). Community Gardens Making Enthusiastic Comeback. London Free Press, April 13, 2009.

During the writing of this report (April 2010), the City approved a “*Community Gardens Policy and Procedures*” report respecting:

- criteria for establishing new community gardens,
- garden plot allocation policies,
- a budget for establishing new community gardens, and
- the provision of appropriate funding for existing community gardens.

The City has recommended that partnerships be sought with community organizations to take over the operation of the three existing municipal community garden sites in 2011, with the intention of establishing five new sites every year (the City would be responsible for the initial capital contribution, with the community organizations taking on all operational costs). This approach is supported by the research that suggests that community gardens are best established and managed in conjunction with local resident support. The more connected the garden is to a community organization, the more likely it is to succeed.

Recommendations – Community Garden Plots

- The City should continue to implement its Community Gardens Policy and Procedures, which outlines partnership opportunities between the City and local organizations in the establishment and management of community garden plots. Future community garden provision should be established based on community interest and capacity.

15.7 Special Event Areas

Countless outdoor community events, festivals, and fairs are held each year in the City, many of which use municipal parks. The size and scope of these events ranges dramatically, from sports group fundraisers to events scheduled around holidays (e.g., Canada Day) to occasional series (e.g., Concerts in the Park) to multi-day events that draw not only locals but also tourists (e.g., Winona Peach Fest, Ancaster Fair, Binbrook Fair, etc.). Most communities within Hamilton host their own unique special events, leading to the requirement for an appropriate special event site in each geographic community.

While the City has some parks that are well suited to accommodating events on a frequent basis (e.g., Gage Park, Bayfront Park, etc.), several sports parks are also used for events due to their large land base. These events have neighbourhood impacts and can displace regular park users for a period of time and occasionally cause damage to sports fields due to the amount of foot or car traffic that is brought about by the event (wet weather conditions can often exacerbate this problem). Additionally, large events also require appropriate services and infrastructure in order to accommodate them year after year, including washrooms, pavilions, electrical services, parking, etc. Not all sports parks (or even those that are currently hosting large events) are designed to do so, and many are over-utilized. Winona Park and Bayfront Park were mentioned during the public consultation program as being sites that require upgrades (the 2010 West Harbour Waterfront Recreation Master Plan also recommends several upgrades for Bayfront Park).

With a population that is aging and becoming more multi-cultural at the same time, the demand for community events is on the rise. From the household survey, 68% of Hamilton’s households support additional spending on picnic areas, ranking them 5th out of 26 facility types; it would not be surprising to see residents place a similar priority on special event venues.

Recommendations – Special Event Areas

- Identify at least one existing site (e.g., park, agricultural fairgrounds) in each community (there are a total of nine ‘communities’ defined in this Study) that is appropriate for hosting large community-based special events (e.g., fairs and festivals). Work with local organizations to ensure that appropriate infrastructure and services are in place within these Community and City-wide Parks; funding commitments and partnership agreements with local groups will be required to undertake these improvements if on municipal lands.

15.8 Pathways in Parks

Note: Trails outside of parks are not within the scope of this Study. For the planning and prioritization of off-road trails in open space corridors, the City has developed a Trails Master Plan. Efforts are also underway to update the “Shifting Gears” document for commuter cycling, to complement the Trails Master Plan document.

Most City parks – and particularly the larger ones – contain internal pathways that connect sidewalks, parking lots, and activity areas. Pathways provide better access to park amenities for all residents – including people with disabilities – as they link sidewalks and parking lots with playgrounds, sports fields, and other amenities within parks. In fact, the City’s design standards for new park construction require 3 metre wide asphalt walkways.

In addition, some pathways also serve as a primary activity feature for people who come to parks to walk, cycle, or jog. The larger parks that offer longer pathways are better for this activity, including those with pathways around natural features or open space areas (e.g., T.B. McQuesten Park, Courtcliffe Park, etc.).

Walking and cycling are two of the most popular leisure activities in Hamilton and participation is expected to increase with an aging population. The household survey found that 73% of Hamilton’s households support additional spending on trails in parks, ranking them 2nd out of 26 facility types. Furthermore, the observation project found that, on average, the City’s open space and pathways systems were in use 77% of the time, a higher rating than most other amenities. Pathways bring people into parks at all times of the day and in all seasons; they promote active living and can be used by people of all ages and backgrounds.

Pathways in parks (including looped trails) are well used amenities that are very much in demand; however, this type of feature was seldom designed into the City’s older parks. Opportunities to accommodate more within the City’s parks system infrastructure that supports walking and biking should be supported. Hard-surface pathways are preferred as they are easier to maintain and accessible to all users.

Recommendations – Pathways in Parks

- In designing new and redeveloped parks, consideration should be given to opportunities to establish looped hard-surface pathways for residents of all ages and backgrounds, as well as providing continuous connectivity throughout the neighbourhood, where possible.

See also recommendations under Section 19: Design and Accessibility.

SECTION 16 SUPPORT BUILDINGS

Note: Rental pavilions and shelters are outside the scope of this Study.

Depending on the park type, intensity of use, and permitted activities, parks may contain a wide variety of support buildings, including washrooms, concessions, storage rooms, office and club space, change rooms, and park maintenance buildings. Often, many of these uses are combined in one building, often referred to as a fieldhouse. Fieldhouses are more common in older parks, particularly those containing club activities such as bocce, lawn bowling, or tennis. Portable toilets are also frequently used, particularly where there is insufficient (or consistent) demand for permanent washrooms.

Of the approximately 300 parks that are part of this Study, nearly 100 parks contain approximately 235 ancillary buildings of varying types and sizes. Most buildings are maintained by the Recreation Department, while some are maintained by Parks under Public Works. This can create confusion both with the public and internally; coordination between the two departments could be improved in this regard.

Ancillary buildings are permitted in Neighbourhood, Community and City-wide Parks, although zoning restrictions may limit their size. Ancillary buildings are, however, less common in Neighbourhood Parks because these sites do not invite the same level and intensity of use as do larger parks.

The City has a partial inventory of park buildings and – through the Recreation Division of the Community Services Department – is currently working to identify all buildings and their condition. Many buildings are older and will be very costly to retrofit in order to make them accessible to people with disabilities. Some buildings have been taken over by local user groups, although most washrooms remain open to the public (during park hours). Maintenance to these buildings is generally undertaken on an as-needed basis.

From the consultation program, it is clear that – although these support buildings are ancillary features to primary attractions such as sports fields and spray pads – they are highly important to the success of a park and have a large impact on a person's willingness to use one park over another. From the user group survey, the sport field amenities that collectively received the poorest ratings were: (1) seating for players; (2) change facilities; (3) storage; (4) concessions; and (5) washroom facilities. Park washrooms received adequate satisfaction ratings from the household survey, but these ratings were considerably lower than those given to other facilities and amenities, such as playgrounds, sports fields, splash pads, courts, etc. 72% support additional spending on park washrooms, ranking them 4th out of 26 facility types.

Given the intensity of use (high) and the type of user they attract (children and older adults), municipally-owned parks with major spray pads, three or more sport fields, artificial ice rinks, and/or club activities (i.e., bocce, lawn bowling, tennis) should all generally have permanent washrooms. Existing parks containing these features that do not have permanent washroom facilities should be evaluated to determine park-specific needs and/or options for washroom provision (or sport facility relocation, should the assessment not find the need for washroom facilities). As a first priority, it is recommended that washrooms be constructed at Turner Park (note: this project is currently underway) and to serve the ball diamond cluster and adjacent soccer fields at the north end of Mohawk Sports Park.

In terms of fieldhouses and club buildings, the stock is aging and City staff do not currently have the budget to properly look after them, let alone add any more to the system. Many of the buildings are old, under-utilized and beyond repair. Once a proper evaluation of these buildings is complete, strong consideration should be given to removing selected buildings (i.e., those that require significant capital upgrades and are under-utilized) and undertaking strategic renewal of other buildings (i.e., those in high use locations). Development or redevelopment of ancillary buildings should only be undertaken when there is a clear public benefit and multiple clubhouses should not be developed in any one park (a shared-use model is recommended). Municipal investment in ancillary buildings that are dedicated to one specific group should only be considered in cases where the need is justified and the group contributes financially, to the satisfaction of the City; said buildings must remain under municipal control (they are public assets, not private clubs).

Recommended Directions

- A full inventory of ancillary buildings, parking, and lighting within parks should be completed, including an audit of their condition, capital improvement requirements, and accessibility upgrades for people with disabilities.
- Develop a strategy, in consultation with key user groups, for the renewal, development and disposition of fieldhouses / clubhouses, giving consideration to long-term capital requirements, operating costs, rental rates, usage levels, and partnership (cost-sharing) potential. In future Community Parks, multiple clubhouses (where required) should not be developed, rather a shared-use model is recommended.
- Existing municipally-owned Community and City-wide Parks without permanent washroom facilities should be evaluated to determine the need and/or options for washroom provision. Not all parks with these features will require permanent washrooms, and the relocation of the recreation facilities to other parks with washrooms may be an option. Washrooms are not recommended for Neighbourhood Parks.
- Municipal investment in ancillary buildings on school or leased land is not recommended unless a long-term lease agreement can be secured.
- As a short-term priority, it is recommended that washrooms be constructed at Turner Park (note: this project is currently underway) and to serve the ball diamond cluster and adjacent soccer fields at the north end of Mohawk Sports Park.
- In designing new and redeveloped parks, consideration should be given to installing benches and shade structures to promote greater usage by residents of all ages.

See also recommendations under Section 19: Design and Accessibility.

SECTION 17 INDOOR SPORTS FACILITIES

Note: Although the focus of this report is on outdoor recreation facilities, due to the strong linkage between Indoor Sports Facilities and outdoor sports fields, they have been included in the scope of this Study. The City's Indoor Facility Study (2008) did not contain reference to Indoor Sports (Turf) Facilities.

This section contains an assessment of City-wide and community-specific indoor sports facility needs, consistent with the methodology established in Section 7. Key data relevant to this assessment is also provided.

17.1 Indoor Soccer / Turf Sports

a) Supply

The City of Hamilton does not currently provide any indoor facilities for turf sports (e.g., soccer, football, baseball, track and field training, etc.), although some gymnasiums are occasionally used for these purposes. Five different private sector providers currently offer purpose-built indoor turf facilities to Hamilton and area residents:

- SoccerWorld (Lower Hamilton) – 44,000 square foot air-supported dome with separate areas for soccer/sports and golf; approximate field dimensions are 180 feet by 100 feet;
- Wentworth Arenas (Ancaster) – permanent steel building containing one indoor soccer/sports field and two indoor ice rinks; approximate field dimensions are 185 feet by 85 feet; and
- Mountain Sports Complex (Hamilton Mountain) – air-supported dome; approximate field dimensions are 150 feet by 80 feet.
- Players Paradise Sports (Lower Stoney Creek) – recently opened permanent steel full field indoor facility; dimensions are 360 feet by 200 feet and field can be split into 4 smaller fields.
- Redeemer University College - two new turf fields with one bubbled for six months a year (available Summer 2010) with contracted prime time hours per week for “community use” (defined as City of Hamilton affiliated sports groups).
- Indoor sports facilities are also available in the adjacent communities of Burlington and Grimsby.

Although there is no standard required size for community-serving indoor soccer fields, most indoor fields are typically in the vicinity of 200 feet by 100 feet; however, some communities in Ontario are building full size indoor/outdoor fields that can be divided into three or more smaller fields to accommodate 5-a-side play.

b) Trends, Best Practices, and Benchmarking

The development of indoor turf facilities is an emerging, widespread trend across Canada; the following points provide a brief overview of some of the key drivers behind this:

- Soccer has overtaken hockey as the most popular youth sport in most communities, including Hamilton and indoor soccer is benefiting at the expense of hockey. This can be attributed to the gender neutrality of soccer, its affordability, its relevance to a wider range of ethno-cultural groups (including many immigrants), and increased exposure at all levels. The future outlook for indoor soccer participation remains positive, particularly with trends suggesting increased interest in adult soccer.
- The number one reason for not participating in sports activities is “lack of time”. Indoor facilities are not affected by the weather the way that outdoor fields are and, as such, allow people to participate when they have the time.
- Most indoor turf facilities generate strong cash flows and healthy profit margins, but can be challenged to maximize usage during the summer and daytime hours (rates are typically \$100 to \$150 per hour for youth groups during prime season; rates are generally higher for adult groups and non-residents).
- Numerous construction options and facility components are available for consideration. Air supported domes appear to be gaining more support in several communities, partially due to their lower initial capital costs (compared to a steel structure).
- In the past, many indoor sports facilities utilized carpet-like surfaces. With the recent introduction of “field turf” technology (which provides a more natural, grass-like surface), interest in indoor turf facilities has grown.

As the popularity of soccer has increased over the past decade, so too has the demand for additional outdoor fields which, in turn, has spurred demand for year-round indoor facilities. To maximize use of these indoor facilities, many are also made available for sports such as football, field and ball hockey, track and field training, and field lacrosse, much of which is marketed toward adults.

In Ontario, the development of indoor venues was historically initiated by non-profit soccer organizations and/or the private sector and focussed on industrial/warehouse locations where land and large buildings were prevalent. As the popularity of soccer continued to grow in the mid-1990s, many community organizations approached municipalities to request assistance with the development of indoor facilities. In some of these cases, the operation of the facilities is entirely funded by a non-profit third party (and is, therefore, self-sufficient), while the capital and land was a mixture of municipal and community funding.

Provincially, the number of indoor soccer players registered with the Ontario Soccer Association has increased by 141% between 1997/98 and 2006/07, while the Hamilton District Soccer Association has experienced an increase of 181% in registration over the same period. These numbers need to be interpreted carefully as – to a much lesser degree than outdoor soccer – participation in indoor soccer is affected by the availability (or lack) of appropriate facilities in which to play.

Hamilton District Soccer Association – Indoor Registrants

Year	Mini/Youth	Adult	Total	Change
1997/1998	302	179	481	--
1998/1999	389	32	421	-12%
1999/2000	534	15	549	30%
2000/2001	428	54	482	-12%
2001/2002	541	314	855	77%
2002/2003	643	666	1,309	53%
2003/2004	611	823	1,434	9%
2004/2005	509	949	1,458	2%
2005/2006	526	1,193	1,719	18%
2006/2007	475	878	1,353	-21%

Source: Ontario Soccer Association, 2008

c) Needs Assessment

Through the household survey, 31% of Hamilton households support additional spending on indoor sports (soccer) facilities, ranking them 17th out of 26 facility types. Greater support was received from potential user groups, with 75% of soccer organizations, 40% of ball groups, and all football, cricket and rugby groups indicated that they would use an indoor artificial turf multi-use facility, as did a local track and field organization.

Calculating demand for indoor sports facilities can be an imprecise exercise for a variety of reasons, most notably that there are no hard and fast provision standards that can be applied – communities provide them at dramatically different rates. There is no accepted per capita provision ratio that can be used to determine the number of indoor turf facilities that are required in the City.

Many municipalities that have chosen to forgo providing indoor field facilities, instead deciding to allow the private sector to fill this void. .

d) Provision Options

In the past, the City of Hamilton has received unsolicited proposals from proponents interested in working with the City to construct indoor soccer facilities and has even gone as far as issuing a call for “Expressions of Interest” to develop, construct and operate an indoor soccer facility; however, the decision to develop or operate of a City of Hamilton municipally-owned indoor turf facility was postponed until a thorough discussion of whether the City should offer these services in conjunction with the private sector could be addressed in the Outdoor Fields Study. Certainly, the significant capital implications of such a facility is one reason why this has not yet happened, as are concerns over competition with private sector operations.

Given that the City does not have a historic service level for municipally-provided indoor soccer facilities and given the City’s other high priority needs within its parks system – it is recommended at this time that the private sector continue to be relied upon to be the primary provider of indoor sports facilities in Hamilton.

Recommended Directions – Indoor Soccer/ Turf Sports

- Municipal development, administration, and/or operation of an indoor sports/soccer facility is not recommended at this time.

17.2 Indoor Tennis, Bocce, Lawn Bowling

There are two indoor tennis locations in the City of Hamilton. The Rosedale Tennis Club, situated in Gage Park (Lower Hamilton), covers 4 of its 8 tennis courts in the winter to permit year-round use. The Jewish Community Centre in Ancaster also provides three indoor tennis courts; this facility is not affiliated with the City of Hamilton.

Demand for these specialized indoor facilities is quite small. From the household survey, 22% of households support additional spending on indoor racquet / tennis facilities (ranking them 20th out of 26 facility types) and 11% support additional spending on indoor lawn bowling or bocce courts (ranking them 24th out of 26 facility types).

The Ancaster Tennis Club – which is moving forward with the redevelopment and expansion of tennis facilities in Village Green Park (reorienting the three existing courts and adding two more) – had considered the possibility of erecting an air-supported dome during the winter. Village Green Park is located in downtown Ancaster and is one of only a few parks offering green space in the area. This Study supports the need to redevelop the lawn bowling green in Village Green Park and also supports the expansion of ‘outdoor’ tennis opportunities at this site, both of which may be able to share the same support building. However, the installation of an air-supported dome cannot be supported at this location.

Should the Ancaster Tennis Club be interested in the establishment of an indoor/outdoor tennis complex and be willing to contribute appropriate funds to the project, the recommended alternative is to relocate the tennis courts to the Ancaster Community Centre Park. It is recognized that the addition of tennis courts and a dome at this site may result in the loss of an existing sports field; site design options are required to determine the proper placement of the courts at this location.

There are no indoor bocce or lawn bowling facilities in the City, although a covered (but not fully enclosed) bocce facility is located at Chedoke Arena. Membership levels in these sports are not sufficient to justify the development of an indoor facility for bocce and/or lawn bowling.

Recommended Directions – Indoor Tennis, Bocce, Lawn Bowling

- Direct municipal provision of indoor tennis, bocce, or lawn bowling facilities is not recommended, but could be considered in partnership with local community-based clubs. Proposals should be considered on a case-by-case basis, using a standardized evaluation framework.

SECTION 18 OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

In the City of Hamilton, the Environmental Services Division (Parks and Cemeteries Section) within the Public Works Department is primarily responsible for the following:

- operational, management, and stewardship services for municipal parks and many school grounds adjoining parks; and,
- services such as general park maintenance, turf management, horticulture, beautification, forestry services, irrigation and drainage, storm water control, etc.

To assist with the analysis of operational and maintenance matters, the Guelph Turfgrass Institute was contracted to undertake an evaluation of existing sport field management practices. The summary findings and recommendations of their review are contained in this section.

The quality and extent of field turf management – one of the Division’s most public visible functions – received mixed reviews from user groups; however, this is to be expected as many groups have an interest in seeing field quality maximized. Most importantly, the Sports Field Management Review (Guelph Turfgrass Institute, 2009; see Attachment IX) found that *“The fields, as a group, had the fewest weeds and the most turf cover of any group of municipal fields we have observed in Ontario. In general, quality of construction of the fields was poor and many of the fields were most likely compacted from the time of construction. Despite this observation, the fields were in very good condition for mid-June and were, as a group, some of the best quality municipal fields we have seen in Ontario.”*

Several challenges affecting the maintenance and operation of outdoor recreation facilities were identified in the Phase I Report and include:

- 1) **Non-permitted Use of Sports Fields:** The unauthorized use of fields in wet conditions and during rest and regeneration periods (including early and late in the year) can cause severe damage to fields – damage from which some cannot fully recover. Parks adjacent to schools are often problematic in this regard as they receive a great deal of use, much of which is not supervised or authorized. Damage from non-permitted activities (including car parking on fields) is also difficult to overcome.

Continued efforts to reduce non-permitted use, including greater coordination with school boards, is required.

- 2) **Sports Field Demand:** Pressures from user groups to book fields to the maximum extent possible (due to high levels of demand) and to extend the length of the playing season are creating immense maintenance challenges, leading to turf conditions that may not be sustainable. Ideally, field use would be restricted or limited to allow turf proper time to regenerate (or even entire fields taken out of rotation for a period of time) – due to the demand pressures that exist in Hamilton, neither of these scenarios are currently possible unless the City were to begin to deny rental requests.

The Sports Field Management Review (Guelph Turfgrass Institute, 2009; see Attachment IX) suggested that *“If fields are to be used as premier fields for weekend tournaments and special events, then the use of these fields during other times must be restricted.”*

Further, *“When a field has been identified as being in a condition of severe wear or damage, it should be taken out of play and provided with a rest period to allow staff to rehabilitate the field. Suspension of field scheduling may also be required to accommodate completion of required routine maintenance tasks...If overall improvement of field conditions is a goal, then it is essential that sufficient field inventory be maintained to allow fields to be removed from active use for rehabilitation and recovery.”*

- 3) **Maintenance Budget:** The annual parks maintenance operating budget is not tied to changes to the overall supply of fields or their usage levels. Ongoing fiscal restraints and unfunded inventory creep increases the underfunding of sports field maintenance programs lowering turf quality and facility capacity. Furthermore, there has been a long-standing shortfall in the budget that has restricted the City from maintaining sports field and outdoor recreation facility conditions at optimal levels. This has left the City scrambling to keep up – repairing turf here and there – but inevitably falling farther behind.
- 4) **Pesticide Ban:** The new Provincial pesticide ban, which took affect in April 2009, is creating changes in how fields are lined (i.e., ‘Round-up’ can no longer be used) and how parks are maintained (e.g., weed and pest management).

The Sports Field Management Review (Guelph Turfgrass Institute, 2009; see Attachment IX) noted that *“The lining of the fields is a new challenge under the provincial pesticide ban...Ideally lines should be painted regularly...Many municipalities have agreements with user groups putting them in charge of the marking of the fields.”*

- 5) **School Fields:** As noted in the City’s 2002 Culture and Recreation Master Plan “the condition of sport fields located on school property varies across the City. Some are scheduled and maintained by the City through agreements with former municipalities such as Stoney Creek and Flamborough. Few of the school fields in old Hamilton are used by the community because of their poor condition and minimal maintenance by school boards.” This statement holds true today.
- 6) **Coordination between Parks Operations & Maintenance and Recreation Services:** Environmental Services (Public Works Department) is responsible for maintaining sports fields and many park amenities, while Recreation Services (Community Services Department) is responsible for administration and booking sports fields, among other things. In order to provide efficient customer service to residents, regular and effective coordination between both Divisions is required; however, being in separate Departments with difference mandates and resources, this can often be difficult.
- 7) **Park Construction:** Although most municipal parks are designed by landscape architects, the actual park construction is overseen by personnel that do not have the same technical background. In some instances, this can lead to changes in construction materials or techniques that compromise the ultimate design and usability of outdoor recreation features. Furthermore, many older parks were not designed or constructed to modern specifications, which can lead to maintenance headaches and lower customer satisfaction.

Specifically, the Sports Field Management Review (Guelph Turfgrass Institute, 2009; see Attachment IX) found that *“Field construction was inconsistent across the sample of*

fields assessed...In general, fields were constructed without proper crowns...In some cases the fields appeared to have been compacted from the time of construction...One of the most noted issues related to field construction was the unevenness of the field underfoot.” Recommendations have been made to promote greater oversight by the Public Works Department during field construction, including the need to closely monitor capital projects so that they meet the City’s new field construction standards.

- 8) **Specific Maintenance Requests:** User groups indicated that different activities may have different maintenance requirements; cricket is a good example of this, as they require shorter turf (meaning that frequent grass cutting is desired). The City tries to accommodate these needs as best as possible; for example, special assistance is given to lawn bowling in some parks (which is offset by a financial contribution from the club) and premier sports fields receive preferred treatment over casual use fields.

Furthermore, some organizations maintain their own fields (e.g., Ancaster Youth Soccer Club, etc.). Although this may be more cost effective for the City, it this often leads to dedicated use of the facilities and a reduction in broader community access. These arrangements may be acceptable in some situations, but as a rule should be discouraged.

- 9) **Vandalism:** Vandalism and destruction of park amenities is commonplace in many City parks, both urban and rural. This not only puts pressure on maintenance budgets, but has also led the City to install more robust amenities (often at greater cost) and to reduce or eliminate the number of amenities available (e.g., many parks do not have any picnic tables or seating, lighting is limited, etc.).
- 10) **Grass Cutting Schedule:** The City’s grass cutting resources are well utilized. The biggest issue raised by user groups was more frequent grass cutting as the height is too long between rotations; some also felt that rain and wet conditions should not disrupt the City’s grass cutting schedule to the degree that it does

The Sports Field Management Review (Guelph Turfgrass Institute, 2009; see Attachment IX) found that *“The current mowing schedule of every seven working days (nine calendar days) is sufficient for most of the fields. On higher profile fields, increased mowing frequency may be desirable to maintain better playing conditions with increased nitrogen fertility (see fertilizer recommendations).”*

Recommended Directions – Operations & Maintenance

- Implement the recommendations of the Sport Field Management Review (Attachment IX to this report), completed by the Guelph Turfgrass Institute (2009), which are as follows:
 - Use new field construction standards for various classes of fields and closely monitor new field construction projects to insure standards are being met.
 - Conduct independent testing of construction materials and insure approval of sod used for new fields as well as field rehabilitation.
 - Enforce restrictions on use of new fields prior to proper establishment.
 - Improve field scheduling, user group education and enforcement to reduce excessive use of high profile fields. More evenly distribute field use across the system.

- Classify high use fields to determine drainage characteristics as part of the development of an enhanced field closure policy.
 - Install properly designed subsurface drainage systems on higher use fields to improve drainage and minimize period that fields are subject to increased wear damage after rainfall events.
 - Develop a sufficient sports field inventory to permit rest and rehabilitation periods to be incorporated into field scheduling.
 - Remove old sod or thatch prior to any resodding of fields.
 - Increase availability of back-up equipment to reduce instances of fields been left unmown for excessive periods of time.
 - Increase mowing frequency on premier fields.
 - Increase nitrogen application rates on higher use and sand based fields.
 - Reduce the amount of phosphorus applied from a 1:2 to a 1:5 phosphorus to nitrogen ratio.
 - Reduce the amount potassium applied (1:2 potassium to nitrogen ratio).
 - Investigate the use of alternative, higher quality slow release nitrogen sources.
 - Provide proper calibration, operator training and back-up equipment to insure proper application of fertilizer.
 - Provide staff training, regular system inspections and audits of irrigation systems to insure effective use.
 - Increase frequency and rate of overseeding to combat weed infestation throughout the season on heavily used fields.
 - Refrain from using fertilizer to burn field lines – investigate alternative lining methods.
 - Inspect and repair or replace any deteriorating goal standards.
 - Insure all tractors used on turf areas are properly equipped with turf tires.
- Ensure that operating (maintenance) budgets are increased annually to reflect new additions to the sports field inventory and recommended changes for improved field management practices (e.g., more aeration, topdressing, overseeding, and fertilization as a result of the pesticide ban, implementation of goal mouth sodding program, etc.).
 - Consideration should be given to increasing the annual lifecycle renewal fund within the municipal budget for the repair and/or replacement of existing outdoor recreation assets.
 - To help mitigate the added costs associated with parks designed/built by developers (particularly those that contain elements that go beyond the City's typical standard of construction), establish agreements that require developers to contribute to a reserve fund for the long-term maintenance of these special park features.
 - Based on appropriate maintenance practices, firm dates should continue to be established for the start and finish of the playing season for outdoor grass rectangular sports fields (e.g., soccer, football, etc.). Early and late season utilization should be redirected to artificial turf fields.

SECTION 19 DESIGN AND ACCESSIBILITY

Many considerations for the design or redesign of outdoor recreation amenities – including considerations of accessibility for persons with disabilities – have been presented in previous sections of this report. This section serves as a ‘catch-all’ for related topics that did not properly fit within other areas of this report.

a) *Design*

As noted in the Phase I Report, In May 2009, a number of observations were made when touring the City’s parks, including the following that relate specifically to park design. Some of these topics have been discussed and addressed in previous sections of this report.

- 1) **Valued Park System:** In comparison to parks systems in other communities, City of Hamilton’s overall parks system would generally appear to be well designed, well maintained, and well used. Having recently prepared a Parks and Open Space Development Manual that provides guidelines for the park design and development process, the City of Hamilton is proactively seeking to improve upon the quality of its parks.
- 2) **Need for Community Parks:** Insufficient funds in parkland reserves, along with competing higher priority capital projects from other areas and the lack of a guiding document, has delayed many park improvements. An underfunded parkland acquisition reserve also makes it difficult for the City to establish new Community Parks, which are not easily gained through the development process.
- 3) **Isolated Park Locations:** Many of the City’s sports parks are located in out-of-the-way places as they require large land bases that cannot always be planned (or affordably acquired) in the centre of a community. Some of these parks have also been built on former landfill sites (e.g., Kay Drage Park, Heritage Green Sports Park, Jerseyville Park) or adjacent to less than desired land uses such as water or sewage treatment plants (e.g., Globe Park). These isolated parks do not provide visible or accessible locations, which can lead to increased vandalism and reduced usage (as cars are generally needed to access them). However, these sites can easily support more intense levels of activity (large sites suitable for multi-field installations are relatively rare in Hamilton), since they typically have little conflict with adjacent residential property. As such, they can also support illuminated facilities, which can help extend usage.
- 4) **Challenges with Older Parks:** With some parks being redeveloped or expanded over time in response to changes in recreational demand, some of the older sports parks were not “master planned”. This has led to parks that contain patchwork pieces that do not always relate well to each other, either in terms of physical linkages, availability of support amenities, or type of use. Further, this reactive approach has created several instances where soccer fields or ball diamonds have been “squeezed” into spaces, resulting in fields that are too small to be used by anything other than the youngest participants (despite growing demand for adult sport opportunities), or fields that are overlapping. There are very few “regulation-size” soccer fields in Hamilton as a result.

Furthermore, many of the City's older parks are not appropriately sized or located to accommodate the changing needs of residents; the high cost of land acquisition in denser urban areas is a major barrier to addressing these needs and greater population intensification has the potential to exacerbate this problem.

- 5) **Under-utilized Facilities:** As with any parks system, some amenities are better used than others, and usage can vary significantly from area to area and park to park. Seldom utilized facilities could be converted to other uses or left unmanicured so as to free up maintenance resources that could be re-allocated to other locations or tasks.
- 6) **Physical Accessibility:** In terms of park accessibility, many of the parks visited contain useful features that are able to accommodate persons with disabilities, such as fully or partially accessible playgrounds, hard surface trails, cut curbs, paved parking lots, etc. To assist in meeting its objectives for physical accessibility, the City only accepts tableland for its active parks and also meets or exceeds CSA guidelines for playgrounds.

Two of the more common areas requiring improvement in several high use parks are washrooms and the need to provide paved pathways from parking lots and trails to playgrounds and sports fields (in some cases, where paved connections were missing, grading of the approach areas were either sloped or allowed for drainage swales); in most cases, design standards for new park construction require 3 metre wide asphalt walkways.

Of the parks that included playgrounds, many were visually accessible from the street. Those that were not were impaired by maintenance buildings and/or dense plantings that hid them further from view.

- 7) **Lack of Unique Features in Many Older Parks:** Many of Hamilton's parks are older than those in newer communities such as Burlington or Mississauga and this is evident in how some parks are laid out. Many parks contain very few unique features that would attract anyone other than someone who wants to play soccer or ball. As parks get redeveloped, however, the City is introducing a broader range of features and activity areas.

Some of the City's most desired parks are those that contain multiple uses that appeal to all ages (e.g., Gage Park, Dundas Driving Park, etc.) and they are memorable for their unique elements and the sense of place that this creates. Valued features that were not often seen in many of Hamilton's older parks include (but are not limited to):

- Multi-feature waterplay areas (many of the City's spray pads are small and simple, and do not include designs that would fully engage a child's imagination). In Hamilton, wading pools are slowly being phased out in favour of spray pads, which are logical candidates for insertion into older parks where space is limited.
- Naturalized areas (most sports parks contain many acres of manicured turf, but do not offer passive use naturalized lands as a way of breaking up the landscape, integrating and protecting the natural environment, and providing opportunities for the non-sport playing public to connect with nature); nature trails at Joe Sams Leisure Park, Courtcliffe Park, and Mohawk Sports Park are good examples of this.
- Picnic tables / sitting areas (although benches are provided along most pathways, there are very few picnic tables or large sitting areas in City parks due

to past experiences with vandalism; with an aging population, the provision of these types of amenities will become much more critical).

- Unique features that would engage the entire range of residents to visit parks, such as graffiti walls, chess boards, artificial ice rinks, kitchenettes, etc. Note: not all of these features are appropriate in all types of parks.
 - Access to shade, whether by trees, or man-made structures, provides relief from the heat of the sun, and allows visitors to linger and extend their stay. A grove of shade trees or a well-designed pavilion (or both), can demarcate space and add visual interest to park areas that would otherwise be open lawn. Tree retention and planting is a focus of the City's in many of its newer parks.
- 8) **Residential Conflicts:** Although many parks are built before adjacent residential construction takes place, changes or expansions to their use are often not proposed until years later, at which point landowners abutting the park may not support the changes for various reasons. Conflicts with adjacent residential areas can result in under-utilized parks (e.g., grassed open space areas large enough for a sports field, an unlit sports field in a Community Park that is a candidate for lighting, etc.), such as William Schwenger Park. Existing bylaws that restrict the range of uses within parks (e.g., Olympic Park) can also increase the challenges of finding sites for needed activities.
- 9) **Parks Adjacent to Schools:** Many of the City's parks are adjacent to schools and are well utilized by students during the school year. Some of these parks also serve as the school grounds or school sports fields (in addition to their availability for community use) and, as a result, receive very high levels of use. Parks adjacent to schools are more likely to have greater maintenance challenges (e.g., litter, vandalism, turf wear, etc.). Formal agreements between the City and local schools regarding field or park use are not in place.
- 10) **Park Connections:** With an increasing emphasis being placed on residential intensification, walkability, and alternative transportation, trail and sidewalk connections to parks will become more critical. Parks that are integrated into neighbourhoods or that are located along a significant natural feature (e.g., valley, creek, etc.) may already have appropriate trail linkages; however, the more isolated the park is, the more difficult it is to establish these connections. Walkable communities require easily accessible parks that are integrated with their surroundings, an objective that can create challenges for developing larger park templates with multiple playing fields. Recent changes to the *Planning Act* allow municipalities to require land dedication for transportation corridors (including trails) through new development proposals, over and above the required parkland dedication.
- 11) **Neighbourhood Park Sites:** Many neighbourhood parks have one sports field (traditionally a ball diamond) and are often under-sized. A lack of amenities and the absence of other fields (which are preferred for league operation) limit the usage of these fields and many appear to be under-utilized for organized play as they are unable to accommodate a full range of participants (they tend to be under-sized for older youth or adult play). This is not necessarily a drawback, however, as these parks provide excellent opportunities for informal play and increase local open space supplies. Community and City-wide Parks should remain the focus for major sports field provision in Hamilton, while Neighbourhood Parks should continue to provide opportunities that are appropriate at the local level.

- 12) **Parking:** Other high-use Community Park sites do not have the parking required to adequately sustain peak levels of park usage (e.g., Macassa Park, Churchill Park – all of these have multiple sports fields but rely on street parking).
- 13) **Amenity Standards:** Partly a result of municipal amalgamation, many City parks have inconsistent amenity standards. For example, the design of park benches, pathway lighting, garbage cans, etc. often varies from park to park. Not only does this provide for an inconsistent look, but it can be problematic when trying to repair or replace such amenities, as maintenance staff have to stock parts for all types of components. The City has recently established Design Guidelines that will provide consistent direction for new and redeveloped parks.
- 14) **External Directional Signage:** While most City parks contain consistent branded signage at their entrance, external directional signage (e.g., street signs that direct people to the park's location) – particularly important for guiding outside residents to tournament sites or for travel teams – does not appear to be in place at many high-use park locations. This is a matter that is beyond the scope of this Study as it would need to be considered by the Traffic Section of the Public Works Department.

The implications of these trends and observations can be most effectively addressed in the future programming and design of new parks within the developing areas of the City and – hopefully – through the redesign of key existing park sites within established areas.

Recommended Directions – Design

- Follow the City's Parks and Open Space Development Manual when developing and redeveloping sports fields and courts, so that the dimensions of new fields/courts and are consistent. The same follows for site infrastructure (e.g., benches, lighting, garbage cans), which require consistency to realize efficiencies in supply, repair, and replacement.
- The integration of full-size sports fields (i.e., fields that can accommodate adults) into new Neighbourhood Parks is discouraged as these facilities require large land bases that are not well suited for this park type. Furthermore, lit fields should not be permitted as they can cause conflicts with adjacent residential properties. As opportunities within Neighbourhood Parks arise, the City should seek to selectively release existing fields from the programmed inventory and return them to informal natural turf areas where residents can play casual sport activities.
- New sports fields and other built recreational infrastructure should not be permitted in floodplains or stormwater management ponds (e.g., Costco/Meadowlands Soccer Pitch).
- Phasing in of sports field lighting at Community Parks is not recommended. Where lighting is appropriate, it should be installed at the time that the fields are developed in order to mitigate future conflicts with adjacent properties that are developed afterward.
- In designing new and redeveloped parks, consideration should be given to opportunities to establish grassed areas for picnicking and informal free play as a way of serving the needs of an aging and more diverse population.

b) Accessibility

In all age groups, the percentage of Hamilton's population with disabilities is higher than both the provincial and national averages. More than 90,000 Hamiltonians have some type of health condition or problem that limits the kind or amount of activities they can do.

Provincial legislation regarding universal accessibility of all public services and facilities has taken effect and regulations are gradually being introduced (*Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act – AODA*). The AODA requires municipalities to develop, implement and enforce accessibility standards across all areas of life to ensure access for all.

'Universal accessibility' is more than having designated wheelchair parking spaces or a ramp for wheelchairs. It is about approaching the entire design from the perspective of ensuring independent use by anyone, regardless of ability.

This will have an effect not only on how future parks are designed, but also on retrofits to existing parks. Converting existing infrastructure will be the biggest challenge. For example, as mentioned in the Playground section of this report, the City has a playground replacement in place that is working to address matters of non-compliance, but more work needs to be done on both playgrounds and other park features, including washrooms and pathways. A cursory review of some of the City's major sports parks found that

- gravel surfaces exist in many playgrounds, which poses some accessibility challenges; some playgrounds are not linked with pathways, requiring the user to cross a grassed surface or other terrain; and some playground borders are missing curb cuts;
- although many playgrounds have accessible swings and features, there is a lack of community awareness about these; and
- many activity areas and ancillary buildings (e.g., washrooms) are not accessible by pathway or in their design.

In 2008, the City of Hamilton developed a *Parks and Open Space Development Manual* that identifies design standards for several facility types. Prior to this (in 2006), the City prepared *Barrier-Free Design Guidelines* that identify best practices for facility design. The following are some of the key suggestions related to outdoor recreation infrastructure from the *Barrier-Free Design Guidelines*:

- Where dressing facilities are provided, at least one male and one female (and a minimum of 50% of each) must be accessible.
- Park entrance gates, paths and walkways must be accessible to individuals using mobility aids.
- Park play equipment shall be designed to be used by children of varying abilities and disabilities, be on an accessible route and located on a firm, level, rapid-drying surface.
- Natural areas shall have accessible pathways, trails and footbridges where the surrounding environment permits.
- Playing field access turnstiles must be accessible for individuals with mobility aids.
- Playing fields must have level seating areas for players and spectators with disabilities.

- Outdoor ice rinks must have an accessible pedestrian route from any parking areas or bus routes, smooth hard surface at the entrance to the rink and a bench on an accessible pedestrian route.

The *Barrier-Free Design Guidelines* are an excellent step towards improving accessibility within the City's new parks and outdoor recreation areas. It is highly likely that many existing amenities are non-compliant with these guidelines; however, the extent of the matter is unknown as the City has not undertaken an accessibility audit of its parks. At the time that the AODA regulations for built infrastructure are released, an audit of municipal parks should be made a priority.

Through this proposed audit, options and priority projects should be established (with an emphasis on addressing safety issues first and foremost, followed by ensuring an equitable geographic distribution of accessible features). Priorities should also include the establishment of appropriate pathways linking parking lots and/or sidewalks to high-use amenities, and improvements to washroom buildings. Accessibility improvements should be phased in over time based on available resources. Greater financial support from other sources (e.g., senior government) will likely be required for the City to fully implement these provincially regulated standards.

Recommended Directions – Accessibility

- Continue to implement the City's 2006 *Barrier-Free Design Guidelines*.
- Establish an annual reserve fund allocated to accessibility improvements in City-wide and Community Parks. Priorities for capital funding from this reserve include:
 - the establishment of appropriate pathways linking parking lots and/or sidewalks to high-use sports fields, playgrounds, spray pads, courts, and public washrooms; and
 - improvements to existing washroom buildings to ensure that they are accessible to people with disabilities.
- At the time that the AODA regulations for built infrastructure are released, an audit of municipal park infrastructure (including, but not limited to washrooms) should be undertaken in order to identify capital improvement requirements and options. This audit should identify options and priority projects, along with funding requirements. Greater financial support from other sources (e.g., senior government) will likely be required for the City to fully implement the AODA regulations.

See also recommendations in Sections 13 (Playgrounds), 15 (Other Outdoor Recreation Amenities – Pathways in Parks), and 16 (Support Buildings).

SECTION 20 RECREATION ADMINISTRATION

This section addresses topics related to the administration of recreation services within the scope of this Study, including many areas of responsibility within the City's Recreation Division (Community Services Department), such as:

- the allocation and booking of sports fields, parks spaces, and pavilions;
- maintenance of park buildings that support sports field users;
- operation of outdoor aquatic facilities (e.g., wading pools);
- policy development and rental fee establishment (in conjunction with Public Works);
- operation of playlot programs;
- sport liaison services; and
- related communications.

Several challenges affecting the administration of outdoor recreation services were identified in the Phase I Report, including the following.

- 1) **Sports Field Booking:** A number of agencies are involved in the booking of public sports fields, including the City, school boards, volunteers, and organizations. Coordination between these various agencies is limited and, as such, there is no true measure of City-wide sports field usage or demand. This disjointed system also creates confusion for the public as to which agency books which field, and can also lead to under-utilization and the inconsistent application of rental fees. Lastly, this approach does not promote accountability as it allows for exclusive use of some fields, particularly for fields not booked by the City.

Of particular note, fields at HWDCSB (Catholic Board) schools – with the occasional exception – are not booked by the City. Many of these are heavily used by the Catholic Youth Organization for after-school recreational programming. The higher quality soccer/football fields at the Board's secondary schools (of which there are seven; one has lights and most are irrigated) are not well utilized during the summer months because there is no one on site to coordinate rentals or maintenance (rentals go through the principal, not a central booking service like at the Public School Board). Reciprocal use agreements with the School Boards for the use of outdoor facilities are not currently in place. There may be opportunities to explore greater usage of these resources, along with strategic enhancements (e.g., lighting, artificial turf) and improved maintenance in partnership with the Board.

- 2) **Sport Participation Data:** Although the City now has an Affiliation Policy that requires user groups to apply for preferred rates (based on factors such as youth membership, residency, etc.), the City does not collect registration data from sports groups that utilize its fields. This data would be invaluable to not only tracking demand over time, but could also be used to validate booking requests and field allocations.
- 3) **Non-permitted Use of Sports Fields:** Non-permitted use and over-booking of fields are both significant problems that impact sports field availability. At present, the City has no formal mechanism for monitoring actual field usage, making enforcement impossible. In some cases, rental fees are low enough that organizations block book time so as to keep other organizations from using a field; some degree of over-booking may be required, however, to make up for rained out games. Field rental rates should be

regularly reviewed to ensure that the fee structure accounts for an appropriate portion of the true cost to administer, operate, and maintain each type of field.

- 4) **Rain-out Policy:** As with the non-permitted use of sports fields, the City does not have a formal mechanism or the resources to enforce its rain-out policy. Further, penalties for the unauthorized use of fields appear to be lacking or, at the very least, seldom enforced.
- 5) **Lack of Sports Field Caps:** As mentioned earlier, at present the City does not restrict the total number of hours permitted on a sports field, nor does it generally restrict early and late season outdoor sporting events, which – due to their timing and intensity of use – are more likely to cause damage to fields.
- 6) **Partnerships:** Many user groups expressed a general willingness to assist the City with upgrading and/or maintaining certain sports fields or outdoor recreation facilities (some through financial support, but most through administrative/operational/volunteer support). By providing organizations with more responsibility over a facility's administration and operation, it was felt that greater stewardship of that facility would result, although caution needs to be taken to ensure that exclusivity to a public resource is not granted. Furthermore, due to reasons of liability, organizations should not be permitted to use mechanical equipment in the maintenance of municipal parks. Consistent treatment of all organizations is paramount, as is the establishment of appropriate formal agreements.
- 7) **Sport Tourism Pressures:** A portion of the City's outdoor recreation facility supply supports sport tourism through the hosting of events such as soccer and baseball tournaments. These events attract a large number of visitors to the City and, in turn, provide an economic benefit to local businesses. Tournaments also place a significant strain on sport field infrastructure due to the intensity of use and often temporarily displace local organizations. These factors lead to greater field usage and maintenance challenges that tend to result in impaired field quality. Although these sporting events are generally supported, the City must continue to ensure that they do not unduly restrict access by Hamilton residents and that they provide an appropriate financial contribution toward offsetting their direct costs.

Recommended Directions – Recreation Administration

- Employ procedures for monitoring usage and demand levels that can be used to confirm future need for new fields and improve field allocation and maximization. Regular monitoring, damage prevention, and timely repair work are required to provide safe, consistent, and good quality sports field conditions.
- Regularly review the effectiveness of the rain-out policy and seek improvements for its enforcement (e.g., strict penalties for repeat offenses) and communication with internal (City) and external (user groups) parties.
- Working collaboratively with Public Works, an educational program should be initiated to encourage a greater stewardship role for sports groups in relation to their use and maintenance of community assets. Any maintenance tasks conducted by persons other than City qualified parks staff should be limited to non-mechanical equipment.

- Through appropriate mechanisms and in collaboration with Public Works, involve user groups and stakeholders in policy and procedure changes that will affect them.
- Ensure that any organization that may be displaced by a potential sports field renovation or removal be first informed and provided the opportunity to comment to the City.
- Establish a system for monitoring and enforcing field use and restrictions to prevent unauthorized use (e.g., usage without approved permits and usage of fields prior to/following defined seasonal field usage dates which unduly damage fields) or “hoarding” of rentals to keep fields from being used by other groups or individuals (i.e., field time slots that are block booked but remain unused for reasons other than weather cancellations, playoff series completion, etc.). Options for monitoring non-permitted or weather-related usage could include random checks, partnering with by-law enforcement, volunteer monitoring (e.g., involving a consortium of sports organizations or peers), or similar methods or combinations therein. As part of this initiative establish appropriate penalties for organizations and individuals that contravene the field use policies including warnings, fines, and lost field allocation for the following season.
- In collaboration with community sports organizations, establish a Field Allocation Policy that establishes a fair, equitable, and transparent process for the amount of rental time that is granted to users of rectangular sports fields and ball diamonds. This policy will assist with the implementation of the sustainable usage caps noted in the accompanying recommendations. Allocations for each organization should be based on formulas involving standards of play that consider the total number of participants, their ages, the specific nature of the sport, competition levels, and time requirements per team/participant grouping. Allocation distribution should be reviewed on an annual basis and may be divided between practice/game/tournament time, prime/non-prime hours, and field type. The field allocation policy should also recognize that total rentable hours may fluctuate from year to year as they are based on a balance between participant requirements and the total amount of time available. The policy should allow opportunities for the expansion of both existing groups and the establishment of new user groups, as the usage caps allow. Residency requirements and priority for rentals should be linked with the City’s Affiliation Policy, which give top priority to local youth. (see Attachment IX for as comparison of field allocation standards used by other municipalities)
- In collaboration with Public Works, rental levels of rectangular sports fields should be capped at current allocation levels on an aggregate level in order to stem field quality degradation and protect against excessive damage, which can further erode field availability for future years. In 2008 Class A fields were permitted an average of 500 hours each, Class B fields 400 hours each, and Class C fields 275 hours each. These allocations should be used as an annual maximum in the current year (2010), with a reduction in usage (primarily for Class A and B fields) targeted for future years as new fields become available. Greater system-wide usage should not be permitted until the sum of new fields added to inventory allow for field quality to be maintained at a consistent level year after year, as determined by the City’s Public Works and Recreation Administration Divisions¹⁸. Implementation of this policy must be

¹⁸ At present, the City has indicated that this range would be an average of 280-320 hours annually for each Class A field and 300-350 hours annually for each Class B field. These figures may be subject to change based on further analysis.

accompanied by an Allocation Policy and a system for monitoring and enforcement (see recommendations above). Field use limits not related to required maintenance, off-season and night closure times are not applicable to artificial turf fields.

- Discourage the use of Class A and B soccer fields for practices in an effort to ensure optimal quality for games.
- As part of the Affiliation Policy process, diligently collect additional registration numbers, detailed participant lists, financial statements, and utilization data from sports groups that utilize municipal fields. This data will assist in tracking demand, validating rental requests and allocations, and implementing the proposed field allocation policy.
- Regularly review field rental rates to ensure that the fee structure accounts for an appropriate portion of the true cost to administer, operate, and maintain all fields. For enhanced amenities such as artificial turf fields, rental rates must be sustainable and capture the full cost of the enhanced level of service (both capital and operating). Variable pricing based on field class (quality), user age (e.g., youth, adult, senior) and skill level (e.g., recreational, competitive, professional), on site amenities, and field location is recommended. Implementation of this recommendation will require the development of a system that identifies true costs attributable to each facility type relative to administration, operations, and maintenance. Once a system for ongoing cost recovery is determined and implemented, regularly review rates on a yearly basis to ensure that they continue to match noted costs. (see Attachment IX for as comparison of field rental rates in other municipalities)
- Work with school boards to identify and implement solutions to reducing non-permitted use of sports fields in parks adjacent to schools.
- Work with school boards to ensure that critical community and school sports field needs are being met. This may include partnerships involving improvements to existing fields or new field development, changes to field maintenance practices, gaining access to unused fields (e.g., HWDCSB secondary schools), etc.
- As opportunities permit, phase out lower quality fields on school board lands from the City's booking system.
- Participation of community organizations and sport user groups in funding of enhanced or value-added amenities (i.e., those that are beyond basic park development standards and community requirements; e.g., scoreboards, plaques, clubhouses, special features, etc.) may be encouraged, with the understanding that the City's contribution may be limited (e.g., land only) and these amenities will belong to the City and are for public use, in keeping with City policies and applicable agreements. A formal policy for evaluating and responding to these types of partnership requests should be created. A formal policy to guide the implementation of partnerships and cost-sharing agreements between the City and community organizations should also be developed, along with standard agreement templates. (see Section 22 for more)

SECTION 21 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a summary of all recommendations within this Study. Recommendations are presented by facility type or service/function and are divided into three separate lists (in order):

- a) Administrative & Operational Recommendations
- b) City-Wide Facility Recommendations
- c) Community-Specific Facility Recommendations
 - a. Ancaster
 - b. Beverly
 - c. Flamborough
 - d. Glanbrook
 - e. Hamilton Mountain
 - f. Lower Hamilton
 - g. Lower Stoney Creek
 - h. Upper Stoney Creek
 - i. West Hamilton / Dundas

21.1 Administrative & Operational Recommendations

Operations & Maintenance

1. Implement the recommendations of the Sport Field Management Review (see Attachment IX to this report), completed by the Guelph Turfgrass Institute (2009), which are as follows:
 - Use new field construction standards for various classes of fields and closely monitor new field construction projects to insure standards are being met.
 - Conduct independent testing of construction materials and insure approval of sod used for new fields as well as field rehabilitation.
 - Enforce restrictions on use of new fields prior to proper establishment.
 - Improve field scheduling, user group education and enforcement to reduce excessive use of high profile fields. More evenly distribute field use across the system.
 - Classify high use fields to determine drainage characteristics as part of the development of an enhanced field closure policy.
 - Install properly designed subsurface drainage systems on higher use fields to improve drainage and minimize period that fields are subject to increased wear damage after rainfall events.
 - Develop a sufficient sports field inventory to permit rest and rehabilitation periods to be incorporated into field scheduling.
 - Remove old sod or thatch prior to any resodding of fields.
 - Increase availability of back-up equipment to reduce instances of fields been left unmown for excessive periods of time.

Operations & Maintenance
(continued)

- Increase mowing frequency on premier fields.
 - Increase nitrogen application rates on higher use and sand based fields.
 - Reduce the amount of phosphorus applied from a 1:2 to a 1:5 phosphorus to nitrogen ratio.
 - Reduce the amount potassium applied (1:2 potassium to nitrogen ratio).
 - Investigate the use of alternative, higher quality slow release nitrogen sources.
 - Provide proper calibration, operator training and back-up equipment to insure proper application of fertilizer.
 - Provide staff training, regular system inspections and audits of irrigation systems to insure effective use.
 - Increase frequency and rate of overseeding to combat weed infestation throughout the season on heavily used fields.
 - Refrain from using fertilizer to burn field lines – investigate alternative lining methods.
 - Inspect and repair or replace any deteriorating goal standards.
 - Insure all tractors used on turf areas are properly equipped with turf tires.
2. Ensure that operating (maintenance) budgets are increased annually to reflect new additions to the sports field inventory and recommended changes for improved field management practices (e.g., more aeration, topdressing, overseeding, and fertilization as a result of the pesticide ban, implementation of goal mouth sodding program, etc.).
 3. Consideration should be given to increasing the annual lifecycle renewal fund within the municipal budget for the repair and/or replacement of existing outdoor recreation assets.
 4. To help mitigate the added costs associated with parks designed/built by developers (particularly those that contain elements that go beyond the City's typical standard of construction), establish agreements that require developers to contribute to a reserve fund for the long-term maintenance of these special park features.
 5. Based on appropriate maintenance practices, firm dates should continue to be established for the start and finish of the playing season for outdoor grass rectangular sports fields (e.g., soccer, football, etc.). Early and late season utilization should be redirected to artificial turf fields.

Design

6. Follow the City's Parks and Open Space Development Manual when developing and redeveloping sports fields and courts, so that the dimensions of new fields/courts and are consistent. The same follows for site infrastructure (e.g., benches, lighting, garbage cans), which require consistency to realize efficiencies in supply, repair, and replacement.

Design
(continued)

7. The integration of full-size sports fields (i.e., fields that can accommodate adults) into new Neighbourhood Parks is discouraged as these facilities require large land bases that are not well suited for this park type. Furthermore, lit fields should not be permitted as they can cause conflicts with adjacent residential properties. As opportunities within Neighbourhood Parks arise, the City should seek to selectively release existing fields from the programmed inventory and return them to informal natural turf areas where residents can play casual sport activities.
8. New sports fields and other built recreational infrastructure should not be permitted in floodplains or stormwater management ponds (e.g., Costco/Meadowlands Soccer Pitch).
9. Phasing in of sports field lighting at Community Parks is not recommended. Where lighting is appropriate, it should be installed at the time that the fields are developed in order to mitigate future conflicts with adjacent properties that are developed afterward.
10. In designing new and redeveloped parks, consideration should be given to opportunities to establish grassed areas for picnicking and informal free play as a way of serving the needs of an aging and more diverse population.

Accessibility

11. Continue to implement the City's 2006 Barrier-Free Design Guidelines.
12. Establish an annual reserve fund allocated to accessibility improvements in City-wide and Community Parks. Priorities for capital funding from this reserve include:
 - o the establishment of appropriate pathways linking parking lots and/or sidewalks to high-use sports fields, playgrounds, spray pads, courts, and public washrooms; and
 - o improvements to existing washroom buildings to ensure that they are accessible to people with disabilities.
13. At the time that the AODA regulations for built infrastructure are released, an audit of municipal park infrastructure (including, but not limited to washrooms) should be undertaken in order to identify capital improvement requirements and options. This audit should identify options and priority projects, along with funding requirements. Greater financial support from other sources (e.g., senior government) will likely be required for the City to fully implement the AODA regulations.

**Recreation
Administration**

14. Employ procedures for monitoring usage and demand levels that can be used to confirm future need for new fields and improve field allocation and maximization. Regular monitoring, damage prevention, and timely repair work are required to provide safe, consistent, and good quality sports field conditions.
15. Regularly review the effectiveness of the rain-out policy and seek improvements for its enforcement (e.g., strict penalties for repeat offenses) and communication with internal (City) and external (user groups) parties.
16. Working collaboratively with Public Works, an educational program should be initiated to encourage a greater stewardship role for sports groups in relation to their use and maintenance of community assets. Any maintenance tasks conducted by persons other than City qualified parks staff should be limited to non-mechanical equipment.
17. Through appropriate mechanisms and in collaboration with Public Works, involve user groups and stakeholders in policy and procedure changes that will affect them.
18. Ensure that any organization that may be displaced by a potential sports field renovation or removal be first informed and provided the opportunity to comment to the City.
19. Establish a system for monitoring and enforcing field use and restrictions to prevent unauthorized use (e.g., usage without approved permits and usage of fields prior to/following defined seasonal field usage dates which unduly damage fields) or “hoarding” of rentals to keep fields from being used by other groups or individuals (i.e., field time slots that are block booked but remain unused for reasons other than weather cancellations, playoff series completion, etc.). Options for monitoring non-permitted or weather-related usage could include random checks, partnering with by-law enforcement, volunteer monitoring (e.g., involving a consortium of sports organizations or peers), or similar methods or combinations therein. As part of this initiative establish appropriate penalties for organizations and individuals that contravene the field use policies including warnings, fines, and lost field allocation for the following season.

**Recreation
Administration**
(continued)

20. In collaboration with community sports organizations, establish a Field Allocation Policy that establishes a fair, equitable, and transparent process for the amount of rental time that is granted to users of rectangular sports fields and ball diamonds. This policy will assist with the implementation of the sustainable usage caps noted in the accompanying recommendations. Allocations for each organization should be based on formulas involving standards of play that consider the total number of participants, their ages, the specific nature of the sport, competition levels, and time requirements per team/participant grouping. Allocation distribution should be reviewed on an annual basis and may be divided between practice/game/tournament time, prime/non-prime hours, and field type. The field allocation policy should also recognize that total rentable hours may fluctuate from year to year as they are based on a balance between participant requirements and the total amount of time available. The policy should allow opportunities for the expansion of both existing groups and the establishment of new user groups, as the usage caps allow. Residency requirements and priority for rentals should be linked with the City's Affiliation Policy, which give top priority to local youth.
21. In collaboration with Public Works, rental levels of rectangular sports fields should be capped at current allocation levels on an aggregate level in order to stem field quality degradation and protect against excessive damage, which can further erode field availability for future years. In 2008 Class A fields were permitted an average of 500 hours each, Class B fields 400 hours each, and Class C fields 275 hours each. These allocations should be used as an annual maximum in the current year (2010), with a reduction in usage (primarily for Class A and B fields) targeted for future years as new fields become available. Greater system-wide usage should not be permitted until the sum of new fields added to inventory allow for field quality to be maintained at a consistent level year after year, as determined by the City's Public Works and Recreation Administration Divisions¹⁹. Implementation of this policy must be accompanied by an Allocation Policy and a system for monitoring and enforcement (see recommendations above). Field use limits not related to required maintenance, off-season and night closure times are not applicable to artificial turf fields.
22. Discourage the use of Class A and B soccer fields for practices in an effort to ensure optimal quality for games.
23. As part of the Affiliation Policy process, diligently collect additional registration numbers, detailed participant lists, financial statements, and utilization data from sports groups that utilize municipal fields. This data will assist in tracking demand, validating rental requests and allocations, and implementing the proposed field allocation policy.

¹⁹ At present, the City has indicated that this range would be an average of 280-320 hours annually for each Class A field and 300-350 hours annually for each Class B field. These figures may be subject to change based on further analysis.

**Recreation
Administration**
(continued)

24. Regularly review field rental rates to ensure that the fee structure accounts for an appropriate portion of the true cost to administer, operate, and maintain all fields. For enhanced amenities such as artificial turf fields, rental rates must be sustainable and capture the full cost of the enhanced level of service (both capital and operating). Variable pricing based on field class (quality), user age (e.g., youth, adult, senior) and skill level (e.g., recreational, competitive, professional), on site amenities, and field location is recommended. Implementation of this recommendation will require the development of a system that identifies true costs attributable to each facility type relative to administration, operations, and maintenance. Once a system for ongoing cost recovery is determined and implemented, regularly review rates on a yearly basis to ensure that they continue to match noted costs.
25. Work with school boards to identify and implement solutions to reducing non-permitted use of sports fields in parks adjacent to schools.
26. Work with school boards to ensure that critical community and school sports field needs are being met. This may include partnerships involving improvements to existing fields or new field development, changes to field maintenance practices, gaining access to unused fields (e.g., HWDCSB secondary schools), etc.
27. As opportunities permit, phase out lower quality fields on school board lands from the City's booking system.
28. Participation of community organizations and sport user groups in funding of enhanced or value-added amenities (i.e., those that are beyond basic park development standards and community requirements; e.g., scoreboards, plaques, clubhouses, special features, etc.) may be encouraged, with the understanding that the City's contribution may be limited (e.g., land only) and these amenities will belong to the City and are for public use, in keeping with City policies and applicable agreements. A formal policy for evaluating and responding to these types of partnership requests should be created. A formal policy to guide the implementation of partnerships and cost-sharing agreements between the City and community organizations should also be developed, along with standard agreement templates.

21.2 City-Wide Facility Recommendations

Soccer Fields

29. Install lights, irrigation, sub-drainage, and perimeter fencing on full-size soccer fields at Community Parks, where possible, with a goal of improving a minimum of one field per year. Proper designs (e.g., fields with appropriate amenities, soil conditions, parking, and buffering from adjacent properties) allow the City to meet the needs of a wide range of users and conduct proper maintenance (particularly given the pesticide ban). Each lit field is generally equivalent to 1.5 unlit fields. Possibilities for lighting should be studied further, with an emphasis placed on Class B fields that are currently unlit.
30. Undertake site-specific improvements to improve playability of existing soccer fields (tbd).
31. The degree to which existing school sites are used by the community for organized field sports (e.g., soccer, football, baseball) – along with the ability to adequately accommodate these uses at municipal sites – should be considered when the City is evaluating the acquisition of those sites deemed surplus by the school boards.
32. Convert under-utilized ball diamonds to full-size soccer fields, as required and in consultation with local community groups. These options are discussed in more detail under the Ball Diamond recommendations of this report.

Football / Rugby / Other Field Sports

33. Discourage the use of the same natural grass fields by both soccer and tackle football/rugby in order to reduce the negative impact on turf quality and scheduling conflicts. Some shared use may be permitted where impacts can be sufficiently mitigated (evaluated on a case-by-case basis). Tackle football and rugby rentals should be encouraged on multi-use artificial turf fields (when available) and dedicated-use fields (for tackle football and/or rugby).
34. Lower participation sports such as field lacrosse, field hockey, and ultimate frisbee should continue to be scheduled on multi-use fields shared with soccer. Exclusive-use fields for these sports are not recommended.

Ball Diamonds

35. Additional ball diamonds should only be constructed in instances where they can be accommodated through the expansion, reconfiguration, or redevelopment of an existing Community Park, where justified demand exists, and where the land is not required for alternative recreational uses.
36. Establish and implement a classification system for ball diamonds to better assess quality and to align amenities with the rental fee structure.
37. Renewal of many older, high use ball diamonds is required, including conversion into slo-pitch diamonds. Older, municipally-owned diamonds should be assessed by the City to identify needed improvements (to the playing surface, fencing, dugouts, etc.).
38. Consider the removal of under-utilized ball diamonds from the active inventory, with specific consideration being given to the criteria established in this report, including single diamonds in neighbourhood park sites and smaller, poor quality diamonds in particular.
39. In areas with unmet soccer field or other outdoor recreation facility needs, under-utilized diamonds should be considered for conversion to in-demand facilities. Prior to conversion, monitoring of usage by ball organizations is required as are appropriate plans for relocating the remaining participants to alternate locations. These diamonds should be replaced with in-demand facilities, many of which are identified through this report. Until the impact of school closures and the associated loss of ball diamonds are known, caution should be exercised on the removal of any municipally-owned diamonds.
40. Consultation with affected user groups should be undertaken prior to deciding on the removal of any diamond from the active inventory; plans should be in place to relocated affected groups well in advance.

Cricket Grounds

41. The City should work with local cricket groups to:
 - identify solutions to enable the sharing of fields (e.g., amalgamation);
 - monitor participation levels and facility usage;
 - improve their organizational capacity;
 - ensure adequate weekday/night utilization prior to expansion of additional fields;
 - identify longer term needs and strategies; and
 - encourage joint fundraising to offset the costs associated with support buildings.
42. When surplus ball diamonds or other large, under-utilized sports fields are identified for removal from the active inventory, consider the conversion of this land into practice cricket pitches (in addition to other 'in-demand' uses).
43. Cricket sites should have access to a water source and ancillary buildings (washrooms, storage, etc.). Cricket grounds need not be situated within larger parks along with other sports fields, but could be located in more isolated single-use parks, if the site is appropriate for such a use. Development of a clubhouse for cricket users may be considered should sufficient funds be contributed from non-municipal sources (e.g., cost-sharing agreement).

Basketball / Multi-Use Courts

44. Between 2009 and 2021, the City's supply of basketball / multi-purpose courts should remain relatively stable. To maintain this balance and serve emerging areas, new courts in high-needs areas should be developed at relatively the same rate that under-utilized courts in low-needs areas are removed. Multi-use court development between 2016 and 2031 should focus primarily on Upper Stoney Creek and Glanbrook.

Tennis Courts

45. An annual renewal program should be established to improve the condition of public and club courts, with consideration being given to creating multi-use court templates in areas where ball hockey and basketball courts are also required (in addition to public tennis courts).
46. Opportunities to partner with growing and under-served community-based (i.e., low fee) tennis clubs in the expansion and improvement of outdoor tennis courts should be considered as needs arise.

Bocce Courts

47. Based on current usage levels and usage trends, no additional bocce courts are required by 2031, indoor or outdoor. Monitoring of usage and membership trends at existing bocce sites is recommended to better understand changing participation patterns.
48. Removal of bocce courts from the active inventory may be considered if and when existing clubs fold.
49. The development of dedicated buildings for bocce clubs in municipal parks is not recommended. Continued access to space within existing shared fieldhouses for bocce storage and offices should be permitted. This space is required for seasonal use and should not be winterized for use as meeting space during the winter; City staff should also retain keys to these facilities within public parks.
50. As washrooms are not recommended for Neighbourhood Parks, those bocce courts that are located in Neighbourhood Parks but do not have access to washroom buildings should continue to operate without them or consider relocating to a Community or City-wide Park. Furthermore, expenditure of money on non-municipal lands is not recommended (e.g., washrooms should not be added to the bocce courts at Sir Allan MacNab as these are on school property and long-term access cannot be guaranteed).
51. Continued communication is required between the City and user groups to ensure the safe and reasonable use and maintenance of support buildings.

Lawn Bowling Greens

52. No additional lawn bowling greens are recommended at this time and monitoring of usage and membership trends at existing clubs sites should be undertaken to better understand capacities and future requirements.
53. An indoor exclusive-use field is not recommended for lawn bowling.
54. Formal agreements between the City and lawn bowling clubs should be prepared to help direct roles and responsibilities on City-owned land.

Playgrounds

55. Play structures should continue to be installed through new park development, consistent with the demographic needs of the neighbourhood (i.e., those living or proposed to be living within approximately a 500-metre radius of the park).
56. Continue to place a high priority on annual funding for the City's Playground Replacement and Retrofit Program, which should be undertaken in compliance with CSA standards.
57. Continue to implement accessible elements into new and redeveloped playgrounds to allow children with disabilities to use them. The development of full barrier-free playgrounds is not traditionally a municipal service level, but the City's involvement in future projects should be considered where substantial community/corporate support exists (financial and otherwise), with a goal of establishing one barrier-free playground in each community (there are a total of nine 'communities' defined in this Study).

**Spray Pads/
Wading Pools**

58. The establishment of new wading pool sites is not recommended.
59. Initiate a spray pad renewal program that provides consistent funding to the upgrading of the City's older spray pads and their support infrastructure.
60. Convert those wading pools that are not identified for renewal into spray pads, at the time that significant repairs/reinvestment is required.

Skate Parks

61. Site selection criteria should be established and followed when evaluating potential locations for new skate parks. Further, all skate parks should be designed in consultation with skateboard representatives and the surrounding community.

Bike Parks

62. Identify an appropriate site for a freestyle bike park (dirt) and seek community partners for its development, administration, and operation. This facility would serve as a pilot project and its long-term viability would be conditional upon its successful short-term operation and community support. Future projects and demand would be evaluated based on the pilot project.

**Off-Leash Dog
Areas**

63. Continue to implement the City's Off-Leash Policy when evaluating requests for new leash free parks.
64. Continue to work towards the goal of implementing the model of at least one "free running area" and/or dog park per ward, subject to the availability appropriate sites and available funding. Based on the current supply, 11 wards currently do not have immediate access to leash free parks. The provision of more fenced dog parks should be a priority for Hamilton; however, it is recommended that the City continue to require that significant community partnerships be in place prior to developing any new dog parks.

Outdoor Ice Rinks

65. When developing and redeveloping Neighbourhood and Community Parks that are within outdoor rink gap areas and/or growth communities (i.e., approximately 1-kilometre from the nearest 'rink-ready' park'; urban residential areas only), install water service in order to allow for the establishment of volunteer-led natural outdoor ice rinks (note: park must be within a serviced urban area). Community partnerships for the operation of outdoor natural ice rinks should be encouraged.
66. Encourage partnerships and community funding for the development of artificial outdoor ice rinks in additional locations across the City.

Outdoor Running Tracks

67. No additional fully-funded municipally-owned tracks are recommended at this time. Municipal participation in joint projects with local schools and post-secondary institutions for the development of new community-level outdoor running track facilities may be considered and evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

Community Garden Plots

68. The City should continue to implement its Community Gardens Policy and Procedures, which outlines partnership opportunities between the City and local organizations in the establishment and management of community garden plots. Future community garden provision should be established based on community interest and capacity.

Special Event Areas

69. Identify at least one existing site (e.g., park, agricultural fairgrounds) in each community (there are a total of nine 'communities' defined in this Study) that is appropriate for hosting large community-based special events (e.g., fairs and festivals). Work with local organizations to ensure that appropriate infrastructure and services are in place within these Community and City-wide Parks; funding commitments and partnership agreements with local groups will be required to undertake these improvements if on municipal lands.

Pathways in Parks

70. In designing new and redeveloped parks, consideration should be given to opportunities to establish looped hard-surface pathways for residents of all ages and backgrounds, as well as providing continuous connectivity throughout the neighbourhood, where possible.

Support Buildings

- 71. A full inventory of ancillary buildings within parks should be completed, including an audit of their condition, capital improvement requirements, and accessibility upgrades for people with disabilities.
- 72. Develop a strategy, in consultation with key user groups, for the renewal, development and disposition of fieldhouses / clubhouses, giving consideration to long-term capital requirements, operating costs, rental rates, usage levels, and partnership (cost-sharing) potential. In future Community Parks, multiple clubhouses (where required) should not be developed, rather a shared-use model is recommended.
- 73. Existing municipally-owned Community and City-wide Parks without permanent washroom facilities should be evaluated to determine the need and/or options for washroom provision. Not all parks with these features will require permanent washrooms, and the relocation of the recreation facilities to other parks with washrooms may be an option. Washrooms are not recommended for Neighbourhood Parks.
- 74. Municipal investment in ancillary buildings on school or leased land is not recommended unless a long-term lease agreement can be secured.
- 75. In designing new and redeveloped parks, consideration should be given to installing benches and shade structures to promote greater usage by residents of all ages.

Indoor Soccer / Turf Sports


- 76. Municipal development, administration, and/or operation of an indoor sports/soccer facility is not recommended at this time.

Indoor Tennis, Bocce, Lawn Bowling

- 77. Direct municipal provision of indoor tennis, bocce, or lawn bowling facilities is not recommended, but could be considered in partnership with local community-based clubs. Proposals should be considered on a case-by-case basis, using a standardized evaluation framework.

21.3 Community-Specific Facility Recommendations

Ancaster – Capital Recommendations



Soccer Fields

78. Seek opportunities to provide additional fields through new Community Park development/redevelopment in Ancaster. The large majority of new field development should be in the form of full-size (senior) turf fields, with as many being Class A and B fields as possible.
79. Continue to implement current planned improvements at the new soccer park (landfill site) in Ancaster (2009/10). This could result in approximately 3 additional fields in the short-term (unlit equivalents). Note: this does not include the City's partnership with Redeemer College regarding the indoor artificial turf facility.

Ball Diamonds

80. Install lights on diamonds at Ancaster Community Centre Park (2 fields).

Basketball / Multi-Use Courts

81. Two basketball / multi-use courts should be developed, one east of Wilson Street and one west of Wilson Street (locations to be determined). Courts should be located in visible areas within parks, with appropriate buffers from adjacent residential properties.
82. The City, in cooperation with the proponent, should undertake a Feasibility Study to identify possible locations, capital, operating, and community implications of the proposed "Field of Hoops" outdoor multi-court complex (currently proposed for Ancaster; location is subject to change).

Tennis Courts

83. The City should work with the Ancaster Tennis Club in order to identify funding, operational, and other arrangements specific to their proposals for investments on municipal lands (Village Green Park).

Lawn Bowling Greens

84. Opportunities to redevelop the lawn bowling green in Village Green Park to accommodate a regulation size green and additional club tennis courts, along with a shared clubhouse (under a cost-sharing agreement), should be explored in partnership with local organizations.



Spray Pads/ Wading Pools

85. Over the short-term (by 2021), look to install a spray pad east of Highway 403 and another in Village Green Park. Spray pads are most appropriate in Community and City-Wide Parks or where washrooms and sufficient parking exist.

Skate Parks

86. Develop a community-wide skate park in Ancaster (4th priority area) at a location to be determined. This facility should generally be 10,000 to 12,000 square feet in size and serve intermediate and advanced users.

Beverly – Capital Recommendations





Soccer Fields

87. Convert under-utilized ball diamonds to full-size soccer fields, as required and in consultation with local community groups.

Basketball / Multi-use Courts

88. At the appropriate time, consider removal of under-utilized basketball courts within either Freelton Community Park or Centennial Heights Park (they have overlapping service areas), with the space being converted into more in-demand recreational amenities or green space.

Flamborough – Capital Recommendations



Soccer Fields

89. Add three soccer fields (two scheduled for 2010 and one in a future phase) to Joe Sams Leisure Park, which would bring the total number of soccer fields on the site to 9 (4 with lights). Consider the installation of an artificial turf soccer field at Joe Sams Leisure Park as part of the future construction phase.
90. Implement current planned improvements at Courtcliffe Park (soccer field development).
91. Should two new ball diamonds be developed at Joe Sams Leisure Park as recommended, the two unlit diamonds in Gatesbury Park should be converted into two Class C soccer fields.



Ball Diamonds

92. As part of a future phase, add two unlit ball diamonds to Joe Sams Leisure Park, which would bring the total number of ball diamonds on the site to 4 (1 with lights). This should be accompanied by the conversion of the two unlit diamonds in Gatesbury Park into two Class C soccer fields.

Tennis Courts

93. The City should work with the Carlisle Tennis Club in order to identify funding, operational, and other arrangements specific to their proposals for investments on municipal lands (locations to be determined).

Glanbrook – Capital Recommendations



Soccer Fields

94. Monitor local soccer demand to determine need for longer-term soccer field expansions at Glanbrook Sports Complex, including the possibility of an artificial turf soccer field.
95. Implement current planned improvements at Fairgrounds Community Park, Summerlea Park, and Glanbrook Sports Park. This could result in approximately 3 additional fields in the short-term (unlit equivalents).

Basketball / Multi-Use Courts

96. One basketball / multi-use court should be developed in Binbrook (location to be determined). The court should be located in a visible area, with appropriate buffers from adjacent residential properties. Additional multi-use court development may be required between 2016 and 2031.

Tennis Courts

97. New tennis court development will be required in the short-term (locations tbd).


Spray Pads/ Wading Pools

98. Over the short-term (by 2021), look to install a spray pad in the Binbrook area. Spray pads are most appropriate in Community and City-Wide Parks or where washrooms and sufficient parking exist.

Skate Parks

99. Consider the construction of a neighbourhood-level skate park in the Binbrook area. These parks would generally be no larger than 2,000ft² in size and contain a limited number of features for beginner skaters in the immediate area. Modular construction should be considered in order for future flexibility should local interests change. Sponsorships and community partnerships should be pursued for these initiatives.

Hamilton Mountain – Capital Recommendations



Soccer Fields

100. Install multi-use artificial turf fields at Mohawk Sports Park and Billy Sherring Park (possibly in place of Class C or lower quality Class B fields). Consideration should also be given to an artificial turf field at William Connell Park.
101. Make the 2 new soccer fields at William Schwenger Park available to the public in 2010 (replacements for fields lost at William McCullough Park).

Football/ Rugby

102. Two new dedicated football/rugby fields (one lit, one unlit) are recommended, with a preference of locating them in the Hamilton Mountain area. Further consultation is required to identify an appropriate site to meet short and long-term needs, as well as to determine partnership potential with local user groups.

Ball Diamonds

103. Continue with the planned replacement of the Seneca School diamonds at William McCulloch Park.
104. Consider the conversion of under-utilized ball diamonds at Gilkson Park and/or R.A. Riddell Public School to full-size soccer fields (to be confirmed through further monitoring and local consultation).
105. Install lights on diamonds at Turner Park (8 diamonds); note: lighting and an accessible washroom facility is scheduled for construction at this site in 2009, partially funding through the RInC program.
106. Install lights on diamonds at Mohawk Sports Park (3 existing diamonds at north end).

Cricket Grounds



107. Replace the existing cricket ground at Mohawk Sports Park with a new cricket ground at Heritage Green Sports Park in the short-term.

Basketball / Multi-Use Courts	108. At the appropriate time, consider removal of under-utilized basketball courts within either <u>Rushdale Park</u> or <u>T.B. McQuesten Park</u> (they have overlapping service areas), with the space being converted into more in-demand recreational amenities or green space. Also consider the removal of the basketball court at <u>Eleanor Park</u> , which is located close to both Billy Sheering Park and Templemead Park.
Tennis Courts	109. Improvements to the quality of tennis courts are required, including at <u>Inch Park</u> or <u>TB McQueston Park</u> (HM), with consideration given to creating multi-use court templates that can accommodate tennis, ball hockey and/or basketball. Improvement of the <u>Hill Park Secondary School</u> tennis courts could also be considered should demand levels warrant, pending rehabilitation of the courts at Inch Park or TB McQueston Park. Acceptable agreements with the School Board and local tennis clubs addressing cost sharing, membership growth, and long-term access must be put into place before improvements on school sites proceed. 110. New <u>tennis court development</u> will be required in the short-term (locations tbd).
Bocce Courts	111. The <u>Sir Allan MacNab and Chedoke bocce clubs</u> – which have small memberships and use facilities located 1.5 kilometres apart – should be amalgamated to make better use of the covered courts at Chedoke Arena. Following this, the bocce courts at Sir Allan MacNab Recreation Centre should be removed from the inventory.
Spray Pads/ Wading Pools	112. Over the short-term (by 2021), look to install spray pads in <u>Buchanan Park</u> , <u>William Schwenger Park</u> , and the area <u>north of the Lincoln Alexander Parkway, between Upper James Street and Upper Wentworth Street</u> . Spray pads are most appropriate in Community and City-Wide Parks or where washrooms and sufficient parking exist. 113. Remove the <u>George L. Armstrong Park</u> wading pool (which is not presently in use and is on school board property) and do not replace it with a spray pad.
Skate Parks	114. Develop a <u>community-wide skate park</u> in Hamilton Mountain (2 nd priority area) at a location to be determined. This facility should generally be 10,000 to 12,000 square feet in size and serve intermediate and advanced users.
Outdoor Running Tracks	115. Maintain the <u>Mohawk Sports Park</u> outdoor running track as a City-wide facility, appropriate for community training and competitions. Achieving this objective may require the initiation of a regular maintenance program.

Support Buildings

116. As a short-term priority, it is recommended that washrooms be constructed at Turner Park (note: this project is currently underway) and to serve the ball diamond cluster and adjacent soccer fields at the north end of Mohawk Sports Park.

Lower Hamilton – Capital Recommendations



Soccer Fields

117. Install a multi-use artificial turf field at a location to be determined, possibly in place of a Class C (or lower quality Class B) field.

118. If the Ivor Wynne and Brian Timmis Stadium fields are removed from the inventory, they should be replaced by 1 full-size lit soccer field for community use in order to maintain an appropriate distribution of fields in the area.

Ball Diamonds

119. Consider the conversion of under-utilized ball diamonds at Eastwood Park to full-size soccer fields (to be confirmed through further monitoring and local consultation).

120. Continue with planned improvements to ball diamonds at Rosedale Park.

121. Globe Park diamonds may be removed from the inventory should the adjacent wastewater treatment plan be expanded. No new diamonds are recommended in their place.

Cricket Grounds

122. In the medium-term, replace the existing cricket ground at Cathedral Park with a new cricket ground elsewhere. Seek a location in Lower Hamilton or Lower Stoney Creek (e.g., Confederation Park).

**Basketball /
Multi-Use Courts**

123. Two basketball / multi-use courts should be developed, generally between Lawrence Road, Ottawa Street, Burlington Street East, and Gage Avenue (locations to be determined). Courts should be located in visible areas within parks, with appropriate buffers from adjacent residential properties.
124. At the appropriate time, consider removal of under-utilized basketball courts within either Carter Park or Corktown Park (they have overlapping service areas), with the space being converted into more in-demand recreational amenities or green space. Also consider the removal of the basketball court at either Andrew Warburton Memorial Park or Fairfield Park.

Tennis Courts

125. Due to poor condition, low utilization, and neighbourhood over-supply, removal of public tennis courts at Central Park (3 courts) should be considered, with in-demand recreation amenities taking their place. Removal of the tennis courts at Globe Park (3 courts) should also be considered.


**Spray Pads/
Wading Pools**

126. Remove the Bayview Playground wading pool (area will be served by proposed spray pad at Parkdale Park); do not replace the wading pool with a spray pad.
127. Convert the Parkdale Park wading pool into a spray pad when the outdoor pool is redeveloped.
128. Remove the Woolverton Park wading pool and the R.T. Steele Park wading pool (which are not presently in use) and do not replace them with spray pads.

Skate Parks

129. Consider the construction of a neighbourhood-level skate park in the Gage Avenue area. These parks would generally be no larger than 2,000ft² in size and contain a limited number of features for beginner skaters in the immediate area. Modular construction should be considered in order for future flexibility should local interests change. Sponsorships and community partnerships should be pursued for these initiatives.

Lower Stoney Creek – Capital Recommendations



Soccer Fields

130. Install a multi-use artificial turf field at a location to be determined, possibly in place of a Class C (or lower quality Class B) field.
131. Seek opportunities to provide additional fields through new Community Park development/redevelopment in Lower Stoney Creek. The large majority of new field development should be in the form of full-size (senior) turf fields, with as many being Class A and B fields as possible.
132. Implement current planned improvements at Winona Park. This could result in 1 additional field in the short-term (unlit equivalents).

Cricket Grounds

133. In the medium-term, replace the existing cricket ground at Cathedral Park with a new cricket ground elsewhere. Seek a location in Lower Hamilton or Lower Stoney Creek (e.g., Confederation Park).

Tennis Courts

134. New tennis court development will be required in the short-term (locations tbd).



Spray Pads/ Wading Pools

135. Over the short-term, look to install a spray pad in Winona Park to improve distribution in the eastern portion of this community. Spray pads are most appropriate in Community and City-Wide Parks or where washrooms and sufficient parking exist.
136. Remove the Green Acres Park wading pool when the outdoor pool is removed from service (if applicable). Do not replace with a spray pad.

Skate Parks

137. Develop a community-wide skate park in Lower Stoney Creek (1st priority area) at a location to be determined. This facility should generally be 10,000 to 12,000 square feet in size and serve intermediate and advanced users.
138. Consider the construction of a neighbourhood-level skate park in the Winona area. These parks would generally be no larger than 2,000ft² in size and contain a limited number of features for beginner skaters in the immediate area. Modular construction should be considered in order for future flexibility should local interests change. Sponsorships and community partnerships should be pursued for these initiatives.

Upper Stoney Creek – Capital Recommendations



Soccer Fields


139. Implement current planned improvements at Heritage Green Sports Park (including one artificial turf field and one Class A field in 2010), Maplewood Park, and Summit Park. This could result in approximately 6 additional fields in the short-term (unlit equivalents).
140. Investigate the potential of working closer with key private facilities in growth areas to maximize community access (e.g. Dofasco Recreation Park).

Soccer Fields (continued)

141. Seek opportunities to provide additional fields through new Community Park development/redevelopment in Upper Stoney Creek. The large majority of new field development should be in the form of full-size (senior) turf fields, with as many being Class A and B fields as possible.

Ball Diamonds	<p>142. Consider the conversion of under-utilized ball diamonds at <u>Paramount Park</u> to full-size soccer fields (to be confirmed through further monitoring and local consultation).</p> <p>143. Continue with the planned changes to <u>Maplewood Park</u>, including the realignment of one diamond and removal of another.</p>
Cricket Grounds	<p>144. Replace the existing cricket ground at Mohawk Sports Park with a new cricket ground at <u>Heritage Green Sports Park</u> in the short-term.</p>
Basketball / Multi-Use Courts	<p>145. At the appropriate time, consider removal of the under-utilized basketball court within <u>White Deer Park</u>, which is located close to both Eringate Park and Cline Park, with the space being converted into more in-demand recreational amenities or green space. Additional multi-use court development will be required between 2016 and 2031.</p>
Tennis Courts	<p>146. New <u>tennis court development</u> will be required in the short-term and long-term (locations tbd).</p>
Spray Pads/ Wading Pools	<p>147. Over the short-term (by 2021), look to install a spray pad in the <u>Paramount Drive area</u>. Spray pads are most appropriate in Community and City-Wide Parks or where washrooms and sufficient parking exist.</p> <p>148. For the period between 2021 and 2031, a minimum of 3 spray pads should be installed in <u>Community Parks</u> in Upper Stoney Creek.</p>
Skate Parks	<p>149. Develop a <u>community-wide skate park</u> in Upper Stoney Creek (longer-term) at a location to be determined. This facility should generally be 10,000 to 12,000 square feet in size and serve intermediate and advanced users.</p> <p>150. Consider the construction of a neighbourhood-level skate park in the <u>Upper Stoney Creek area</u>. These parks would generally be no larger than 2,000ft² in size and contain a limited number of features for beginner skaters in the immediate area. Modular construction should be considered in order for future flexibility should local interests change. Sponsorships and community partnerships should be pursued for these initiatives.</p>

West Hamilton / Dundas – Capital Recommendations



- Soccer Fields**
- 151. Undertake improvements to improve playability of the upper field at Olympic Sports Park.
 - 152. Implement current planned improvements at Churchill Park. This could result in 1 additional field in the short-term (unlit equivalents).
 - 153. Install one artificial turf field at a location to be determined.

- Ball Diamonds**
- 154. Consider the conversion of under-utilized ball diamonds at Alexander Park and Veteran's Park to full-size soccer fields (to be confirmed through further monitoring and local consultation).

- Cricket Grounds**
- 155. Evaluate options in the short-term to improve the playability, safety, and level of service at the cricket pitch in Churchill Park, in consultation with local cricket organizations.

- Basketball / Multi-Use Courts**
- 156. Two basketball / multi-use courts should be developed, one in the Westdale/Ainslie Wood area and another in the downtown Dundas area (locations to be determined). Courts should be located in visible areas within parks, with appropriate buffers from adjacent residential properties.

- Tennis Courts**
- 157. Consider improvements to the Westdale Secondary School (WHD) tennis courts. Acceptable agreements with the School Board and local tennis club addressing cost sharing, membership growth, and long-term access must be put into place before improvements proceed.

- Spray Pads/ Wading Pools**
- 158. Remove the Coronation Park wading pool when the outdoor pool is removed from service (if applicable) and do not replace it with a spray pad.

- Skate Parks**
- 159. Develop a community-wide skate park in West Hamilton/Dundas (3rd priority area), possibly at Cathedral Park. This facility should generally be 10,000 to 12,000 square feet in size and serve intermediate and advanced users.

SECTION 22 CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS & IMPLEMENTATION

The implementation schedule summarizes the magnitude, timing, and financial implications of the Study's recommendations. The emphasis of the financial analysis is on the 2011 to 2021 period, including both one-time and ongoing capital requirements.

22.1 *Capital Budgets and Current Funding Levels*

Municipal capital funding for sports fields and other outdoor park assets comes from the following sources:

- Capital Block Funding / Discretionary Funds
(note: decisions regarding the allocation of this block funding are made by staff in the respective divisions)
 - Parks and Open Space Development (Public Works) – used mostly for the development of new/expanded parks, trails, open space and museum/heritage sites and related assets. Development of trails, open space and museum/heritage sites and related amenities are outside the scope of this study.
 - Parks and Cemetery Maintenance (Public Works) – used mostly for the rehabilitation and replacement of existing assets and the purchase of equipment related to maintenance. Some of this funding is divided into envelopes for upgrades to specific asset types (e.g., playgrounds, pathways, fencing, etc.).
 - Recreation (Community Services) – used mostly for projects related to indoor recreation facilities and golf courses, but can include select outdoor items such as those related to park washroom buildings, tennis court resurfacing, etc.
- Development Charges – intended to cover 90% of growth-related infrastructure; there is a 10% municipal co-payment amount that is generally funded out of the Parks and Open Space Development block funding. This amount changes from year-to-year depending on development activity.
- Operating Budgets – occasionally used for small scale projects, typically related to the repair of assets (most notably within the Recreation Division).
- Municipal Reserves – requests are made from time to time to fund major projects (such as strategic land acquisitions) from sources outside the block or development charges; this is left to the discretion of Council.
- Parkland Reserve Fund – funded by cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication as per provisions in the *Planning Act* and Official Plans, this reserve is used to purchase land largely to serve new development areas. Note: the costs of land acquisition are not considered as part of this Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan.

In addition, government grants and fundraising can also contribute to the capital development of municipal outdoor recreation assets, from time to time.

These aforementioned funds are also used to pay for a number of other items in addition to the development of facilities and assets addressed by this Plan, including:

- land acquisition;
- parkland development;
- the construction of works and assets not directly covered by this Plan (e.g., trails, cemeteries, equipment, indoor recreation facilities, etc.);
- asset/facility renewal; and
- equipment purchases.

The scope of these municipal funds/budgets is larger than the scope of the recommendations within this Plan. Efforts have been made to ensure that the capital requirements (see Section 22.2) of this Plan's recommendations capture the full costs of constructing and maintaining the City's parks system; however, items and funding related to trails/corridors/links, bridges, works buildings, cemeteries, golf courses, heritage/museum sites, indoor recreation facilities, equipment, and land acquisition have been excluded in this analysis.

For the purposes of this Study, the amounts in the City's approved 2010 capital plan have been projected forward as annual averages. Furthermore, because the Recreation, Parks & Open Space, and Parks & Cemetery blocks include a number of items outside the scope of this study, the amount typically associated with these other projects has been identified and the totals adjusted accordingly.

Capital Budget Amounts, Park Development and Renewal (excluding land acquisition)

Capital Funding Source	2010 Approved Budget Amount (\$000's, net funding), including 'in-scope' and 'out-of-scope' assets	Budget Amount Attributable to 'In-scope' Assets* (net funding)	
		Estimated % of Annual Budget typically attributable to 'in-scope' assets (\$000's)	Estimated Annual Budget Average for 'in-scope' assets (\$000's)
Parks and Open Space Development Block Funding	\$5,770	62%	\$3,580
Development Charge Revenues**	\$620	87%	\$540
Subtotal: Asset Development	\$6,390	--	\$4,120
Parks and Cemetery Maintenance Block Funding	\$1,200	70%	\$840
Recreation Block Funding***	\$2,000	1.5%	\$160
Subtotal: Asset Renewal	\$3,200	--	\$1,000
Total	\$9,590	--	\$5,120

Source: City of Hamilton 2010 Tax Supported Capital Budget

* Out-of-scope items include trails/corridors/links, bridges, works buildings, cemeteries, golf courses, heritage/museum sites, indoor recreation facilities, equipment, and land acquisition. In-scope items include all facilities addressed in Sections 8 to 15 of this Study, including park development costs.

** The economic downturn has negatively affected development charge revenues and estimates for the short-term are likely to be considerably less

*** The 2010 Capital Budget amount was reduced due to the \$62.0 million received through the Infrastructure Stimulus Fund and the Recreation Infrastructure Canada Program.

As illustrated in the previous table, the total annual budget for 'in-scope' park and outdoor asset development and renewal (including block funding and development charges) is \$5.12 million. **Of this total amount, an annual average of \$4.12 million is allocated to the development of new assets and an annual average of \$1.0 million is allocated to the rehabilitation/replacement of existing assets.** These averages are based on the 2010 budget; block funding and development charge revenues change from year to year. It is recognized that funding requirements will fluctuate from year to year based on specific projects and the pace of new housing growth.

22.2 Capital Requirements

Rehabilitation & Replacement Cost Requirements

With regard to capital renewal costs, a benchmark of 2% of facility/asset replacement value will be used for estimating the future annual requirements for capital rehabilitation (excluding regular maintenance). This is consistent with the City's *State of the Infrastructure Report*, which recommends spending "between 1.5% and 2.5% of the current replacement value of facilities, every year." This percentage will not be sufficient to account for functional or accessibility improvements and does not include deferred maintenance, facility expansions, functional upgrades or enhancements, barrier-free accessibility upgrades, or the construction of new facilities.

Because the variation of facility quality and design varies so widely – as do site conditions – it is not possible to accurately estimate the replacement value of current facilities. Nevertheless, for the purposes of this analysis, the current inventory has been compared against the construction cost estimates. This methodology suggests that the replacement value for all outdoor facilities within the scope of this study (e.g., fields, courts, ancillary buildings, etc.) that are on municipal lands at around \$100-125 million. This includes costs for new construction and excludes land development and land acquisition. It also excludes site amenities, such as benches, pathways, general lighting, parking lots, signage, and other items outside of the project scope (e.g., trails, bandshells, works buildings, bridges, cemeteries, etc.).

Assuming a replacement value of \$100-125 million and using a 2% benchmark, the annual budget requirement for facility rehabilitation for in-scope assets is approximately \$2 to \$2.5 million. This excludes maintenance and staffing costs, but includes capital items that are typically covered by the operating budget, as well as major capital rehabilitation. This requirement is compared against the current funding levels in Section 22.3.

Construction Cost Requirements

Recreational facility construction values were established by the consulting team using the following order of magnitude cost assumptions. These costs refer to the cost of building a recreational facility designed to today's design and construction standards, rather than simply replacing an existing recreational facility (which may or may not comply with modern requirements).

The capital construction costs identified in the table below have been used to determine high-level costs for the Study's implementation.

Capital Cost Estimates for Outdoor Recreation Facility Construction

Facility Type	Estimated Cost per Facility			Required Land Area (ha), excluding setback to residential	Notes / Assumptions
	Construction	Land Development (park type)	Total		
Senior Soccer Field –Class A+ Lit (Champion, international size)	\$330,000	\$180,000 (city-wide)	\$510,000	1.32 ha	64m x 110m with 15m buffers on all sides
Senior Soccer Field –Class A Lit	\$310,000	\$110,000 (community)	\$420,000	0.99 ha	60m x 100m + 10m buffer on sides and 12m on ends
Senior Soccer Field –Class B Lit	\$290,000	\$110,000 (community)	\$400,000	0.99 ha	60m x 100m + 10m buffer on sides and 12m on ends
Senior Soccer Field –Class B Unlit	\$190,000	\$110,000 (community)	\$300,000	0.99 ha	60m x 100m + 10m buffer on sides and 12m on ends
Senior Soccer Field –Class C Unlit	\$90,000	\$110,000 (community)	\$200,000	0.99 ha	60m x 100m + 10m buffer on sides and 12m on ends
Senior Soccer Field –Class D Unlit	\$48,200	\$110,000 (community)	\$158,200	0.99 ha	60m x 100m + 10m buffer on sides and 12m on ends
Mini Soccer Field	\$16,900	\$45,800 (neighbourhood)	\$62,700	0.35 ha	36.6m x 55m + 5m buffer on sides and 10m on ends
Artificial Turf Field (full size, lit)	\$800,000	\$110,000 (community)	\$910,000	1.32 ha	64m x 110m with 15m buffers on all sides
Lighting of existing soccer field	\$130,000	n/a	\$130,000	n/a	Excludes the cost to connect, which will vary per site
Irrigation & sub-drainage of existing soccer field	\$250,000	n/a	\$250,000	n/a	
Football Field	\$130,500	\$110,000 (community)	\$240,500	1.32 ha	Similar area to that of a senior soccer field
Senior Hardball Diamond Lit (Premier)	\$300,000	\$165,500 (community)	\$465,500	1.49 ha	122m x 122m (not including buffers as they will vary depending on what is adjacent to the diamond)
Senior Softball Diamond Lit	\$279,000	\$71,000 (community)	\$350,000	0.64 ha	80m x 80m (not including buffers as they will vary depending on what is adjacent to the diamond)
Senior Softball Diamond Unlit	\$129,000	\$71,000 (community)	\$200,000	0.64 ha	80m x 80m (not including buffers as they will vary depending on what is adjacent to the diamond)

Facility Type	Estimated Cost per Facility			Required Land Area (ha), excluding setback to residential	Notes / Assumptions
	Construction	Land Development (park type)	Total		
Intermediate Softball Diamond	\$86,000	\$64,000 (neighbourhood)	\$150,000	0.49 ha	70m x 70m (not including buffers as they will vary depending on what is adjacent to the diamond); no irrigation
Lighting of existing ball diamond	\$150,000	n/a	\$150,000	n/a	Excludes the cost to connect, which will vary per site
Cricket Pitch, Class A	\$1,000,000	\$178,000	\$1,178,000	1.60 ha	Oval – generally 137m x 150m
Multi-use Court	\$55,500	\$6,500 (neighbourhood)	\$62,000	0.05 ha	29.6m x 17.24m
Basketball Court - full	\$55,500	\$6,500 (neighbourhood)	\$62,000	0.05 ha	Same as multi-use court size
Basketball Court - half	\$35,000	\$6,500 (neighbourhood)	\$41,500	0.03 ha	Half of multi-use court size
Tennis Court – Club Lit	\$64,300	\$6,500 (community)	\$70,800	0.06 ha	18m x 36m (this does not include buffers as it would typically be fenced.)
Tennis Court – Public Lit	\$64,300	\$6,500 (community)	\$70,800	0.06 ha	18m x 36m (this does not include buffers as it would typically be fenced.)
Tennis Court – Public Unlit	\$41,700	\$6,500 (community)	\$48,200	0.06 ha	18m x 36m (this does not include buffers as it would typically be fenced.)
Bocce Courts (set of 2) Lit	\$103,500	\$5,500 (community)	\$109,000	0.05 ha	13m x 37m (this does not include buffers as it would typically be fenced.)
Lawn Bowling Green	\$80,000	\$17,800 (community)	\$97,800	0.16 ha	40m x 40m (this does not include buffers as it would typically be fenced.); excludes lighting
Playground – Neighbourhood	\$40,000	\$7,950 (neighbourhood)	\$47,950	0.05 ha	As a guideline, total play area is typically 500 sq. m.
Playground – Community	\$65,000	\$6,750 (community)	\$71,750	0.05 ha	As a guideline, total play area is typically 500 sq. m.
Spray Pad	\$172,361	\$8,900 (community)	\$181,261	0.08 ha	
Wading Pool	\$49,600	\$4,500 (community)	\$54,100	0.04 ha	Based on the average of Dundas Driving Park and Inch Park wading pools
Skateboard Park – Community	\$737,700	\$12,230 (community)	\$750,000	0.11 ha	Approximately 10,000 to 12,000 square feet in size
Skateboard Park – Neighbourhood	\$147,380	\$2,620 (neighbourhood)	\$150,000	0.02 ha	Approximately 2,000 square feet in size

Facility Type	Estimated Cost per Facility			Required Land Area (ha), excluding setback to residential	Notes / Assumptions
	Construction	Land Development (park type)	Total		
Bike Park	\$75,000	n/a	\$75,000	1.50 ha	
Off-leash Dog Park	\$75,000	n/a	\$75,000	1.70 ha	Approximately 100m x 100m, with a 15m buffer (buffer could be greater depending on adjacent uses); lighting is not recommended; costs would be considerably less for Free Running Area
Outdoor Ice Rink – Natural	\$30,000	\$10,500 (neighbourhood)	\$40,500	0.08 ha	Includes water connection and storage/lighting building; maintained by local community group
Outdoor Ice Rink – Artificial	\$1,500,000	\$8,900 (community)	\$1,508,900	0.08 ha	Includes refrigeration equip., concrete deck, equipment building – excludes ice resurfacer & garage
Community Garden Plot	\$4,000	\$7,950 (neighbourhood)	\$11,950	0.05 ha	Water connection cost only
Running Track – Asphalt	\$150,000	\$133,400 (community)	\$283,400	1.20 ha	400m track, 6 lanes
Running Track – All-weather	\$500,000	\$163,300 (city-wide)	\$663,300	1.20 ha	400m track, 6 lanes
Fieldhouse Bldg. (Storage, Changerooms, Washrooms, etc)	\$350,000	\$1,000	\$351,000	1,000+ sq.ft.	12m x 7.4m, based on Waterdown Memorial Park
Tennis Clubhouse	\$360,000	\$1,000	\$361,000	600+sq.ft.	
Washroom Building (stand-alone)	\$200,000	\$1,000	\$201,000	~500 sq.ft	Cost is based on a non-heated facility
Storage Building (stand-alone)	\$55,000	\$1,000	\$56,000	~600 sq.ft.	
Asphalt Pathway, 3-m wide (per kilometre)	\$52,100/km	n/a	\$52,100/km	0.30 ha	

Notes:

- 1) All costs are estimated to be in current year (2010) dollars.
- 2) The estimates shown represent the minimum land area and cost to construct the recreational asset alone (construction costs are consistent with Level 3 costs within the Development Charges Study). They do not represent the actual cost to develop a park as a whole as they do not account for buffer spaces (from asset to property lines, or in between park uses), inspection and testing, archaeological, geotechnical, project management and design, fill material, furnishings, or contingencies.
- 3) Land development costs are consistent with Level 2 costs within the Development Charges Study. Costs are broken down using the asset cost plus the cost per hectare to develop the land. In brackets is the level of park that was used to generate the per hectare cost (e.g., neighbourhood, community, etc.). This per hectare cost was produced for the City's 2009 Development Charge

Background Study and includes fine grading, top soil spread, seed/sod, utilities such as water meter chamber, electrical service, sanitary, storm, CB's, manholes, 50% boundary fence costs, and all plantings. The 2009 cost per hectare for each park level is as follows:

City Wide	\$136,000
Community	\$111,200
Neighbourhood	\$131,000

NOTE: The supplementary costs provided would be required for new park developments and some (but not all) park redevelopments.

- 4) Level 1 costs (defined within the Development Charges Study as including rough grading of the park site, 50% of the park boundary fence cost, water and sewer service stub to road allowance limit, topsoil spread and seeding) are not included in these estimates as they are typically the responsibility of developers in growth developments.
- 5) Cost estimates were developed by the City of Hamilton Open Space Development and Park Planning Division and supplemented by STLA Landscape Architects.

The aforementioned capital costs (including facility/asset construction and land development) have been compared to the new facilities recommended by this Study. Capital cost estimates are high level and exclude facility/asset replacement/rehabilitation, land acquisition, and demolition costs. Furthermore, it should be noted that the estimates presented in the table below represent the minimum cost to construct the asset alone; they do not represent the actual cost to develop a park as a whole as they do not account for buffer spaces (from asset to property lines, or in between park uses), inspection and testing, archaeological, geotechnical, project management and design, fill material, furnishings, or contingencies.

Specifically, construction costs have been assessed the following facility types:

- Ball Diamonds
- Basketball & Multi-purpose Courts
- Community-level Skate Parks
- Cricket Pitches
- Neighbourhood-level Skate Parks
- Soccer and Multi-use Fields
- Spray Pads
- Tennis Courts (Public and Club)

It is not possible to define costing in the same way for facilities such as bike parks, community garden plots, and leash free parks as many of these projects will require partnerships or other collaborations involving cost sharing. Other amenities, such as playgrounds, support buildings, pathways, and ancillary amenities are estimated in the following text using a percentage of other capital works.

The cost to develop and construct major new outdoor facilities (see bulleted list above) in order to address current deficiencies and projected growth is estimated at \$34.707 million to 2031 (these are commonly referred to as Level 3 costs). It is further estimated that the costs to develop the parkland surrounding these recommended assets (including fencing, utilities, plantings, and land for buffers and open space) could increase costs by as much as 50%²⁰ (an additional \$17.354 million; these are commonly referred to as Level 2 costs). This would bring the development and construction cost total to approximately \$52.061 million for the 2010-2031 period. 85% of these costs are incurred between 2010 and 2021 (with the remainder being between 2022 and 2031). These estimates are attributed largely to sports fields, courts, skate parks, spray pads, and their surrounding land base.

²⁰ This percentage is based on a ratio of buffer/ancillary park space to facility footprint space (which currently ranges between 2:1 and 3.5:1 within the City's existing parks), combined with land development costs (level 2 costs) generally required for these buffer/ancillary lands within parks.

Taking the analysis one step further, based on current ratios, it can be expected that approximately an additional \$12.0 million will be required between 2010 and 2031 (\$9.0 million between 2010 and 2021 alone) to develop and construct new playgrounds and support buildings (including washrooms, fieldhouses, storage buildings, but excluding works buildings). These amenities are factored separately due to the model by which their needs were identified. This brings the total capital costs for the 2010-2031 period to \$64.061 million.

These above estimates exclude a significant number of other park amenities (such as parking, lighting, seating, pathways, signage, etc.). It is impossible to identify an accurate cost estimate for these amenities due to their considerable variance from location to location; however, they must be considered in the overall analysis. For the purpose of this assessment, they are estimated at 10% of total park and asset development costs (10% of \$64.061 million for the 2010-2031 period), which equals an additional \$6.406 million. This brings the total capital costs for the 2010-2031 period to \$70.467 million.

These aforementioned costs are depicted in the following table.

Total Estimated Capital Requirements for Outdoor Sports Fields, Recreation Amenities, and Park Development (2010-2031)

Capital Cost Item	Cost Estimate (000's)	Notes
<u>Construction of new outdoor facilities</u> , as recommended in this Study (major facilities only; includes land development)	\$ 29,517 (2010-21) <u>\$ 5,190 (2022-31)</u> \$ 34,707 (Total)	Includes only Soccer/ Multi-use Fields, Ball Diamonds, Cricket Pitches, Skate Parks, Basketball & Multi-purpose Courts, Spray Pads, and Tennis Courts
<u>Development of parkland</u> surrounding new outdoor facilities (estimated at 50% of construction costs)	\$ 14,759 (2010-21) <u>\$ 2,595 (2022-31)</u> \$ 17,354 (Total)	Includes costs for items such as fencing, utilities, plantings, and land for buffers and open space
<u>Construction of new playgrounds and support buildings</u> (specific requirements not identified in this Study, but projected forward based on current supply ratios)	\$ 9,000 (2010-21) <u>\$ 3,000 (2022-31)</u> \$ 12,000 (Total)	Support buildings include washrooms, fieldhouses, storage buildings, but exclude works buildings
<u>Construction of other site amenities</u> (estimated at 10% of total park and asset development costs)	\$ 5,328 (2010-21) <u>\$ 1,078 (2022-31)</u> \$ 6,406 (Total)	Includes items such as parking, lighting, seating, pathways, signage, etc.
Total Estimated Capital Costs	\$ 58,603 (2010-21) <u>\$ 11,864 (2022-31)</u> \$70,467 (Total)	Estimated Annual Average (000's): \$ 5,328 (2010-21) \$ 1,186 (2022-31)

Totals may not add due to rounding

Note: Excluded from these cost estimates are land acquisition, facility renewal (i.e., rehabilitation, replacement), equipment, Level 1 land development costs (generally paid by the developer), and out-of-scope assets (e.g., trails, open space, heritage sites, indoor recreation facilities, etc.).

All together, for the 2010 to 2021 period, this results in an average annual capital requirement of **\$5.328 million per year**. For the 2022 to 2031 period, this annual average drops significantly to **\$1.186 million per year**. This decrease is attributable to a number of factors: (1) slower projected population growth; an aging population that has lesser requirements for new outdoor recreation facilities; and (3) current deficiencies having been largely addressed in the 2010-2021 period. The only park-related capital costs excluded from this analysis are land acquisition, facility renewal (i.e., rehabilitation, replacement), and equipment. These requirements are compared against the current funding levels in Section 22.3.

22.3 Comparison of Capital Funding Levels & Capital Requirements

Assuming a replacement value of \$100-125 million and using a 2% benchmark, the annual budget requirement for facility renewal for in-scope assets is approximately \$2.0 to \$2.5 million. Presently, the City is budgeting approximately \$1.0 million per year for the complete range of park and outdoor recreation amenity rehabilitation and replacement. **There is a resultant shortfall of \$1.0 to \$1.5 million per year in the outdoor recreation asset renewal budget. As the City's inventory of outdoor assets grows, so too will this budget requirement.**

Presently, the City is budgeting approximately \$4.120 million per year for the development and construction of new parks and outdoor recreation assets, which is funded through the Parks and Open Space Development block and Development Charges. This is \$1.208 million less than the capital requirement of \$5.328 million per year for the 2010 to 2021 period. For the 2022 to 2031 period, this annual average could decline as low as \$1.186 million per year. For at least the short-term, it would appear that the City's capital budget and Development Charges will not provide sufficient funding for most needs relative to outdoor recreation development and construction. **There is a resultant shortfall of \$1.2 million per year in the outdoor recreation asset development budget.**

With regard to asset development, the specific sources of funding should also be considered. Development Charge revenues are declining due to the economic downturn and slower than anticipated housing growth. Current funding amounts will not allow the City to build new outdoor amenities as early in the long-term forecast as expected. As a result, capital projects are likely to be pushed back, but they should still generally be delivered in time with new population growth.

Development Charge revenues can be used to build facilities serving new population growth; they are not to be used to address current deficiencies. A sizable portion of the new facility investments recommended in this Study is related to filling existing gaps and bringing supply in line with demand. In 2010, 87% of the City's outdoor recreation asset development budget is not funded through Development Charges. As long as the block funding continues to cover a significant portion of future asset development, the balance of funding for deficiencies versus new development should not be a concern.

22.4 Facility Provision Scenarios

Three facility provision scenarios (identified at right and described in detail on the next page) have been developed, each depicting a different reality and range of municipal capital spending. The scenarios are linked to capital spending on two items:

- facility renewal (lifecycle); and
- facility development;

All three scenarios assume that growth-related outdoor recreation facility development will continue to occur as per Development Charge funding. The degree to which the City chooses to supplement these funding mechanisms, however, will dictate if and how gaps and other priorities are addressed.

As such, the scenarios differ in terms of not only spending levels, but also the extent to which outdoor amenities are upgraded and constructed.


Unlike the Indoor Recreation Facilities Study, all scenarios assume some level of re-purposing for assets that are redundant, beyond reasonable repair, and/or under-utilized (these would be converted to in-demand facilities, where appropriate). Prior to any facility being removed from the municipal inventory, more detailed study is recommended, including opportunities for public and stakeholder input.

It should also be noted that all scenarios exclude funding and strategies related to trails/corridors/links, bridges, works buildings, cemeteries, golf courses, heritage/museum sites, indoor recreation facilities, equipment, and land acquisition.

Scenario 3 (Strategic Renewal & Filling the Gaps) is the scenario that the City should strive to achieve as it is:


- a balanced approach that is responsive to both the current and future needs of Hamilton residents;
- supported by the Study's Guiding Principles;
- the result of extensive study and analysis; and
- flexible in its implementation (e.g., emphasis on partnerships).

The details relating to each scenario are discussed on the following pages.



Scenarios Considered in this Study		ESTIMATED COST IMPACT (annual average, 2010-2019)				
		Reactive Renewal & Development of Growth-Related Assets	Proactive Renewal of Existing Assets	Magnitude of non-DC Construction Costs	Magnitude of Capital Renewal Costs	
1 Status Quo Spending	<p><u>Facility Renewal</u>: Fund at existing levels.</p> <p><u>Facility Development</u>: Fund at existing levels (mostly growth-related).</p> <p><u>Benefits</u>: Most cost efficient scenario. Some new facilities are brought on stream (growth-related).</p> <p><u>Risks</u>: Quality of existing facilities will slowly deteriorate. Existing facility gaps not addressed. Possible facility closures if they become unsafe.</p>	✓	✗	↓	\$0	\$0
	<p><u>Facility Renewal</u>: Increase funding to improve existing facilities through proper rehabilitation and replacement.</p> <p><u>Facility Development</u>: Fund at existing levels (mostly growth-related).</p> <p><u>Benefits</u>: Existing facilities will remain and be upgraded when required. Quality of existing facilities will improve.</p> <p><u>Risks</u>: Existing facility gaps not addressed. Supply will be unable to keep pace with needs. Modernization of facilities will lag behind.</p>	✓	✓	↓	\$0	\$1.0m (min.)
3 Strategic Renewal & Filling the Gaps	<p><u>Facility Renewal</u>: Increase funding to improve existing facilities through proper rehabilitation and replacement.</p> <p><u>Facility Development</u>: Increase funding to develop new facilities that address priority needs and gaps. Place an emphasis on alternative funding sources, including partnerships.</p> <p>RECOMMENDED STRATEGY</p> <p><u>Benefits</u>: Facility gaps are addressed, existing facilities are renewed/modernized, and supply/demand in equilibrium.</p> <p><u>Risks</u>: Greater staff resources required to manage partnerships. Uncertainty around partnerships could affect timing/scope of construction.</p>	✓	✓	↑	<\$1.2m	\$1.0m (min.)
	<p><u>Facility Renewal</u>: Increase funding to improve existing facilities through proper rehabilitation and replacement.</p> <p><u>Facility Development</u>: Increase funding to develop new facilities that address priority needs and gaps. Place an emphasis on alternative funding sources, including partnerships.</p> <p><u>Benefits</u>: Facility gaps are addressed, existing facilities are renewed/modernized, and supply/demand in equilibrium.</p> <p><u>Risks</u>: Greater staff resources required to manage partnerships. Uncertainty around partnerships could affect timing/scope of construction.</p>	✓	✓	↑	<\$1.2m	\$1.0m (min.)

NOTE: An analysis of operating costs and partnership options should be undertaken prior to undertaking each capital project. Additional operating costs may be partially offset by revenues generated through the revised pricing policy, which would better align true costs with rental rates, as recommended in this Study.



Scenario 1 (Status Quo Spending) assumes that current funding levels and practices would be maintained – no new capital funding would be allocated to facilities. This falls well short of resident expectations and is not sustainable over the long-term. It does not address current gaps and would result in the deterioration of existing facilities. The City cannot allow this scenario to occur.

As described below, if block funding is not increased, the implications would be dire:

- 1) the City will not be able to accommodate all park users and outdoor sport participants as:
 - a. greater pressures would be placed on assets that are already over-utilized;
 - b. accessibility to existing facilities would worsen due to fewer new opportunities; and
 - c. current spending levels are not sufficient to address the gaps that currently exist between community needs and the existing supply of facilities;
- 2) the quality of many amenities will decline to a point where they may have to be removed to protect public safety because current spending levels are not sufficient to cover the backlog of repairs; and
- 3) the City's existing facilities would not be modernized and would become more antiquated.

If current funding levels and practices are maintained, it is estimated that the City will not be able to rectify existing gaps:

- Over 2,000 soccer and football players (mostly youth) do not currently have proper access to sports fields (representing 8% of all players).
- Over 5,000 teens do not currently have proper access to basketball courts in their area (representing 8% of all teens).
- Nearly 8,000 children do not currently have proper access to spray pads in their area (representing 14% of all children).
- Approximately 30,000 teens do not currently have proper access to skate parks (representing 45% of all teens).
- There is also a shortage of lit adult slo-pitch diamonds and trends suggest greater demand for bike parks, community gardens, and leash free areas, to name a few.


- Additional investment will be required to improve physical accessibility within the parks system, including pathways and support buildings (e.g., washrooms).

Just as troubling, without sufficient funding, the gap between supply and demand will become even greater over time and more people will be left without access to safe, accessible, and well designed outdoor recreation facilities.

In addition, this scenario would lead to insufficient maintenance of existing parks and facilities. Unlike indoor recreation facilities that have projected lifecycle costs and a generally finite lifespan, similar data does not exist for outdoor fields, amenities, and parks. Most outdoor recreation amenities do not have the same complex mechanical or structural elements inherent with indoor facilities and, therefore, are not generally subject to catastrophic failure resulting in facility closure. Rather, the deterioration of sports fields is gradual, with the result being a slow decline in playability (which is defined differently by various user groups). This deterioration can be partially mitigated through effective maintenance programs that may be able to extend usability from year to year; however, significant rehabilitation or replacement is inevitable over the long-run. Some outdoor recreational amenities – such as playgrounds, support buildings, spray pads, etc. – can be closed due to safety or functionality concerns, but many are more easily fixable than arenas or indoor pools, for example. It should be noted that the City is in the process of developing a comprehensive inventory of its support buildings in parks (e.g., washrooms, storage units, fieldhouses, etc.), which will eventually enable the use of lifecycle costing that is similar to that used for recreation centres and arenas.

Under this scenario, the City's existing outdoor recreation facilities would become more antiquated and not be brought up to modern standards. Although the current capital program will allow for some new facilities and improvements, it is not sufficient to fund the development of artificial turf fields, to convert redundant facilities into new uses (e.g., spray pads, basketball courts, community gardens, adult sports fields, etc.), to add lights to enough sports fields, or to make parks and their buildings accessible for persons with disabilities.

The capital renewal of existing outdoor recreation amenities is under-funded in the City of Hamilton by \$1.0 million per year. In addition, the capital development of new outdoor recreation amenities is under-funded in the City of Hamilton by \$1.2 million per year. The total funding shortfall is \$2.2 million per year. **By maintaining current allocated funding levels, this scenario does not address any of the shortfall.**



Scenario 2 (Focus on Renewal) is slightly more progressive than Scenario 1 in that it allocates additional funding (approximately \$1.0 million) to keep Hamilton’s existing outdoor recreation amenities open and safe. However, no new funding would be allocated to facility development, meaning that current and future gaps would not be addressed. This scenario represents a narrow and minimalistic response to the problem. In order to enhance Hamilton’s long-term viability, it is imperative that the City set its sights higher.

While allowing for more proactive renewal of its outdoor facilities, this scenario – like Scenario 1 – does not address the current deficiencies and poor service provision standards across the City. Although it would be prudent to improve existing assets before adding new ones that the City cannot afford to properly maintain, this would only serve to delay the problem. Other than new facilities in new subdivisions (largely made possible by Development Charges), there will be few new outdoor recreational facilities under Scenario 2. The risks associated with this scenario will increase over time as a result of decreased accessibility and supply ratios.

In addition, this scenario does not include any significant enhancements or expansions to existing outdoor amenities (beyond those that can be accommodated within current funding levels). These unfunded improvements will be required over time in order to modernize the City’s outdoor recreational infrastructure.

Ongoing lifecycle and maintenance costs are also expected to increase as the City’s outdoor amenities become older, particularly if budgets do not allow for proper maintenance and renewal. The amount of currently backlogged repairs is unknown, but we know that the backlog for indoor recreation facilities is considerable due to the compounding effect of insufficient funding levels over time.

The City’s current block funding levels are not sufficient to adequately maintain all existing outdoor facilities and amenities. To provide adequate funding to outdoor facility renewal projects, the City would have to contribute an average of \$2.2 million per year to the Parks and Cemetery Maintenance block fund; this represents an increase to the block funding of 83% (\$1.0 million per year). These costs would likely be higher in the short term as there is a need to address the backlog of deferred maintenance items. **This scenario would see the City address this \$1.0 million gap, but not the shortfall associated with new capital development (\$1.2 million per year).**



Scenario 3 (Strategic Renewal & Filling the Gaps) is recommended as the scenario that the City should strive to achieve. Scenario 3 is:

- a balanced approach that is responsive to both the current and future needs of Hamilton residents;
- supported by the Study’s Guiding Principles;
- the result of extensive study and analysis; and
- flexible in its implementation (e.g., emphasis on partnerships).

Adoption of this approach allows for Council and staff to meet community needs in a planned manner, targeting specific projects to match available funding, while protecting further deterioration of these important community assets. Through its implementation, this scenario recognizes that the City cannot meet all of these needs on its own and requires the pursuit of partnerships and collaborations with outside parties (e.g., school boards, user groups, community organizations, private providers, etc.).

The strategies put forth by Scenario 3 are numerous and represent modest changes to the City’s outdoor recreational infrastructure inventory, as well as administrative, design, development, and maintenance practices. These changes have been necessitated by a mix and distribution of facilities that is not fully responsive to current or long-term needs. Many of these assets were designed for a different time and are not able to accommodate current usage patterns or meet resident expectations.

Specifically, Scenario 3 best meets the needs of Hamilton residents by:

- 1) proactively addressing facility renewal requirements (resulting in the improved condition of fields, playgrounds, spray pads, courts, etc.), as captured in Scenario 2; and
- 2) providing improved and additional facilities in under-serviced areas (i.e., address current deficiencies in keeping with the changing demographics of Hamilton).

In reference to the second point above, the public consultation initiatives and needs assessment exercises identified several high priority deficiencies (i.e., facilities that are needed now, to serve existing residents). These are outlined in the following table. These deficiencies have increased gradually over time due to insufficient funding levels, growing resident expectations, and emerging activity choices and facility needs. None of these areas would be adequately addressed in Scenarios 1 or 2, but are accommodated in Scenario 3.

Current Outdoor Recreation Facility Deficiencies (2010)

Facility Type	Current Deficiencies
Soccer / Multi-use Fields	18 unlit equivalents* (mostly Class A and B fields)
Football Fields	1 lit field and 1 unlit field
Ball Diamonds	No additional fields, but improvements to existing inventory, such as lighting and conversion of smaller fields to adult slo-pitch diamonds, etc.
Cricket Grounds	1 proper cricket ground (recommended as replacement for pitches at Mohawk Sports Park)
Basketball Courts	Up to 7 new courts to serve gaps in geographic distribution; to be addressed over time; may be designed as multi-use courts
Spray Pads	Up to 7 new spray pads to serve gaps in geographic distribution; to be addressed over time
Skate Parks	Up to 4 new community-level skate parks and 4-5 neighbourhood-level skate parks to serve gaps in geographic distribution; to be addressed over time
Other: Community Gardens, Leash Free Parks, Bike Park, Support Buildings, Pathways in Parks	Specific needs to be identified through further analysis and/or as opportunities/partnerships are presented

* each lit field is equal to 1.5 unlit fields; each artificial turf field is equivalent to 3 unlit fields

The total funding shortfall is \$2.2 million per year (\$1.0 million for capital renewal and \$1.2 million for new construction), all of which is accounted for under this scenario. Although there is a need for additional funding on a yearly basis, this need is most dramatic over the next ten years (to approximately 2021), as much of the funding is to address current deficiencies (in addition to providing an enhanced array of outdoor recreation facilities to new residents in the future).

In order to reduce this figure, it is suggested that the City pursue alternative funding approaches that can create an initial or ongoing infusion of capital. Specifically, the establishment of partnership arrangements are supported and recognize that the community has a responsibility to assist in achieving the objectives of this Study. The successful implementation of this scenario requires the development of a standardized Partnership Framework to assess and secure suitable partners. The establishment of a fair, equitable, and transparent process for creating future relationships with outside entities is essential. Additional discussions are required with potential partners in order to confirm the timing and cost sharing possibilities associated with implementation of this scenario; key considerations of a framework are discussed in Section 22.6.

In addition to partnerships, there are several options that may be available to the City in achieving the benefits of Scenario 3, such as:

- Re-purposing an existing amenity into another use would allow the City to make use of existing infrastructure and retain neighbourhood locations, while better matching services to local needs.
- Consolidating fields at fewer locations, which would offer operational efficiencies and is consistent with user expectations.
- Designing amenities such as spray pads and skate parks in keeping with modern best practices, which will improve responsiveness to community demands.

- Removing under-utilized and antiquated facilities from the municipal inventory would assist in redirecting resources to higher priority services and facilities; removing such facilities also absolves the City of the responsibility of making them AODA-compliant (i.e., accessible).
- Working with school boards to offer needed amenities serving the local neighbourhood that would not otherwise be available due to a deficit of parkland in certain areas.

22.5 Implementation Plan for the Recommended Option (Strategic Renewal & Filling the Gaps)

The following summaries are the result of a detailed needs assessment that was based heavily on factual information such as facility usage, amenities, current condition, distribution, etc. This data was then balanced against extensive public input and trends research in order to identify a reasonable set of facility requirements tailored to each of the nine geographic areas of study. The data utilized in this study is considered to be the best available at this time; however, it should be noted that it is subject to change.

While the needs assessment findings are precise, some flexibility is required in their implementation. As opportunities arise, the recommended strategies may vary slightly from what was identified in this report. For example, additional discussions are required with potential partners (including school boards) in order to confirm the timing and possibilities associated with several of the capital projects. Population growth that occurs quicker or slower than anticipated may also affect the timing of implementation, as will funding availability.

The recommended strategies focus on large scale development and alterations to the City's outdoor recreational inventory. Nothing in this report should keep the City from undertaking necessary or desired upgrades to viable facilities as identified through regular maintenance checks, annual business plans, and similar processes. Before any new park is developed or existing park is redeveloped, the City may require that additional public consultation and/or a park master plan be completed to engage the local neighbourhood and user groups in identifying specific needs, impacts, and design elements.

Specifically, the following pages provide a schedule of new facility provision by community and timeframe for the following facility types:

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| • Ball Diamonds | • Neighbourhood-level Skate Parks |
| • Basketball & Multi-purpose Courts | • Soccer and Multi-use Fields |
| • Community-level Skate Parks | • Spray Pads |
| • Cricket Pitches | • Tennis Courts (Public and Club) |

It is not possible to define timing or location for all new facility/asset types due to the nature of the recommendations.

Facility/asset requirements have been identified for the 2010-11 period and then by 5 year terms (e.g., 2012-2016, 2017-2021, etc.); it is expected that City staff will advance projects in a logical order based on priority and opportunity within each of these periods. Projects that are not completed within their specified time period should become the highest priorities in the subsequent timeframe.

Soccer and Multi-use Fields		Existing Supply					204.5	
City-wide Needs	2009	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031	Recommended City-wide Provision Target	
Requirements	223.7	221.6	226.6	241.3	253.5	270.0	1 field (unit equivalent) for every 100 registered players, youth and adult	
Surplus (-Deficit)	-19.2	-17.1	-22.1	-36.8	-49.0	-65.5		
Proposed Implementation	2009 (Existing)	2010-2011	2012-2016	2017-2021	2022-2026	2027-2031	Comments	
Ancaster	21	3		2			Ancaster Landfill (3 fields in 2010); Redeemer College fields not included; location tbd (2 ULE, 2017-21)	
Beverly	6							
Flamborough	21	0	7.5				North Wentworth Park (removal of 2.5 ULE, 2010), Joe Sams (2.5 ULE fields in 2010 and 1.5 ULE fields in 2012-16), Courtcliffe Park (4 fields in 2012-16); Gatesbury Park (2 ULE fields in 2012-16) possible future artificial turf	
Glanbrook	11.5	3					Fairgrounds (1 field in 2010), Sports Park (1 field in 2010), Summerlea (1 field in 2010); possible future artificial turf	
Hamilton Mountain	60.5	1	11.5	1			McCullough fields to be replaced at Schwenger (2010; no net change), Gilkson Park/ RA Riddell (2 ULE, 2011, 2012-16), Mohawk Sports Park (conversion to artificial turf 1.5 ULE, net; 2012-16), Billy Sherring (conversion to artificial turf 1.5 ULE, net; 2012-16), Location tbd (2.5 ULE football fields, 2012-16), William Connell Park (5 ULE, 2012-16; 1 ULE 2017-21)	
Lower Hamilton	13		2.5	1.5	1		Eastwood Park (2.5 ULE in 2012-16), Location tbd (conversion to artificial turf 1.5 ULE, net; 2017-2021), location tbd (1 ULE, 2022-26)	
Lower Stoney Creek	36	1		3	2.5		Winona Park (1 field in 2010), location tbd (artificial turf 3 ULE, 2017-21), location tbd (2.5 ULE, 2022-26)	
Upper Stoney Creek	19	5.5	1	1	2	3	Heritage Green (1 lit & 1 artificial turf in 2010-11 = 4.5 ULE), Summit Park (1 field in 2010), Meplewood Park (1 field in 2012), Paramount Park (1 ULE, 2017-21), location tbd (5 ULE, 2022-31)	
West Hamilton / Dundas	16.5	1	2	3	1.5		Churchill Park (1 field in 2010), Veterans Park (2 ULE, 2012-16), Alexander Park (3 ULE, 2017-21), Location tbd (conversion to artificial turf 1.5 ULE, net; 2022-26)	
Subtotal - New Supply	--	14.5	24.5	11.5	7	3		
Total Supply		219	243.5	255	262	265		
Estimated Capital Costs		\$5,670,000	\$7,840,000	\$4,130,000	\$2,030,000	\$910,000		

All field supply and demand numbers are "unit equivalents" (1 lit field = 1.5 unit equivalents; 1 lit artificial field = 3 unit equivalents).

Ball Diamonds		Existing Supply					261.5	
City-wide Needs		2009	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031	Recommended City-wide Provision Target
Requirements		215.3	214.8	211.4	216.5	224.5	237.8	1 diamond (unit equivalent) for every 75 registered players, youth and adult
Surplus (-Deficit)		46.2	46.7	50.1	45.0	37.0	23.7	
Proposed Implementation	2009 (Existing)	2010-2011	2012-2016	2017-2021	2022-2026	2027-2031	Comments	
Ancaster	13.5		1				Lighting of 2 diamonds (1.0 ULE) in Community Centre Park (2012-16)	
Beverly	30						Joe Sams Leisure Park (2 ULE in 2012-16)	
Flamborough	18		2					
Glanbrook	10							
Hamilton Mountain	73.5	4	0.5				Seneca School diamonds being replaced at William McCulloch Park (2010, no net change), Lighting of 8 diamonds (4.0 ULE) at Turner Park (2010-11), Lighting of 3 diamonds (1.5 ULE) at Mohawk Sports Park (2012-16), Glikson Park/Ra Riddell (removal of 1 diamond, 2012-16)	
Lower Hamilton	47.5	-5.5	-2				Globe Park (loss of 6 diamonds - 7.5 ULE - in 2010), changes to Rosedale Park (net change is 2 ULE diamonds, 2010), Eastwood Park (removal of 2 diamonds, 2012-16)	
Lower Stoney Creek	31							
Upper Stoney Creek	16	-1		-1			Maplewood Park (removal of 1 diamond in 2011), Paramount Park (removal of 1 diamond, 2017-21)	
West Hamilton / Dundas	22		-2	-4			Veterans Park (removal of 2 diamonds, 2012-16), Alexander Park (removal of 4 diamonds, 2017-21)	
Subtotal - New Supply	--	-1.5	-0.5	-5	0	0		
Total Supply		260	259.5	254.5	254.5	254.5		
Estimated Capital Costs		\$1,655,000	\$1,150,000	\$0	\$0	\$0		

All supply and demand numbers are "unit equivalents" (1 litr diamond = 1.5 unit equivalents).

Cricket Pitches		Existing Supply					3	
City-wide Needs		2009	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031	Recommended City-wide Provision Target
Requirements		4	4	5	5	5	5 to 6	1 pitch for every 120,000 residents
Surplus (-Deficit)		-1	-1	-2	-2	-2	-2 to -3	
Proposed Implementation	2009 (Existing)	2010-2011	2012-2016	2017-2021	2022-2026	2027-2031	Comments	
Ancaster	0							
Beverly	0							
Flamborough	0							
Glanbrook	0							
Hamilton Mountain	1	-1					Mohawk Sports Park (removal of pitch in 2010-11)	
Lower Hamilton	1		-1				Cathedral Park (removal of pitch in 2012-16)	
Lower Stoney Creek	0		1				Location tbd (2012-16)	
Upper Stoney Creek	0	1					Heritage Green Sports Park - tbd (1 pitch in 2010-11)	
West Hamilton / Dundas	1							
Subtotal - New Supply	--	0	0	0	0	0		
Total Supply		3	3	3	3	3		
Estimated Capital Costs		\$1,178,000	\$1,178,000	\$0	\$0	\$0		

Basketball & Multi-purpose Courts					Existing Supply			84
City-wide Needs	2009	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031	Recommended City-wide Provision Target	
Requirements	89	88	81	83	87	95	1 court (full court equivalent) for every 750 youth (ages 10 to 19)	
Surplus (-Deficit)	-5	-4	3	1	-3	-11		
Proposed Implementation (Existing)	2009	2010-2011	2012-2016	2017-2021	2022-2026	2027-2031	Comments	
Ancaster	4.5		1				Location tbd (2 new courts, 1 removal)	
Beverly	6.5			-1			Location tbd (1 removal)	
Flamborough	4.5							
Glanbrook	0	1		2			Summerlea Park (1 in 2010), Locations tbd (2 new courts)	
Hamilton Mountain	24						William Connell Park (2 courts in 2012-16), Location tbd (2 removals in 2012-16)	
Lower Hamilton	25						2 new locations, 2 removals	
Lower Stoney Creek	13.5							
Upper Stoney Creek	3		-1	2	3	2	Locations tbd (1 removal, 7 new courts)	
West Hamilton / Dundas	3	1	1				Locations tbd (2 new courts)	
Subtotal - New Supply	--	2	1	3	3	2		
Total Supply		86	87	90	93	95		
Estimated Capital Costs		\$248,000	\$310,000	\$248,000	\$186,000	\$124,000		
All supply and demand numbers are "full court equivalents" (1 half court = 0.5 full court).								
Excludes school basketball hoops								

Tennis Courts (Public and Club)					Existing Supply			91
City-wide Needs	2009	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031	Recommended City-wide Provision Target	
Requirements	80	82	86	92	96	102	1 court for every 6,500 residents	
Surplus (-Deficit)	11	9	5	-1	-5	-11		
Proposed Implementation (Existing)	2009	2010-2011	2012-2016	2017-2021	2022-2026	2027-2031	Comments	
Ancaster	6							
Beverly	8							
Flamborough	5		2				Location tbd (2 new courts)	
Glanbrook	1		2	2			Locations tbd (4 new courts)	
Hamilton Mountain	16		2		2		William Connell Park (2 courts in 2012-16), Location tbd (2 courts)	
Lower Hamilton	32	-3		-3			Globe Park (loss of 3 courts in 2010), Central Park (removal of 3 courts, 2017-21)	
Lower Stoney Creek	9			2			Location tbd (2 new courts)	
Upper Stoney Creek	4			2	3		Locations tbd (5 new courts)	
West Hamilton / Dundas	10							
Subtotal - New Supply	--	-3	6	3	5	0		
Total Supply		88	94	97	102	102		
Estimated Capital Costs		\$0	\$420,000	\$420,000	\$350,000	\$0		

Spray Pads		Existing Supply					51
City-wide Needs	2009	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031	Recommended City-wide Provision Target
Requirements	51	51	54	58	60	61	1 spray pad for every 1,100 children (ages 0 to 9)
Surplus (-Deficit)	0	0	-3	-7	-9	-10	
Proposed Implementation	2009 (Existing)	2010-2011	2012-2016	2017-2021	2022-2026	2027-2031	Comments
Ancaster	0	1	1				Village Green Park (2010-11), location tbd (2012-16)
Beverly	0						
Flamborough	1						
Glanbrook	0			1			Location tbd
Hamilton Mountain	22	1	2				Schwenger Park (2010-11), Buchanan Park (2012-16), location tbd
Lower Hamilton	21		1				Parkdale Park (2012-16)
Lower Stoney Creek	5	1					Winona Park (2010-11)
Upper Stoney Creek	0			1	2	1	Location tbd (2017-21), Locations tbd (3, 2022-31)
West Hamilton / Dundas	2						
Subtotal - New Supply	--	3	4	2	2	1	
Total Supply		54	58	60	62	63	
Estimated Capital Costs		\$540,000	\$720,000	\$360,000	\$360,000	\$180,000	

Community-level Skate Parks							Existing Supply			5
City-wide Needs	2009	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031	Recommended City-wide Provision Target			
Requirements	9	9	8	8	9	10	1 park for every 7,500 youth (ages 10 to 19)			
Surplus (-Deficit)	-4	-4	-3	-3	-4	-5				
Proposed Implementation (Existing)	2009	2010-2011	2012-2016	2017-2021	2022-2026	2027-2031	Comments			
Ancaster	0			1			Location tbd			
Beverly	0									
Flamborough	1									
Glanbrook	0						Location tbd			
Hamilton Mountain	2		1							
Lower Hamilton	2									
Lower Stoney Creek	0		1				Location tbd			
Upper Stoney Creek	0					1	Location tbd			
West Hamilton / Dundas	0			1			Location tbd			
Subtotal - New Supply	--	0	2	2	0	1				
Total Supply		5	7	9	9	10				
Estimated Capital Costs		\$0	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	\$0	\$750,000				

Neighbourhood-level Skate Parks							Existing Supply			0
City-wide Needs	2009	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031	Recommended City-wide Provision Target			
Requirements	4	4	4	4	4	5	1 park for every 15,000 youth (ages 10 to 19)			
Surplus (-Deficit)	-4	-4	-4	-4	-4	-5				
Proposed Implementation (Existing)	2009	2010-2011	2012-2016	2017-2021	2022-2026	2027-2031	Comments			
Ancaster	0									
Beverly	0									
Flamborough	0						Location tbd			
Glanbrook	0		1							
Hamilton Mountain	0						Locations tbd			
Lower Hamilton	0		1			1	Location tbd			
Lower Stoney Creek	0			1			Location tbd			
Upper Stoney Creek	0				1		Location tbd			
West Hamilton / Dundas	0									
Subtotal - New Supply	--	0	2	1	1	1				
Total Supply		0	2	3	4	5				
Estimated Capital Costs		\$0	\$300,000	\$150,000	\$150,000	\$150,000				

22.6 Partnerships – The Need for a Standardized Framework

Earlier in this report, it was recommended that the City develop a formal policy for evaluating and responding to partnership requests for items beyond the typical scope of municipal provision in Hamilton. This may include small items (such as commemorative plaques) or larger ventures and could include elements related to funding (capital and operating), roles and responsibilities, community access, etc. Certainly, full implementation of this Plan will require considerable cooperation by local residents and organizations. This Plan is supportive of partnerships that provide benefits to the general public that outweigh the risks and that make appropriate use of public and private funds.

Background

The City of Hamilton's Strategic Directions that describe Council's long term vision for the City include a number of commitments:

- Growing our local economy;
- Great City to live in;
- Invest in health, environment and neighbourhoods;
- Open and accessible government;
- Efficient City government; and
- Employer of choice.

The strategic directions illustrate that the City aspires to continuously improve its ability to provide meaningful, valuable and cost efficient services to Hamiltonians. The ultimate objective is to make the City as liveable as possible.

As discussed earlier in this report, eight guiding principles were developed to inform the Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan. In their entirety, the principles set a direction for prioritizing outdoor recreation facility/asset developments and improvements. The principles are:

- Exercise fiscal accountability
- Build healthy communities and promote outdoor activity for children and persons of all ages
- Collaborate with others and seek innovative solutions
- Invest strategically in the redevelopment or repurposing of outdoor recreational assets
- Ensure appropriate provision levels
- Ensure appropriate maintenance levels
- Engage the community and recognize our differences
- Implement designs that are flexible, accessible and appropriate

Although the principles were developed and aligned with the objectives of this study, they offer useful insights and guidance that could be applied to other municipal initiatives such as partnership creation.

Alternative Facility Provision Approaches

Over the past decade, recreation service providers have dealt with an unprecedented rate of change. Shifts in community socio-demographics, consumer lifestyle changes, new and elevated expectations related to recreation facilities and services, intensified calls for increased accountability plus significant financial pressures have caused municipal officials to search for new facility provision strategies. Recognizing that doing more with less is daunting, most municipalities are looking at relationships with outside entities as a means to advance their effectiveness in responding to change and to deliver solutions that would otherwise not be possible.

Hamilton is certainly no stranger to the concept of developing productive relationships with outside groups. The Mohawk Multi-pad Indoor Sports Complex, the privately operated fitness centre at the Morgan Firestone arena, and initiatives with the Hamilton Waterfront Trust, as well as the City's relationships with its volunteer groups and School Boards are clear evidence that the City has a long history of successfully cultivating and securing productive partnerships.

In most jurisdictions, relationships with external groups are seen as one of several development methods for future capital projects. And, as the number of partnership examples grows, it is becoming increasingly clear to municipal officials that partnerships involve nuances not normally found in traditional facility provision models. Consequently, many jurisdictions ensure that all potential partnerships undergo rigorous scrutiny through the application of a consistent screening mechanism before the project proceeds. Municipalities that have adopted a standardized partnership framework to assess and secure suitable partners have found that it: (1) informs municipal officials of the merits and drawbacks of each partnership candidate and project; and (2) clarifies the expectations and obligations of organizations looking to partner with the municipality.

It is recommended that Hamilton adopt a Standardized Partnership Framework that sets out a fair, equitable and transparent process for creating future relationships with outside entities.

Benefits of Partnerships

Several common elements are inherent with successful municipal partnerships.

- The venture will be mutually beneficial to each partner.
- There are clearly defined roles and responsibilities.
- There is a performance evaluation methodology.
- There is a shared commitment to serve the needs of those affected by the venture.
- There is a commitment to improve.
- There is fair and honest recognition of each partner's contribution.

Hamilton's relationships with outside groups are only practical if reasonable benefits accrue to the City and that the relationship supports municipal priorities as defined by the strategic directions and guiding principles. To this end, it is the City's responsibility to thoroughly analyze each relationship prior to pursuing or approving the partnership. Generally, this analysis would involve an assessment of the relationship's ability to provide one or more of the following beneficial outcomes - which for clarity purposes have been linked to one of the eight guiding principles described above:

- to create or maintain public infrastructure at less cost than a traditional municipal capital project exercising fiscal accountability;
- to create public buy-in to the project by engaging the community;
- to improve provision/service levels through strategic investment in the development of municipal assets;
- to gain access to techniques and resources that are beyond municipal capabilities by collaborating with others to seek innovative solutions;
- to reduce development by exercising fiscal accountability;
- to introduce a higher degree of productivity to a development process through collaboration;
- to provide greater access to new sources of capital through which appropriate provision and maintenance levels can be achieved; and
- to take advantage of collective expertise and to leverage experience that is outside the normal municipal approach through engagement and collaboration.

Many of the preceding benefits have been achieved through the City's existing partnerships, such as in the case of the Mohawk Sports Complex. The go-forward challenge is to build on the City's past partnership successes to achieve its strategic objectives. This will require the application of a logical decision-making mechanism to determine the most appropriate course of action when considering a relationship with outside interests.

The following Standardized Partnership Framework sets out a uniform process to evaluate potential relationships with outside entities for capital projects. The application of the Framework should take into account the preceding information pertaining to the benefits, drawbacks, success factors and beneficial outcomes of successful partnerships.

Standardized Partnership Framework for Capital Projects

As defined by City's vision, mission, values and strategic priorities, does the City have a role to play in providing the facility?	Yes ▼	No ▶	Do not consider municipal involvement in the project.
Is there demonstrated current and long-term community need for the facility?	Yes ▼	No ▶	Do not consider municipal involvement in the project.
Is the project identified as a priority in any previous municipal planning studies or supplementary analysis?	Yes ▼	No ▶	Do not consider municipal involvement in the project.
If the project is not included the City's 10 year capital plan, would the application of the capital budget rating system result in a score sufficient to consider adding the project to the capital plan?	Yes ▼	No ▶	Do not consider municipal involvement in the project.
Is the proposed development on City land, and if not, is the City able to control the long-term future of the project?	Yes ▼	No ▶	Do not consider municipal involvement in the project.
Does the project result in financial and liability risks that can be reasonably mitigated?	Yes ▼	No ▶	Do not consider municipal involvement in the project.
Does the potential partner have adequate capacity and resources to support the project?	Yes ▼	No ▶	Consider providing facility using a traditional municipal approach.
Can the City enter into the partnership relationship on a sole source basis?	Yes ▼	No ▶	Issue a Request For Proposal or other procurement process specified by purchasing policies.
Is there consensus regarding the terms, conditions, standards of delivery and responsibilities of the proposed partner?	Yes ▼	No ▶	Negotiate mutually acceptable standards of responsibility with the outside entity.
Establish a relationship with an outside entity to undertake the project and adopt a mutually agreeable monitoring system.			

It is important that the partnership is with a compatible and willing partner that shares the City's long-term vision for the project. Not only should the partner bring the necessary skills and resources to fulfill its project obligations, but also demonstrate a public service attitude. Recognizing that all partnerships should be developed in direct response to the specific circumstances of a particular project, potential partners should understand the City's intent to develop an open and honest relationship where each partner's contribution is important to the success of the project. Furthermore, the partner must be dedicated to the pursuit of the mutually accepted objectives and endorse a philosophy of constant improvement. Finally, there must be shared commitment to provide quality leisure services in an environment consistent with the expectations of Hamilton's residents.

Unsolicited Proposals

A uniform approach to evaluating potential partnerships is especially applicable when dealing with unsolicited proposals. As in most municipalities across the province, Hamilton is often presented with ideas or partnership propositions from public, not-for-profit or private groups. Frequently, these propositions suggest that the proposed partner would contribute funds to help pay for the project and to facilitate a more rapid development cycle. Sometimes, these projects bypass the usual capital planning and approval process and are simply inserted in the City's development plans - essentially parachuting into the capital plan thereby delaying the development schedule of other projects already in the plan. The size and scope of these projects are widely variable. They may range from relatively small undertakings (such as building an equipment storage facility adjacent to an outdoor sports field) to complex arrangements like erecting and operating an air supported dome structure over a municipally-owned soccer field. By adopting a pre-set evaluation system, Hamilton would establish its capability to provide organized and thoughtful responses to proponents and position itself to identify projects with merit and to cull those that should be avoided.

A pre-established evaluation mechanism is invaluable in demonstrating that the City will seriously entertain propositions, so long as they are within pre-determined parameters and meet preset criteria. This is particularly helpful when partnerships are proposed by community organizations – especially groups with longstanding relationships with the municipality. Sometimes these groups feel that they should receive “preferential treatment” because of previous public service or close connections with elected officials. A well conceived, fair and transparent pre-established evaluation mechanism helps groups recognize that they must conform to a thoughtful process that provides the City with assurances that the relationship is truly capable of providing the municipality with community benefits envisioned by the candidate.

Given that the number and complexity of unsolicited proposals is likely to increase in the future, it would be advisable for Hamilton to establish a staff team – a Technical Review Committee – that would be charged with the responsibility of analyzing and evaluating propositions. The Review Committee should be made up of individuals with various backgrounds from a number of different departments including recreation, public works, finance, legal, and planning.

It should be understood that simply because a relationship is proposed by a potential partner, it is not reason enough to pursue an arrangement. The venture must first demonstrate compliance with municipal vision, mission, values and strategic priorities similar to the first question in the preceding Standardized Partnership Framework. At a minimum, the following criteria should be employed to determine the applicability of the proponent's proposition.

- The proposition conforms to the City's mandate, values and strategic directions.
- In cases where the relationship is on-going, confirmation that there is legal authority to undertake the partnership.
- The proposition responds to a demonstrated need or presents an attractive benefit to the municipality.
- There is clear community benefit and/or economic spin-offs for, or within the municipality.

Assuming that there appears to be no conflict between the proposed project and municipal vision, mission, values and strategic directions, the proposal should be reviewed for its merits and drawbacks. The Technical Review Committee would test the proposal against pre-established criteria that would be customized to the project. At a minimum, the following criteria should be employed during this analysis.

- There is a business plan demonstrating the revenue/cost and administrative/operating advantages of the proposal, relative to other proposals or to the City's ability to deliver the facility, project or service. If the proposal involves some sort of administrative/operating relationship, this assessment would involve the comparison of the proponent's business plan to a municipal comparator representing a cost estimate if the City were to undertake the project on its own.
- There is value inherent in the proposal that would provide the municipality with enhanced levels of service.
- The proposal includes a risk analysis (financial, continuity of service, public relations, liability, etc.) that is acceptable to the City.
- The financial, administrative, and operating risk or other obligations that are proposed to be absorbed by the City are acceptable and can be managed within the municipal 10-year capital plan or annual budget.
- The proponent is capable of demonstrating administrative, operating and technical qualifications and financial ability commensurate with the nature and scope of the project.
- The project is clear of any environmental concerns.
- The proposal includes a benefit analysis for both the municipality and the proponent that is acceptable to the City.

Proponents will frequently contend that their propositions are unique and should qualify as a sole source opportunity. It will be important for the City to thoroughly investigate the validity of these claims prior to proceeding.

The issues that the City should consider regarding the proprietary nature of a proposed project when examining the merits of unsolicited proposals are listed below.

- magnitude of the project (dollar value and complexity);
- availability of other proponents with similar capacities or expertise;
- uniqueness of the idea or concept;
- trade mark and copy right issues;
- exclusivity issues;
- length of the proposed term of the relationship; and
- nature of the proposed agreement.

If the concept meets the proprietary test, the City would be free to negotiate with the proponent on a sole source basis. However, if the concept fails to meet the test, the City could elect to either pursue the project utilizing its normal Request for Proposal process or abandon the project altogether.

If the City is satisfied that the concept conforms with municipal values, is worthy of further attention and it is deemed proprietary such that a sole source negotiation would be appropriate, the proponent should provide detailed information, which at a minimum should include the following:

- a comprehensive needs analysis;
- a comprehensive business plan;
- the proponent's financial capacity;
- a clear demonstration of the sustainability of the project;
- in the case of a not-for-profit group, the organization's secession plan;
- detailed evidence of community benefit;
- level of financial contribution (note, at present the Operations and Maintenance funding policy requires that a minimum of 35% of the project cost be contributed for projects relating to naming rights); and
- a full risk analysis.

The Unsolicited Proposal Review Framework on the following page provides a simple and uniform method of evaluate partnership submissions to the City from private sector entities, community groups or other external organizations. This Review Framework represents an additional evaluation mechanism in the City's standardized approach to developing successful partnerships.

In summary, a standardized approach to developing successful partnerships would normalize the evaluation of potential partners and help to position the municipality as "open for business". In the absence of a standardized approach, roles, responsibilities, expectations, and relationship structures are often established in response to the characteristics of a particular project rather than what makes most sense for the municipality. Furthermore, knee-jerk decisions can cause difficulty in creating an equitable partnership that has the best chance for success. A standardized evaluation mechanism would protect the interest of potential partners while ensuring that the municipality does not enter into an arrangement before adequate due diligence has been undertaken. The Standardized Partnership Framework and the Unsolicited Proposal Review Framework combine to form a standardized approach to developing successful partnerships which should guide Hamilton's future discussions with all potential partners.

Unsolicited Proposal Review Framework

The City receives an unsolicited proposal from an outside entity.



Proposal is forwarded to the Technical Review Committee for analysis.

Does the proposal fulfil the pre-established criteria related to compliance with municipal values, public-service philosophies and community focus?	Yes ▼	No ►	Reject the proposal.
Does the proposed project meet a demonstrated need and provide community benefit consistent with municipal priorities?	Yes ▼	No ►	Reject the proposal.
Does the proposed project fulfil the minimum requirements as set out by the pre-established criteria related to a business plan, risk assessment plan, value assessment, municipal financial and risk obligations, proponent's qualifications, etc.?	Yes ▼	No ►	Reject the proposal.
Does the proposed project or concept meet the proprietary test?	Yes ▼	No ►	Issue the City's customary Request for Proposal or reject the project.
Does the additional detailed information requested by the Review Committee meet the test of reasonableness and does the project seem viable?	Yes ▼	No ►	Reject the proposal.

Recommend the project to Council for its consideration.



Outdoor Recreation Facilities & Sports Field Provision Plan

ATTACHMENTS

November 2011



Monteith + Brown
planning consultants

In Association
With



The JF Group

stla



& Environmental Research Centre


TABLE OF CONTENTS

ATTACHMENT I	Demographic & Facility Mapping (<i>25 pages</i>)
Map 1	Study Areas
Map 2	Demographic Profile
Map 2A	Demographic Profile 2006 Population of Persons 0 to 9 Years of Age, Persons per hectare
Map 2B	Demographic Profile 2006 Population of Persons 10 to 19 Years of Age, Persons per hectare
Map 2C	Demographic Profile 2006 Population of Persons 20 to 49 Years of Age, Persons per hectare
Map 2D	Demographic Profile 2006 Population of Persons 50 to 59 Years of Age, Persons per hectare
Map 2E	Demographic Profile 2006 Population of Persons 60+ Years of Age, Persons per hectare
Map 3	Population Forecast by Community
Map 4	Percentage of Population with Low Income after Tax (2005)
Map 5	Percentage of Population that speaks a non-official language (i.e., other than English & French) most often at home
Map 6	Soccer & Multi-Use Fields
Map 7	Ball Diamonds
Map 8	Other Dedicated Sports Fields (Football & Cricket)
Map 9	Basketball Courts
Map 10	Splash Pads & Wading Pools
Map 11	Bocce Ball & Lawn Bowling
Map 12	Outdoor Ice Rinks
Map 13	Playgrounds
Map 14	Outdoor Running Tracks
Map 15	Skateboard Parks
Map 16	Tennis Courts
Map 17	Leash Free Parks
Map 18	Schools
Map 19	Schools – Current and Conditional Future Projects (HWDSB)
Map 20	Schools – Potential School Closures (HWDSB)
ATTACHMENT II	Public Consultation Summaries (<i>26 pages</i>)
ATTACHMENT III	Community-Specific Demographic Forecasts (<i>2 pages</i>)
ATTACHMENT IV	Listing of Background Documents (<i>1 page</i>)
ATTACHMENT V	Sports Field Booking Data (2008) (<i>5 pages</i>)
ATTACHMENT VI	Recreation Facility Inventory (<i>8 pages</i>)
ATTACHMENT VII	Facility Provision Levels by Community (<i>21 pages</i>)
ATTACHMENT VIII	Proposed Short-Term Facility/Park Changes (subject to change) (<i>2 pages</i>)
ATTACHMENT IX	Sports Field Management Review & Recommendations (<i>14 pages</i>)
ATTACHMENT X	Comparison of Municipal Field Rental Rates & Allocation Standards (<i>4 pages</i>)

CITY OF HAMILTON

**Outdoor Recreation Facilities
& Sports Field Provision Plan**

ATTACHMENT I: DEMOGRAPHIC & FACILITY MAPPING




Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009





Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan

Map 1 Study Areas



Community Name	0 to 9 Years	10 to 19 Years	20 to 49 Years	50 to 59 Years	60+ Years
ANCASTER	11.92%	16.03%	38.28%	15.04%	18.73%
BEVERLY	11.03%	15.05%	37.85%	15.81%	20.25%
FLAMBOROUGH	14.25%	16.02%	42.50%	13.00%	14.22%
GLANBROOK	10.54%	13.38%	37.95%	13.75%	24.38%
HAMILTON MOUNTAIN	11.55%	14.35%	40.99%	12.72%	20.39%
LOWER HAMILTON	10.58%	11.82%	46.03%	13.18%	18.40%
LOWER STONEY CREEK	10.79%	12.62%	40.12%	14.17%	22.30%
UPPER STONEY CREEK	13.46%	17.29%	44.53%	13.39%	11.33%
WEST HAMILTON / DUNDAS	9.26%	12.52%	41.13%	13.99%	23.10%






Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton. Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009
Adapted from: Statistics Canada, Age and Sex for the Population of Census Tracts (100% Data), Cat. No. 97-551-X2006007, 2006 Census.



Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan

Map 2 Demographic Profile







Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009
 Adapted from: Statistics Canada, Age and Sex for the Population of Census Tracts (100% Data), Cat. No. 97-551-X2006007, 2006 Census.



Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan
Map 2A Demographic Profile 2006 Population of Persons 0 to 9 Years of Age, Persons per hectare







Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009
 Adapted from: Statistics Canada, Age and Sex for the Population of Census Tracts (100% Data), Cat. No. 97-551-X2006007, 2006 Census.



Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan
 Map 2B Demographic Profile 2006 Population of Persons 10 to 19 Years of Age, Persons per hectare







Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009
 Adapted from: Statistics Canada, Age and Sex for the Population of Census Tracts (100% Data), Cat. No. 97-551-X2006007, 2006 Census.



Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan
 Map 2C Demographic Profile 2006 Population of Persons 20 to 49 Years of Age, Persons per hectare








Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009
 Adapted from: Statistics Canada, Age and Sex for the Population of Census Tracts (100% Data), Cat. No. 97-551-X2006007, 2006 Census.



Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan
Map 2D Demographic Profile 2006 Population of Persons 50 to 59 Years of Age, Persons per hectare







Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009
 Adapted from: Statistics Canada, Age and Sex for the Population of Census Tracts (100% Data), Cat. No. 97-551-X2006007, 2006 Census.



Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan
 Map 2E Demographic Profile 2006 Population of Persons Age 60 Years and Over, Persons per hectare



Year	
2006	Population (Census)
2011	Population Forecast
2016	Population Forecast
2021	Population Forecast
2026	Population Forecast
2031	Population Forecast





Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009
 Adapted from: Statistics Canada, Age and Sex for the Population of Census Tracts (100% Data), Cat. No. 97-551-X2006007, 2006 Census.



Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan

Map 3 Population Forecast by Community





Notes:

*Income status after tax - Refers to the position of an economic family or a person 15 years of age and over not in an economic family in relation to Statistics Canada's low income after-tax cut-offs (LICO-AT).

**Prevalence of low income rates (before or after-tax) are calculated from rounded counts of low income persons or families and the total number persons or families. These counts have been rounded independently of the rounded counts shown in the table; thus, there may be a small difference between the rate shown and one derived from the counts shown. Users are advised to interpret prevalence of low income rates based upon small counts with caution.

Data for census tract 0036.00 (the area from James St to Wellington St, between King St and the CN tracks) is suppressed, most likely due to a high rate of non-response.



All data for census tract 0018.00 (the Centre for Mountain Health Services) is suppressed due to the small number, i.e., absence, of private households in this area.

Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009



Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan
Map 4 Percentage of Population with Low Income After Tax (2005)






Notes:


- *20% sample data
- **This is a subtotal of all languages collected by the census that are not displayed separately here. For a full list of languages collected in the census, please refer to Appendix G in the 2006 Census Dictionary.
- ***20% sample data; Knowledge of non-official languages, refers to languages, other than English or French, in which the respondent can conduct a conversation.
- Data for census tract 0036.00 (the area from James St to Wellington St, between King St and the CN tracks) is suppressed, most likely due to a high rate of non-response.
- All data for census tract 0018.00 (the Centre for Mountain Health Services) is suppressed due to the small number, i.e., absence, of private households in this area.

Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009



Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan
 Map 5 Percentage of Population that Speaks a Non-Official Language (i.e., other than English or French) Most Often at Home





Legend

- Community Boundary
- City Boundary

Parks with Soccer & Multi-use Fields

Class

- 1 or more Class A (and possibly B and / or C) fields
- 1 or more Class B (and possibly C) fields
- 1 or more Class C fields
- 1.5km Service Area

CLASS	
A	lit, irrigated, field house, bleachers, regulation
B	some amenities, i.e. lit irrigated, regulation to intermediate size
C	non-lit, no spectator seating, no change rooms, regulation to mini-size, irrigated 'C' class fields pay a surcharge

PARKS WITH SOCCER FIELDS

NO.	PARK NAME
1	ALBION ESTATES PARK
2	ANCASTER COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK
3	ANCASTER HIGH SCHOOL
4	BARTON SECONDARY SCHOOL
5	BAYVIEW WEST PARK
6	BEVERLY COMMUNITY PARK
7	BILLY SHERRING PARK
8	BOBBY KERR PARK
9	BRIAN TIMMIS STADIUM
10	CAPTAIN CORNELIUS PARK
11	CECIL B. STIRLING SCHOOL
12	CENTENNIAL HEIGHTS PARK
13	CHERRY HEIGHTS PARK
14	CHURCHILL PARK
15	CLINE PARK
16	CORKTOWN PARK
17	CORMAN PARK
18	COURTCLIFFE COMMUNITY PARK
19	DALEWOOD SCHOOL
20	DOVER PARK
21	EASTDALE PARK
22	EASTWOOD PARK
23	FATHER SEAN O'SULLIVAN MEMORIAL PARK
24	FELKER PARK
25	FERNWOOD PARK
26	FERRIS PARK
27	FISHER'S MILL PARK
28	FLAMBOROUGH CENTRE PARK
29	GARTH ST. RESEVOIR
30	GATESBURY PARK
31	GILKSON PARK - R.A. RIDDELL SCHOOL
32	GLANBROOK SPORTS COMPLEX
33	GLENDALE PARK
34	GREEN ACRES PARK
35	GREENHILL RESEVOIR
36	HENRY & BEATRICE WARDEN PARK
37	HERITAGE GREEN SPORTS PARK
38	HIGHLAND GARDENS PARK
39	HILLCREST PARK
40	HILLPARK SECONDARY SCHOOL
41	IVOR WYNN STADIUM
42	JAMES SMITH PARK
43	JOE SAMS LEISURE PARK
44	KAY DRAGE PARK
45	LAWFIELD PARK
46	LESLIE B. COULDREY PARK
47	LISGAR PARK
48	LYNDEN LIONS SOUTH
49	MACASSA PARK
50	MAPLEWOOD GREEN PARK
51	MEADOWLANDS PERMANENT
52	MEADOWLANDS SOCCER PITCH
53	MEMORIAL PARK
54	MOHAWK SPORTS PARK
55	MONTGOMERY PARK
56	MOUNT LION'S CLUB PARK
57	MOUNTVIEW PARK
58	NORTH WENTWORTH COMMUNITY PARK
59	OLYMPIC PARK
60	OLYMPIC SPORTS PARK 1
61	ORCHARD PARK HIGH SCHOOL
62	PARAMOUNT PARK
63	PROPOSED
64	RIVERDALE EAST PARK (OAKLANDS)
65	ROCKCLIFFE GARDENS
66	SACKVILLE HILL MEMORIAL PARK
67	SALT FLEET DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOL
68	SAM MANSON PARK
69	SANCTUARY
70	SHERWOOD HEIGHTS SECONDARY SCHOOL
71	SHERWOOD MEADOWS PARK
72	SHERWOOD PARK
73	SIR ALLAN MACNAB RECREATION CENTER
74	SIR ISAAC BROCK SCHOOL PLAYGROUND
75	SIR WILFRID LAURIER SECONDARY SCHOOL
76	SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH'S PARK
77	T.B. McQUESTEN PARK
78	TAPLETTOWN PARK
79	TEMPLEMEAD PARK SCHOOL LANDS
80	VALLEY PARK
81	VETERANS PARK
82	VILLAGE GREEN PARK
83	WATERDOWN MEMORIAL PARK
84	WESTDALE SECONDARY SCHOOL
85	WESTMOUNT SECONDARY SCHOOL
86	WHITE DEER PARK
87	WILLIAM McCULLOCH PARK
88	WOODLAND PARK

Notes:


Several facilities are multi-use and may be utilized for multiple sports / activities. Municipal facilities only. School facilities are only included in instances where there is a maintenance or booking agreement in place with the City.


Inventory current as of May 31 / 09.

Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009



Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan
 Map 6 Soccer & Multi-use Fields - 2009 -





Legend

- Community Boundary
- City Boundary

Baseball Diamonds

- Parks with 1 ball diamond
- Parks with 2-3 ball diamonds
- Parks with 4-5 ball diamonds
- Parks with 6 or more ball diamonds
- 1.5km Service Area


Notes:

Several facilities are multi-use and may be utilized for multiple sports / activities. Municipal facilities only. School facilities are only included in instances where there is a maintenance or booking agreement in place with the City.

Inventory current as of May 31 / 09.

NO.	PARK NAME	TOTAL	HARDBALL LIT	HARDBALL UNLIT	SOFTBALL LIT	SOFTBALL UNLIT	T BALL (LIT AND UNLIT)
1	ALBION ESTATES PARK	2	0	0	2	0	0
2	ALEXANDER PARK	4	0	1	0	2	1
3	AMBERLY PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
4	ANCASTER COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK	4	1	0	1	2	0
5	ANCASTER LITTLE LEAGUE (SPRING VALLEY BOW)	3	1	1	0	0	1
6	BAYVIEW WEST PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
7	BEACH BLVD PARK #2	1	0	1	0	0	0
8	BELMONT PARK	0	0	1	0	0	0
9	BEVERLY COMMUNITY PARK	2	0	0	1	1	0
10	BINBROOK FAIRGROUNDS	1	0	0	0	1	0
11	BINBROOK FAIRGROUNDS	2	0	0	0	0	2
12	BOBBY KERR PARK	2	0	0	0	2	0
13	BOBBY KERR PARK SCHOOL	2	0	0	0	2	0
14	BRUCE PARK	2	0	0	0	2	0
15	BUCHANAN PARK	5	0	0	0	5	0
16	BULLOCKS CORNERS	2	0	0	1	1	0
17	CARLISLE COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK	2	0	0	1	1	0
18	CARLISLE MEMORIAL PARK	1	0	0	0	0	1
19	CARTER PARK	1	0	0	0	0	1
20	CENTENNIAL HEIGHTS PARK	1	1	0	0	0	0
21	CENTRAL PARK	1	0	0	0	0	1
22	CHERRY HEIGHTS PARK	2	0	0	0	2	0
23	CHURCHILL PARK	2	0	0	0	2	0
24	CLINE PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
25	COLQUHOUN PARK	2	0	0	0	2	0
26	COMMUNITY PARK	1	0	0	0	0	1
27	COPETOWN LIONS PARK	2	0	0	1	1	0
28	DEWITT PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
29	DR. WILLIAM BETHUNE PARK	2	0	0	0	2	0
30	DUNDAS DRIVING PARK	4	0	0	1	2	1
31	EASTDALE PARK	1	0	0	1	0	0
32	EASTDALE SCHOOL	3	0	0	0	0	3
33	EASTMOUNT	5	0	0	0	4	1
34	EASTWOOD PARK	4	0	1	0	3	0
35	EDWARDS MEMORIAL PARK	2	0	0	0	0	2
36	ELEANOR PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
37	FERRIS PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
38	FLAMBOROUGH CENTRE PARK	1	0	0	1	0	0
39	FREELTON COMMUNITY PARK	1	0	0	1	0	0
40	GAGE PARK	3	0	0	0	2	1
41	GATESBURY PARK	2	0	0	0	2	0
42	GILSON PARK	2	0	0	0	2	0
43	GILSON PARK - R. RIDDELL SCHOOL	1	0	0	0	0	1
44	GLANBROOK SPORTS COMPLEX	1	1	0	0	0	0
45	GLENDALE PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
46	GLOBE PARK	6	0	0	3	3	0
47	GORD OAKES PARK	1	1	0	0	0	0
48	GOURLEY PARK	1	0	0	0	0	1
49	GREEN ACRES PARK	1	0	1	0	0	0
50	HAMPTON PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
51	HERITAGE GREEN SPORTS PARK	2	1	0	1	0	0
52	HIGHLAND GARDENS PARK	2	0	0	0	1	1
53	HIGHVIEW PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
54	HILLCREST PARK	4	0	0	0	4	0
55	HOLBROOK PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
56	HUNTER ESTATES PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
57	HUNTINGTON PARK	2	0	0	0	2	0
58	INCH PARK	6	0	6	0	0	0
59	JAMES MACDONALD SCHOOL - GOURLEY PARK	5	0	0	0	4	1
60	JAMES SMITH PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
61	JERSEVILLE PARK	2	0	0	0	2	0
62	JOE SAM'S LEISURE PARK	2	1	0	1	0	0
63	JOHN KNOX SCHOOL	3	0	0	0	3	0
64	KAY DRAGE PARK	2	0	0	0	2	0
65	KITTY MURRAY PARK	1	0	0	0	0	1
66	LAKE AVENUE PARK / BOW VALLEY OPEN SPACE	1	0	0	0	1	0
67	LISGAR PARK SCHOOL LANDS	1	0	0	0	1	0
68	LITTLE LEAGUE PARK	2	0	0	1	0	1
69	LYNDEN LEGION PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
70	LYNDEN LIONS SOUTH	2	0	0	1	1	0
71	MAHONY PARK	4	1	3	0	0	0
72	MAPLEWOOD PARK	2	0	0	1	1	0
73	MARTINO MEMORIAL PARK	2	1	0	0	1	0
74	MEADOWLANDS PERMANENT	1	0	0	0	1	0
75	MILLGROVE COMMUNITY PARK	2	0	0	1	1	0
76	MIDHAWK SPORTS PARK	7	3	2	0	2	0
77	MONTGOMERY PARK	2	0	0	2	0	0
78	MOUTSBERG HALL PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
79	NORTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY PARK	1	0	0	0	0	1
80	OLYMPIC PARK	2	0	2	0	0	0
81	OLYMPIC SPORTS PARK #1	1	0	0	1	0	0
82	PARAMOUNT PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
83	PROPOSED	2	0	1	0	0	1
84	PROPOSED	1	0	0	0	1	0
85	RED HILL BOWL	3	0	0	0	3	0
86	RED HILL NEIGHBOURHOOD PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
87	ROSEBUSH PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
88	ROSEDALE PARK	5	0	0	0	3	2
89	ROXBOROUGH PARK	2	0	0	0	2	0
90	SCENIC WOODS	1	0	0	0	1	0
91	SCOTT PARK	3	0	0	0	3	0
92	SHEFFIELD BALL PARK	2	0	0	1	1	0
93	SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH'S PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
94	ST. CHRISTOPHER'S PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
95	STONEWOOD PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
96	STRABANE COMMUNITY PARK	3	0	0	2	1	0
97	T.B. McQUESTEN PARK	1	0	1	0	0	0
98	TAPLETTOWN MEN'S CLUB PARK	2	0	0	0	2	0
99	TAPLETTOWN PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
100	TEMPLEMEAD PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
101	TURNER PARK	13	0	0	0	13	0
102	VALENS APARK	1	0	0	0	0	1
103	VALLEY COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK	2	0	0	0	2	0
104	VALLEY PARK	2	1	0	0	1	0
105	VETERANS PARK	2	0	0	0	2	0
106	VICTORIA PARK	1	1	0	0	0	0
107	VOLUNTEER FIELD PARK	1	1	0	0	0	0
108	WATERDOWN MEMORIAL PARK	4	0	0	2	2	0
109	WATERFORD PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
110	WESTOVER PARK	2	0	0	1	0	1
111	WILLIAM MCCULLOCH PARK	3	0	1	0	2	0
112	WILLIAM MCCULLOCH PARK - SENECA SCHOOL	3	0	0	0	2	1
113	WINDONA PARK	1	0	0	1	0	0
114	WOODBURN BALL PARK	3	0	0	0	0	3
115	WOODLAND PARK	1	0	0	0	1	0
116	WOODWARD PARK	2	0	0	0	2	0

Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009



Legend

- City Boundary
- Community Boundary
- Cricket Pitches

Football Fields (Dedicated)

Type


- Lit
- Unlit


Notes:

Several facilities are multi-use and may be utilized for multiple sports / activities. Municipal facilities only. School facilities are only included in instances where there is a maintenance or booking agreement in place with the City.

Inventory current as of May 31 / 09.

Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009





Legend

- Community Boundary
- City Boundary

Basketball Courts

- Parks with 1 basketball / ball hockey / multi-use court features
- Parks with 2 (or more) basketball / ball hockey / multi-use court features
- 1km Service Area

Notes:

Several facilities are multi-use and may be utilized for multiple sports / activities. Municipal facilities only. School facilities are only included in instances where there is a maintenance or booking agreement in place with the City.

Inventory current as of May 31 / 09.


NO.	PARK NAME
1	ALBION ESTATES PARK
2	ANCASTER COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK
3	ANDREW WARBURTON MEMORIAL PARK
4	BAYVIEW WEST PARK
5	BENETTO REC CENTER
6	BEVERLY COMMUNITY PARK
7	BILLY SHERRING PARK
8	BIRGE PARK
9	BROUGHTON PARK EAST
10	BRUCE PARK
11	BRYNA PARK
12	CARTER PARK
13	CENTENNIAL HEIGHTS PARK
14	CENTRAL PARK
15	CUNE PARK
16	COPETOWN LIONS PARK
17	CORKTOWN PARK
18	CORMAN PARK
19	DEWITT PARK
20	DUNDAS DRIVING PARK
21	EASTWOOD PARK
22	EDGELAKE PARK
23	ELEANOR PARK
24	ELMAR PARK
25	ERINGATE PARK
26	FAIRFIELD PARK
27	FATHER SEAN O'SULLIVAN MEMORIAL PARK
28	FERRIS PARK
29	FREELTON COMMUNITY PARK
30	GATESBURY PARK
31	GLENDALE PARK
32	GOURLEY PARK
33	HAMILTON AMATEUR ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
34	HAMPTON PARK
35	HARMONY PARK
36	HENRY & BEATRICE WARDEN PARK
37	HIGHVIEW PARK
38	HOMEBROOK PARK
39	HUNTER ESTATES PARK
40	JACKIE WASHINGTON PARK
41	JAMES SMITH PARK
42	JOHN WILSON PARK
43	KENNEDY EAST PARK
44	KINSMEN PARK
45	KOPPERFIELD PARK
46	LAWFIELD PARK
47	LEASIDE PARK
48	LIFESAVERS PARK
49	USGAR PARK
50	LYNDEN LIONS SOUTH
51	MACASSA PARK
52	MCLAREN PARK
53	MEADOWLANDS PERMANENT
54	MONTGOMERY PARK
55	MOORLAND PARK
56	MOUNTVIEW PARK
57	NEWLANDS PARK
58	NORTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY PARK
59	PARKDALE SCHOOL PLAYGROUND
60	PLATEAU PARK
61	POWELL PARK
62	ROSEBOUGH PARK
63	ROSEDALE PARK
64	RUSHDALE PARK
65	SEALY PARK
66	SHAWINIGAN PARK
67	SHEFFIELD BALL PARK
68	SIR ALLAN MACNAB RECREATION CENTER
69	ST. HELEN'S / ST. PETERS WALKWAY
70	STRABANE COMMUNITY PARK
71	T.B. McQUESTEN PARK
72	TEMPLEMEAD PARK
73	TRENHOLME PARK
74	VALLEY COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK
75	VETERANS PARK
76	VICTORIA PARK
77	WATERDOWN MEMORIAL PARK
78	WATERFORD PARK
79	WESTOVER PARK
80	WHITE DEER PARK
81	WILDAN TOT LOT
82	WILLIAM SCHWENGER PARK
83	WINONA PARK
84	WOOLVERTON PARK

Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009



Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan
 Map 9 Basketball Courts - 2009 -





Legend

- Community Boundary
- City Boundary
- Outdoor Aquatics**
- Splash Pads Only
- Wading Pools Only (Some may be closed)
- Both Splash Pads and Wading Pools
- 1km Service Area


Notes:
 Several facilities are multi-use and may be utilized for multiple sports / activities. Municipal facilities only. School facilities are only included in instances where there is a maintenance or booking agreement in place with the City.
 Inventory current as of May 31 / 09.


SPLASH PADS	
NO.	PARK NAME
1	ALLISON NEIGHBOURHOOD PARK
2	BEASLEY PARK
3	BELVIEW PARK
4	BERRISFIELD PARK
5	BILLY SHERRING PARK
6	BROUGHTON PARK EAST
7	CARTER PARK
8	CENTRAL PARK
9	CHURCHILL PARK
10	EASTMOUNT
11	EASTWOOD PARK
12	ELEANOR PARK
13	ELMAR PARK
14	FAIRFIELD PARK
15	FATHER SEAN O'SULLIVAN MEMORIAL PARK
16	GILKSON PARK
17	GLENDALE PARK
18	GOURLY PARK
19	HAMILTON AMATEUR ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
20	HENRY & BEATRICE WARDEN PARK
21	HIGHVIEW PARK
22	KENNEDY EAST PARK
23	LAWFIELD PARK
24	LISGAR PARK
25	LUCY DAY PARK
26	MACASSA PARK
27	MCLAREN PARK
28	MONTGOMERY PARK
29	MOUNT LION'S CLUB PARK
30	MOUNTVIEW PARK
31	NORTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY PARK
32	PIER 4 PARK
33	ROSEDALE PARK
34	ROXBOROUGH PARK
35	RUSHDALE PARK
36	SAM MANSON PARK
37	SHAWINIGAN PARK
38	ST. CHRISTOPHER'S PARK
39	TEMPLEMEAD PARK
40	TRENHOLME PARK
41	VEEVERS PARK
42	VICTORIA PARK
43	WATERDOWN MEMORIAL PARK
44	WILLIAM McCULLOCH PARK
45	WOODWARD PARK
WADING POOLS	
NO.	PARK NAME
46	ALEXANDER PARK
47	BAYVIEW PLAYGROUND (CLOSED)
48	CORONATION PARK POOL RINK
49	GEORGE L. ARMSTRONG PLAYGROUND (CLOSED)
50	GREEN ACRES PARK
51	INCH PARK
52	KINSMEN PARK
53	LION'S OUTDOOR POOL (HEMMING PARK)
54	MYRTLE PARK
55	PARKDALE PARK (CLOSED)
56	R.T. STEELE PARK (CLOSED)
57	WOOLVERTON PARK (CLOSED)
BOTH SPLASH PADS & WADING POOLS	
NO.	PARK NAME
58	ANDREW WARBURTON MEMORIAL PARK
59	DUNDAS DRIVING PARK
60	GAGE PARK
61	HUNTINGTON PARK / RECREATION CENTRE
62	J.C. BEEMER PARK
63	POWELL PARK

Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009



Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan
 Map 10 Splash Pads & Wading Pools - 2009 -





- Legend**
- Community Boundary
 - City Boundary
- Bocce & Lawn Bowling**
- Bocce Courts
 - Lawn Bowling

Notes:


Several facilities are multi-use and may be utilized for multiple sports / activities. Municipal facilities only. School facilities are only included in instances where there is a maintenance or booking agreement in place with the City.

Inventory current as of May 31 / 09.

NO.	PARK NAME	# BOCCÉ COURTS	# LAWN-BOWLING GREENS
1	CHEDOKE TWIN PAD ARENA	4	0
2	CORMAN PARK	2	0
3	DR. WILLIAM BETHUNE PARK	4	0
4	DUNDAS DRIVING PARK	0	1
5	EASTDALE PARK	2	0
6	FATHER SEAN O'SULLIVAN MEMORIAL PAR	2	0
7	FERRIS PARK	2	0
8	GAGE PARK	0	2
9	GLEN CASTLE PARK	2	0
10	GREENHILL RESEVOIR	2	0
11	LISGAR PARK	2	0
12	MAPLEDENE PARK	2	0
13	MEMORIAL PARK	2	0
14	MOUNTAIN AREANA / SKATING CENTRE	3	0
15	RIVERDALE EAST PARK (OAKLANDS)	2	0
16	ROSEDALE PARK	4	0
17	SACKVILLE HILL MEMORIAL PARK	2	0
18	SAM MANSON PARK	3	0
19	SIR ALLAN MACNAB REC CENTER	4	0
20	TEMPLEMEAD PARK	2	0
21	TRENHOLME PARK	3	0
22	VILLAGE GREEN PARK	0	1

Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009





Legend

- Community Boundary
- City Boundary
- Outdoor Rinks (Natural / Variable)
- Outdoor Rinks (Artificial)
- 1km Service Area

Notes:

Several facilities are multi-use and may be utilized for multiple sports / activities. Municipal facilities only. School facilities are only included in instances where there is a maintenance or booking agreement in place with the City.

Inventory current as of May 31 / 09.

NATURAL / VARIABLE ICE RINKS

NO.	PARK NAME
1	ALEXANDER PARK
2	ANCASTER HEIGHTS
3	ANDREW WARBURTON MEMORIAL PARK
4	ARCADE PARK
5	BERRISFIELD PARK
6	BROUGHTON PARK EAST
7	BRUCE PARK
8	BUCHANAN PARK
9	CARTER PARK
10	CHURCHILL PARK
11	COLQUHOUN PARK
12	CORKTOWN PARK
13	DURAND PARK
14	EASTMOUNT
15	ELEANOR PARK
16	ERINGATE PARK
17	FATHER SEAN O'SULLIVAN MEMORIAL PARK
18	ELMAR PARK
19	FAY AVENUE PARK
20	FREELTON COMMUNITY PARK
21	GAGE PARK
22	GILKSON PARK
23	GLENDALE PARK
24	GOURLEY PARK
25	GREEN ACRES PARK
26	HAMILTON AMATEUR ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION
27	HAMPTON PARK
28	HIGHLAND GARDENS PARK
29	HIGHVIEW PARK
30	HIXON ROAD PARK
31	KENNEDY EAST PARK
32	LYNDEN LEGION PARK
33	MACASSA PARK
34	MILLGROVE COMMUNITY PARK
35	MOHAWK MEADOWS
36	MOORLAND PARK
37	MOUNT LION'S CLUB PARK
38	MOUNTAIN DRIVE
39	MOUNTVIEW PARK
40	MYRTLE PARK
41	NORTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY PARK
42	OPTIMIST PARK
43	PINECREST PARK
44	POWELL PARK
45	RADIAL PARK
46	ROSEBOUGH PARK
47	ROXBOROUGH PARK
48	RUSHDALE PARK
49	SCENIC PARK
50	SCOTT PARK
51	SHAWINIGAN PARK
52	ST. CHRISTOPHER'S PARK
53	TEMPLEMEAD PARK
54	TRENHOLME PARK
55	VETERANS PARK
56	VICTORIA PARK
57	WATERDOWN MEMORIAL PARK
58	WILLIAM SCHWENGER PARK
59	WOODWARD PARK


ARTIFICIAL ICE RINKS


60	DUNDAS DRIVING PARK
----	---------------------

Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009



Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan
 Map 12 Outdoor Ice Rinks - 2009 -





Legend

- Community Boundary
- City Boundary

Playground Structures & Equipment

Description:

- Playgrounds with park structures (for creative play) and possibly play equipment and / or swingsets
- Playgrounds with play equipment only (for traditional play, such as slides and teeter-totters); may contain swingsets
- Playgrounds with swingsets only
- 500m Service Area

Notes:

Several facilities are multi-use and may be utilized for multiple sports / activities. Municipal facilities only. School facilities are only included in instances where there is a maintenance or booking agreement in place with the City.


Inventory current as of May 31 / 09


Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009







Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan

Map 13 Playgrounds - 2009 -





- Legend**
-  Community Boundary
 -  City Boundary
 -  City-wide Outdoor Running Tracks
 -  Other Outdoor Running Tracks (various designs/quality)

Notes:

Several facilities are multi-use and may be utilized for multiple sports / activities. Municipal facilities only. School facilities are only included in instances where there is a maintenance or booking agreement in place with the City.

Inventory current as of May 31 / 09.
Created Apr 26 / 10


Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009







Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan

Map 14 Outdoor Running Tracks - 2009 -





- Legend**
-  Community Boundary
 -  City Boundary
 -  Skateboard Parks
 -  2km Service Area

Notes:

Several facilities are multi-use and may be utilized for multiple sports / activities.
 Municipal facilities only. School facilities are only included in instances where there is a maintenance or booking agreement in place with the City.


Inventory current as of May 31 / 09.


Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009



Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan

Map 15 Skateboard Parks - 2009 -





Legend

- City Boundary
- Community Boundary

Tennis Courts

Type

- Public Tennis Courts; 1 or more; lit and / or unlit
- Club Tennis Courts; require membership; 2 or more; lit
- 2km Service Area

Notes:

Several fields are multi-use and may be utilized for multiple sports / activities. Municipal facilities only. School facilities are only included in instances where there is a maintenance agreement in place with the City.

Inventory current as of Dec. 31 / 08.
Created Apr 26 / 10


NO.	PARK NAME	PUBLIC COURTS (LT)	PUBLIC COURTS (UNLIT)	CLUB COURTS (LT)
1	BENETTO RECREATION CENTRE	0	2	0
2	BEVERLY COMMUNITY PARK	0	0	2
3	BULLOCKS CORNERS	0	0	3
4	CARLSLE COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK	1	0	0
5	CENTRAL PARK	2	0	0
6	DUNDAS DRIVING PARK	0	0	5
7	EDGE LAKE PARK	0	1	0
8	FRELTON COMMUNITY PARK	1	0	0
9	GAGE PARK	0	0	12
10	GLOBE PARK	3	0	0
11	GORD OAKES PARK	0	1	0
12	GOURLEY PARK	0	1	0
13	GREEN ACRES PARK	0	0	7
14	HAMILTON AMATEUR ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION	0	0	8
15	HILLPARK SECONDARY SCHOOL	4	0	0
16	HUNTINGTON PARK / RECREATION CENTRE	0	0	4
17	INCH PARK	0	2	0
18	JAMES SMITH PARK	0	2	0
19	LAWFIELD PARK	2	0	0
20	LITTLE JOHN PARK	0	1	0
21	LYNDEN LEGION PARK	2	0	0
22	MEADOWLANDS PERMANENT	0	1	0
23	MEMORIAL PARK	0	1	0
24	PALOMINO RANCH	0	0	2
25	PARKDALE PARK	0	2	0
26	SEALY PARK	0	2	0
27	SIR ALLAN MACNAB RECREATION CENTRE	2	0	0
28	T.B. McQUESTEN PARK	0	1	0
29	VALLEY PARK	4	0	0
30	VICTORIA PARK	3	0	0
31	VILLAGE GREEN PARK	0	0	3
32	WESTDALE SECONDARY SCHOOL	4	0	0






Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009



Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan
Map 16 Tennis Courts - 2009 -





- Legend**
-  Community Boundary
 -  City Boundary
 -  Dog Parks
 -  Free Running Areas
 -  2km Service Area

Notes:

Several facilities are multi-use and may be utilized for multiple sports / activities. Municipal facilities only. School facilities are only included in instances where there is a maintenance or booking agreement in place with the City.

Inventory current as of May 31 / 09
Created Apr 26 / 10


Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009



Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan

Map 17 Leash Free Parks - 2009 -





Legend

- Community Boundary
- City Boundary
- Schools


Notes:


Several facilities are multi-use and may be utilized for multiple sports / activities. Municipal facilities only. School facilities are only included in instances where there is a maintenance or booking agreement in place with the City.

Inventory current as of May 31 / 09.

NO.	SCHOOL NAME	NO.	SCHOOL NAME
1	A.M. Cunningham	111	Mount Hope
2	Adelaide Hoodless	112	Mount Olive Christian Academy
3	Adelaide Hoodless Alternative Education	113	Mountain Secondary
4	Adult Academic & Career Training Vocational School	114	Mountain View
5	Allan A. Greenleaf	115	Mountview
6	Ancaster High	116	New Testament Academy
7	Ancaster Meadows	117	Norwood Park
8	Ancaster Senior	118	Notre-Dame
9	Balaclava	119	Orchard Park
10	Barton	120	Our Lady of Lourdes
11	Bell-Stone	121	Our Lady of Mount Carmel
12	Bellmore	122	Our Lady of Peace
13	Bennetto	123	Our Lady of the Assumption
14	Beth Jacob	124	Parkdale
15	Beverly Central	125	Parkside
16	Billy Green	126	Parkview
17	Bishop Ryan	127	Pauline Johnson
18	Bishop Tonnos	128	Pavillon de la jeunesse
19	Blessed Kateri Tekakwitha	129	Phoenix Alternative Education
20	Blessed Sacrament	130	Pope John Paul II
21	Buchanan Park	131	Prince of Wales
22	C.H. Bray	132	Prince Philip
23	Calvin Christian (Dundas)	133	Queen's Rangers
24	Calvin Christian (Hamilton)	134	Queen Mary
25	Canadian Martyrs	135	Queen Victoria
26	Canterbury Elementary Alternative Education	136	Queensdale
27	Cardinal Heights	137	R. A. Riddell
28	Cardinal Newman	138	R. L. Hyslop
29	Cathedral High	139	Ray Lewis
30	Cathy Weaver	140	Regina Mundi
31	Cecil B. Stirling	141	Rehoboth Christian
32	Central	142	Richard Beasley
33	Chedoke	143	Ridgemount
34	Colin Macdonald Community	144	Riverwalk Country Montessori
35	Collingate Avenue	145	Rosedale
36	Columbia International College	146	Rousseau
37	Corpus Christi	147	Roxborough Park
38	Covenant Christian	148	Ryerson
39	Dalewood	149	Sacred Heart
40	Delta	150	Salfleet
41	Dr. Edgar Davey	151	Sanford Avenue
42	Dr. John Seaton	152	Sherwood Secondary
43	Dundana	153	Sir Allan MacNab
44	Dundas Central	154	Sir Isaac Brock
45	Dundas District	155	Sir John A. Macdonald
46	Dundas Valley Montessori	156	Sir Wilfrid Laurier
47	Earl Kitchener	157	Sir William Osler
48	Eastdale	158	Sir Winston Churchill
49	Eastmount Park	159	Southern Ontario College
50	Elementary Alternative Education	160	Spencer Valley
51	Elizabeth Highshaw	161	St. Agnes
52	Fessenden	162	St. Ann (Ancaster)
53	Flamborough Centre	163	St. Ann (Hamilton)
54	Franklin Road	164	St. Augustine
55	Gatestone	165	St. Bernadette
56	George L. Armstrong	166	St. Brigid
57	George R. Allan	167	St. Catherine of Siena
58	Georges-P. Vanier	168	St. Christopher
59	Gibson	169	St. Clare of Assisi
60	Glen Brae	170	St. Columba
61	Glen Echo	171	St. Daniel
62	Glendale	172	St. David
63	Glenwood	173	St. Eugene
64	Gordon Price	174	St. Francis Xavier
65	Grandview Adventist Academy	175	St. Helen
66	Green Acres	176	St. James the Apostle
67	Greensville	177	St. Jean de Brebeuf
68	Guardian Angels	178	St. Jerome
69	Guédo de Brés	179	St. Joachim
70	Guy Brown	180	St. John the Baptist
71	Hamilton District Christian High	181	St. Joseph
72	Hamilton Hebrew Academy	182	St. Lawrence
73	Hamilton Learning Centre	183	St. Luke
74	Helen Detweiler	184	St. Margaret Mary
75	Hess Street	185	St. Marguerite D'Youville
76	Highland	186	St. Mark
77	Highview	187	St. Martin of Tours
78	Hill Park	188	St. Mary Elementary
79	Hilkrest	189	St. Mary High
80	Hillfield Strathallan College	190	St. Michael
81	Holbrook	191	St. Patrick
82	Holy Family	192	St. Paul
83	Holy Name of Jesus	193	St. Thomas
84	Holy Name of Mary	194	St. Thérèse of Lisieux
85	Holy Spirit	195	St. Teresa of Avila
86	Huntington Park	196	St. Thomas More
87	Immaculate Heart of Mary	197	St. Vincent de Paul
88	Islamic School of Hamilton	198	Stimson Street
89	Jackson High Alternative Education	199	Strathcona
90	James Macdonald	200	St. Peter and Paul
91	Janet Lee	201	Tapscott
92	John Knox Christian	202	Tappin Binet College
93	Kehila Jewish Community	203	Templemead
94	King George	204	The Gregory School for Exceptional Learning
95	Kollet of Hamilton	205	The Joy of Learning Montessori
96	L'Académie Mère-Teresa	206	Timothy Canadian Reformed
97	Lake Avenue	207	Viscount Montgomery
98	Lawfield	208	W. H. Ballard
99	Lee Academy	209	Waterdown District
100	Lincoln Alexander	210	Westdale
101	Linden Park	211	Westmount
102	Lisgar	212	Westview
103	Living Hope Christian	213	Westwood
104	Mary Hopkins	214	Wilma's Place
105	Memorial (Hamilton)	215	Wilsons
106	Memorial (Stoney Creek)	216	Woodward
107	Milgrove	217	Yorkview
108	Monsieur-de-Laval		
109	Mother Teresa		
110	Mount Albion		

Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009





Hill Park Associated Cluster Elementary Schools
 This review is due to Linden Park being deemed "prohibitive-to-repair" and a current surplus of 600 pupil places and a 10-year projected surplus of 1000 places.

Bellmoore, Bell-Stone and Mount Hope Review
 This review is to consider the attendance boundaries program, grade-structure, and potential consolidation opportunities in this area

Sir Winston Churchill Associated Cluster Elementary Schools
 This review is due to a current surplus of nearly 700 pupil places and to the recently opened Hillcrest Elementary School which may have space to accommodate students.

Legend

- City Boundary
- Community Boundary
- Potential School Closures**
- Hill Park Associated Cluster Elementary Schools
- Sir Winston Churchill Associated Cluster Elementary Schools
- Bellmoore, Bell-Stone and Mount Hope Review

Source:
 Letter to City of Hamilton from HWDSB, dated March 25, 2009
 re: HWDSB Long-term capital plans


Notes:
 A school closure can only occur following a community-based Pupil Accommodation Review. This process typically involves a cluster of schools with only a small portion of the schools being recommended for closure. The ward Councillor is invited to serve on the committee.

Secondary Schools
 All but three secondary schools (HWDSB) are under review by Secondary School Pupil Accommodation Review Committees. The goal is to reduce the number of secondary schools so as to better meet pupil place needs.

Produced using information under license with the City of Hamilton, Copyright © City of Hamilton, 2009

HWCDSD projects are not listed.
 Inventory current as of May 31 / 09.

Created Apr 26 / 10.



CITY OF HAMILTON

**Outdoor Recreation Facilities
& Sports Field Provision Plan**

ATTACHMENT II: PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARIES

**City of Hamilton, Outdoor Recreation Facilities & Sports Field Study
Household Telephone Survey – FINAL**

Good evening, this is _____ and I am calling on behalf of the City of Hamilton. This is not a sales call – I am not selling anything. We're conducting a survey about outdoor parks and recreation amenities such as soccer fields, ball diamonds, playgrounds, and splash pads. Your input is really important to us and will help to develop a plan for the future.

A. Would you have a few minutes to complete a survey? (it should take about 10 minutes)

Yes ⇒ Continue to question B

No ⇒ When would be a good time to call back? ⇒ Record day & time

B. If unsure of respondent's age: Are you age 16 or older?

Yes ⇒ Continue to question 1

No ⇒ Could I speak to someone who is?

Yes ⇒ Continue to Question 1

No ⇒ When would be a good time to call back?

1. Before I begin, can you please give me the first three digits of your postal code? (DO NOT READ)

1 L8E	6 L8L	11 L8S	16 L9B	If <u>L0R</u> , ask for full postal code:		
2 L8G	7 L8M	12 L8T	17 L9C	21 L0R 1A0	28 L0R 1T0	
3 L8H	8 L8N	13 L8V	18 L9G	22 L0R 1C0	29 L0R 1V0	
4 L8J	9 L8P	14 L8W	19 L9H	23 L0R 1H0	30 L0R 1W0	
5 L8K	10 L8R	15 L9A	20 L9K	24 L0R 1J0	31 L0R 1X0	
				25 L0R 1K0	32 L0R 1Z0	
0 Don't Know				26 L0R 1P0	33 L0R 2B0	
				27 L0R 1R0	34 L0R 2H0	
				35 Other L0R _____	(Confirm residence in Hamilton)	

If not listed above: Terminate call...

"You're living outside of our study area. I'm sorry to have bothered you. Goodbye."

2. a) In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your household visited a City of Hamilton park?

1 Yes

2 No → Go to 4

0 Don't Know

b) In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your household used any City _____:
(READ & ROTATE IN TABLE BELOW)

c) If YES: Using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is "Poor" and 5 is "Excellent", how would you rate the overall maintenance of the City's _____? (e.g., condition of turf or equipment, litter control, general appearance)

b) Usage

c) Quality of Maintenance
(skip if not used)

	Yes	No	DK		Poor	↔	Excellent	DK		
i) Park washrooms	1	2	0	→	1	2	3	4	5	0
ii) Wading pools (shallow water)	1	2	0	→	1	2	3	4	5	0
iii) Off-leash dog areas	1	2	0	→	1	2	3	4	5	0
iv) Outdoor ice rinks	1	2	0	→	1	2	3	4	5	0
v) Skateboard or bmx parks	1	2	0	→	1	2	3	4	5	0
vi) Running tracks	1	2	0	→	1	2	3	4	5	0
vii) Football fields	1	2	0	→	1	2	3	4	5	0
viii) Rugby fields	1	2	0	→	1	2	3	4	5	0
ix) Lacrosse fields	1	2	0	→	1	2	3	4	5	0
x) Cricket pitches	1	2	0	→	1	2	3	4	5	0
xi) Outdoor bocce courts	1	2	0	→	1	2	3	4	5	0
xii) Lawn bowling greens	1	2	0	→	1	2	3	4	5	0
xiii) If offered, record other: _____				→	1	2	3	4	5	0

3. I have a few more City park amenities to ask you about.

(i) (ii) (iii) (iv) (v) (vi)
 a) In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your household used any City... (READ & ROTATE)

	Play-grounds	Soccer Fields	Softball, Hardball, or Slo-pitch Diamonds	Splash Pads (children's waterplay facilities)	Tennis Courts	Multi-use Courts for Basketball and Ball Hockey
No / Don't Know	x (skip all below)	x (skip all below)	x (skip all below)	x (skip all below)	x (skip all below)	x (skip all below)
Yes	1 ↓	1 ↓	1 ↓	1 ↓	1 ↓	1 ↓

Total Annual Visits (Spring/Summer/Fall)

b) Last year, during the warm weather months (May to October), how often did members of your household visit a: ____: (DO NOT READ)

1-4 times	1	1	1	1	1	1
5-9 (1x/month)	2	2	2	2	2	2
10-19 (2x/month)	3	3	3	3	3	3
20-34 (1x/week)	4	4	4	4	4	4
35-64 (2x/ week)	5	5	5	5	5	5
65-89 (3x/ week)	6	6	6	6	6	6
90+ (4x/week)	7	7	7	7	7	7
Don't Know	0 ↓	0 ↓	0 ↓	0 ↓	0 ↓	0 ↓

c) Using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is "Poor" and 5 is "Excellent", how would you rate the overall maintenance of the City's ____: (condition of turf or equipment, litter control, general appearance)

Poor	1	1	1	1	1	1
↑	2	2	2	2	2	2
↕	3	3	3	3	3	3
↓	4	4	4	4	4	4
Excellent	5	5	5	5	5	5
Don't Know	0 ↓	0 ↓	0 ↓	0 ↓	0 ↓	0 ↓

d) What mode of travel does your household use most when you visit ____? Do you: (READ)

Walk	1	1	1	1	1	1
Bike	2	2	2	2	2	2
Drive	3	3	3	3	3	3
Use Public Transit	4	4	4	4	4	4
Another form of travel	5	5	5	5	5	5
Do Not Ask: Don't Know	0 ↓	0 ↓	0 ↓	0 ↓	0 ↓	0 ↓

e) How many minutes would your household normally be willing to travel to make regular use of ____: :

0-5 minutes	1	1	1	1	1	1
6-10 minutes	2	2	2	2	2	2
11-15 minutes	3	3	3	3	3	3
16-30 minutes	4	4	4	4	4	4
31+ minutes	5	5	5	5	5	5
Don't Know	0	0	0	0	0	0

4. a) Are you and members of your household able to participate in outdoor recreational activities as often as you would like?

1 Yes } Go to 5
 0 Don't Know }
 2 No
 ↓

b) If NO: Why not? (DO NOT READ, RECORD FIRST 2 MENTIONS)

- 1 Lack of personal time / Too busy
- 2 Lack of desired facilities or activity – specify facility/program: _____
- 3 Activity not offered at convenient time
- 4 Lack of money / Too expensive
- 5 Lack of information / Unaware of opportunities
- 6 Lack of transportation / Facility is too far away
- 7 Park / facility is too busy or crowded
- 8 Quality or maintenance of facility is too poor / unsafe
- 9 Health problems / Disability / Age
- 10 Other (specify): _____

5. I am going to read a series of statements relating to the City's outdoor parks and recreation areas. Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is "strongly disagree" and 5 is "strongly agree". (READ & ROTATE)

	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>		↔		<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Don't Know/ No Opinion</u>
a) Most of the City's outdoor park facilities and amenities are <u>well-maintained</u> .	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) Most of the City's outdoor park facilities and amenities are <u>well-designed and laid out</u> .	1	2	3	4	5	0
c) Most of the City's outdoor park facilities and amenities are <u>in the right locations</u> .	1	2	3	4	5	0
d) There is enough parking at most of the City's parks.	1	2	3	4	5	0
e) Providing outdoor sports fields and recreation amenities for adults is just as important as providing them for children and teens.	1	2	3	4	5	0
f) The needs of local residents should be given priority over tournaments and other occasional sporting events.	1	2	3	4	5	0
g) Park facilities and amenities that are older and not well used should be removed and replaced with open space or facilities and amenities that are in demand.	1	2	3	4	5	0
h) There are sufficient parks and open spaces in your neighbourhood to suit the needs of your household.	1	2	3	4	5	0

6. If you had to choose, would you prefer ...? (READ & ROTATE)

- 1 a small park with only a few outdoor facilities and amenities that is close to your home **OR**
- 2 a large park with many outdoor facilities and amenities that is farther away from your home

(DO NOT READ...)

- 3 A little of both / Depends
- 4 Neither
- 0 Don't know/ don't use parks

7. Please use a scale of 1 to 5 to rate how important the following items are to your household and rate your general level of satisfaction with them (where 1 is the lowest and 5 is highest): (READ & ROTATE)

		<u>Not at all Important/ Not at all Satisfied</u>			<u>Very Important/ Very Satisfied</u>	<u>Don't Know/ Don't Use</u>
a) Outdoor Soccer Fields						
i)	IMPORTANCE →	1	2	3	4	5
ii)	SATISFACTION →	1	2	3	4	5
b) Softball, Slo-pitch and Hardball Diamonds						
i)	IMPORTANCE →	1	2	3	4	5
ii)	SATISFACTION →	1	2	3	4	5
c) Playgrounds						
i)	IMPORTANCE →	1	2	3	4	5
ii)	SATISFACTION →	1	2	3	4	5
d) Splash Pads (i.e., children's waterplay facilities)						
i)	IMPORTANCE →	1	2	3	4	5
ii)	SATISFACTION →	1	2	3	4	5
e) Tennis Courts (outdoor)						
i)	IMPORTANCE →	1	2	3	4	5
ii)	SATISFACTION →	1	2	3	4	5
f) Basketball Courts (outdoor)						
i)	IMPORTANCE →	1	2	3	4	5
ii)	SATISFACTION →	1	2	3	4	5
g) Outdoor recreation and park amenities overall						
i)	IMPORTANCE →	1	2	3	4	5
ii)	SATISFACTION →	1	2	3	4	5

8. a) To improve existing outdoor recreation facilities and park amenities – or to build more – the City uses tax dollars and money from new development. With this in mind, please tell me the degree that you want **ADDITIONAL public funds** spent on the following items. Please use a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is the lowest priority and 5 is the highest priority. (READ & ROTATE)

	<u>Do Not</u> <u>Spend</u>				<u>Definitely</u> <u>Spend</u>	<u>Don't Know/</u> <u>Don't Use</u>
1. Basketball courts (outdoor)	1	2	3	4	5	0
2. Bocce courts (outdoor)	1	2	3	4	5	0
3. Community garden plots (e.g. vegetables)	1	2	3	4	5	0
4. Cricket pitches	1	2	3	4	5	0
5. Football, rugby, or lacrosse fields	1	2	3	4	5	0
6. Hardball, softball or slo-pitch diamonds	1	2	3	4	5	0
7. Indoor soccer facilities	1	2	3	4	5	0
8. Indoor lawn bowling or bocce courts	1	2	3	4	5	0
9. Informal play fields (cannot be booked)	1	2	3	4	5	0
10. Lawn bowling greens (outdoor)	1	2	3	4	5	0
11. Natural open space in parks	1	2	3	4	5	0
12. Off-leash dog areas	1	2	3	4	5	0
13. Outdoor ice rinks (natural or artificial)	1	2	3	4	5	0
14. Park washrooms	1	2	3	4	5	0
15. Picnic areas	1	2	3	4	5	0
16. Playgrounds	1	2	3	4	5	0
17. Running tracks	1	2	3	4	5	0
18. Outdoor grass soccer fields	1	2	3	4	5	0
19. Outdoor artificial turf soccer fields	1	2	3	4	5	0
20. Skateboard and bmx parks	1	2	3	4	5	0
21. Splash pads	1	2	3	4	5	0
22. Tennis courts (outdoor)	1	2	3	4	5	0
23. Trails in parks	1	2	3	4	5	0
24. Wading pools	1	2	3	4	5	0
25. Are there any <u>outdoor facilities</u> that I missed? (specify): _____						

- b) Which **TWO** of these facility types do you feel are needed the most in your area?
(RECORD FIRST 2 MENTIONS)

Circle # in 8a above

To help us summarize the responses, we would like some information about you and your household...

9. How many **people**, including yourself, live in your household? _____ x No Response
10. Please indicate the total number of persons within your household that fall into the following **age categories**: (READ)
- a) under 10 years _____ c) 20 - 34 years _____ e) 55 and over _____
b) 10 - 19 years _____ d) 35 - 54 years _____ x No Response
11. In what year were you **born**? 19_____ x No Response
12. What is your household's total annual **income** before taxes? Is it ... (READ)
- 1 Under \$40,000 4 Between \$80,000 and \$99,000
2 Between \$40,000 and \$59,000 5 \$100,000 or more
3 Between \$60,000 and \$79,000 0 Don't Know x No Response
13. Gender (DO NOT ASK) 1 Male
2 Female

We appreciate your participation in this survey and thank you for your time.

Questions about the project: Dale Wood (Community Services Dept., City of Hamilton), 905-546-2424 x. 7018

Questions about our Privacy Policy: Steve Langlois (Privacy Officer, MBPC), 519-686-1300 x.237

See website: www.hamilton.ca/publicuse

GEOGRAPHIC REPRESENTATION

1. Before I begin, can you please give me the first three digits of your postal code?

	#	%	Canada Post %
L8E	47	6%	6%
L8G	27	3%	4%
L8H	31	4%	6%
L8J	29	4%	3%
L8K	53	7%	7%
L8L	30	4%	6%
L8M	19	2%	3%
L8N	21	3%	4%
L8P	43	5%	6%
L8R	8	1%	2%
L8S	33	4%	4%
L8T	38	5%	4%
L8V	37	5%	5%
L8W	32	4%	4%
L9A	32	4%	5%
L9B	38	5%	3%
L9C	58	7%	7%
L9G	35	4%	4%
L9H	65	8%	6%
L9K	21	3%	1%
L0R (rural)	77	10%	8%
Don't Know	26	3%	-
Total	800	100%	100%

PARKS & PARK FACILITIES

2. a) In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your household visited a City of Hamilton park?

	#	%
Yes	564	71%
No	235	29%
Total	799	100%

no response 1

2. b) In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your household used any City _____ :

	Yes #	Yes %	No #	No %	Don't Know #	Don't Know %	Total #	Total %
Park washrooms	192	34%	367	65%	5	1%	564	100%
Wading pools (shallow water)	128	23%	436	77%	0	0%	564	100%
Outdoor ice rinks	116	21%	448	79%	0	0%	564	100%
Running tracks	109	19%	455	81%	0	0%	564	100%
Football fields	98	17%	466	83%	0	0%	564	100%
Off-leash dog areas	96	17%	468	83%	0	0%	564	100%
Skateboard or bmx parks	29	5%	534	95%	1	0%	564	100%
Rugby fields	24	4%	540	96%	0	0%	564	100%
Outdoor bocce courts	16	3%	548	97%	0	0%	564	100%
Lawn bowling greens	14	2%	550	98%	0	0%	564	100%
Lacrosse fields	8	1%	556	99%	0	0%	564	100%
Cricket pitches	4	1%	560	99%	0	0%	564	100%

2. c) IF YES: Using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is "Poor" and 5 is "Excellent", how would you rate the overall maintenance of the City's _____?

	Poor (1)		%		#		%		#		%		Excellent (5)		Don't Know		Total		AVG		
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
Lawn bowling greens	0	0%	0	0%	1	7%	4	29%	8	57%	1	7%	14	100%	14	100%	4.54				
Outdoor bocce courts	0	0%	0	0%	4	25%	2	13%	9	56%	1	6%	16	100%	16	100%	4.33				
Running tracks	1	1%	4	4%	22	20%	51	47%	24	22%	7	6%	109	100%	109	100%	3.91				
Outdoor ice rinks	1	1%	5	4%	30	26%	42	36%	31	27%	7	6%	116	100%	116	100%	3.89				
Skateboard or bmx parks	1	3%	1	3%	7	24%	12	41%	6	21%	2	7%	29	100%	29	100%	3.78				
Rugby fields	0	0%	1	4%	7	29%	10	42%	3	13%	3	13%	24	100%	24	100%	3.71				
Wading pools (shallow water)	2	2%	10	8%	33	26%	57	45%	23	18%	3	2%	128	100%	128	100%	3.71				
Football fields	0	0%	7	7%	29	30%	43	44%	15	15%	4	4%	98	100%	98	100%	3.70				
Off-leash dog areas	2	2%	4	4%	33	34%	39	41%	16	17%	2	2%	96	100%	96	100%	3.67				
Lacrosse fields	0	0%	2	25%	1	13%	3	38%	1	13%	1	13%	8	100%	8	100%	3.43				
Cricknet pitches	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	2	50%	0	0%	1	25%	4	100%	4	100%	3.33				
Park washrooms	12	6%	25	13%	81	42%	54	28%	13	7%	7	4%	192	100%	192	100%	3.17				

3. I have a few more City park amenities to ask you about.

3. a) In the past 12 months, have you or anyone in your household used any City _____?

	Playgrounds		Soccer Fields		Softball, Hardball, or Slo-pitch Diamonds		Splash Pads		Tennis Courts		Multi-use Courts for Basketball and Ball Hockey	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Yes	342	43%	174	22%	119	15%	120	15%	64	8%	100	13%
No/Don't Know	458	57%	626	78%	681	85%	680	85%	736	92%	700	88%
Total	800	100%	800	100%	800	100%	800	100%	800	100%	800	100%

3. b) Last year, during the warm weather months (May to October), how often did members of your household visit a City _____? (DO NOT READ)

	Playgrounds		Soccer Fields		Softball, Hardball, or Slo-pitch Diamonds		Splash Pads		Tennis Courts		Multi-use Courts for Basketball and Ball Hockey	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1-4 times	33	10%	18	10%	16	14%	16	13%	8	13%	15	15%
5-9 (1x/month)	40	12%	14	8%	11	9%	26	22%	10	16%	21	21%
10-19 (2x/month)	30	9%	14	8%	8	7%	29	24%	13	20%	16	16%
20-34 (1x/week)	85	25%	56	32%	40	34%	25	21%	20	31%	24	24%
35-64 (2x/week)	60	18%	39	23%	26	22%	9	8%	4	6%	14	14%
65-89 (3x/week)	29	9%	11	6%	5	4%	7	6%	7	11%	6	6%
90+ (4x/week)	64	19%	20	12%	12	10%	8	7%	1	2%	4	4%
Don't Know	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
Total	341	100%	173	100%	118	100%	120	100%	64	100%	100	100%
No Response	1		1		1		0		0		0	

3. c) Using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is "Poor" and 5 is "Excellent", how would you rate the overall maintenance of the City's _____?

	Playgrounds		Soccer Fields		Softball, Hardball, or Slo-pitch Diamonds		Splash Pads		Tennis Courts		Multi-use Courts for Basketball and Ball Hockey	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Poor (1)	5	1%	5	3%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%
	19	6%	16	9%	11	9%	5	4%	11	17%	6	6%
	92	27%	43	25%	26	22%	12	10%	14	22%	26	26%
	164	48%	84	49%	60	50%	61	51%	25	40%	48	48%
Excellent (5)	61	18%	25	14%	20	17%	39	33%	12	19%	17	17%
Don't Know	1	0%	0	0%	1	1%	3	3%	1	2%	0	0%
Total	342	100%	173	100%	119	100%	120	100%	63	100%	99	100%
No Response	0		1		0		0		1		1	
Average	3.75		3.62		3.74		4.15		3.61		3.73	

3. d) What mode of travel does your household use most when you visit City _____? Do you: (READ)

	Playgrounds		Soccer Fields		Softball, Hardball, or Slo-pitch Diamonds		Splash Pads		Tennis Courts		Multi-use Courts for Basketball and Ball Hockey	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Walk	238	70%	54	31%	38	32%	49	41%	25	40%	49	49%
Bike	11	3%	4	2%	1	1%	9	8%	4	6%	7	7%
Drive	86	25%	112	64%	75	63%	60	50%	29	47%	39	39%
Use Public Transit	6	2%	4	2%	5	4%	2	2%	3	5%	5	5%
Another form of Travel	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
Don't Know	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	341	100%	174	100%	119	100%	120	100%	62	100%	100	100%
No Response	1		0		0		0		2		0	

3. e) How many minutes would your household normally be willing to travel to make regular use of City _____?

	Playgrounds		Soccer Fields		Softball, Hardball, or Slo-pitch Diamonds		Splash Pads		Tennis Courts		Multi-use Courts for Basketball and Ball Hockey	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
0-5 minutes	97	29%	30	17%	18	15%	23	19%	16	25%	22	22%
6-10 minutes	107	32%	58	33%	38	32%	35	30%	17	27%	36	36%
11-15 minutes	66	19%	41	24%	23	19%	35	30%	17	27%	20	20%
16-30 minutes	56	17%	37	21%	32	27%	22	19%	11	17%	19	19%
31+ minutes	9	3%	7	4%	8	7%	3	3%	1	2%	2	2%
Don't Know	4	1%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	1	1%
Total	339	100%	174	100%	119	100%	118	100%	63	100%	100	100%
No Response	3		0		0		2		1		0	

4. a) Are you and members of your household able to participate in outdoor recreation activities as often as you would like?

	#	%
Yes	497	63%
No	297	37%
Don't Know	1	0%
Total	795	100%
No Response	4	

4. b) Why not? (DO NOT READ, RECORD FIRST 2 MENTIONS)

	#	% sample	% total
Lack of personal time/too busy	179	56%	22%
Health problems / Disability / Age	85	27%	11%
Lack of desired facilities or activity	19	6%	2%
Lack of transportation / Facility is too far away	15	5%	2%
Lack of Money / Too expensive	10	3%	1%
Activity not offered at convenient time	3	1%	0%
Lack of information / unaware of opportunities	3	1%	0%
Park / Facility is too busy or crowded	2	1%	0%
Other	2	1%	0%
Total	318	100%	

Barrier
 bad sidewalks
 lack of people to participate with

FACILITY PREFERENCES AND FINANCIAL ASPECTS

5. Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement using a scale of 1 to 5 where 1 is "strongly disagree" and 5 is "strongly agree". (READ & ROTATE)

	Strongly Disagree (1)					Strongly Agree (5)					Don't Know / No Response		Total #	AVG	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Providing outdoor sports fields and recreation amenities for adults is just as important as providing them for children and teens.	11	1%	54	7%	126	16%	267	33%	335	42%	7	1%	800	100%	4.09
There are sufficient parks and open spaces in your neighbourhood to suit the needs of your household.	53	7%	84	11%	87	11%	271	34%	292	37%	13	2%	800	100%	3.84
Park facilities and amenities that are older and not well used should be removed and replaced with open space or facilities and amenities that are in demand.	51	6%	66	8%	133	17%	283	35%	251	31%	16	2%	800	100%	3.79
Most of the City's outdoor park facilities and amenities are well-maintained.	21	3%	53	7%	210	26%	347	43%	129	16%	40	5%	800	100%	3.67
Most of the City's outdoor park facilities and amenities are well-designed and laid out.	10	1%	72	9%	212	27%	336	42%	107	13%	63	8%	800	100%	3.62
Most of the City's outdoor park facilities and amenities are in the right locations.	22	3%	82	10%	204	26%	308	39%	118	15%	66	8%	800	100%	3.57
The needs of local residents should be given priority over tournaments and other occasional sporting events.	37	5%	102	13%	231	29%	250	31%	162	20%	18	2%	800	100%	3.51
There is enough parking at most of the City's parks.	73	9%	165	21%	189	24%	212	27%	88	11%	73	9%	800	100%	3.11

6. If you had to choose, would you prefer...?

	#	%
a small park with only a few outdoor facilities and amenities that is close to your home	514	65%
a large park with many outdoor facilities and amenities that is farther away from your home	194	24%
A little of both / Depends	65	8%
Neither	11	1%
Don't know / Don't use parks	8	1%
Total	792	100%
No Response	8	

7. Please use a scale of 1 to 5 to rate how important the following items are to your household and rate your general level of satisfaction with them (where 1 is the lowest and 5 is highest) (READ & ROTATE)

IMPORTANCE	Not at all important (1)					Very Important (5)					Don't Know / No Response		Total #	AVG	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%			
Outdoor Soccer Fields	183	23%	89	11%	120	15%	170	21%	144	18%	94	12%	800	100%	3.00
Softball, Slo-pitch and Hardball Diamonds	191	24%	86	11%	136	17%	155	19%	120	15%	112	14%	800	100%	2.89
Playgrounds	101	13%	26	3%	93	12%	183	23%	310	39%	87	11%	800	100%	3.81
Splash Pads	165	21%	68	9%	127	16%	148	19%	161	20%	131	16%	800	100%	3.11
Tennis Courts	219	27%	91	11%	154	19%	128	16%	86	11%	122	15%	800	100%	2.66
Basketball Courts	174	22%	75	9%	145	18%	170	21%	112	14%	124	16%	800	100%	2.96
Outdoor recreation and park amenities overall	33	4%	18	2%	100	13%	269	34%	347	43%	33	4%	800	100%	4.15

SATISFACTION	Not at all Satisfied (1)			Very Satisfied (5)			Don't Know / No Response			Total			AVG			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%				
Outdoor Soccer Fields	27	3%	44	6%	149	19%	203	25%	85	11%	292	37%	800	100%	3.54	0.5669
Softball, Slo-pitch and Hardball Diamonds	21	3%	41	5%	170	21%	181	23%	73	9%	314	39%	800	100%	3.50	0.5226
Playgrounds	16	2%	34	4%	157	20%	247	31%	147	18%	199	25%	800	100%	3.79	0.6556
Splash Pads	36	5%	40	5%	144	18%	173	22%	94	12%	313	39%	800	100%	3.51	0.5483
Tennis Courts	53	7%	68	9%	170	21%	110	14%	54	7%	345	43%	800	100%	3.10	0.3604
Basketball Courts	42	5%	61	8%	170	21%	159	20%	60	8%	308	39%	800	100%	3.27	0.4451
Outdoor recreation and park amenities overall	16	2%	38	5%	195	24%	360	45%	124	16%	67	8%	800	100%	3.73	0.6603

8. a) To improve existing outdoor recreation facilities and park amenities - or to build more - the City uses tax dollars and money from new development. With this in mind, please tell me the degree that you want ADDITIONAL public funds spent on the following items. Please use a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is the lowest priority and 5 is the highest priority. (READ & ROTATE)

	Don't Spend (1)			Definitely Spend (5)			Don't Know / Don't Use			Total			Top 2 (#4 + #5)		Needed the Most			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%		
Natural open space in parks	41	5%	27	3%	127	16%	261	33%	330	41%	14	2%	800	100%	74%	4.03	165	13%
Trails in parks	46	6%	30	4%	129	16%	255	32%	328	41%	12	2%	800	100%	73%	4.00	130	10%
Playgrounds	50	6%	38	5%	125	16%	245	31%	331	41%	11	1%	800	100%	72%	3.97	140	11%
Park washrooms	51	6%	29	4%	136	17%	242	30%	332	42%	10	1%	800	100%	72%	3.98	100	8%
Picnic areas	45	6%	40	5%	155	19%	268	34%	278	35%	14	2%	800	100%	68%	3.88	78	6%
Outdoor ice rinks	74	9%	58	7%	209	26%	241	30%	195	24%	23	3%	800	100%	55%	3.55	62	5%
Informal play fields (cannot be booked)	94	12%	79	10%	229	29%	237	30%	138	17%	23	3%	800	100%	47%	3.32	21	2%
Outdoor grass soccer fields	101	13%	88	11%	226	28%	203	25%	163	20%	19	2%	800	100%	46%	3.31	80	6%
Wading pools	98	12%	92	12%	232	29%	197	25%	161	20%	20	3%	800	100%	45%	3.30	54	4%
Community garden plots (e.g. vegetables)	124	16%	99	12%	215	27%	213	27%	129	16%	20	3%	800	100%	43%	3.16	51	4%
Hardball, softball or slo-pitch diamonds	112	14%	90	11%	237	30%	200	25%	132	17%	29	4%	800	100%	42%	3.19	48	4%
Splash pads	123	15%	100	13%	216	27%	187	23%	142	18%	32	4%	800	100%	41%	3.16	72	6%
Off-leash dog areas	161	20%	115	14%	204	26%	154	19%	133	17%	33	4%	800	100%	36%	2.98	61	5%
Running tracks	112	14%	118	15%	273	34%	176	22%	95	12%	26	3%	800	100%	34%	3.03	25	2%
Football, rugby, or lacrosse fields	135	17%	128	16%	238	30%	191	24%	78	10%	30	4%	800	100%	34%	2.93	22	2%
Indoor soccer facilities	192	24%	122	15%	200	25%	153	19%	94	12%	39	5%	800	100%	31%	2.78	22	2%
Tennis courts (outdoor)	150	19%	149	19%	255	32%	122	15%	98	12%	26	3%	800	100%	28%	2.83	50	4%
Basketball courts (outdoor)	158	20%	159	20%	238	30%	134	17%	75	9%	36	5%	800	100%	26%	2.75	46	4%
Skateboard and bmx parks	217	27%	145	18%	237	30%	104	13%	64	8%	33	4%	800	100%	21%	2.55	22	2%
Outdoor artificial turf soccer fields	281	35%	170	21%	156	20%	95	12%	63	8%	35	4%	800	100%	20%	2.33	9	1%
Lawn bowling greens	260	33%	198	25%	201	25%	68	9%	33	4%	40	5%	800	100%	13%	2.23	3	0%
Indoor lawn bowling or bocce courts	318	40%	179	22%	171	21%	56	7%	33	4%	43	5%	800	100%	11%	2.08	7	1%
Bocce courts (outdoor)	303	38%	180	23%	176	22%	55	7%	32	4%	54	7%	800	100%	11%	2.11	10	1%
Cricknet pitches	325	41%	229	29%	135	17%	43	5%	21	3%	47	6%	800	100%	8%	1.95	1	0%
Other													46				17	1%
																	1296	100%

Outdoor Facilities

Outdoor Facilities	#
swimming pool	8
camping	1
cross-country skiing	1
fishing ponds	1
mini golf	1
multi-purpose areas	1
paved multi-use trails	1
rifle range	1
snack booths	1
speedway	1
tobogganing hills	1
water fountains	1

DEMOGRAPHICS

9. How many people, including yourself, live in your household?

	#	%
1	123	16%
2	275	35%
3	121	15%
4	173	22%
5	67	8%
6	31	4%
7 or more	1	0%
Total	791	100%
Total Persons	2256	
Persons per Household	2.9	
2006 Census Average Household Size	2.5	
No Response	9	

10. Please indicate the total number of persons within your household that fall into the following age categories:

	#	%	2006 Census
Under 10 years	266	12%	11%
10 - 19 years	313	14%	14%
20 - 34 years	401	18%	19%
35 - 54 years	686	31%	30%
55 and over	561	25%	26%
Total	2227	100%	100%
No Response	22		

11. In what year were you born?

	#	%
1929 or earlier	29	4%
1930 to 1939	51	7%
1940 to 1949	125	18%
1950 to 1959	149	21%
1960 to 1969	164	23%
1970 or later	191	27%
Total	709	100%
Average Year of Birth	1959	
Average Age	49	
No Response	91	

12. What is your household's total annual income before taxes? Is it ... (READ)

	#	%
Under \$40,000	101	21%
Between \$40,000 and \$59,000	98	21%
Between \$60,000 and \$79,000	77	16%
Between \$80,000 and \$99,000	75	16%
\$100,000 or more	122	26%
Total	473	100%
No Response	327	

13. Gender

	#	%
Female	329	41%
Male	471	59%
Total	800	100%

USER GROUP SURVEY - DISTRIBUTION LIST

Organization	Completed Survey
Alexander Park Baseball Association	yes
Ancaster Cyclones	no
Ancaster Ladies 3-Pitch	yes
Ancaster Little League	yes
Ancaster Men's Slo-Pitch	no
Ancaster Mixed Slo-Pitch	no
Ancaster Veterans Slo-Pitch	yes
Ancaster Youth Soccer Club	yes
Beach T-ball	yes
Berrisfield Community Council	no
Binbrook Cal Ripken Baseball	yes
BMFA House League Championship	no
Canadian Reformed Soccer League	no
Canadian Thunderbirds Baseball Club	no
Carlisle Minor Baseball	no
Carlisle Rebels Baseball	no
Catholic Youth Organization	yes
Central City Soccer	yes
Champions Soccer School	yes
City Mixed 3-Pitch League	no
Civic Employees Slo-Pitch League	no
Crescent Cricket Club	no
Croatia Hamilton Sports Club	no
Dofasco Oldtimers Soccer	no
Dundas Chiefs Mens Baseball	no
Dundas Girls' Softball League	no
Dundas Little League	yes
Dundas Men's Rec Slo-Pitch League	yes
Dundas Slo-Pitch League	no
Dundas United Soccer Club-Men's Open	no
Dundas Womens Softball Association	yes
Dundas Youth Soccer Club	yes
East Hamilton Mixed League	yes
East Hamilton Soccer Club	no
East Mountain Baseball Assoc	yes
Eastmount Park Softball	yes
Eastwood Minor Baseball	no
Flamborough Slo Pitch	no
Flamborough Soccer	yes
Gage Park Softball Assoc	no
Gilkson Community Park (Sports)	no
Glanbrook Grizzlies (Glanbrook Seniors)	yes
Glanbrook Youth Soccer	yes
Gourley Park Community Association	yes
Greensville Ladies Fastball	no
Greensville Grizzlies	yes
Greensville Minor Baseball	yes
Greensville Oldtimers Fastball Club	yes
Greensville Slo Pitch	no
GSA Soccer League	no
Hamilton & District Oldtimers Soccer	no
Hamilton & District Senior Soccer League	no
Hamilton & District Slo-Pitch Associat'n	no
Hamilton Avalanche	yes
Hamilton Cardinals Rep Baseball Assoc.	yes
Hamilton Challenger Baseball	no
Hamilton Civic Hospitals Softball	no
Hamilton Classic Co-ed Slo-Pitch	yes
Hamilton Cricket Club	yes
Hamilton Dealership League	yes
Hamilton District Baseball Assoc.	no
Hamilton East Kiwanis Boys and Girls Club	yes
Hamilton Hornets (Rugby)	yes
Hamilton Hurricanes	yes
Hamilton Inter-Church Soccer League	no
Hamilton Jamesville Soccer	no
Hamilton Jr. Football Inc.	yes
Hamilton Ladies Slo-Pitch	yes

Organization	Completed Survey
Hamilton Media Slo-Pitch League	yes
Hamilton Men's Fastball League	yes
Hamilton Minor Football Association	yes
Hamilton Mixed 3-Pitch	yes
Hamilton Mountain Slo-Pitch	no
Hamilton Olde Sports Association	no
Hamilton Oldtimers Baseball Organization	yes
Hamilton Pontiacs (Tri County League)	yes
Hamilton Separate School Board	no
Hamilton Serbians Youth Soccer	no
Hamilton Skateboard Assembly	no
Hamilton Sparta & South Region Soccer	yes
Hamilton Steelers Midget Girls Fastball	no
Hamilton Thunderbirds	no
Hamilton Touch Football Association	yes
Hamilton Wildcats Aust. Football 2003	no
Hamilton/Burlington CA Softball	no
Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board	no
Hellas Oldtimers Soccer Club	yes
Inter-Church Christian Men's Fastball	no
Kirkendall Recreation Association	no
Kiwanis Boys & Girls Club	yes
Kory 3-Pitch League	yes
Mahoney Park Baseball	yes
McMaster University	no
Mohawk College - Athletics Dept.	no
Mount Hamilton Youth Soccer/House Lea	no
Mount Hamilton Youth Soccer/Rep Progra	no
Oldtimers 1st Serbian	no
Master Gators Slo Pitch	yes
Ontario Football Alliance	yes
Ontario Special Olympics	no
Quad City Slow Pitch	no
Quinndale Community Council	no
Rosedale Community Council	yes
Roxborough Park Baseball	no
Royal City Soccer Club	yes
Saltfleet Go Ahead Soccer Club	yes
Scooby Soccer	yes
Scott Park Baseball	yes
Small Industrial Slo-Pitch	yes
Southmount Ladies Softball	yes
Springfield Hockey Association	no
Special Olympics	yes
Steel City Slo Pitch	yes
Steel City Steelers Football Club	no
Stelco Employee Fastball League	no
Stoney Creek Disabled Sports Association	no
Stoney Creek Mens Slo-Pitch	no
Stoney Creek Minor Softball Association	no
Stoney Creek Optimist Little League	yes
Stoney Creek Slo-Pitch Assoc.	no
Stoney Creek Soccer Club	no
Sudanese League of Hamilton	no
Templemead Community Sports	yes
U.S. Steel 3 Pitch League	yes
Unified Old Boys Soccer	yes
Vincent Community Men's Slo-Pitch	yes
Waterdown Ladies Fastball	no
Waterdown Bulldogs Soccer Club	yes
Waterdown Men's Fastball League	yes
Waterdown Minor Baseball Association	yes
Wentworth Adult Mixed Slo-Pitch League	no
Wentworth Minor Football	yes
Wentworth Varsity Football	no
West Hamilton Youth Soccer Club	yes
West Mountain Baseball	no
Women's Touch Football	no

City of Hamilton
Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan

Focus Group Summary – Sports Field Users

Prepared by Monteith Brown Planning Consultants – May 5, 2009

The purpose of the Sports Field User Focus Groups was to engage key organizations that utilize municipal sports fields in discussions pertaining to field usage, allocation, maintenance, design, and supply. The Focus Groups were scheduled early on in the development of the City of Hamilton’s Outdoor Recreation Facilities and Sports Field Provision Plan so as to create a basis for understanding key issues and perspectives. The intent of the sessions – which were facilitated by the Consulting Team with the assistance of City staff – was to listen to the groups, rather than to present Study findings or options.

City of Hamilton staff, with the assistance of the Consulting Team, selected key user groups to attend these sessions and distributed invitations. Attendance was limited to approximately 10-15 people per session in order to encourage group discussion and interaction. Selected field user groups were divided into three separate groups – soccer field users, ball diamond users and mixed sport field users; due to the amount of discussion required, soccer and ball organizations were asked to participate in a series of two related, but separate focus group sessions.

Group	Date	Location
Soccer Groups	April 6, 2009	Chedoke Arena
Baseball Groups	April 9, 2009	Mountain Arena
Mixed Field Groups	April 14, 2009	Chedoke Arena
Soccer Groups	May 13, 2009	Chedoke Arena
Baseball Groups	May 14, 2009	Mountain Arena

This report is a summary of the issues and ideas that arose during these discussions. These notes are summarized, but represent the opinions of those in attendance. It was not the objective of the sessions to reach consensus on every issue, but rather to encourage debate and problem-solving. It is important to note that much of this input is opinion-based (and some is based on misinformation or facts that cannot be fully verified) and should not be construed as being recommendations of the Study. The Consulting Team will use this input – in concert with other information, including additional public input, benchmarking, staff consultation, trends, etc. – to assist in developing recommendations and a strategy for future sport field investment.

Soccer Focus Group #1

At the first focus group for soccer, there were 11 representatives for soccer groups throughout Hamilton in attendance, including those from both youth and adult organizations. Groups were asked to discuss three topics pertaining to outdoor recreation: (1) guiding principles that will underpin the Sports Field and Outdoor Recreation Facilities Provision Study; (2) field maintenance and design; and (3) operational issues.

Topic 1: Guiding Principles

Decipher what the target market is:	Youth are the target market, but this should flow through to adults. If full-sized fields are constructed, then these can be used by all age groups. Adults can play at times that are less desirable for youth teams – like later in the evening. Also, residents from the community should have priority over groups coming from outside of Hamilton. Additionally, given that youth are the target market, it is important that fees are affordable for youth.
Stewardship and Partnership agreements should be a priority:	There is a need to have a variety of options for partnerships; perhaps the City could look at examples from other communities to identify strategies that have been successful. One problem faced is that sometimes insurance costs can act as a deterrent to entering into an agreement.
Improve fields already in existence:	It is important to maximize use of existing fields and make improvements where possible. It is possible that older facilities can be repurposed.
There should be a long-term approach to field maintenance:	Field bookings should be strategic as to avoid damage to fields. For example, rugby should be booked later in the season when it's not as wet. The overuse of fields should be avoided as well.

Topic 2: Field Maintenance

Need to do a better job maintaining existing fields:	New sod is needed, especially at goal mouths. Irrigation makes a big difference as fields do not deteriorate as quickly. Workers should be reallocated in the fall and used for seeding at this time.
Fences at fields:	Fields could be fenced in to minimize vandalism and unwanted activities.
More dedicated fields:	Perhaps there should be separate fields for practices and games. Minimize over-use of fields through dedicating fields to sports such as rugby, lacrosse and football. It was also suggested that single fields could be consolidated at a single location.
Better Design:	Poor design can create maintenance problems later on (e.g. gradients, irrigation). More investment up front could lead to savings in the long-run. Soil testing would be a good idea – would be beneficial to get an expert to test pH levels. The same engineering used for older fields and Mohawk should not be used.

Topic 2: Field Maintenance

Enforce the rain out policy:	Some felt that this rule is not enforced consistently. The fields should also be closed for drainage days. It was suggested that perhaps there should not be any tournaments on 'A' fields until June when fields are not as wet.
Maintenance schedules and policy should be transparent:	Some felt that more accountability was needed for maintenance staff and there could be better communication with user groups. It was suggested that there could be a stewardship of field maintenance.
Specific maintenance issues:	Some groups noted specific issues pertaining to field maintenance that they would like to see improved <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Poor turf growth• Gradients are not conducive to children• Fields are over-drained• Goal mouths are damaged• The fence height is too short• Goals are old and not straight• Field lining is sometimes not visible• Lighting should be increased (more lit fields)

Topic 3: Operational Issues

All sport field users should be treated equally:	There should be a universally applied policy and all groups pay equally. Also, there should be no unpermitted use of fields.
Groups do not want to pay higher fees:	Some groups feel as though they are not gaining anything from paying higher fees – maintenance has not improved. Also, clubs do not feel as though they should have to pay for field improvements. This issue is further complicated because there are three times as many parents applying for financial aid as in the past. Some attendees felt that the City should provide financial assistance for families that aren't able to pay.
Support from the City:	Some groups outlined ways in which the City could better support them. The City can assist in marketing programs and also advertising registration dates in the newspaper or other publications. The City could perhaps provide groups with office space to assist with organizational management.
Club amalgamation:	Many felt that clubs had become too numerous and that the provision of soccer programs would be easier if clubs were amalgamated to form one or more larger organizations. At present, the duplication of services can seem unnecessary.
More communication with user groups:	Some groups would like more interaction with the City, and more communication of their needs with regards to facilities. As stated before, rules and regulations pertaining to fields need to be more clearly defined and communicated to user groups.

Topic 3: Operational Issues

Short-term and long-term goals:

Many felt that creating short-term and long-term goals with regards to field maintenance and provision would ensure that the needs of the organizations using the fields are met.

Soccer Focus Group #2

At the second focus group for soccer, there were 7 representatives for soccer groups throughout Hamilton in attendance, including those from both youth and adult organizations. Groups were asked to discuss three topics pertaining to outdoor recreation: (1) field allocation approaches (2) capital funding, design and amenities; and (3) field supply.

Topic 1: Field Allocation

Is there a “balanced” approach to allocating fields to existing, as well as emerging groups?

A variety of opinions were received on this issue. Some felt that existing groups should be the highest priority because of those currently using fields cannot be served, but the existing groups should be required to verify their registration and field usage. Many like consistency in schedule from year to year (also with regards to tournaments). There is a desire to keep local fields and home fields for local users. Field allocation should be fairly distributed based on group needs. Need to balanced relationships with clubs where a partnership has formed and other groups using fields.

Field allocation policies that utilize formulas:

Youth should use fields earlier in the evening, while adults should use fields later at night. Rep teams need lit fields by regulation, so considerations such as these needs to be factored into the formula. Clubs that aren't anchored to a specific community have more trouble securing fields because they are more nomadic.

New fields should be given to groups proportionately to their current usage. Sometimes the City asks for field hour requests before registration is complete thereby leading to discrepancies between time needed and time allotted and teams are sometimes hesitant to request fewer hours and give up fields in case they are needed in the future. Perhaps a five year range could be used to discern what registration will be because it factors in peaks and valleys in registration. When using a formula it should also be taken into consideration that some teams have too many players due to field shortage.

More fields are needed in the short-term. The City has a poor track record in field provision, which is why teams are hesitant to give up field times. Lights are needed at Billy Sherring Park – Mt. Hamilton had committed to doing this in the past, but the City didn't respond. Also, the ball diamonds at Paramount Park are hardly used and they could be converted into two mini fields.

Topic 2: Capital Funding, Design and Amenities

Feedback from Clubs

- Sparta Club:** The Sparta Club uses class 'A' fields with mini fields and artificial turf. McMaster has two artificial turf fields and they are highly used and appreciated. The justification for artificial turf fields is there.
- Oldtimers Soccer League:** This organization uses 'A', 'B' and 'C' fields, as well as private/ethnic club fields.
- Stoney Creek Soccer Club:** This organization does not have home fields and additional fields are needed to accommodate all ages. They are always grateful for whatever they can get (some 'A's some 'B's and some 'C's).
- Flamborough Soccer Club:** This club uses both mini and full fields. Fields at the North Wentworth Arena Site are being replaced at Joe Sam's Park. More fields will be needed because more families have moved into the area – perhaps mini fields can be converted to full fields in the future.
- Mount Hamilton Youth Soccer Club:** This organization has found that they do not have enough practice fields; there are few practice fields and there are over 200 teams. Allocated fields are automatically used as game fields. Practice fields have to be shared.

Other Feedback

- Amenities are lacking:** Washroom maintenance and provision is usually lacking, especially at high traffic parks. Parking is often found to be deficient, which can affect surrounding neighbours; Billy Sherring has enough parking and Courtcliffe Park is adequate. Spectator seating is also deficient at some parks and practice fields generally do not have any amenities.
- Shared fields:** It can be difficult to share with rugby and football because they destroy fields at a faster rate. Multi-use fields are effective only if they are artificial.
- Design:** Many fields could use better drainage and irrigation. If irrigation is improved, then this will require more grass cutting. Mini fields should be designed so that they can be easily converted to full-sized fields.
- Capital contributions** It sometimes seems that clubs are more willing to donate their time than their money. The City's costs are higher than the private sector for capital projects and this creates a lack of trust.
- Exclusivity** When lights are installed, this can lead to concerns over exclusivity. It is difficult to determine how to achieve equality between groups and discern how much each user group should contribute financially.

Topic 2: Capital Funding, Design and Amenities

Other forms of contributions: User groups are more than willing to pay reasonable user fees, but would like to see the resources gained from fundraising stay in the specific communities where the money was raised. It is possible that partnerships could be formed to deal with maintenance issues.

Topic 3: Field Supply

Registration increases: Most years, a 3-10% increase is witnessed and there is an emerging interest in men's and women's teams. These trends are expected to continue. Five to ten thousand new homes going into Waterdown will increase pressures on the Flamborough soccer club.

School fields: Many felt that there needed to be better access to school fields. Ancaster maintains 12 school fields (\$75,000 per year and children pay a \$25 surcharge). This results in more accessible fields which open at the beginning of May. The provincial government will fund access to school gyms, but not fields – fields are fenced and locked. Maybe open space or agricultural land adjacent to schools could be acquired when new fields are needed.

Field conditions: Fields with properly and consistently cut grass are difficult to find. It was suggested that permit fees could be increased so that grass could be cut more frequently. Many find that the conditions of competitive fields need to be improved.

Alternative locations: Perhaps the City could rent agricultural land to create fields and relieve the pressure on existing fields – this would likely require a zoning change.

Baseball Focus Group #1

At the first focus group for ball, 16 participants were present, representing baseball, slo-pitch, and softball organizations (both minor and adult). Groups were asked to discuss three topics pertaining to outdoor recreation: (1) guiding principles that will underpin the Sports Field and Outdoor Recreation Facilities Provision Study; (2) field maintenance and design; and (3) operational issues.

Topic 1: Guiding Principles

Affordability: Programs should be affordable, especially to youth – they should be encouraged to play instead of deterred. Nobody should be priced out of playing.

Ball diamond allocation: Existing users should be supported, and both new and regular users need to know which diamonds are available. Some groups felt that there should be more transparency and consistency with regards to ball diamond allocation.

Topic 1: Guiding Principles

Secure school sites:	If a school site is at risk, effort should be made to ensure that the well-used sites remain in operation and available.
Priorities:	Funding should be used for the highest level needs.
Design and Amenities:	Ball diamonds should be flexibly designed to accommodate a variety of activities and age groups and all fields should be an appropriate size. Sites should possess the needed amenities like shade, washrooms, storage etc. Ball diamonds should be accessibly located within the community.
Partnerships:	Challenger baseball is a good example (Inch Park) – can they work with other groups?

Topic 2: Field Maintenance

Grass cutting:	The cycle of grass cutting is disrupted if it rains, and grass is not cut until the next scheduled time.
Field openings:	If fields are scheduled to be open on May 19 th , then fields should be ready by that date.
Older fields:	Older fields should be assessed to discern which improvements are needed at which fields. Diamonds have been built over a 40 year period and renewal is required.
Maintenance Staff:	There should be one person in charge of management and there should be a system of accountability. Also, it is important that staff members are well trained in sport field management techniques.
More pre-emptive maintenance:	It can seem as though maintenance issues are dealt with only after they've become serious issues. Some have said it is akin to "firefighting" instead of ensuring that fields are kept in good shape.
Specific maintenance issues:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mounds are not properly maintained; they require a clay mixture otherwise they deteriorate too quickly and get dusty• More benches and shaded areas are needed• Some home plates are raised and made of wood• Some fields have improper surfaces or are uneven, which can be a safety issue• Bathrooms need to be kept clean• Better lighting is needed• Batting cages are needed• Some bleachers are damaged• The field condition is very important for Challenger Baseball at Inch Park, and improvements are needed. There are ruts, and often lots of dust.

Topic 3: Operational Issues

Ball diamond allocation:	Perhaps field use could be put into a database, which would be accessible to user groups
Communications:	The City could better support through advertising programs and registration.
Fees:	Fees go to recreation and culture, but perhaps more should go toward maintenance. Maybe a new system could be created to ensure that maintenance is properly funded and user groups could be integrated or consulted in the process. It was suggested that in-kind services could be provided instead of charges. At present, some feel that costs are prohibitive to providing affordable youth programs. Slo-pitch is relatively inexpensive to play, so these groups would be more open to paying 5-10% more.
Usage guidelines and restrictions	Most groups felt that diamond usage guidelines and restrictions are reasonable.

Baseball Focus Group #2

At the second focus group for ball, 13 participants were present, again representing baseball, slo-pitch, and softball organizations (both minor and adult). Groups were asked to discuss three topics pertaining to outdoor recreation: (1) allocation approaches; (2) capital funding, design & amenities; and (3) field supply.

Topic 1: Allocation Approaches

Balanced allocation:	Some fields are wasted because new groups are unsure of their requirements, whereas established groups know from past experience. Established groups should have first priority for booking diamonds. Better communication might allow groups to know and secure diamonds that are available. In Dundas there are usually 4 or 5 diamonds available for use.
A formula-based approach for ball diamond allocation:	Some representatives suggested that unforeseen conditions, such as rainouts, are not factored into a formula. Some groups are afraid to concede diamond usage if their numbers decrease in case they need it in the future, so sometimes the proper registration numbers are not disclosed.
Should an allocation policy assign both prime and non-prime time?	This is only an issue with adult teams and leagues, so it would not apply to all ball groups.
Priority:	Many representatives stated that youth should use youth ball diamonds and adult should use adult diamonds. The residents that live in the communities where diamonds exist should have use of those diamonds; recreational sports should be neighbourhood-oriented. Many felt that existing ball diamond user groups should take priority over new groups.

Topic 2: Capital Funding, Design and Amenities

Diamonds with the greatest demand:

The characteristics that groups sought in a ball diamond were lighting, a 300ft. or 330ft. fenced in area, sufficient parking that is paved and washrooms. Parks that user groups found to be of good quality are Dundas Driving Park and Joe Sams Leisure Park. Baseball diamonds should not overlap with soccer fields because it creates a safety issue. It is also undesirable for fields to be west facing.

Amenities:

It was felt that washrooms and fences are very needed at ball diamonds. Some stated that the road leading to Turner Park is too dusty and inaccessible and some updating is required at Inch Park and Churchill Park. Trees should be planted when new parks are built. Signage that gives directions to parks would be beneficial as well.

Existing diamonds:

Better crowning of fields is needed, which could require increased or improved staff training. The “lips” between the infield and outfield, if not properly maintained, create an uneven surface which can be a safety issue, or affect the way balls bounce on the ground. Diamonds should not be placed so that the glare from the sun becomes an issue.

It was suggested that the City could move the unlit diamond at Maplewood Park onto the existing soccer pitch, which is under-utilized.

Capital Contributions:

Fundraising can help to create a sense of community – City parks become “our parks”. A sense of ownership of parks could decrease vandalism and let people become personally invested in the quality of parks. Some would like to know of ways to form partnerships with the City to increase the provision of diamonds (also to create home diamonds). Some feel that communications with the City are strained. Outside sponsorship should be considered.

Deficiencies:

Ancaster requires 4 full diamonds and 2 with lights. Additionally, there are no proper baseball fields and lights would be appreciated at Turner Park.

Topic 3: Field Supply

Program growth: Stoney Creek is still growing and therefore more diamonds will be required. Diamonds provision could be improved in the East end as well. In Dundas, baseball and T-ball have been growing steadily by 8 or 10% annually, however it seems that women's softball is becoming less popular and young girls would rather play fastball. Adults are more likely to choose to play in leagues that are a better value – cost is a concern. Hamilton could promote itself more for tournaments, which would be good for sport development in the area.

Some representatives felt that registration has levelled off in the Inner City. Perhaps families will begin to enrol their children in baseball as other activities become expensive during difficult economic times.

School Properties: School diamonds should be accessible in new subdivisions.

Mixed Field Focus Group

Mixed field groups (a total of 9 representatives) included touch football, lacrosse, aussie rules football, minor football (tackle), rugby, cricket, and baseball and soccer (neighbourhood associations). Groups were asked to discuss four topics pertaining to outdoor recreation: (1) guiding principles that will underpin the Sports Field and Outdoor Recreation Facilities Provision Study; (2) field maintenance and design; and (3) funding and operational issues; and (4) field supply.

Topic 1: Guiding Principles

Increase the playing season: Some teams would benefit from a longer playing season, and it was suggested that the season openings could be changed to accommodate this.

Field allocation: Some felt that there were inconsistencies in field allocation. It was mentioned that smaller groups and groups that provide programming for children should have priority.

Multi-use fields versus specific use fields: There were some conflicting opinions concerning how fields should be designed. Some felt that fields should be designed flexibly so that a multitude of sports groups can make use of playing fields. Others felt that sports fields should be more sport-specific, or dedicated to a specific sport given that maintenance techniques can vary significantly between types of sport fields. Some user groups were proponents of artificial turf.

Affordability: Many felt that keeping sports affordable should be a main concern. It is especially important that programs are affordable for children.

Enforcement of field regulations: There seem to be problems with the enforcement of regulations for the use of fields – enforcement needs to be consistent.

Topic 1: Guiding Principles

Other amenities: All fields should be equipped with the appropriate support amenities such as storage.

Topic 2: Field Maintenance and Design

Maintenance for specific sport fields: Cricket fields need very specific maintenance while aussie rules football fields require minimal maintenance, especially for grass cutting (cricket fields are kept at 1”to1.5”).

Support Amenities: More support amenities are needed at most fields, such as parking, seating and washrooms.

Full-sized fields: Full-sized fields are far more flexible and able to accommodate a variety of sports and age groups.

Dedicated fields: Some feel that dedicated fields are better for sport development.

Topic 3: Funding & Operational Issues

Dedicated fields: There were mixed feelings regarding whether dedicating fields results in fewer funding, maintenance and booking issues.

The “mine vs. yours” mindset needs to be dispelled: When fields are allocated, existing groups should not be marginalized. Although groups have their own interests in mind, cooperation should be fostered.

Topic 4: Field Supply

Cricket: Cricket would like to be at Heritage Green (the new location at Mohawk is not good). Many cricket members live in Stoney Creek, so the pitches should be near this area. Pitches in existence are not the proper dimensions, grass is not cut appropriately for cricket and there is no clubhouse.

Rugby: Rugby needs more fields, preferably at Mohawk College.

Soccer field allocation: Gilkson soccer is forced to turn away roughly 200 kids per year due to inadequate space for practices and games. There is a lot of competition for fields.

Lacrosse: Lacrosse had problems with field availability in the spring, so the organization moved to artificial turf in Mississauga to relieve the problem.

Permit enforcement: Permit enforcement has become an issue – perhaps more staff members are needed to ensure that regulations are followed consistently.

City of Hamilton Public Information Sessions - SUMMARIES

Binbrook (April 21, 2009)

- Has the City considered artificial fields
 - What about corporate sponsoring?
- Is there a plan for parkland in the Binbrook area?
 - Some have heard that the fairground will be cut into by developers.
 - What about the Glanbrook Arena Park Site?
 - Any considerations for the t-ball, rookie ball diamonds for that site? Why are Stoney Creek residents using this site instead of Binbrook?
- Binbrook is doubling in population. Shouldn't this coincide with an increase in sports field? Could there be a skate park in Binbrook?
- Would like the PowerPoint to be online

Bennetto Recreation Centre (April 22, 2009)

- Some felt that there was a specific problem of soccer crowding out baseball, especially in the Westdale/West Hamilton area.

Sackville Hill Seniors Centre (April 23, 2009)

- Which department sets permit fees?
 - Perhaps the money should go into public works
- Should school lands be acquired if a school is shut down?
- There are opportunities for linkages at Turner Park through Ryckman's Park.
- Need to address the need for passive parkland, but study seems to focus on active parks
- West Mountain facilities are of poor quality and not comparable to the rest of Hamilton
 - The study should say something about fair and equitable parks
- There is nowhere for kids 16 and older to play – there needs to be lights at Olympic Park.
- Olympic Sports Park cannot be lit due to a by-law, but needs light
- Need to petition province to change rules for school land
- Could install boulevards between rows of townhouses to provide some greenery
- There is a request to have the park classification system on the website
- In play areas – asphalt is too hard and rubberized areas are needed

Dundas Lions Memorial Community Centre (April 28, 2009)

- Interest in outdoor skating park in Little John Park
- Maintenance in West Flamborough
- Teenagers hang around play structures in parks because they are not well-lit
- Have offered to test burning lines into fields to limit maintenance
- Perhaps some programs can be run later in the evening to dissuade kids from getting into trouble

Ancaster Old Town Hall (April 29, 2009)

- Artificial turf has an 8 year life span – it is silicon-based and much better/safer than rubber-based
 - Rubber based turf is not FIFA certified
- Westdale Lawn Bowling at Churchill Park just went under
 - It folded because of a lack of parking
 - What did we do with the space?
 - Can it be tennis (it was four courts)?
 - Perhaps a winter ice rink?
- Is City funding upgrades to high school tennis courts?
- A lot of older adults play tennis (ages 60-80)
- Carlisle tennis courts are not well-maintained
 - Many to go Greenville (Hill Top Community Club)
- Soccer field on SWM pond
 - Won't be doing more of this
- Criteria for artificial turf location?
 - At a city-wide or community park
- Hamilton fields are better maintained than in Toronto
- Indoor lawn bowling – multi-use but separate (with soccer)

Sealey Park Scout Hall, Waterdown (April 30, 2009)

- Notes to be added

Stoney Creek Municipal Service Centre (May 5, 2009)

- Councillor Mitchell had a meeting that promoted the renovations to Winona Park and said things would be in place by 2007 and nothing has happened
- In the West Mountain there were 3 diamonds at a closed school and perhaps the City should have bought the school site
- Is intensification addressed in the study?
- Population statistics are way off – where do these statistics come from?
- Request to have another meeting for Stoney Creek and there was an offer to hand out flyers
- Mount Hamilton Lawn Bowling did not receive a notice of meeting – Harry Wood
- Saw plans for two new greens – James Smith Park, Garner Road – neighbourhood park is too small for lawn bowling club.
 - Lawn bowling can play on an indoor turf provided that the right kind of turf is provided
- (Rob N.) Peach festival requested to redo the Master Plan for Winona Park because they would like to see some changes.

Hamilton – notes from emails/documents received

1. Written Brief “Pirated Parkland”

It is felt that there is insufficient parkland on South Central Hamilton Mountain, which has been caused by the School Board, the City and the sale of a significant portion of land to developers that is currently zoned agricultural and has remained undeveloped. The land was originally secured for a school, but the school was not built. There should be better walking trails and more parkland development – most parkland is developed into playgrounds, although many older adults do not benefit from this.

2. The Dundas Youth Soccer Club

This club serves between 1200-1500 Hamilton Youth between the ages of 5 and 19 years of age. The organization is limited in available game slots due to a scarcity of lit pitches. Games are restricted to daylight hours. Fields are used for practices before and after games. Other issues faced pertain to maintenance – fields need better maintenance and consistent lining of the fields.

3. Email Response: (April 21, 2009)

This email contained suggestions for improvements throughout the parks and recreation system and also for specific facilities.

- Another outdoor skating rink (no hockey allowed) like at Dundas Driving Park, but with benches and a rubberized surface for walking with skates.
- Swim programs at Ryerson should have more focus on swim instruction instead of student assessment
- The basketball nets should be removed from Earl Kitchener Public School because use of the courts late at night could be disturbing to the surrounding residential area.

4. Email Response: (April 27, 2009)

This response articulated a desire for specific facilities within Waterdown. Waterdown needs proper tennis courts with a clubhouse, as seen in Carlisle. An artificial ice rink is also desirable; Memorial Park or Joe Sams would be an ideal location.

5. Hamilton Skateboard Assembly

This group was writing in response to the user group survey, which they felt overlooked skateboarders and the significance of the sport. The HSA is trying to advocate for new facilities and more consideration within the Parks and Recreation system.

The HSA also commented on maintenance issues at various skateboard parks. There are many cracks at the Beasley Park skateboard facility, and BMX bikers are damaging the Turner Park facility (prohibitive signs should be posted ensuring that bikers are not using the skateboarding facilities)

6. Waterdown Minor Baseball Association

The WMBA organizes house league play for 380 participants. It is not a Flamborough baseball association, but residents of Greensville, Millgrove, Freelon and Carlisle are welcome to play if they cannot find baseball within their area. The four parks that they use are Gatesbury Park, Belmont Park, Memorial Park and Joe Sams Park. Problems associated with each ball diamond have been listed. They have stated that an all ages facility should be established so that the sport can be properly developed within the area. This facility could cater to minor levels as well as men's slowpitch, men's fastball, women's fastball and minor softball.

It was suggested that initially the park development at Joe Sams Leisure Park could forego the cost of irrigation/lighting, which would allow additional funds for soccer lighting and other recreational demands. The WMBA also offered to participate financially in the development of the two additional diamonds.

7. Cricketers Association of Canada

This organization currently has over 200 members. There are some issues that they have communicated that they would like to be addressed. Issues discussed were:

- The demand for a field is high, and the games are played on parking lots
- There are plans to add divisions for youth ages 8-11, 12-15, 16-18 and also girls' and women's teams.
- Hamilton doesn't have any proper cricket grounds (They don't have the proper size, quality, parking, grading, clubhouse, etc.
- If a new field were to be established, the demographic that would be most interested in cricket would live near the East Mountain, Hamilton East or Stoney Creek.
- Having a proper field would raise the sports profile and aid in its development.

CITY OF HAMILTON







**Outdoor Recreation Facilities
& Sports Field Provision Plan**




ATTACHMENT III: COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC DEMOGRAPHIC FORECASTS

ATTACHMENT III

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC DEMOGRAPHIC FORECASTS

The following graphs illustrate the forecasted changes in the age structure of the population of each of the 9 communities defined for the purposes of this study.





Sources: 2006 data adapted from: Statistics Canada, Population of Census Tracts (100% Data), Cat. No. 97-551-X2006007, 2006 Census. Projections based on data provided by City of Hamilton (2007 - GRIDS), modified by Monteith Brown Planning Consultants.

CITY OF HAMILTON

**Outdoor Recreation Facilities
& Sports Field Provision Plan**

ATTACHMENT IV: LISTING OF BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

MASTER DOCUMENT LIST

- 1) City of Hamilton Strategic Plan
- 2) Vision 2020 Hamilton (2003)
- 3) Sport Field Management Strategy (2008)
- 4) Use Renovation & Replacement Study for Hamilton Recreation & Public Use Indoor Facilities (2008)
- 5) Recreational Trails Master Plan (2007)
- 6) City of Hamilton Parks, Culture and Recreation Master Plan (2002)
- 7) City of Hamilton Life-Cycle State of the Infrastructure Report – 2006 Summary Report (2007)
- 8) Affiliation Policy for Hamilton Minor Sports Organizations (2009)
- 9) Parks Maintenance Standards Manual – draft (2009)
- 10) Park and Open Space Development Manual – draft (2008)
- 11) City of Hamilton Barrier-Free Design Guidelines (2006)
- 12) Capital Budget Book, including 10-year forecast (2009)
- 13) Field Rental Fees (2009)
- 14) Hamilton Sport Tourism Action Plan – Draft (2004)
- 15) Tourism Hamilton Strategic Plan, 2008-2010 (2007)
- 16) Tourism Hamilton Marketing, 2009 (2008)
- 17) Reciprocal use Agreement – Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board (2005)
- 18) Recreation Service Study (2005)
- 19) Social and Health Issues Report (2005)
- 20) Hamilton Roundtable for Poverty Reduction, various documents (2005-2008)
- 21) Social Vision for the New City (2002)
- 22) Recreation Access for Children and Youth of Hamilton’s Diverse Communities: Opening Doors, Expanding Opportunities (2006)
- 23) School Boards, various documents (2003, 2004, 2005, 2008)
- 24) Skateboard Park Locations Selection (2004)
- 25) Recreational Infrastructure Canada Program in Ontario and Ontario Recreation Funding Program (staff report) (May 14, 2009); Recreational Infrastructure Stimulus Projects (received June 16, 2009)
- 26) Cootes to Escarpment Park System – draft (2008)
- 27) Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (GRIDS): Growth Report (2006)
- 28) Rural Official Plan (2006)
- 29) City of Hamilton Zoning By-law (2005)
- 30) City Parkland Dedication Reserve (City-wide) (2009)
- 31) Parkland Dedication / Cash-in-Lieu: Official Plan Amendment, New Implementing By-law and Policy (staff report) (2008)
- 32) Park and Open Space Standards and Deficiencies – Information Report (2007)
- 33) Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan (2000)
- 34) City of Hamilton (old) Culture and Recreation Department Infrastructure Study on Facilities (1997)
- 35) Dundas Recreation Facilities and Parks Needs Assessment (1998/99)
- 36) Flamborough Recreation, Parks and Facilities Master Plan (1991)
- 37) Glanbrook Cultural & Recreational Review (1999)
- 38) Town of Ancaster Culture, Parks and Recreation Master Plan (1992)
- 39) Town Owned Lands - Flamborough (1997)
- 40) Parks Directory (2006)

CITY OF HAMILTON

**Outdoor Recreation Facilities
& Sports Field Provision Plan**

ATTACHMENT V: SPORTS FIELD BOOKING DATA (2008)

CRICKET PITCHES - 2008 REPORTED UTILIZATION							
Area	Park	Field / Diamond / Rented Area	Lights?	Field Class	Sport(s)	Total Hours (2008)	Hours Rented per Field
HM	Mohawk Sports Park	Cricket Area			Cricket	126	
WHD	Churchill Park	Cricket 5-C			Cricket	385	
TOTAL - CITY						511	255
Source: City of Hamilton, CLASS Reports, March 2009							
BALL DIAMONDS - 2008 REPORTED UTILIZATION							
Area	Park	Field / Diamond / Rented Area	Lights?	Field Class	Sport(s)	Total Hours (2008)	Hours Rented per Field (2008)
ANC	Amberly Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	555	
ANC	Ancaster Community Centre Park	Diamond 1-B - softball - lit	Yes	B	Softball	776	
ANC	Ancaster Community Centre Park	Diamond 2-B - softball - unlit		B	Softball	518	
ANC	Ancaster Community Centre Park	Diamond 3-B - softball - unlit		B	Softball	481	
ANC	Ancaster Community Centre Park	Diamond 4-B - hardball - lit	Yes	B	Baseball	994	
ANC	James Smith Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	749	
ANC	Kitty Murray Park	Diamond 1-C - t-ball		C	Baseball / Softball	169	
ANC	Meadowlands Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	85	
ANC	Scenic Woods Park	Diamond - 1-C		C	Baseball	738	
TOTAL - ANC						5,064	563
BEV	Bullock's Corners Park	Diamond - 1C lit	Yes	C	Baseball	367	
BEV	Bullock's Corners Park	Diamond - 2C		C	Baseball	249	
TOTAL - BEV						616	308
FLA	Belmont Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball	58	
FLA	Carlisle Community Park	Diamond 1-B - Lit	Yes	B	Baseball	125	
FLA	Carlisle Community Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Baseball	53	
FLA	Carlisle Memorial Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball	24	
FLA	Flamborough Centre	Diamond 1-B - Lit	Yes	B	Softball	78	
FLA	Gatesbury Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball	161	
FLA	Gatesbury Park	Diamond 2-C Youth T-Ball		C	Baseball	161	
FLA	Joe Sams Flamborough Leisure Park	Diamond 1-A - hardball - Lit	Yes	A	Baseball	180	
FLA	Joe Sams Flamborough Leisure Park	Diamond 2-A - softball - Lit	Yes	A	Softball	215	
FLA	Waterdown Memorial Park	Diamond 1-B - Lit	Yes	B	Baseball	408	
FLA	Waterdown Memorial Park	Diamond 2-B - lit	Yes	B	Baseball	383	
FLA	Waterdown Memorial Park	Diamond 3-C		C	Baseball	190	
FLA	Waterdown Memorial Park	Diamond 4-C		C	Baseball	206	
TOTAL - FLA						2,239	172
GLA	Binbrook Fairgrounds	Diamond 1-B - lit (Gord Martin)	Yes	B	Softball	417	
GLA	Glanbrook Sports Complex	Diamond 1-B - hardball - lit	Yes	B	Baseball	114	
GLA	Mt. Hope Com Prk	Diamond 1-B (Gord Oakes)	Yes	B	Softball	183	
GLA	Woodburn Park	Diamond 1-C - T-BALL		C	Softball	64	
GLA	Woodburn Park	Diamond 2-C - T-BALL		C	Softball	30	
GLA	Woodburn Park	Diamond 3-C - T-BALL		C	Softball	25	
TOTAL - GLA						833	139
HM	Bobby Kerr Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	357	
HM	Bobby Kerr Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	357	
HM	Bobby Kerr Park	Diamond 3-C		C	Softball	357	
HM	Bobby Kerr Park	Diamond 4-C		C	Softball	357	
HM	Bruce Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	52	
HM	Bruce Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	30	
HM	Buchanan Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	116	
HM	Buchanan Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	116	
HM	Buchanan Park	Diamond 3-C		C	Softball	106	
HM	Buchanan Park	Diamond 4-C		C	Softball	106	
HM	Buchanan Park	Diamond 5-C		C	Baseball	106	
HM	Colquhoun Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	234	
HM	Colquhoun Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	127	
HM	Eastmount Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball	292	
HM	Eastmount Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Baseball	292	
HM	Eastmount Park	Diamond 3-C		C	Baseball	292	
HM	Eastmount Park	Diamond 4-C		C	Baseball	292	
HM	Eastmount Park	Diamond 5-C - t-ball		C	Baseball	292	
HM	Eleanor Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball	112	
HM	Gilkson Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	745	
HM	Gilkson Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	168	
HM	Gourley Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball / Softball	266	
HM	Gourley Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Baseball / Softball	321	
HM	Gourley Park	Diamond 3-C		C	Baseball / Softball	325	
HM	Gourley Park	Diamond 4-C		C	Baseball / Softball	265	
HM	Holbrook Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball	150	
HM	Huntington Park	Diamond 1-C - east - t-ball		C	Softball	64	
HM	Huntington Park	Diamond 2-C - west		C	Softball	34	
HM	Inch Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball / Softball	145	
HM	Inch Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Baseball / Softball	165	
HM	Inch Park	Diamond 3-C		C	Baseball / Softball	77	
HM	Inch Park	Diamond 4-C		C	Softball	2	
HM	Mohawk Sports Park	Diamond - Bernie Arbour Stadium	Yes	C	Baseball	806	
HM	Mohawk Sports Park	Diamond 1-A - lit - softball	Yes	A	Baseball / Softball	317	
HM	Mohawk Sports Park	Diamond 2-B - lit - hardball	Yes	B	Baseball	555	
HM	Mohawk Sports Park	Diamond 3-B-unlit-hardball-Yth U-12		B	Baseball	407	
HM	Mohawk Sports Park	Diamond 4-B - unlit - hardball		B	Baseball	393	
HM	Mohawk Sports Park	Diamond 5-B - unlit - hardball		B	Baseball	396	
HM	Mohawk Sports Park	Diamond 6-B - unlit - softball		B	Baseball / Softball	305	
HM	Olympic Park - Hamilton	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball / Softball	177	
HM	Olympic Park - Hamilton	Diamond 2-C		C	Baseball	145	
HM	T. B. McQuesten Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball / Softball	228	
HM	Templemead Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball / Softball	89	
HM	Turner Park	Diamond 10-C		C	Baseball / Softball	373	
HM	Turner Park	Diamond 11-C		C	Baseball / Softball	382	

Area	Park	Field / Diamond / Rented Area	Lights?	Field Class	Sport(s)	Total Hours (2008)	Hours Rented per Field
HM	Turner Park	Diamond 12-C		C	Baseball / Softball	371	
HM	Turner Park	Diamond 13-C		C	Baseball / Softball	185	
HM	Turner Park	Diamond 14-C		C	Baseball / Softball	201	
HM	Turner Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Baseball / Softball	235	
HM	Turner Park	Diamond 3-C		C	Baseball / Softball	296	
HM	Turner Park	Diamond 4-C		C	Baseball / Softball	296	
HM	Turner Park	Diamond 5-C		C	Baseball / Softball	338	
HM	Turner Park	Diamond 6-C		C	Baseball / Softball	417	
HM	Turner Park	Diamond 7-C		C	Baseball / Softball	412	
HM	Turner Park	Diamond 8-C		C	Baseball / Softball	398	
HM	Turner Park	Diamond 9-C		C	Baseball / Softball	347	
HM	Wm. McCulloch Park (Brown's)	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball / Softball	168	
HM	Wm. McCulloch Park (Brown's)	Diamond 2-C		C	Baseball / Softball	168	
HM	Wm. McCulloch Park (Brown's)	Diamond 3-C		C	Baseball / Softball	145	
HM	Wm. McCulloch Park (Brown's)	Diamond 4-C		C	Baseball / Softball	166	
TOTAL - HM						15,429	257
LH	Beach Strip	Diamond 1-C - Youth only		C	Softball	12	
LH	Eastwood Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball	6	
LH	Gage Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	621	
LH	Gage Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	560	
LH	Gage Park	Diamond 3-C - t-ball		C	Softball	138	
LH	Globe Park	Diamond 1-B - Lit	Yes	B	Baseball / Softball	493	
LH	Globe Park	Diamond 2-B - lit	Yes	B	Baseball / Softball	390	
LH	Globe Park	Diamond 3-B - lit	Yes	B	Baseball / Softball	414	
LH	Globe Park	Diamond 4-B - unlit Youth		B	Softball	8	
LH	Highland Gardens Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball / Softball	48	
LH	Highland Gardens Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	11	
LH	Kay Drage Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	206	
LH	Kay Drage Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	138	
LH	Mahoney Park	Diamond 1-B - unlit		B	Baseball	378	
LH	Mahoney Park	Diamond 2-B - unlit		B	Baseball	354	
LH	Mahoney Park	Diamond 3-B - lit	Yes	B	Baseball	451	
LH	Mahoney Park	Diamond 4-B - unlit		B	Baseball	354	
LH	Montgomery Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	602	
LH	Montgomery Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	602	
LH	Red Hill Bowl Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	188	
LH	Red Hill Bowl Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	187	
LH	Red Hill Bowl Park	Diamond 3-C		C	Softball	154	
LH	Rosedale Park/King's Forest Park	Diamond 1-C - North CSO		C	Softball	689	
LH	Rosedale Park/King's Forest Park	Diamond 2-C - North CSO		C	Softball	689	
LH	Rosedale Park/King's Forest Park	Diamond 3-C - South - mini		C	Softball	696	
LH	Rosedale Park/King's Forest Park	Diamond 4-C - South - mini		C	Softball	696	
LH	Rosedale Park/King's Forest Park	Diamond 5-C - Reservoir - mid size		C	Softball	653	
LH	Roxborough Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball	78	
LH	Scott Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball	429	
LH	Scott Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Baseball	428	
LH	Scott Park	Diamond 3-C		C	Baseball	334	
LH	Victoria Park	Diamond 1-A - lit	Yes	A	Baseball / Softball	261	
LH	Victoria Park (REMOVED IN 2009)	Diamond 2-C		C	Baseball / Softball	161	
LH	Woodlands Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Baseball / Softball	135	
TOTAL - LH						11,559	340
LSC	Cherry Hts Pk	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	198	
LSC	Cherry Hts Pk	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	312	
LSC	Community Park	Diamond 1-B - Lit	Yes	B	Softball	277	
LSC	Dewitt Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	102	
LSC	Eastdale Park/School	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	304	
LSC	Eastdale Park/School	Diamond 2-B - lit	Yes	B	Softball	316	
LSC	Eastdale Park/School	Diamond 3-C - Youth only		C	Softball	104	
LSC	Eastdale Park/School	Diamond 4-C - Youth only		C	Softball	104	
LSC	Ferris Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	86	
LSC	Green Acres Park	Diamond 1-C - Youth only		C	Softball	200	
LSC	Hillcrest Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	92	
LSC	Hillcrest Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	184	
LSC	Hillcrest Park	Diamond 3-C		C	Softball	134	
LSC	Hillcrest Park	Diamond 4-C		C	Softball	207	
LSC	John Knox Field	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	66	
LSC	John Knox Field	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	66	
LSC	John Knox Field	Diamond 3-C		C	Softball	66	
LSC	Lake Avenue Park/Bow Valley Open space	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	96	
LSC	Little League Park - Stoney Creek	Diamond 1-B - lit - Youth only	Yes	B	Softball	508	
LSC	Little League Park - Stoney Creek	Diamond 2-B - Youth only		B	Softball	528	
LSC	Sisters of St. Joseph's Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	110	
LSC	Waterford Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	72	
LSC	Winona Park	Diamond 1-C - lit	Yes	C	Baseball/City Use	487	
TOTAL - LSC						4,616	201
USC	Albion Estates Park	Diamond 1-C - north		C	Softball	83	
USC	Albion Estates Park	Diamond 2-C - south		C	Softball	83	
USC	Cline Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	81	
USC	Heritage Green Sports Park	Diamond 1-A - lit - hardball	Yes	A	Baseball	495	
USC	Heritage Green Sports Park	Diamond 2B - lit - softball	Yes	B	Baseball / Softball	403	
USC	Maplewood Park	Diamond 1-B - Lit	Yes	B	Softball	277	
USC	Maplewood Park	Diamond 2-C - unlit		C	Softball	50	
USC	Stoneywood Park	Diamond 1-C - Youth only		C	Softball	36	
USC	Tapleystown Men's Club	Diamond - 1C		C	Softball	40	
USC	Tapleystown Men's Club	Diamond - 2C		C	Softball	38	
USC	Tapleystown Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	68	
USC	Valley Park	Diamond 1-C - lit	Yes	C	Softball	312	
USC	Valley Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	5	

Area	Park	Field / Diamond / Rented Area	Lights?	Field Class	Sport(s)	Total Hours (2008)	Hours Rented per Field
TOTAL - USC						1,970	152
WHD	Alexander Park	Diamond 1-C - Youth only		C	Baseball / Softball	225	
WHD	Alexander Park	Diamond 2-C - Youth only		C	Baseball / Softball	133	
WHD	Alexander Park	Diamond 3-C - Youth only		C	Baseball / Softball	37	
WHD	Alexander Park	Diamond 4-C - Youth only		C	Baseball	34	
WHD	Alexander Park	Diamond 5-C (Prince Philip) - Youth only		C	Baseball	5	
WHD	Churchill Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	230	
WHD	Churchill Park	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	234	
WHD	Churchill Park (REMOVED IN 2009)	Diamond 3-C		C	Softball	246	
WHD	Dundas Driving Park	Diamond 1-C - Parkside - Youth only		C	Softball	165	
WHD	Dundas Driving Park	Diamond 2-C - lit	Yes	C	Softball	396	
WHD	Dundas Valley Community Centre	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	168	
WHD	Dundas Valley Community Centre	Diamond 2-C		C	Softball	168	
WHD	Edwards Park	Diamond 1-C		C	Softball	139	
WHD	Edwards Park	Diamond 2-B		B	Softball	87	
WHD	Martino Memorial Park	Diamond 1-B - Little League		B	Baseball	163	
WHD	Olympic Sp Park-Dun	Diamond 1 - C lit	Yes	C	Baseball / Softball	204	
WHD	Veterans Park	Diamond 1-C - Youth only		C	Softball	86	
WHD	Volunteer Park	Diamond 1-A - Hardball		A	Baseball	5	
TOTAL - WHD						2,722	151
TOTAL - CITY						45,045	253
Source: City of Hamilton, CLASS Reports, March 2009							
SOCCER, FOOTBALL AND MULTI-USE FIELDS - 2008 REPORTED UTILIZATION							
Area	Park	Field / Diamond / Rented Area	Lights?	Field Class	Sport(s)	Total Hours (2008)	Hours Rented per Field (2008)
ANC	Ancaster Community Centre Park	Soccer 1-C mini		C	Soccer	491	
ANC	Ancaster Community Centre Park	Soccer 2-C - lit	Yes	B	Soccer	647	
ANC	Ancaster Community Centre Park	Soccer 3-C mini		C	Soccer	417	
ANC	Ancaster Community Centre Park	Soccer 4-C mini		C	Soccer	417	
ANC	Ancaster Community Centre Park	Soccer 5-C mini		C	Soccer	417	
ANC	Costco Park / Meadowlands Soccer	Soccer 1-C (lit)	Yes	B	Soccer	539	
ANC	James Smith Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	419	
ANC	James Smith Park	Soccer 2-C - mini		C	Soccer	453	
ANC	James Smith Park	Soccer 3-C - mini		C	Soccer	417	
ANC	Meadowlands Park	Soccer 1 - C		C	Soccer / Football	355	
ANC	Meadowlands Park	Soccer 2 - C		C	Soccer / Football	315	
ANC	Village Green Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	282	
TOTAL - ANC				12		5,166	430
BEV	Beverly Community Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	142	
BEV	Beverly Community Park	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer	170	
BEV	Freelton Centennial Park (Centennial Heights)	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	174	
BEV	Freelton Centennial Park (Centennial Heights)	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer	174	
TOTAL - BEV				4		660	165
FLA	Courtcliffe Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	186	
FLA	Courtcliffe Park	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer	186	
FLA	Courtcliffe Park	Soccer 3-C		C	Soccer	186	
FLA	Courtcliffe Park	Soccer 4-C		C	Soccer	186	
FLA	Courtcliffe Park	Soccer 5-C		C	Soccer	186	
FLA	Gatesbury Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	200	
FLA	Gatesbury Park	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer	146	
FLA	Joe Sams Flamborough Leisure Park	Soccer Field 1-A - lit	Yes	A	Soccer	424	
FLA	Joe Sams Flamborough Leisure Park	Soccer Field 1-C		C	Soccer	232	
FLA	Joe Sams Flamborough Leisure Park	Soccer Field 2-A - lit	Yes	A	Soccer	426	
FLA	Joe Sams Flamborough Leisure Park	Soccer Field 2-C		C	Soccer	232	
FLA	Joe Sams Flamborough Leisure Park	Soccer Field 3-C - mini		C	Soccer	167	
FLA	Joe Sams Flamborough Leisure Park	Soccer Field 4-C - mini		C	Soccer	167	
FLA	North Wentworth Park - Waterdown	Soccer 1-B Lit	Yes	B	Soccer	228	
FLA	North Wentworth Park - Waterdown	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer	73	
FLA	Rockcliffe Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	28	
FLA	Waterdown Memorial Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	311	
TOTAL - FLA				17		3,564	210
GLA	Glanbrook Sports Complex	Soccer 1-C - lit	Yes	B	Soccer	468	
GLA	Glanbrook Sports Complex	Soccer 2-C - unlit		C	Soccer	218	
GLA	Glanbrook Sports Complex	Soccer 3-C - unlit - mini		C	Soccer	218	
GLA	Glanbrook Sports Complex	Soccer 4-C - unlit		C	Soccer	218	
GLA	Glanbrook Sports Complex	Soccer 5-C - unlit - short		C	Soccer	218	
GLA	Glanbrook Sports Complex	Soccer 6-C - unlit - mini		C	Soccer	224	
GLA	Glanbrook Sports Complex	Soccer 7-C - unlit - mini		C	Soccer	8	
TOTAL - GLA				7		1,572	225
HM	Barton Secondary School	Soccer 1-C		C	Football	174	
HM	Billy Sherring Park	Soccer - 3B		B	Soccer	146	
HM	Billy Sherring Park	Soccer - Mini 1 B		C	Soccer	187	
HM	Billy Sherring Park	Soccer - Mini 2 B		C	Soccer	180	
HM	Billy Sherring Park	Soccer 2-B - lit	Yes	A	Soccer	292	
HM	Bobby Kerr Park	Soccer/Football 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	249	
HM	C. B. Strirling School	Soccer - Field 1-C		C	Soccer	255	
HM	Captain Cornelius Park	Soccer / Football 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	172	
HM	Captain Cornelius Park	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer	104	
HM	Fernwood Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	285	
HM	Garth Street Reservoir	Soccer 1-C Soccer/Football		C	Soccer	189	
HM	Garth Street Reservoir	Soccer 2-C Soccer/Football		C	Soccer	125	
HM	Hill Park High School	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	83	
HM	Lisgar Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	248	
HM	Macassa Park	Soccer - 10-C		C	Soccer	346	
HM	Macassa Park	Soccer - 11-C		C	Soccer	344	
HM	Macassa Park	Soccer - 9-C		C	Soccer	344	
HM	Macassa Park	Soccer 1-C - mini		C	Soccer	342	

Area	Park	Field / Diamond / Rented Area	Lights?	Field Class	Sport(s)	Total Hours (2008)	Hours Rented per Field
HM	Macassa Park	Soccer 2-C - mini		C	Soccer	342	
HM	Macassa Park	Soccer 3-C - mini		C	Soccer	318	
HM	Macassa Park	Soccer 4-C - mini		C	Soccer	318	
HM	Macassa Park	Soccer 5-C - mini		C	Soccer	318	
HM	Macassa Park	Soccer 6-C - mini		C	Soccer	320	
HM	Macassa Park	Soccer 7-C -mini		C	Soccer	332	
HM	Macassa Park	Soccer 8-C		C	Soccer	344	
HM	Mohawk Sports Park	Soccer - Field 1- A - S/F/R - lit	Yes	A	Multiple	650	
HM	Mohawk Sports Park	Soccer - Field 2 - A - S/F/R - lit	Yes	A	Soccer / Football	637	
HM	Mohawk Sports Park	Soccer - Field 3 - A - S - lit	Yes	A	Multiple	479	
HM	Mohawk Sports Park	Soccer - Field 4 - A - S/F/R - lit	Yes	A	Multiple	701	
HM	Mohawk Sports Park	Soccer - Field 5 - A - S/field hockey-unlit		B	Multiple	471	
HM	Mohawk Sports Park	Soccer - Field 6 - A - S/F/R - unlit		B	Multiple	491	
HM	Mohawk Sports Park	Soccer - Open 1C - S/F/R & Aussie		C	Soccer / Aussie	318	
HM	Mohawk Sports Park	Soccer - Open 2C - S/F/R & Aussie		C	Soccer / Aussie	317	
HM	Mount Lions Club Park	Soccer 1-C	Yes	B	Soccer	283	
HM	Mountview Park	Soccer - 1C		C	Soccer	291	
HM	Olympic Park - Hamilton	Soccer 1-C - west		C	Soccer / Football	202	
HM	Olympic Park - Hamilton	Soccer/Football 2-C - east		C	Soccer / Football	162	
HM	R.A. Riddell School	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	778	
HM	R.A. Riddell School	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer	664	
HM	R.A. Riddell School	Soccer 3 - Mini		C	Soccer	778	
HM	R.A. Riddell School	Soccer 4 - Mini check parking lot		C	Soccer	540	
HM	Sackville Hill Prk	Soccer 1A - Lit	Yes	A	Soccer / Football	363	
HM	Sackville Hill Prk	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer	168	
HM	Sackville Hill Prk	Soccer 3-C		C	Soccer	164	
HM	Sackville Hill Prk	Soccer 4-C - mini		C	Soccer	142	
HM	Sackville Hill Prk	Soccer 5-C - mini		C	Soccer	164	
HM	Sackville Hill Prk	Soccer 6-C - mini		C	Soccer	164	
HM	Sackville Hill Prk	Soccer 7-C - mini		C	Soccer	164	
HM	Sherwood Secondary School	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	176	
HM	Sir Allan MacNab Secondary School	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer / Football	577	
HM	Sir Allan MacNab Secondary School	Soccer/Football 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	244	
HM	T. B. McQuesten Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	185	
HM	Templemead Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	183	
HM	Westmount High School	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	361	
HM	Wm. McCulloch Park (Brown's)	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	153	
HM	Wm. McCulloch Park (Brown's)	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer	107	
TOTAL - HM				56		17,427	311
LH	C. P. Lands Park/Corktown Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	137	
LH	C. P. Lands Park/Corktown Park	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer	104	
LH	C. P. Lands Park/Corktown Park	Soccer 3-C		C	Soccer	4	
LH	Eastwood Park	Soccer - Park		N/A	Soccer	45	
LH	Eastwood Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	407	
LH	HAAA Grounds	Soccer 1-A - lit	Yes	A	Soccer / Football	256	
LH	Highland Gardens Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	117	
LH	Ivor Wynne Stadium/Brian Timmis	Soccer - Brian Timmis Stadium	Yes	A	Soccer	327	
LH	Ivor Wynne Stadium/Brian Timmis	Soccer - Ivor Wynne Turf	Yes	A	Soccer / Football	781	
LH	Kay Drage Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	266	
LH	Kay Drage Park	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer	240	
LH	Kay Drage Park	Soccer 3-C		C	Soccer	237	
LH	Montgomery Park	Soccer 1-C - mini		C	Soccer	7	
LH	Woodlands Park	Soccer/Football 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	475	
TOTAL - LH				14		3,400	243
LSC	Bayview Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	272	
LSC	Cherry Hts Pk	Soccer - 1 - C		C	Soccer	282	
LSC	Cherry Hts Pk	Soccer - 2 - C		C	Soccer	285	
LSC	Corman Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	142	
LSC	Dover Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	251	
LSC	Eastdale Park/School	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	142	
LSC	Father Sean O'Sullivan	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	144	
LSC	Ferris Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	302	
LSC	Glendale Park	Soccer 1- Mini		C	Soccer	75	
LSC	Green Acres Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	258	
LSC	Greenhill Reservoir	Soccer 1C		C	Soccer	193	
LSC	Hillcrest Park (now owned by school)	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	274	
LSC	Hillcrest Park	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer	294	
LSC	Memorial Park-Stoney Creek	Soccer - Field 1C - unlit		C	Soccer	243	
LSC	Sam Manson Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	751	
LSC	Sam Manson Park	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer / Football	710	
LSC	Sam Manson Park	Soccer 3-C		C	Soccer / Football	710	
LSC	Sam Manson Park	Soccer 4-C		C	Soccer / Football	710	
LSC	Sam Manson Park	Soccer 5-C		C	Soccer	683	
LSC	Sam Manson Park	Soccer 6-C		C	Soccer	683	
LSC	Sherwood Meadows	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	315	
LSC	Sherwood Meadows	Soccer 2- C		C	Soccer	327	
LSC	Sherwood Park	Soccer 1-A - Lit	Yes	A	Soccer	522	
LSC	Sherwood Park	Soccer 2-B - Lit	Yes	B	Soccer	501	
LSC	Sherwood Park	Soccer 3-C		C	Soccer	280	
LSC	Sherwood Park	Soccer 4-C		C	Soccer	276	
LSC	Sherwood Park	Soccer 5-Mini		C	Soccer	237	
LSC	Sherwood Park	Soccer 6-Mini		C	Soccer	213	
LSC	Sherwood Park	Soccer 7-Mini		C	Soccer	237	
LSC	Sir Isaac Brock School	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	243	
LSC	Sir Wilfrid Laurier P.S.	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	245	
LSC	Sir Wilfrid Laurier P.S.	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer	243	
LSC	Sir Wilfrid Laurier P.S.	Soccer 3-C		C	Soccer	243	
LSC	Sisters of St. Joseph's Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	266	

Area	Park	Field / Diamond / Rented Area	Lights?	Field Class	Sport(s)	Total Hours (2008)	Hours Rented per Field
LSC	Sisters of St. Joseph's Park	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer / Football	258	
LSC	St. Agnes Park (Oakland Park)	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	183	
TOTAL - LSC				36		11,988	333
USC	Albion Estates Park	Soccer 2-C - Rough shape		C	Football	245	
USC	Cline Park	Soccer 4-C - mini		C	Soccer	142	
USC	Felker Park	Soccer - Field 1 - mini		C	Soccer	144	
USC	Heritage Green Sports Park	Soccer 1-A - lit	Yes	A	Soccer	677	
USC	Heritage Green Sports Park	Soccer 2-A - lit	Yes	A	Soccer	588	
USC	Heritage Green Sports Park	Soccer 3-A - lit	Yes	A	Soccer	472	
USC	Maplewood Green Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	241	
USC	Paramount Park	Soccer 1-C - 2 minis in inventory		C	Soccer	216	
USC	Saltfleet High School	Soccer 1-C - Lit	Yes	C	Soccer	495	
USC	Taplestown Park	Soccer - Field 1-C		C	Soccer	144	
USC	Valley Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	166	
USC	White Deer Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	258	
TOTAL - USC				12		3,787	316
WHD	Churchill Park	Soccer - Open Space		N/A	Soccer	60	
WHD	Churchill Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer / Football	532	
WHD	Churchill Park	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer / Football	458	
WHD	Churchill Park	Soccer 3-C - mini		C	Soccer / Football	509	
WHD	Churchill Park	Soccer 4-C - mini		C	Soccer / Football	509	
WHD	Couldry Park-Dundas (Leslie B.)	Soccer - #1B		C	Soccer	97	
WHD	Dalewood Public School	Soccer 1 D		C	Soccer	289	
WHD	Olympic Sp Park-Dun	Soccer 1-B - unlit		B	Soccer / Football	169	
WHD	Olympic Sp Park-Dun	Soccer 2-A - lit	Yes	A	Soccer	452	
WHD	Olympic Sp Park-Dun	Soccer 3-C unlit - mini		C	Soccer	141	
WHD	Olympic Sp Park-Dun	Soccer 4-C - unlit - mini		C	Soccer	141	
WHD	Olympic Sp Park-Dun	Soccer 5-C - unlit - mini		C	Soccer	141	
WHD	Sanctuary Park	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	97	
WHD	Sanctuary Park	Soccer 2-C		C	Soccer	97	
WHD	Westdale Secondary School	Soccer 1-C		C	Soccer	300	
TOTAL - WHD				15		3,991	266
TOTAL - CITY				173		51,554	298

Source: City of Hamilton, CLASS Reports, March 2009

CITY OF HAMILTON

**Outdoor Recreation Facilities
& Sports Field Provision Plan**

ATTACHMENT VI: RECREATION FACILITY INVENTORY

INVENTORY - BALL DIAMONDS

Name	Plan Area	Owner	Total Diamonds (unit equivalents)	Hardball - Premier (Lit)	Hardball (Lit)	Hardball (Unit)	Softball (Lit)	Softball (Unit)	Tball (Lit)	Tball (Unit)
ALBION ESTATES PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
ALEXANDER PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	4.0			1		2		1
AMBERLY PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
ANCASTER COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	5.0		1		1	2		
ANCASTER LITTLE LEAGUE (SPRING VALLEY BOWL)	ANC	City of Hamilton	3.5		1	1				1
BAYVIEW WEST PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
Beach Blvd Park #2	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0			1				
BELMONT PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1.0			1				
BEVERLY COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	2.5				1	1		
BINBROOK FAIRGROUNDS	GLA	City of Hamilton	2.5						1	1
BINBROOK FAIRGROUNDS	GLA	Other	1.5				1			
BOBBY KERR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
BOBBY KERR PARK SCHOOL	HM	School Board	2.0					2		
BRUCE PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
BUCHANAN PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	5.0					5		
BULLOCKS CORNERS	BEV	City of Hamilton	2.5				1	1		
CARLISLE COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	2.5				1	1		
CARLISLE MEMORIAL PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1.0							1
CARTER PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0							1
CENTENNIAL HEIGHTS PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1.5		1					
CENTRAL PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0							1
CERRY HEIGHTS PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
CHURCHILL PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
CLINE PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
COLOUHOUN PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
COMMUNITY PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.5				1			
Copetown Lions Park	BEV	City of Hamilton	2.5				1	1		
DEWITT PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
DR. WILLIAM BETHUNE PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
DUNDAS DRIVING PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	4.5				1	2		1
EASTDALE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.5				1			
EASTDALE SCHOOL	LSC	School Board	3.0							3
EASTMOUNT	HM	City of Hamilton	5.0					4		1
EASTWOOD PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	4.0			1				3
EDWARDS MEMORIAL PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	2.0							2
ELEANOR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
FERRIS PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
FLAMBOROUGH CENTRE PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1.5				1			
FREELTON COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1.5				1			
GAGE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	3.0					2		1
GATESBURY PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
GILKSON PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
GILKSON PARK-R.A.RIDDELL SCHOOL	HM	School Board	1.0					1		
GLANBROOK SPORTS COMPLEX	GLA	City of Hamilton	1.5		1					
GLENDALE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
GLOBE PARK	LH	Other	7.5				3	3		
GORD OAKES PARK	GLA	City of Hamilton	1.5		1					
GOURLEY PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0							1
GREEN ACRES PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0			1				
HAMPTON PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
Heritage Green Sports Park	USC	Other	3.0		1		1			
HIGHLAND GARDENS PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	2.0					1		1
HIGHVIEW PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
HILLCREST PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	4.0					4		
HOLBROOK PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
HUNTER ESTATES PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
HUNTINGTON PARK	HM	School Board	2.0					2		
INCH PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	6.0			6				
JAMES MACDONALD SCHOOL-GOURLEY PARK	HM	School Board	5.0					4		1
JAMES SMITH PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
JERSEVILLE PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
JOE SAMS LEISURE PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	3.0		1		1			
JOHN KNOX SCHOOL	LSC	Other	3.0					3		
KAY DRAGE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
KITTY MURRAY PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1.0							1
Lake Avenue Park/Bow Valley Open Space	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
LISGAR PARK SCHOOL LANDS	HM	School Board	1.0					1		
LITTLE LEAGUE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	2.5				1			1
LYNDEN LEGION PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1.5				1			
LYNDEN LIONS SOUTH	BEV	City of Hamilton	2.5				1	1		
MAHONEY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	4.5		1	3				
MAPLEWOOD PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	2.5				1	1		
MARTINO MEMORIAL PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	2.5		1			1		
Meadowlands Permanent	ANC	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
MILLGROVE COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	2.5				1	1		
MOHAWK SPORTS PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	8.5	1	2	2		2		
MONTGOMERY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
Mountsberg Hall Park	FLA	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
NORTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0							1
OLYMPIC PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	2.0			2				
OLYMPIC SPORTS PARK 1	WHD	City of Hamilton	1.5				1			
PARAMOUNT PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
PROPOSED	FLA	Other	1.0					1		
PROPOSED	LSC	School Board	2.0			1				1
RED HILL BOWL	LH	City of Hamilton	3.0					3		
RED HILL NEIGHBOURHOOD PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0							1
ROSEBOUGH PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
ROSDALE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	5.0					3		2
ROXBOROUGH PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
SCENIC WOODS	ANC	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
SCOTT PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	3.0					3		
SHEFFIELD BALL PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	2.5				1	1		
SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH'S PARK	LSC	Other	1.0					1		
ST. CHRISTOPHER'S PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
STONEWOOD PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
STRABANE COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	4.0				2	1		
T.B. McQUESTEN PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0			1				
TAPLEYTOWN MENS CLUB PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
TAPLEYTOWN PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
TEMPLEHEAD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
TURNER PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	13.0					13		

INVENTORY - FOOTBALL FIELDS

Name	Plan Area	Owner	Football Fields Dedicated (Lit)	Football Fields Dedicated (Unlit)
ALBION ESTATES PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1.0	1
BEVERLY COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	2	
CAPTAIN CORNELIUS PARK	HM	City of Hamilton		1
HAMILTON AMATEUR ATHLETIC ASSOC.	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
			3	2

INVENTORY - SOCCER FIELDS

Name	Plan Area	Owner	Total Soccer / Multi-use Fields (unlit equivalents)	Class A Fields (Lit)	Class B Fields (Lit)	Class B Fields (Unlit)	Class C Fields (Unlit)
ALBION ESTATES PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
ANCASTER COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	5.5		1		4
ANCASTER HIGH SCHOOL	ANC	School Board	8.0				8
BARTON SECONDARY SCHOOL	HM	School Board	1.0				1
BAYVIEW WEST PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
BEVERLY COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	3.0				3
BILLY SHERRING PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	4.5	1		1	2
BOBBY KERR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
BRIAN TIMMIS STADIUM	LH	City of Hamilton	1.5	1			
C.B. STIRLING SCHOOL	HM	School Board	1.0				1
CAPTAIN CORNELIUS PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	2.0				2
CENTENNIAL HEIGHTS PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	2.0				2
CHERRY HEIGHTS PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	2.0				2
CHURCHILL PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	4.0				4
CLINE PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
CORKTOWN PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	3.0				3
CORMAN PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
COURTCLIFFE COMMUNITY PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	5.0				5
DALEWOOD PUBLIC SCHOOL	WHD	School Board	1.0				1
DOVER PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
EASTDALE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
EASTWOOD PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
FATHER SEAN O'SULLIVAN MEMORIAL PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
FELKER PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
FERNWOOD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
FERRIS PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
FISHER'S MILL PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
FLAMBOROUGH CENTRE PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	2.5		1		1
Garth St. Reservoir	HM	City of Hamilton	2.0				2
GATESBURY PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	2.0				2
GILKSON PARK-R.A.RIDDELL SCHOOL	HM	School Board	4.0				4
GLANBROOK SPORTS COMPLEX	GLA	City of Hamilton	11.5		1		10
GLENDALE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
GREEN ACRES PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
Greenhill Reservoir	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
HENRY & BEATRICE WARDEN PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
Heritage Green Sports Park	USC	Other	4.5	3			
HIGHLAND GARDENS PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
HILL PARK SECONDARY SCHOOL	HM	School Board	1.0				1
HILLCREST PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
IVOR WYNNE STADIUM	LH	City of Hamilton	1.5	1			
JAMES SMITH PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	3.0				3
JOE SAMS LEISURE PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	7.0	2			4
KAY DRAGE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	3.0				3
LAWFIELD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
LESLIE B. COULDREY PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1.0			1	
LISGAR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
LYNDEN LIONS SOUTH	BEV	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
MACASSA PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	11.0				11
MAPLEWOOD GREEN PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
Meadowlands Permanent	ANC	City of Hamilton	2.0				2
MEADOWLANDS SOCCER PITCH	ANC	City of Hamilton	1.5		1		1
MEMORIAL PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
MOHAWK SPORTS PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	10.0	4		2	2
MONTGOMERY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
MOUNT LION'S CLUB PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.5		1		
MOUNTVIEW PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
NORTH WENTWORTH COMMUNITY PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	2.5		1		1
OLYMPIC PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	2.0				2
OLYMPIC SPORTS PARK 1	WHD	City of Hamilton	5.5	1		2	2
PARAMOUNT PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	2.0				2
PROPOSED	LSC	School Board	1.0				1
RIVERDALE EAST PARK (OAKLANDS)	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
ROCKCLIFFE GARDENS	FLA	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
SACKVILLE HILL MEMORIAL PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	7.5	1			6
SALT FLEET DISTRICT HIGH SCHOOL	USC	School Board	5.5	2	1		1
SAM MANSON PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	6.0				6
Sanctuary	WHD	City of Hamilton	2.0				2
SHERWOOD MEADOWS PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	2.0				2
SHERWOOD PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	6.0	1	1		3
SHERWOOD SECONDARY SCHOOL	HM	School Board	1.0				1
SIR ALLAN MACNAB SECONDARY SCHOOL	HM	School Board	2.0				2
SIR ISAAC BROCK SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	LSC	School Board	1.0				1
SIR WILFRID SECONDARY SCHOOL	LSC	School Board	3.0				3
SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH'S PARK	LSC	Other	2.0				2
T.B. McQUESTEN PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
TAPLEYTOWN PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
TEMPLEMEAD PARK SCHOOL LANDS	HM	School Board	1.0				1
VALLEY PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
VETERANS PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
Village Green Park	ANC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
WATERDOWN MEMORIAL PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
WESTDALE SECONDARY SCHOOL	WHD	School Board	1.0				1
WESTMOUNT SECONDARY SCHOOL	HM	School Board	1.0				1
WHITE DEER PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
WILLIAM McCULLOCH PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	2.0				2
WOODLANDS PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
			204.5	17	8	6	161

Name	Plan Area	Owner	Total Diamonds (unit equivalents)	Hardball - Premier (Lit)	Hardball (Lit)	Hardball (Unit)	Softball (Lit)	Softball (Unit)	Tball (Lit)	Tball (Unit)
Valens Park	BEV	City of Hamilton	1.0							1
VALLEY COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
VALLEY PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	2.5		1			1		
VETERANS PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
VICTORIA PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.5		1					
VOUNTEER FIELD PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1.5		1					
WATERDOWN MEMORIAL PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	5.0				2	2		
Waterford Park	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
WESTOVER PARK	BEV	Other	2.5				1			1
WILLIAM McCULLOCH PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	3.0			1		2		
WILLIAM MCCULLOCH PARK-SENECA SCHOOL	HM	School Board	3.0					2		1
WINONA PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.5				1			
WOODBURN BALL PARK	GLA	City of Hamilton	3.0							3
WOODLANDS PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0					1		
WOODWARD PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	2.0					2		
			261.5	1	14	22	29	139	1	33

INVENTORY - BOCCE COURTS

Name	Plan Area	Owner	Bocce Courts
Chedoke Twin Pad Arena	HM	City of Hamilton	4
CORMAN PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	2
DR. WILLIAM BETHUNE PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	4
EASTDALE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	2
FATHER SEAN O'SULLIVAN MEMORIAL PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	2
FERRIS PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	2
GLEN CASTLE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	2
Greenhill Reservoir	LSC	City of Hamilton	2
LISGAR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	2
MAPLEDENE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	2
MEMORIAL PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	2
Mountain Arena/Skating Centre	HM	City of Hamilton	3
RIVERDALE EAST PARK (OAKLANDS)	LSC	City of Hamilton	2
ROSEDALE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	4
SACKVILLE HILL MEMORIAL PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	2
SAM MANSON PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	3
SIR ALLEN MACNAB REC CENTER	HM	School Board	4
TEMPLEMEAD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	2
TRENHOLME PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	3
			49

INVENTORY - BASKETBALL COURTS

Name	Plan Area	Owner	Total Basketball Courts (full court equivalents)	Multi-Purpose Court (pad only)	Basketball Courts (Full)	Basketball Courts (Half)	Basketball Courts with Hockey Nets
ALBION ESTATES PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
ANCASTER COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
ANDREW WARBURTON MEMORIAL PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
BAYVIEW WEST PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
BENETTO REC CENTER	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
BEVERLY COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
BILLY SHERRING PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
BIRGE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
BROUGHTON PARK EAST	HM	School Board	1.0		1		
BRUCE PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0			2	
BRYNA PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
CARTER PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
CENTENNIAL HEIGHTS PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
CENTRAL PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
CLINE PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
Copetown Lions Park	BEV	City of Hamilton	1.0			2	
CORKTOWN PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
CORMAN PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
DEWITT PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
DUNDAS DRIVING PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1.0			2	
EASTWOOD PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
EDGE LAKE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
ELEANOR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
ELMAR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
ERINGATE PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
FAIRFIELD PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
FATHER SEAN O'SULLIVAN MEMORIAL PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
FERRIS PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
FREELTON COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
GATESBURY PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
GLENDALE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	2.0		2		
GOURLY PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
HAMILTON AMATEUR ATHLETIC ASSOC.	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0			2	
HAMPTON PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.5		1	1	
HARMONY PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
HENRY & BEATRICE WARDEN PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	2.0		2		
HIGHVIEW PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
HOMEBROOK PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
HUNTER ESTATES PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
JACKIE WASHINGTON PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
JAMES SMITH PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
John Wilson Park	LSC	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
KENNEDY EAST PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
KINSMAN PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
KOPPERFIELD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
LAWFIELD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
LEASIDE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
LIFESAVERS PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
LISGAR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
LYNDEN LEGION PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
LYNDEN LIONS SOUTH	BEV	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
MACASSA PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
MCLAREN PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	2.0	1	1		
Meadowlands Permanent	ANC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
MONTGOMERY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	2.0		2		
MOORLAND PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
MOUNTVIEW PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
NEWLANDS PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0				1

Name	Plan Area	Owner	Total Basketball Courts (full court equivalents)	Multi-Purpose Court (pad only)	Basketball Courts (Full)	Basketball Courts (Half)	Basketball Courts with Hockey Nets
NORTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
PARKDALE SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	LH	School Board	1.0		1		
PLATEAU PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
POWELL PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
ROSEBOUGH PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
ROSEDALE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
Rushdale Park	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
SEALY PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
SHAWINIGAN PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
SHEFFIELD BALL PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
SIR ALLEN MACNAB REC CENTER	HM	School Board	2.0	1	1		
ST HELEN'S/ST. PETERS WALKWAY	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
STRABANE COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1.0				1
T.B. McQUESTEN PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
TEMPLEMEAD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
TRENHOLME PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
VALLEY COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
VETERANS PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1.0			2	
VICTORIA PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	2.0	1	1		
WATERDOWN MEMORIAL PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	2.0		2		
Waterford Park	LSC	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
WESTOVER PARK	BEV	Other	0.5			1	
WHITE DEER PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
WILDAN TOT LOT	FLA	City of Hamilton	1.5		1	1	
WILLIAM SCHWENGER PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
WINONA PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	0.5			1	
WOOLVERTON PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1.0		1		
			84	3	59	30	7

INVENTORY - TENNIS COURTS

Name	Plan Area	Owner	Total Tennis Courts (number)	Tennis Courts - Public (Lit)	Tennis Courts - Public (Unlit)	Tennis Courts - Club (Lit)
BENETTO REC CENTER	LH	City of Hamilton	2		2	
BEVERLY COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	2			2
BULLOCKS CORNERS	BEV	City of Hamilton	3			3
CARLISLE COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1	1		
CENTRAL PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	2	2		
DUNDAS DRIVING PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	5			5
EDGE LAKE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1		1	
FREELTON COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1	1		
GAGE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	12			12
GLOBE PARK	LH	Other	3	3		
GORD OAKES PARK	GLA	City of Hamilton	1		1	
GOURLEY PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1		1	
GREEN ACRES PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	7			7
HAMILTON AMATEUR ATHLETIC ASSOC.	LH	City of Hamilton	8			8
HILL PARK SECONDARY SCHOOL	HM	School Board	4	4		
Huntington Park/Recreation Centre	HM	City of Hamilton	4			4
INCH PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	2		2	
JAMES SMITH PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	2		2	
LAWFIELD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	2	2		
LITTLE JOHN PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1		1	
LYNDEN LEGION PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	2	2		
Meadowlands Permanent	ANC	City of Hamilton	1		1	
MEMORIAL PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1		1	
PALOMINO RANCH	FLA	City of Hamilton	2			2
PARKDALE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	2		2	
SEALY PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	2		2	
SIR ALLEN MACNAB REC CENTER	HM	School Board	2	2		
T.B. McQUESTEN PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1		1	
VALLEY PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	4	4		
VICTORIA PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	3	3		
Village Green Park	ANC	City of Hamilton	3			3
			87	24	17	46

INVENTORY - SPRAY PADS & WADING POOLS

Name	Plan Area	Owner	Spray Pads	Wading Pools
ALEXANDER PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton		1
ALLISON NEIGHBOURHOOD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
ANCASTER LIONS PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton		1
ANDREW WARBURTON MEMORIAL PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	1
BAYVIEW PLAYGROUND	LH	City of Hamilton		1
BEASLEY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
Belview Park	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
BERRISFIELD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
BILLY SHERRING PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
BROUGHTON PARK EAST	HM	School Board	1	
CARTER PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
CENTRAL PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
CHURCHILL PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1	
CORONATION PARK POOL RINK	WHD	City of Hamilton		1
DUNDAS DRIVING PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1	1
EASTMOUNT	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
EASTWOOD PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
ELEANOR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
ELMAR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
FAIRFIELD PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
FATHER SEAN O'SULLIVAN MEMORIAL PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1	
GAGE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	1
GEORGE L. ARMSTRONG PLAYGROUND	HM	School Board		1
GILKSON PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
GLENDALE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1	
GOURLEY PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
GREEN ACRES PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton		1
HAMILTON AMATEUR ATHLETIC ASSOC.	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
HENRY & BEATRICE WARDEN PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1	
HIGHVIEW PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
Huntington Park/Recreation Centre	HM	City of Hamilton	1	1
INCH PARK	HM	City of Hamilton		1
J.C. BEEMER PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	1
KENNEDY EAST PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
KINSMAN PARK	LH	City of Hamilton		1
LAWFIELD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
LISGAR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
LUCY DAY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
MACASSA PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
MCLAREN PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
MONTGOMERY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
MOUNT LION'S CLUB PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
MOUNTVIEW PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
MYRTLE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton		1
NORTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
PARKDALE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton		1
PIER 4 PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
POWELL PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	1
R.T. STEELE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton		1
ROSEDALE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
ROXBOROUGH PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
Rushdale Park	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
SAM MANSON PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1	
SHAWINIGAN PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
ST. CHRISTOPHER'S PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
TEMPLEMEAD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
TRENHOLME PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
VEEVERS PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1	
VICTORIA PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
WATERDOWN MEMORIAL PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1	
WILLIAM McCULLOCH PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
WOODWARD PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
WOOLVERTON PARK	LH	City of Hamilton		1
			51	18

INVENTORY - SKATE PARKS

Name	Plan Area	Owner	Skate Parks
BEASLEY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
MOHAWK SPORTS PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
PARKDALE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
TURNER PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
WATERDOWN MEMORIAL PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1
			5

INVENTORY - LAWN BOWLING GREENS

Name	Plan Area	Owner	Lawn bowling Greens
DUNDAS DRIVING PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1
GAGE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	2
Village Green Park	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
			4

INVENTORY - RUNNING TRACKS

Name	Plan Area	Owner	RunningTracks
BOBBY KERR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
HAMILTON AMATEUR ATHLETIC ASSOC.	LH	City of Hamilton	1
J.C. BEEMER PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
MOHAWK SPORTS PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
SACKVILLE HILL MEMORIAL PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
			5

INVENTORY - OUTDOOR ICE RINKS

Name	Plan Area	Owner	Outdoor Rink - Natural (variable)	Outdoor Rink - Artificial
ALEXANDER PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1	
ANCASTER HEIGHTS	ANC	City of Hamilton	1	
ANDREW WARBURTON MEMORIAL PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
ARCADE PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
BERRISFIELD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
BROUGHTON PARK EAST	HM	School Board	1	
BRUCE PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
BUCHANAN PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
CARTER PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
CHURCHILL PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1	
COLOUHOUN PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
CORKTOWN PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
DUNDAS DRIVING PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton		1
DURAND PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
EASTMOUNT	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
ELEANOR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
ELMAR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
ERINGATE PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1	
FATHER SEAN O'SULLIVAN MEMORIAL PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1	
FAY AVENUE PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
FREELTON COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1	
GAGE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
GILKSON PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
GLENDALE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1	
GOURLEY PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
GREEN ACRES PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1	
HAMILTON AMATEUR ATHLETIC ASSOC.	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
HAMPTON PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
HARMONY PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1	
HIGHLAND GARDENS PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
HIGHVIEW PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
HIXON ROAD PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1	
KENNEDY EAST PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
LYNDEN LEGION PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1	
MACASSA PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
MILLGROVE COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1	
MOHAWK MEADOWS	ANC	City of Hamilton	1	
MOORLAND PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1	
MOUNT LION'S CLUB PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
MOUNTAIN DRIVE	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
MOUNTVIEW PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
MYRTLE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
NORTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
OPTIMIST PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1	
PINECREST PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1	
POWELL PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
RADIAL PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
ROSEBOUGH PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1	
ROXBOROUGH PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
Rushdale Park	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
SCENIC PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
SCOTT PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
SHAWINIGAN PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
ST. CHRISTOPHER'S PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
TEMPLEMEAD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
TRENHOLME PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
VETERANS PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1	
VICTORIA PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
WATERDOWN MEMORIAL PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1	
WILLIAM SCHWENGER PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1	
WOODWARD PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1	
			60	1

INVENTORY - PLAYGROUND LOCATIONS

Name	Plan Area	Owner	Playground or Play Equipment Locations
A.M.CUNNINGHAM SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	LH	School Board	1
ADELAIDE HOODLESS SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	LH	School Board	1
ALBION ESTATES PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1
ALEXANDER PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1
ALLISON NEIGHBOURHOOD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
ANCASTER COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
ANCASTER HEIGHTS	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
ANDREW WARBURTON MEMORIAL PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
ARCADE PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
AUSTIN PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
Bayview Playground	LH	City of Hamilton	1
BAYVIEW WEST PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
BEASLEY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
BELMONT PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1
Belview Park	LH	City of Hamilton	1
BENNETTO REC CENTER	LH	City of Hamilton	1
BERRISFIELD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
BEULAH PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
BEVERLY COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1
BILLY SHERRING PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
BINBROOK FAIRGROUNDS	GLA	City of Hamilton	1
BIRGE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
BLOCK 87 PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1
BOBBY KERR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
BROUGHTON PARK EAST	HM	School Board	1
BROUGHTON PARK WEST	HM	City of Hamilton	1
BRUCE PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
Bruleville Nature Park	HM	City of Hamilton	1
BRYNA PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
BUCHANAN PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
BULLOCKS CORNERS	BEV	City of Hamilton	1
BURKHOLDER PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
CAPTAIN CORNELIUS PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
CARLSLE COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1
CARLSLE MEMORIAL PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1

INVENTORY - PLAYGROUND LOCATIONS

Name	Plan Area	Owner	Playground or Play Equipment Locations
LAWRENCE P. SAYERS PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
LEASIDE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
LESLIE B. COULDREY PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1
LIFESAVERS PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
LINDEN PARK SCHOOL	HM	School Board	1
LIONS GATE PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
LION'S OUTDOOR POOL (HEMMING PARK)	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
LISGAR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
LITTLE JOHN PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1
Livingston	WHD	City of Hamilton	1
LUCY DAY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
LYNDEN LEGION PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1
LYNDEN LIONS SOUTH	BEV	City of Hamilton	1
MACASSA PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
MAHONEY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
MAPLE LANE PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
MAPLEDENE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
MAPLEWOOD PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1
MARGARET STREET PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1
MCLAREN PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
MEADOWBROOK PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
Meadowlands Permanent	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
MEMORIAL PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
MEMORIAL SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	LH	School Board	1
MILLGROVE COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1
MOHAWK GARDENS	HM	City of Hamilton	1
MOHAWK MEADOWS	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
MOHAWK SPORTS PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
MONTGOMERY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
MORTON PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1
MOUNT LION'S CLUB PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
MOUNTAIN DRIVE	HM	City of Hamilton	1
Mountsberg Hall Park	FLA	City of Hamilton	1
MOUNTVIEW PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
MYRTLE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1

Name	Plan Area	Owner	Playground or Play Equipment Locations
CARLUKE HALL	GLA	City of Hamilton	1
Carpenter Neighbourhood Park	HM	City of Hamilton	1
CARTER PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
CENTENNIAL HEIGHTS PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1
CENTRAL PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
CENTRAL SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	LH	School Board	1
CHEDOKE SCHOOL	HM	School Board	1
CHERRY HEIGHTS PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
CHURCHILL PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1
CLINE PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1
COMMUNITY PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
Copetown Lions Park	BEV	City of Hamilton	1
CORKTOWN PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
CORMAN PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
CORONATION PARK POOL RINK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1
Crerar Neighbourhood Park #1	HM	City of Hamilton	1
DEWITT PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
Dofasco Property	LH	City of Hamilton	1
DR. WILLIAM BETHUNE PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
DUNDAS DRIVING PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1
DUNDURN PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
DURAND PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
EARL KITCHENER SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	LH	School Board	1
EASTDALE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
EASTMOUNT	HM	City of Hamilton	1
EASTWOOD PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
EDGE LAKE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
EDWARDS MEMORIAL PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1
ELEANOR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
ELIZABETH BAGSHAW SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	LSC	School Board	1
ELMAR PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
ERINGATE PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1
FAIRCOURT PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
FAIRFIELD PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
FATHER SEAN O'SULLIVAN MEMORIAL PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
FAY AVENUE PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
FELKER PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1
FERRIS PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
FLAMBOROUGH CENTRE PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1
FONTHILL PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
FREELTON COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1
GAGE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
GATESBURY PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1
GEORGE ALLAN SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	WHD	School Board	1
GEORGE L. ARMSTRONG PLAYGROUND	HM	School Board	1
GILKSON PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
GLANBROOK SPORTS COMPLEX	GLA	City of Hamilton	1
GLEN CASTLE PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
GLENDALE HIGH SCHOOL	LSC	School Board	1
Glenwood School	WHD	School Board	1
GLOW PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
Golf Links Rd. Open Space 1	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
GORD OAKES PARK	GLA	City of Hamilton	1
GOURLY PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
GREEN ACRES PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
Greenhill Open Space	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
HAMILTON AMATEUR ATHLETIC ASSOC.	LH	City of Hamilton	1
HAMPTON PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
HARMONY PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
HAYWOOD PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
HEBREW ACADEMY SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	WHD	School Board	1
HENRY & BEATRICE WARDEN PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
Heritage Green Sports Park	USC	Other	1
HIGHVIEW PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
Hill Street Park/Lots	LH	City of Hamilton	1
HILLSIDE PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1
HI XON ROAD PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
HOLBROOK PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
HOMEBROOK PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
HUNTER ESTATES PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
Huntington Park/Recreation Centre	HM	City of Hamilton	1
INCH PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
J.C. BEEMER PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
Jackson Playground	LH	City of Hamilton	1
JAMES MACDONALD SCHOOL-GOURLY PARK	HM	School Board	1
JAMES SMITH PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
JERSEYVILLE PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1
John Willson Park	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
KEITH PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
KENNEDY EAST PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
Kernighan Neighbourhood Park	HM	City of Hamilton	1
KING GEORGE SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	LH	School Board	1
KINSMAN PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
KITTY MURRAY PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
KOPPERFIELD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
Lake Avenue Park/Bow Valley Open Space	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
LAKE AVENUE SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	LSC	School Board	1
LAKEPOINT PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
LAURIER RECREATION CENTRE	LSC	School Board	1
LAWFIELD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1

Name	Plan Area	Owner	Playground or Play Equipment Locations
NEWLANDS PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
Noble Kirk Park	BEV	City of Hamilton	1
NORTH CENTRAL COMMUNITY PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
NORWOOD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
OPTIMIST PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
PALOMINO RANCH	FLA	City of Hamilton	1
PARAMOUNT PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1
PARKDALE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
PARKDALE SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	LH	School Board	1
PEACE MEMORIAL	HM	City of Hamilton	1
PIER 4 PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
PINECREST PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
PLATEAU PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
POSTLAWN PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
POWELL PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
R.T. STEELE PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
RADIAL PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
RANDALL PARK SCHOOL LANDS	HM	School Board	1
RICHWILL PLAYGROUND	HM	City of Hamilton	1
RIDGEMOUNT SCHOOL	HM	School Board	1
RIVERDALE EAST PARK (OAKLANDS)	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
RIVERWALK PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1
ROCKCLIFFE GARDENS	FLA	City of Hamilton	1
ROCKVIEW SUMMIT	FLA	City of Hamilton	1
ROSEBOUGH PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1
ROSEDALE SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	LH	School Board	1
ROXBOROUGH PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
ROXBOROUGH SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	LH	School Board	1
Rushdale Park	HM	City of Hamilton	1
RYCKMANS NEIGHBOURHOOD PARK	HM	School Board	1
SACKVILLE HILL MEMORIAL PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
SAM MANSON PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
SANCTUARY PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1
SCENIC PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
SCENIC WOODS	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
SEALY PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1
SHAMROCK PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
SHAWINIGAN PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
SHEFFIELD BALL PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1
SHELDON MANOR	WHD	City of Hamilton	1
SHERWOOD HEIGHTS PLAYGROUND	HM	School Board	1
SHERWOOD MEADOWS PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
SHERWOOD PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
SIR ALLEN MACNAB REC CENTER	HM	School Board	1
SIR ISAAC BROCK SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	LSC	School Board	1
SISTERS OF ST. JOSEPH'S PARK	LSC	Other	1
SOMERSET PARK	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
SOUTHBROOK PARK	GLA	City of Hamilton	1
St. Brigid's Playground	LH	School Board	1
ST. CHRISTOPHER'S PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
St. Helen's School Walkway	LH	City of Hamilton	1
ST. JOSEPH'S PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
St. Luke's School Playground	LSC	School Board	1
St. Mary's Playground	LH	School Board	1
ST. JOSEPH'S PLAYGROUND	LH	School Board	1
ST. LAWRENCE SCHOOL PLAYGROUND	LH	School Board	1
STONEWOOD PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1
STRABANE COMMUNITY PARK	BEV	City of Hamilton	1
T.B. McQUESTEN PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
TAPLEYTOWN MEN'S CLUB PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1
TEMPLEMEAD PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
THORNER PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
Todd Ofield Memorial Park	BEV	City of Hamilton	1
Tom Street Park	LH	City of Hamilton	1
TOWER PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1
TRENHOLME PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
Troy Tot Lot	BEV	City of Hamilton	1
Valens Park	BEV	City of Hamilton	1
VALLEY COMMUNITY CENTRE PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1
VALLEY PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1
VEEVERS PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
VETERANS PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1
VICTORIA PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
Village Green Park	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
WATERDOWN MEMORIAL PARK	FLA	City of Hamilton	1
Waterford Park	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
WESTOVER PARK	BEV	Other	1
WHITE DEER PARK	USC	City of Hamilton	1
WILDAN TOT LOT	FLA	City of Hamilton	1
Wildwood Park	ANC	City of Hamilton	1
WILLIAM McCULLOCH PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
WILLIAM SCHWENGER PARK	HM	City of Hamilton	1
WINONA PARK	LSC	City of Hamilton	1
WITHERSPOON PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1
WOODBURN BALL PARK	GLA	City of Hamilton	1
WOODLANDS PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
WOODWARD PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
WOOLVERTON PARK	LH	City of Hamilton	1
YORKSHIRE HEIGHTS PARK	WHD	City of Hamilton	1

AREA	SCHOOL FACILITIES NOT BOOKED BY CITY	FIELDS - APPROXIMATE	PERMIT ISSUED BY
ANC	Ancaster Sr.	1 DIAMOND	HWDSB
ANC	Fessenden	1 DIAMOND	HWDSB
ANC	Rousseau	2 DIAMONDS	HWDSB
BEV	Greenville	1 SOCCER	HWDSB
FLA	Flamborough Centre	1 SOCCER	HWDSB
HM	C.B. Stirling	2 DIAMONDS	unknown
HM	Ridgemount	2 DIAMONDS	unknown
LH	Bennetto	1 DIAMOND	unknown
LH	Central Park	1 DIAMOND	HWDSB
LH	Hillcrest Elementary School	1 SOCCER	HWDSB (NEW ARRANGEMENT IN 2009)
LSC	Collegiate	2 DIAMONDS, 1 SOCCER	HWDSB books 1 diamond
LSC	Eastdale	2 DIAMONDS	HWDSB
LSC	Memorial (SC)	4 DIAMONDS	HWDSB
LSC	Mountain View	2 DIAMONDS	HWDSB
LSC	Orchard Park	2 SOCCER	HWDSB
USC	Mount Albion	2 DIAMONDS	HWDSB
USC	Saltfleet	1 SOCCER C UNLIT AND 1 SOCCER LIT	HWDSB BOOKS UNLIT FIELD, CITY BOOKS LIT FIELD
USC	Tapleystown	1 SOCCER	HWDSB
WHD	Dundana	1 SOCCER	unknown
WHD	Highland	1 SOCCER	HWDSB
WHD	Yorkview	1 DIAMOND, 1 SOCCER	HWDSB

HWDCSB Facilities are not listed / not known.

AREA	PRIVATE FACILITIES	FACILITIES	COMMENTS
ANC	Redeemer College	1 soccer field, 2 tennis courts	
GLA	Shady Acres	1 soccer field	
HM	Centre for Mountain Health Services	1 soccer field, 1 ball diamond, 1 Lawn bowling green, 2 tennis courts	Lawn bowling and tennis will be removed at end of 2009
HM	Mohawk College	1 ball diamond	
HM	Hillfield Strathallan College	7 soccer fields, 1 ball diamond, 4 tennis courts	
LSC	Glover Road Park	1 soccer field	
USC	Dofasco Sports Park	4 adult ball diamonds, 2 tball diamonds, 1 soccer field, 1 running track, 4 tennis courts	
WHD	McMaster University	1 artificial turf field, 2 soccer fields, 1 rugby field, 1 running track, 3 ball diamonds, 6 tennis courts	

CITY OF HAMILTON

**Outdoor Recreation Facilities
& Sports Field Provision Plan**

ATTACHMENT VII: FACILITY PROVISION LEVELS BY COMMUNITY

Facility Provision Levels by Community

The following series of tables, charts, and dialogue describes current outdoor recreation facility provision levels for major facilities within the City and its nine communities. Using 2009 population data, facility inventories have been illustrated using per capita ratios.


In this section, judgements are not made as to the adequacy of the current provision levels. This information was used to further assess needs in Phase II of the Study, including the following items:

- identification of appropriate provision targets (some of which may target specific age groups; e.g., skate parks could be linked to the number of 10 to 19 year olds living within a community);
- comparison of inventory to population changes over time;
- analysis of spatial distribution (which is particularly important for neighbourhood-serving facilities such as playgrounds, spray pads, hard surface courts, etc.);
- assessment of community-specific demand factors, linked to current and future facility needs; and
- recommendations for addressing current and future facility needs.

Active Parkland (ha/1000) (City & Properties under Municipal Influence)

Community & Ownership		Hectares of Active Parkland	Current Provision Level (ha/1000)
ANC	- City only	90.3	2.9
	- City & Properties under City Influence	90.3	2.9
BEV	- City only	215.3	11.8
	- City & Properties under City Influence	215.3	11.8
FLA	- City only	130.8	5.6
	- City & Properties under City Influence	130.8	5.6
GLA	- City only	81.8	5.5
	- City & Properties under City Influence	81.8	5.5
HM	- City only	325.0	2.1
	- City & Properties under City Influence	341.1	2.3
LH	- City only	454.5	3.3
	- City & Properties under City Influence	455.8	3.3
LSC	- City only	205.7	2.6
	- City & Properties under City Influence	210.7	2.7
USC	- City only	103.1	4.7
	- City & Properties under City Influence	103.9	4.7
WHD	- City only	79.8	1.9
	- City & Properties under City Influence	79.9	1.9
Total	- City only	1,686.2	3.2
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1,709.7	3.3

There is a total of 1,709.7 hectares of active parkland within the City of Hamilton and the average provision level is 3.3 hectares per 1,000 population. Some communities like Beverly, (11.8 ha/1000), Flamborough, (5.6 ha/1000), Glanbrook (5.5 ha/1000), and Upper Stoney Creek (4.7 ha/1000) have provision levels that are significantly higher than the Hamilton average. The areas where provision levels are lower than the Hamilton average are Ancaster, Hamilton Mountain, Lower Stoney Creek, and West Hamilton/Dundas. The graph below visually represents the provision levels for the various communities within Hamilton (as stated, the provision levels are given as hectares per 1000 population).




Soccer & Multi-Sport Fields (City & Properties under Municipal Influence) – Unlit Equivalents

	Community & Ownership	# of Soccer Fields (ULE)*	Current Provision Level	Comments
ANC	- City only	13.0	1:2,434	1 additional field is available at Redeemer College
	- City & Properties under City Influence	21.0	1:1,507	
BEV	- City only	6.0	1:3,050	1 additional field is booked by the HWDSB
	- City & Properties under City Influence	6.0	1:3,050	
FLA	- City only	21.0	1:1,119	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	21.0	1:1,119	
GLA	- City only	11.5	1:1,301	1 additional field is rented by the private sector
	- City & Properties under City Influence	11.5	1:1,301	
HM	- City only	48.5	1:3,125	1 additional field is at the hospital and 7 additional fields are at Hillfield Strathallan College
	- City & Properties under City Influence	60.5	1:2,505	
LH	- City only	13.0	1:10,579	1 additional field is booked by the HWDSB
	- City & Properties under City Influence	13.0	1:10,579	
LSC	- City only	31.0	1:2,544	3 additional fields are booked by the HWDSB and 1 additional field is rented by the private sector
	- City & Properties under City Influence	36.0	1:2,190	
USC	- City only	13.5	1:1,642	3 additional fields are booked by the HWDSB and 1 additional field is provided at Dofasco Sports Park
	- City & Properties under City Influence	19.0	1:1,167	
WHD	- City only	14.5	1:2,905	3 additional fields are booked by the HWDSB and three additional fields are available at McMaster University (one of which is artificial)
	- City & Properties under City Influence	16.5	1:2,553	
Total	- City only	172.0	1:3,027	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	204.5	1:2,546	

* ULE = Unlit Equivalents (where one lit field equals 1.5 unlit fields).

The largest variation in the provision of soccer and multi-field sports fields is the much lower provision rate for Lower Hamilton of one field for every 13,753 people. All other provision levels are below one field for every 3,100 people. Communities with the highest and best provision rates are Flamborough, Upper Stoney Creek, Glanbrook and Ancaster.



* The numbers above are indicative of a per capita ratio. Smaller ratios equate to better field provision.

Soccer & Multi-Sport Fields (City & Properties under Municipal Influence) – Totals (by Class)


Community & Ownership		# of Lit Fields (Class A & B)	Current Provision Level	# of Unlit Fields (Class B & C)	Current Provision Level
ANC	- City only	2	1:15,822	10	1:3,164
	- City & Properties under City Influence	2	1:15,822	18	1:1,758
BEV	- City only	0	0:18,300	6	1:3,050
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:18,300	6	1:3,050
FLA	- City only	4	1:5,873	15	1:1,566
	- City & Properties under City Influence	4	1:5,873	15	1:1,566
GLA	- City only	1	1:14,961	10	1:1,496
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1	1:14,961	10	1:1,496
HM	- City only	7	1:21,651	38	1:3,988
	- City & Properties under City Influence	7	1:21,651	50	1:3,031
LH	- City only	2	1:68,763	10	1:13,725
	- City & Properties under City Influence	2	1:68,763	10	1:13,725
LSC	- City only	2	1:39,425	28	1:2,816
	- City & Properties under City Influence	2	1:39,425	33	1:2,389
USC	- City only	3	1:7,388	9	1:2,463
	- City & Properties under City Influence	6	1:3,694	10	1:2,217
WHD	- City only	1	1:42,122	13	1:3,240
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1	1:42,122	15	1:2,808
Total	- City only	23	1:22,636	139	1:3,745
	- City & Properties under City Influence	25	1:20,825	167	1:3,117

Ball Diamonds (City & Properties under Municipal Influence) – Unlit Equivalents

Community & Ownership		# of Ball Diamonds (ULE)*	Current Provision Level	Comments
ANC	- City only	13.5	1:2,344	3 additional fields are booked by the HWDSB
	- City & Properties under City Influence	13.5	1:2,344	
BEV	- City only	30.0	1:610	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	30.0	1:610	
FLA	- City only	18.0	1:1,305	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	18.0	1:1,305	
GLA	- City only	10.0	1:1,496	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	10.0	1:1,496	
HM	- City only	59.5	1:2,547	4 additional fields are booked by the HWDSB; 1 additional field is at the hospital; 2 additional fields are at Mohawk College / Hillfield Strathallan College
	- City & Properties under City Influence	73.5	1:2,062	
LH	- City only	47.5	1:2,895	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	47.5	1:2,895	
LSC	- City only	26.0	1:3,033	10 additional fields are booked by the HWDSB
	- City & Properties under City Influence	31.0	1:2,544	
USC	- City only	16.0	1:1,385	2 additional fields are booked by the HWDSB; 4 additional diamonds are provided at Dofasco Sports Park
	- City & Properties under City Influence	16.0	1:1,385	
WHD	- City only	22.0	1:1,915	2 additional fields are booked by the HWDSB; 3 additional diamonds are provided at McMaster University
	- City & Properties under City Influence	22.0	1:1,915	
Total	- City only	242.5	1:2,147	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	261.5	1:1,991	

* ULE = Unlit Equivalents (where one lit field equals 1.5 unlit fields).

The following graph is representative of ball diamond provision rates by population by community. The best ball diamond provision rate is in Beverly, where there is one baseball diamond for every 610 residents. The next best provision rates are in Flamborough (1:1,305) and Upper Stoney Creek (1:1,385). The lowest provision rates are in Lower Hamilton (1:2,896), Lower Stoney Creek (1:2,544), and Ancaster (1:2,344).



* The numbers above are indicative of a per capita ratio. Smaller ratios equate to better ball diamond provision.

Ball Diamonds (City & Properties under Municipal Influence) – Totals (Lit and Unlit)

Community & Ownership		# of Lit Ball Diamonds	Current Provision Level	# of Unlit Ball Diamonds	Current Provision Level
ANC	- City only	3	1:10,548	9	1:3,516
	- City & Properties under City Influence	3	1:10,548	9	1:3,516
BEV	- City only	12	1:1,525	12	1:1,525
	- City & Properties under City Influence	12	1:1,525	12	1:1,525
FLA	- City only	6	1:3,915	9	1:2,610
	- City & Properties under City Influence	6	1:3,915	9	1:2,610
GLA	- City only	4	1:3,740	4	1:3,740
	- City & Properties under City Influence	4	1:3,740	4	1:3,740
HM	- City only	3	1:50,520	55	1:2,756
	- City & Properties under City Influence	3	1:50,520	69	1:2,197
LH	- City only	5	1:27,505	40	1:3,438
	- City & Properties under City Influence	5	1:27,505	40	1:3,438
LSC	- City only	4	1:19,712	20	1:3,942
	- City & Properties under City Influence	4	1:19,712	25	1:3,154
USC	- City only	4	1:5,541	10	1:2,217
	- City & Properties under City Influence	4	1:5,541	10	1:2,217
WHD	- City only	4	1:10,531	16	1:2,633
	- City & Properties under City Influence	4	1:10,531	16	1:2,633
Total	- City only	45	1:11,569	175	1:2,975
	- City & Properties under City Influence	45	1:11,569	194	1:2,684


Football Fields – Dedicated (City & Properties under Municipal Influence)

Community & Ownership		# of Football Fields (ULE)*	Current Provision Level
ANC	- City only	0	0:31,643
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:31,643
BEV	- City only	3.0	1:6,100
	- City & Properties under City Influence	3.0	1:6,100
FLA	- City only	0	0:23,492
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:23,492
GLA	- City only	0	0:14,961
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:14,961
HM	- City only	1.0	1:151,559
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1.0	1:151,559
LH	- City only	1.5	1:91,683
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1.5	1:91,683
LSC	- City only	0	0:78,849
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:78,849
USC	- City only	1.0	1:22,165
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1.0	1:22,165
WHD	- City only	0	0:42,122
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:42,122
Total	- City only	6.5	1:80,095
	- City & Properties under City Influence	6.5	1:80,095

* ULE = Unlit Equivalents (where one lit field equals 1.5 unlit fields).

Includes Dedicated Football Fields only. Fields that are shared with other sports are listed under “Soccer & Multi-sport Fields”.

With only four of nine communities having dedicated football fields, there is great variation across the City. For example, the provision level in Beverly is much higher than anywhere else; they are currently providing one field per 6,100 residents (a total of 3 fields).




* The numbers above are indicative of a per capita ratio. Smaller ratios equate to better field provision. An ‘x’ indicates that there is no field provision in that community.

Cricket Pitches – Dedicated (City & Properties under Municipal Influence)

Community & Ownership		# of Cricket Pitches	Current Provision Level	Comments
ANC	- City only	0	0:31,643	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:31,643	
BEV	- City only	0	0:18,300	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:18,300	
FLA	- City only	0	0:23,492	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:23,492	
GLA	- City only	0	0:14,961	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:14,961	
HM	- City only	1.0	1:151,559	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1.0	1:151,559	
LH	- City only	1.0	1:137,525	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1.0	1:137,525	
LSC	- City only	0	0:78,849	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:78,849	
USC	- City only	0	0:22,165	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:22,165	
WHD	- City only	1.0	1:42,122	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1.0	1:42,122	
Total	- City only	3.0	1:173,539	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	3.0	1:173,539	

Within the City of Hamilton, there are 3 City-maintained Cricket Pitches. These pitches exist within the communities of Hamilton Mountain, Lower Hamilton, and West Hamilton/Dundas. The best provision level is in West Hamilton/Dundas because it has the smallest population of the three.




* The numbers above are indicative of a per capita ratio. Smaller ratios equate to better field provision. An 'x' indicates that there is no field provision in that community.

Basketball Courts (City & Properties under Municipal Influence)

Community & Ownership		# of Basketball Courts (FCE)*	Current Provision Level
ANC	- City only	4.5	1:7,032
	- City & Properties under City Influence	4.5	1:7,032
BEV	- City only	6.5	1:2,815
	- City & Properties under City Influence	6.5	1:2,815
FLA	- City only	4.5	1:5,221
	- City & Properties under City Influence	4.5	1:5,221
GLA	- City only	0	0:14,961
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:14,961
HM	- City only	21	1:7,217
	- City & Properties under City Influence	24	1:6,315
LH	- City only	24	1:5,730
	- City & Properties under City Influence	25	1:5,501
LSC	- City only	13.5	1:5,841
	- City & Properties under City Influence	13.5	1:5,841
USC	- City only	3	1:7,388
	- City & Properties under City Influence	3	1:7,388
WHD	- City only	3	1:14,041
	- City & Properties under City Influence	3	1:14,041
Total	- City only	80	1:6,508
	- City & Properties under City Influence	84	1:6,198

* FCE = Full Court Equivalents (where one half court/single hoop equals 0,5 full courts). Includes Multi-purpose courts and courts with hockey nets.

The basketball court provision rates in Hamilton are relatively more consistent than for other facilities, with the exception of three outliers: Beverly, which has a much higher provision (1:2,815); West Hamilton/Dundas, which has a much lower provision (1:14,041); Glanbrook where there are no basketball hoops. All other provision rates are between 1:5,500 and 1:7,500; even in Hamilton Mountain and Lower Hamilton where populations are significantly higher, rates are still comparable to the rest of the City.




* Basketball hoops are counted in Full Court Equivalents (FCE). The numbers above are indicative of a per capita ratio. Smaller ratios equate to better field provision. An 'X' indicates that there is no field provision in that community.

Tennis Courts (City & Properties under Municipal Influence) – Total (Public & Club)

Community & Ownership		# of Tennis Courts - Total	Current Provision Level	Comments
ANC	- City only	6	1:5,274	2 additional courts are available at Redeemer College
	- City & Properties under City Influence	6	1:5,274	
BEV	- City only	8	1:2,288	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	8	1:2,288	
FLA	- City only	5	1:4,698	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	5	1:4,698	
GLA	- City only	1	1:14,961	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1	1:14,961	
HM	- City only	10	1:15,156	4 additional courts are available at Hillfield Strathallan College
	- City & Properties under City Influence	16	1:9,472	
LH	- City only	32	1:4,298	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	32	1:4,298	
LSC	- City only	9	1:8,761	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	9	1:8,761	
USC	- City only	4	1:5,541	4 additional courts are available at Dofasco Sports Park
	- City & Properties under City Influence	4	1:5,541	
WHD	- City only	10	1:4,212	6 additional courts are available at McMaster University
	- City & Properties under City Influence	10	1:4,212	
Total	- City only	81	1:6,427	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	91	1:5,721	

Public tennis courts are open to public play. Club tennis courts require memberships.

As seen in the previous graph displaying the provision of basketball hoops, Beverly again has the highest provision rate by a large margin. Other strong provision levels are found in Lower Hamilton and Flamborough. Glanbrook has the lowest provision rate (one tennis court for the entire population of 14,961 residents). Low provision levels are also found in Hamilton Mountain and Lower Stoney Creek.



* The numbers above are indicative of a per capita ratio. Smaller ratios equate to better tennis court provision.

Tennis Courts (City & Properties under Municipal Influence) – Public & Club


Community & Ownership		# of Public Tennis Courts	Current Provision Level	# of Club Tennis Courts	Current Provision Level
ANC	- City only	3	1:10,548	3	1:10,548
	- City & Properties under City Influence	3	1:10,548	3	1:10,548
BEV	- City only	3	1:6,100	5	1:3,660
	- City & Properties under City Influence	3	1:6,100	5	1:3,660
FLA	- City only	3	1:7,831	2	1:11,746
	- City & Properties under City Influence	3	1:7,831	2	1:11,746
GLA	- City only	1	1:14,961	0	0:14,961
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1	1:14,961	0	0:14,961
HM	- City only	6	1:25,260	4	1:37,890
	- City & Properties under City Influence	12	1:12,630	4	1:37,890
LH	- City only	12	1:11,460	20	1:6,876
	- City & Properties under City Influence	12	1:11,460	20	1:6,876
LSC	- City only	2	1:39,425	7	1:11,264
	- City & Properties under City Influence	2	1:39,425	7	1:11,264
USC	- City only	4	1:5,541	0	0:22,165
	- City & Properties under City Influence	4	1:5,541	0	0:22,165
WHD	- City only	1	1:42,122	5	1:8,424
	- City & Properties under City Influence	5	1:8,424	5	1:8,424
Total	- City only	35	1:14,875	46	1:11,318
	- City & Properties under City Influence	45	1:11,569	46	1:11,318

Public tennis courts are open to public play. Club tennis courts require memberships.

Playground Locations (City & Properties under Municipal Influence)

Community & Ownership		# of Playground Locations	Current Provision Level
ANC	- City only	18	1:1,758
	- City & Properties under City Influence	18	1:1,758
BEV	- City only	17	1:1,076
	- City & Properties under City Influence	17	1:1,076
FLA	- City only	16	1:1,468
	- City & Properties under City Influence	16	1:1,468
GLA	- City only	6	1:2,493
	- City & Properties under City Influence	6	1:2,493
HM	- City only	55	1:2,756
	- City & Properties under City Influence	65	1:2,332
LH	- City only	47	1:2,926
	- City & Properties under City Influence	60	1:2,292
LSC	- City only	31	1:2,544
	- City & Properties under City Influence	37	1:2,131
USC	- City only	11	1:2,015
	- City & Properties under City Influence	11	1:2,015
WHD	- City only	16	1:2,633
	- City & Properties under City Influence	19	1:2,217
Total	- City only	217	1:2,399
	- City & Properties under City Influence	249	1:2,091

There was less variation in provision levels for playgrounds than other City facilities. The best provision rates are found in Beverly, Ancaster, Flamborough, and Upper Stoney Creek. All other provision levels are below the City average of 1:2,091 – which includes Glanbrook, Hamilton Mountain, Lower Hamilton, Lower Stoney Creek and West Hamilton/Dundas.




* The numbers above are indicative of a per capita ratio. Smaller ratios equate to playground provision.

Spray Pads (City & Properties under Municipal Influence)

Community & Ownership		# of Spray pads	Current Provision Level
ANC	- City only	0	0:31,643
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:31,643
BEV	- City only	0	0:18,300
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:18,300
FLA	- City only	1	1:23,492
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1	1:23,492
GLA	- City only	0	0:14,961
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:14,961
HM	- City only	21	1:7,217
	- City & Properties under City Influence	22	1:6,889
LH	- City only	21	1:6,549
	- City & Properties under City Influence	21	1:6,549
LSC	- City only	5	1:15,770
	- City & Properties under City Influence	5	1:15,770
USC	- City only	0	0:22,165
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:22,165
WHD	- City only	2	1:21,061
	- City & Properties under City Influence	2	1:21,061
Total	- City only	50	1:10,412
	- City & Properties under City Influence	51	1:10,208

There are four communities within Hamilton that do not currently have spray pads – Ancaster, Beverly, Glanbrook, and Upper Stoney Creek. Communities with spray pads have widely different rates; Flamborough has 1 spray pad, West Hamilton/Dundas has 2, Lower Stoney Creek has 5, while Hamilton Mountain has 22, and Lower Hamilton has 21 (noting that Hamilton Mountain and Lower Hamilton have the largest populations, but still have the best spray pad per population ratio).




* The numbers above are indicative of a per capita ratio. Smaller ratios equate to better spray pad provision. An 'x' indicates that there is no spray pad provision in that community.

Wading Pools (City & Properties under Municipal Influence)

Community & Ownership		# of Wading Pools	Current Provision Level
ANC	- City only	1	1:31,643
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1	1:31,643
BEV	- City only	0	0:18,300
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:18,300
FLA	- City only	0	0:23,492
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:23,492
GLA	- City only	0	0:14,961
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:14,961
HM	- City only	2	1:75,779
	- City & Properties under City Influence	3	1:50,520
LH	- City only	10	1:13,753
	- City & Properties under City Influence	10	1:13,753
LSC	- City only	1	1:78,849
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1	1:78,849
USC	- City only	0	0:22,165
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:22,165
WHD	- City only	3	1:14,041
	- City & Properties under City Influence	3	1:14,041
Total	- City only	17	1: 30,625
	- City & Properties under City Influence	18	1:28,923

There are four Hamilton communities that do not have wading pools: Beverly, Flamborough, Glanbrook, and Upper Stoney Creek. The best wading pool provision rates are in West Hamilton/Dundas and Lower Hamilton (which has the largest number of wading pools – 10). It is likely that wading pool provision will decline in the future as wading pools are converted into spray pads or are decommissioned.




* The numbers above are indicative of a per capita ratio. Smaller ratios equate to better wading pool provision. An 'x' indicates that there is no wading pool provision in that community.

Skateboard Parks (City & Properties under Municipal Influence)

Community & Ownership		# of Skate Parks	Current Provision Level
ANC	- City only	0	0:31,643
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:31,643
BEV	- City only	0	0:18,300
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:18,300
FLA	- City only	1	1:23,492
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1	1:23,492
GLA	- City only	0	0:14,961
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:14,961
HM	- City only	2	1:75,780
	- City & Properties under City Influence	2	1:75,780
LH	- City only	2	1:68,763
	- City & Properties under City Influence	2	1:68,763
LSC	- City only	0	0:78,849
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:78,849
USC	- City only	0	0:22,165
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:22,165
WHD	- City only	0	0:42,122
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:42,122
Total	- City only	5	1:104,123
	- City & Properties under City Influence	5	1:104,123

Flamborough, Hamilton Mountain, and Lower Hamilton are the only communities within Hamilton that have skate parks; the latter two communities each have two facilities.




* The numbers above are indicative of a per capita ratio. Smaller ratios equate to better skateboard park provision. An 'x' indicates that there is no skateboard park provision in that community.

Bocce Courts (City & Properties under Municipal Influence)

Community & Ownership		# of Bocce Courts	Current Provision Level
ANC	- City only	0	0:31,643
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:31,643
BEV	- City only	0	0:18,300
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:18,300
FLA	- City only	0	0:23,492
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:23,492
GLA	- City only	0	0:14,961
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:14,961
HM	- City only	20	1:7,578
	- City & Properties under City Influence	24	1:6,315
LH	- City only	4	1:34,381
	- City & Properties under City Influence	4	1:34,381
LSC	- City only	21	1:3,755
	- City & Properties under City Influence	21	1:3,755
USC	- City only	0	0:22,165
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:22,165
WHD	- City only	0	0:42,122
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:42,122
Total	- City only	45	1:11,569
	- City & Properties under City Influence	49	1:10,625

Hamilton Mountain and Lower Stoney Creek have by far the best bocce court provision levels in the City; there are 24 bocce courts in Hamilton Mountain and 21 in Lower Stoney Creek. Not surprisingly, these two communities also have large Italian populations and it is likely that demand for the sport is highest in these areas. Lower Hamilton also has 4 bocce courts and the remaining six communities do not have any bocce courts.




* The numbers above are indicative of a per capita ratio. Smaller ratios equate to better bocce court provision. An 'x' indicates that there is no bocce court provision in that community.

Lawn Bowling Greens (City & Properties under Municipal Influence)

Community & Ownership		# of Lawn Bowling Greens	Current Provision Level	Comments
ANC	- City only	1	1:31,643	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1	1:31,643	
BEV	- City only	0	0:18,300	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:18,300	
FLA	- City only	0	0:23,492	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:23,492	
GLA	- City only	0	0:14,961	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:14,961	
HM	- City only	0	0:151,559	1 additional green is available at the hospital (for 2009 only)
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:151,559	
LH	- City only	2	1:68,763	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	2	1:68,763	
LSC	- City only	0	0:78,849	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:78,849	
USC	- City only	0	0:22,165	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:22,165	
WHD	- City only	1	1:42,122	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1	1:42,122	
Total	- City only	4	1:130,154	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	4	1:130,154	

There are a total of 4 lawn bowling greens in Hamilton – 1 in Ancaster, 2 in Lower Hamilton, and 1 in West Hamilton/Dundas (excluding the greens that were recently removed at Churchill Park). The remaining six Hamilton communities do not have any lawn bowling greens. It possible that demand for these facilities will increase in areas where there is an aging population. The following graph displays the provision levels that currently exist within the City.




* The numbers above are indicative of a per capita ratio. Smaller ratios equate to better lawn bowling green provision. An 'x' indicates that there is no lawn bowling green provision in that community.

Running Tracks (City & Properties under Municipal Influence)

Community & Ownership		# of Running Tracks	Current Provision Level	Comments
ANC	- City only	0	0:31,643	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:31,643	
BEV	- City only	0	0:18,300	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:18,300	
FLA	- City only	0	0:23,492	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:23,492	
GLA	- City only	0	0:14,961	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:14,961	
HM	- City only	3	1:50,520	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	3	1:50,520	
LH	- City only	2	1:68,763	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	2	1:68,763	
LSC	- City only	0	0:78,849	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:78,849	
USC	- City only	0	0:22,165	1 additional running track is provided at Dofasco Sports Park
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:22,165	
WHD	- City only	0	0:42,122	1 additional running track is provided at McMaster University
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:42,122	
Total	- City only	5	1:104,123	
	- City & Properties under City Influence	5	1:104,123	

There are few municipal running tracks within the City, with locations limited to Hamilton Mountain and Lower Hamilton. Additional running tracks are likely provided at many high schools, however, an inventory of these facilities has not been compiled.




* The numbers above are indicative of a per capita ratio. Smaller ratios equate to better running track provision. An 'x' indicates that there is no running track provision in that community.

Natural and Artificial Outdoor Rinks* (City & Properties under Municipal Influence)

Community & Ownership		# of Outdoor Rinks*	Current Provision Level
ANC	- City only	6	1:5,274
	- City & Properties under City Influence	6	1:5,274
BEV	- City only	4	1:4,575
	- City & Properties under City Influence	4	1:4,575
FLA	- City only	1	1:23,492
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1	1:23,492
GLA	- City only	0	0:14,961
	- City & Properties under City Influence	0	0:14,961
HM	- City only	24	1:6,315
	- City & Properties under City Influence	25	1:6,062
LH	- City only	16	1:8,595
	- City & Properties under City Influence	16	1:8,595
LSC	- City only	4	1:19,712
	- City & Properties under City Influence	4	1:19,712
USC	- City only	1	1:22,165
	- City & Properties under City Influence	1	1:22,165
WHD	- City only	3	1:14,041
	- City & Properties under City Influence	3	1:14,041
Total	- City only	59	1:8,824
	- City & Properties under City Influence	60	1:8,677

* All outdoor rinks are natural/variable and operated by volunteers, with the exception of the artificial outdoor rink in Dundas Driving Park (WHD).

Outdoor skating rinks are provided in all Hamilton Communities with the exception of Glanbrook. Hamilton Mountain has the largest number of outdoor rinks (25), followed by Lower Hamilton (16). The best provision levels relative to population can be found in Ancaster and Beverly. Areas with provision levels lower than the City average include Flamborough, Lower Stoney Creek, Upper Stoney Creek, and West Hamilton/Dundas. There is one artificial outdoor rink within the City (West Hamilton/Dundas).



* The numbers above are indicative of a per capita ratio. Smaller ratios equate to better outdoor skating rink provision. An 'x' indicates that there is no outdoor skating rink provision in that community.

Summary – Based on Current City-wide Provision Levels

Community	<u>Greater</u> (i.e., better) than Average Per Capita Provision	<u>Lower</u> (i.e., poorer) than Average Per Capita Provision
Ancaster (ANC)	Soccer and Multi-Sport Fields Tennis Courts Playgrounds Lawn Bowling Greens Outdoor Ice Skating Rinks	Active Parkland Ball Diamonds Cricket Pitches Basketball Hoops Spray Pads Skateboard Parks Bocce Courts Running Tracks
Beverly (BEV)	Active Parkland Ball Diamonds Football Fields (dedicated) Basketball Hoops Tennis Courts Playgrounds Outdoor Rinks	Soccer and Multi-Sport Fields Cricket Pitches Spray Pads Wading Pools Skateboard Parks Bocce Courts Lawn Bowling Greens Running Tracks
Flamborough (FLA)	Active Parkland Soccer and Multi-Sport Fields Ball Diamonds Basketball Courts Tennis Courts Playgrounds Skateboard Parks	Football Fields (dedicated) Cricket Pitches Spray Pads Wading Pools Bocce Courts Lawn Bowling Greens Running Tracks Outdoor Rinks
Glanbrook (GLA)	Active Parkland Soccer and Multi-Sport Fields Ball Diamonds	Football Fields (dedicated) Cricket Pitches Basketball Hoops Tennis Courts Playgrounds Spray Pads Wading Pools Skateboard Parks Bocce Courts Lawn Bowling Greens Running Tracks Outdoor Rinks
Hamilton Mountain (HM)	Soccer and Multi-Sport Fields Spray Pads Skateboard Parks Bocce Courts Running Tracks Outdoor Rinks	Active Parkland Ball Diamonds Football Fields (dedicated) Cricket Pitches Basketball Hoops Tennis Courts Playgrounds Wading Pools Lawn Bowling Greens
Lower Hamilton (LH)	Active Parkland Cricket Pitches Basketball Hoops Tennis Courts Spray Pads Wading Pools Skateboard Parks Lawn Bowling Greens Running Tracks Outdoor Rinks	Soccer and Multi-Sport Fields Ball Diamonds Football Fields (dedicated) Playgrounds Bocce Courts

Community	Greater (i.e., better) than Average Per Capita Provision	Lower (i.e., poorer) than Average Per Capita Provision
Lower Stoney Creek (LSC)	Soccer and Multi-Sport Fields Ball Diamonds Football Fields (dedicated) Basketball Courts Bocce Courts	Active Parkland Cricket Pitches Tennis Courts Playgrounds Spray Pads Wading Pools Skateboard Parks Lawn Bowling Greens Running Tracks Outdoor Rinks
Upper Stoney Creek (USC)	Active Parkland Soccer and Multi-Sport Fields Football Fields (dedicated) Tennis Courts Playgrounds	Cricket Pitches Basketball Hoops Spray Pads Wading Pools Skateboard Parks Bocce Courts Lawn Bowling Greens Running Tracks Outdoor Rinks
West Hamilton / Dundas (WHD)	Soccer and Multi-Sport Fields Ball diamonds Football Fields (dedicated) Cricket Pitches Playgrounds Wading Pools Lawn Bowling Greens	Active Parkland Basketball Hoops Tennis Courts Spray Pads Skateboard Parks Bocce Courts Running Tracks Outdoor Rinks

Note: This information will be assessed further in Phase II to determine appropriate City-wide and community-specific provision targets and provision strategies.

CITY OF HAMILTON

**Outdoor Recreation Facilities
& Sports Field Provision Plan**

**ATTACHMENT VIII: PROPOSED SHORT-TERM FACILITY / PARK CHANGES
(subject to change)**

Proposed Short-term Facility/Park Changes (as per current plans)

The City's Public Works Department is currently pursuing a number of changes and expansions to parks. The following table summarizes major projects that are in design, tender or construction phases, with an emphasis on projects that may add or change outdoor recreational facilities or sports fields within the scope of this Study. These projects are not captured in the inventory. ***They are considered to be accurate as of May 2009 and are subject to change, based on available funding and community priorities.***

Park	Area	Proposed Changes to Recreation Facility Inventory (subject to change)	Proposed Timing (subject to change)
Ancaster Landfill	ANC	3 full size Class C soccer fields have been constructed (which will be used as 6 minis) – they are not yet operational. These fields will be maintained and used solely by Ancaster Minor Soccer.	2009/10
Ancaster Community Centre Park	ANC	Installation of ball diamond lighting proposed in long-term capital budget.	2011/12
Joe Sams Leisure Park	FLA	2 class B soccer fields are currently under construction; estimated operational timeframe may be 2010; 1 may be lit. In 2010 there are plans to install a parking lot to service the diamonds, and possibly 2011 (or later), the plan is to construct at least one more soccer field (lit and irrigated) and either 2 non-lit ball diamonds or 1 lit and irrigated soccer field.	2010 and beyond
Courtcliffe Park	FLA	The plan is to add new soccer fields and reconfigure the 5 intermediate fields to accommodate a total of 9 mini fields. The addition of a playground is also proposed. The new fields will likely not be available for 3 years.	2011 and beyond
Fairgrounds Community Park	GLA	1 new Class C soccer field	2010
Glanbrook Sports Park	GLA	1 new Class C soccer field in 2009/10 (site of former ball diamond); additional expansion potential exists to north of cemetery lands	2010 and beyond
William McCulloch Park	HM	Proposed replacement of 3 diamonds lost to the sale of the Seneca School lands through the conversion of 2 Class C soccer fields	2010

Park	Area	Proposed Changes to Recreation Facility Inventory (subject to change)	Proposed Timing (subject to change)
William Schwenger Park	HM	Addition of 2 class C soccer fields – could be operational in late 2009 or early 2010 (replacement for 2 soccer fields to be converted to ball diamonds at William McCulloch Park) New spray pad proposed in long-term capital budget (2011).	2009 - 2011
Hampton Park	HM	New spray pad proposed in long-term capital budget.	2009+
Buchanan Park	HM	New spray pad proposed in long-term capital budget.	2013
Rosedale Park	LH	2 diamonds will be removed in 2009 and replaced with 3 new ones; 2 will be lit, senior diamonds. In 2010, 1 diamond may be upgraded, contingent on a favourable assessment of the exiting CSO tank upon which it sits.	2009/10
Parkdale Park	LH	New spray pad proposed in long-term capital budget.	2010+
Winona Park	LSC	1 new Class C soccer field to be tendered fall 2009/spring 2010.	2009/10
Heritage Green Sports Park	USC	2 new Class A soccer fields are to be tendered in 2009. Additional land exists for future sports fields.	2009 and beyond
Maplewood Park	USC	This proposal will realign the existing lit softball diamond, add 1 mini soccer pitch, and remove the unlit softball diamond.	2010 and beyond
Summit Park	USC	1 new Class C soccer field	2009+
Churchill Park	WHD	1 new Class C soccer field (to replace diamond removed in 2009)	2010
Summerlea Park	GLA	1 new Class C soccer field (mini), multi-purpose court, and playground	2010

CITY OF HAMILTON

**Outdoor Recreation Facilities
& Sports Field Provision Plan**

**ATTACHMENT IX: SPORTS FIELD MANAGEMENT REVIEW &
RECOMMENDATIONS**



Consulting Report

City of Hamilton Outdoor Recreation Facility and Sport Field Provision Plan

Sports Field Management Review & Recommendations

September 11, 2009

1.0 Introduction

The Consulting Services Division of the Guelph Turfgrass Institute & Environmental Research Centre was contracted by Monteith Brown Planning Consultants to provide the following information as a component of a larger outdoor recreational facility and sport field review for the City of Hamilton:

- General condition of City sports fields as evaluated from the sample group of fields;
- Identification of potential limits to field use based on field conditions;
- Identification of problem fields and the conditions that create problem fields (maintenance, use patterns, etc.);
- Evaluation of existing soil conditions (physical and chemical analysis) and recommendations for soil improvement; and
- Evaluation of existing maintenance program and recommendations for improvement.

A total of 33 sports field sites were visited and one representative sports field was chosen at each site for evaluation and soil testing. On sites with multiple fields, most fields were visually inspected to look for any differences in use patterns or inconsistency from field to field on a given site.

This summary will include an overall impression of the fields focusing on construction, infrastructure (primarily irrigation systems or lack thereof), management practices and limitations. Specific comments and recommendations are provided.

2.0 General comments

Most of the selected fields were in good condition when the assessment took place, although wear patterns were beginning to occur due to heavy use the weekend prior to the field assessments. The assessments took place relatively early in the playing season (June 16th – June 20th, 2009). This time is generally the best time of the year for field quality as the grass is growing well and, in most situations, excessive wear has yet to take place.

The fields, as a group, had the fewest weeds and the most turf cover of any group of municipal fields we have observed in Ontario. In general, quality of construction of the fields was poor and many of the fields were most likely compacted from the time of construction. Despite this observation, the fields were in very good condition for mid-June and were, as a group, some of the best quality municipal fields we have seen in Ontario.

3.1 Use Patterns

It was obvious at the time of the assessment that the fields with lights were experiencing a much greater amount of wear. **It was also observed that as a general rule, the fields in the more rural areas appeared to have the least amount of wear, although fields with lights in rural areas had greater wear patterns than unlit fields in more urban areas.**

Despite the observed wear, the fields were still predominately composed of desirable turfgrass species, most likely due to an ability to make a fall herbicide application in previous years including 2008. **Even if wear patterns remain the same, it will become more difficult to re-establish turfgrass without the use of herbicides. Over time the excessive wear will become more of an issue for field managers.** One lit field (Figure 1) had been scheduled for four hours of use per night for two straight weeks and the center of the field had almost completely failed at the time of visitation (completely bare ground). With the new provincial ban on chemical pesticides, reestablishment of grass as has been done in the past through chemical eradication of undesirable weeds and overseeding with turfgrass seed will become much more difficult.



Figure 1. Wear pattern on lit field subjected to excessive early season use.

If fields are to be used as premier fields for weekend tournaments and special events, then the use of these fields during other times must be restricted. The stadium field at Mohawk sports complex (Figure 2) was severely worn and close to failure at the time of assessment. The surrounding fields were in much better condition and field conditions improved the further a field was from the central area of the complex. If the stadium field is to be a premier field it must be booked less often and if possible use should be directed to lower profile fields for weekday and regular league play.



Figure 2. Severely worn turf on main stadium field at Mohawk Sports Complex.

Field closure policies should be addressed. It was noted that the manager at Mohawk has until 10 a.m. to make a decision on the closure of fields. The closure policy after the manager makes their decision is unknown. A closure policy must be in place to close a field if an excessive rainfall event occurs in the afternoon. Use of fields after heavy afternoon thunderstorms can cause excessive wear which will be much more difficult to recover from particularly with the current legislation restricting the use of chemical herbicides in restoring turf cover to playing fields.

Poorly drained sports fields constructed on fine textured soils are subject to significant compaction if play is allowed during periods when the soil is completely saturated. Water in the soil acts as a lubricant allowing the fine soil particles to easily move into spaces between the larger soil particles and create compaction. Field maintenance (i.e. – mowing, aerating, etc.) should also be delayed until the field has an opportunity to properly drain.

Consideration should be given to assessing soil permeability on individual fields, particularly higher profile fields, to determine the specific use capacities of each field.

Scheduling flexibility to allow fields to drain properly before play is allowed will minimize the impact of play on compaction providing for better growing conditions and a healthier and denser stand of turf. The amount of time required before the fields can be brought back into play will vary depending upon a number of factors including the permeability of the root zone and subgrade material, the amount of precipitation and weather conditions following the rainfall event.

Monitoring of the fields to determine when the soil has drained and is no longer fully saturated requires on-site evaluation of field soil conditions. A very simple test can be conducted to determine whether the field is ready for play or maintenance activities. Collect a small soil sample that is representative of the field using a soil probe or spade. Roll a small amount of the soil between your fingers into a ball and then press the ball between your thumb and index finger. If the ball cracks along the edges or shatters, it indicates that the soil has dried sufficiently to allow play. If the soil ball compresses without shattering or cracking along the edges, the field should remain out of play to avoid soil compaction.

Another method of reducing field compaction and wear is the practice of moving goal areas and lines on a regular basis to evenly distribute wear across the field. This approach may not be an option where the available field area, light standards, fencing, fixed seating or other field amenities prevent movement of goals and line repainting.

3.2 Field Rest Periods

Field wear should be monitored on a weekly basis and intensity of use recorded to establish quality standards for field wear. **When a field has been identified as being in a condition of severe wear or damage, it should be taken out of play and provided with a rest period to allow staff to rehabilitate the field.** Depending upon growing conditions and method of rehabilitation (sod versus seed), the rest period may vary from 10-12 weeks for a resodded field to up to a year if the field is completely renovated and reseeded. Due to the provincial pesticide ban, sodding is recommended over seeding as the potential for weed infestation is significantly reduced. Although all efforts should be made to accommodate scheduling needs, maintenance operations should take priority to insure that they are conducted in a timely manner and under weather and soil moisture conditions when they will be most effective. **Suspension of field scheduling may also be required to accommodate completion of required routine maintenance tasks.**

4.0 Field Construction

Field construction was inconsistent across the sample of fields assessed. Construction type ranged from simple grading and seeding to more intensive sand based construction and sodded fields. **In general, fields were constructed without proper crowns.** Field crown refers to the slope from the centre of the field to the sidelines to permit surface drainage during periods of excessive rainfall or during rapid snow melt. Often the crowns were oriented diagonally across a field or the slopes were not consistent from center to the sideline causing low spots and possible tripping hazards. One field assessed had severe settling after construction causing a very uneven playing surface which resulted not only in unplayable conditions due to topography but also a very difficult management situation where high areas are dry and compacted and low areas are wet and subject to damage from equipment.



Figure 3. Uneven surface topography at Olympic Sports Park soccer field.

The most effective method of providing proper drainage to sports fields is the installation of a properly designed drainage system. Surface drainage alone is insufficient to adequately drain a field, as a healthy stand of turfgrass plants is a very effective barrier to the lateral movement of water even with a significant crown. The primary purpose of the crown is to prevent standing water on the centre of the field where much of the play is concentrated. Fields with an irrigation system should also have a drainage system unless underlain by a very pervious sub grade. A drainage system will not increase the inherent permeability of a field soil, but it will improve the subsurface removal of excess water allowing the field to drain more quickly, reducing the potential for compaction following rainfall events. The need for a drainage system is dependent on the particle size distribution and compaction of the subgrade material. Further examination of the composition of the rootzone and subgrade materials will be necessary prior to making specific recommendations for the installation of a drainage system for specific fields.

In some cases the fields appeared to have been compacted from the time of construction.

The most obvious was Kay Drage Park where the fields were consistently and severely compacted. The quality of these fields will remain poor until this issue can be addressed. The special circumstances of Kay Drage Park having been built on a former landfill site are recognized. Many other fields appear to have compacted soils from the time of construction, notably Joe Sam's Leisure Park and Meadowlands Community Park, the latter of which appears to have been resodded at one time without the removal of the previous thatch or sod.

When special rootzone material is specified in tender documents, proper oversight is needed and independent testing of the root zone material prior to installation is essential. Heritage Green Sports Park appeared to have a root zone mix (Figure 4) that contained a fair amount of small pebbles and very coarse sand. It is essential to have tight specifications regarding the rootzone construction materials that define the character of the sand in the sand mixture.



Figure 4. Soil core sample from Heritage Green field showing irregularity of rootzone material.

One of the most noted issues related to field construction was the unevenness of the field underfoot. Many fields had numerous small depressions that pose tripping hazards and may cause injuries to players. We believe that this unevenness is caused by seams between the rolls of the sod becoming more prevalent during field establishment. When sod is laid properly the seams are very close but, if the sod is allowed to dry out, it can shrink causing a gap to form. Soil may then erode from this gap causing a more severe depression. These depressions can be alleviated through regular topdressing and by aeration and matting of aeration cores in order level field depressions. Generally, seeding new fields is a better practice because it avoids this phenomenon and in the past seeding of new fields was recommended for this reason. With the provincial pesticide ban, sodding of newly constructed fields is recommended as seeded fields are more prone to broadleaf weed infestation which cannot be controlled in an economically sustainable manner on sports fields. **Special care must be given to proper installation of the sod and preventing the installed sod from**

shrinking by applying frequent, deep irrigation. It is also essential to fill and overseed any seams that have developed early in the life of the field to maintain a safe and level playing surface as well as minimize weed establishment in the open seams. In addition, sodded fields should be aerated multiple times per year in the first few years after construction to alleviate any layers that may have formed due to the sodding and to allow for better root penetration into the base soil to reduce the sod's susceptibility to drought in the second and third years of establishment.

One park visited, William Schwenger Park, was still under the care of the sod installer who was irrigating the field and backfilling seams with soil to alleviate the unevenness caused by sod shrinkage. Unfortunately, goal standards were already in place and the fields were painted and being used. **It is crucial during construction that the fields are allowed to establish and goal standards not installed until the field has been accepted by the parks department and approved for use by user groups.** Early wear of newly constructed fields can be detrimental to the playability of the field for the entire life of the field. In addition, depending upon agreements with contractors in charge of the field construction, early scheduled use of fields may be a breach of contract on the part of the City voiding the contractor of any responsibility for subsequent field failure.

5.0 Field Rehabilitation

Some fields had buried thatch layers under the soil surface. It is possible that this was due to resodding of the field after failure during establishment. **It is crucial to remove thatch layers when resodding fields as the new soil on top of the previous thatch layer will not drain properly.** The buried thatch layer can create a perched water table preventing water movement through the soil profile. When resodding the center of the field due to excessive wear, this is less important because there may be very little thatch due to the lack of vegetation. In this case it is essential that the soil on the sod being used to resod the field closely match the texture of the existing rootzone material. If resodding sand based fields, every possible effort should be made to use sand-based sod that physically resembles the field rootzone material. Soil based sod laid on top of sand will inhibit water movement through the profile and cause the field to maintain surface moisture. The saturated conditions at the soil surface can then lead to excessive wear and turf failure. If a soil-based sod must be used, aeration should be performed multiple times and sand topdressing should be applied to attempt to provide sand channels for water to move through the sod layer into the sand root zone.

If overall improvement of field conditions is a goal, then it is essential that sufficient field inventory be maintained to allow fields to be removed from active use for rehabilitation and recovery. This would require assessment of individual field wear characteristics, field scheduling needs and the minimum time required for field rehabilitation and recovery to determine the optimum field inventory needs.

6.0 Management Practices

6.1 Mowing

Most fields examined appeared to be on an adequate mowing cycle. Only two of the fields appeared to be behind schedule on the prescribed mowing schedule. **The current mowing schedule of every seven working days (nine calendar days) is sufficient for most of the fields. On higher profile fields, increased mowing frequency may be desirable to maintain better playing conditions with increased nitrogen fertility (see fertilizer recommendations).** Some park sections are already performing this with good success.

In some cases it appeared that mower blades were somewhat dull and possibly in need of sharpening. This is not uncommon in June as the grasses are producing seed heads and becoming “stemmy”. Planning an increase in sharpening schedule around this time of year is recommended if resources allow. Sharp blades allow for quicker growth after recovery and allow the grass to fill in from traffic more efficiently.

Mowing heights appeared to be well within the recommended ranges. It is important to not set the mowing height too high as a reduction in the quality of the cut of grass may occur along with reduced playability. In addition, high mowing heights can result in a reduction of tiller densities resulting in less traffic tolerance. This is also true of mowing heights that are too low.

One limitation of the mowing schedules is a lack of equipment if a mower should happen to be in need of repair. According to information received from parks maintenance staff, both fields that were behind on the mowing schedule were a result of a mower that was out of service for repairs. **It is important to have sufficient equipment to account for loss of time from unexpected breakdowns as well as routine repair and maintenance (sharpening of blades).** Some redundancy is essential to maintain healthy turfgrass. With provincial legislation restricting pesticide use, mowing frequently enough to prevent turfgrass decline is essential since herbicides can no longer be used to eliminate weeds that will invade when turf is weakened from excessive leaf removal due to extended periods between mowing.

Generally it appeared that fields had very little damage from mowers, although some fields with low spots and drainage issues had some rutting from equipment (or possibly other service or unauthorized vehicle traffic on the field).

On some fields it appeared that that lined areas were mowed with a walk behind mower to facilitate line painting. This may not be the best allocation of man hours and on the fields where this is being performed it may actually be more cost effective longer term to have more equipment and allow for increased mowing frequency across the entire field, rather than push mowing lines.

6.2 Fertility

6.2.1 Nitrogen (N)

The nitrogen fertility of most fields assessed appeared to be on the low side of adequate levels. Nitrogen fertility must be assessed by turfgrass growth and color as no accurate soil test for nitrogen requirement is available. General assessment showed that the standards set forward are most likely being followed. The standards are on the low side of adequate for high use athletic fields. The Class A fields and sand based fields should have increased nitrogen fertility throughout the year. This may require an increase in mowing frequency as the fields may grow slightly faster. Many of the junior fields and lower use fields such as baseball outfields have sufficient nitrogen under the current fertilizer regime.

6.2.2 Phosphorus (P)

No evidence of phosphorus deficiency was observed in the field and soil tests showed only one field out of the 33 to have sufficient phosphorus limitation to growth. It may be possible to reduce the amount of phosphorus in the blend and reallocate savings to increased application of nitrogen. Phosphorus should not be completely eliminated from the blend but reducing the amount of phosphorus applied from a 1:2 phosphorus to nitrogen ratio to a 1:5 P:N ratio would be appropriate.

6.2.3 Potassium (K)

No potassium deficiency was observed from soil tests, but the high base saturation level of calcium may make the need for potassium more prevalent. Based on soil testing it would be desirable to reduce the amount potassium applied (1:2 K:N ratio) and use any saving to increase the total nitrogen fertility on high use fields within each region.

6.2.4 Fertilizer Type

Nitrogen sources can determine the amount of nitrogen that is actually being delivered to the plant. Current fertilizers include sulfur coated urea (SCU) as a slow release source of nitrogen. This is often the lowest of cost form of slow release fertilizers. It is important to realize that nitrogen release from SCU is based on the amount of water available. There is also a fair amount of readily available (fast release) nitrogen in each application. **Cost analysis should be done on more expensive temperature-based release forms of nitrogen such as methylene urea.** If fertilizing three times per year, it is essential to have more than 60% of the nitrogen being applied in a slow release form with an ideal release curve of 8-12 weeks for the nitrogen to become available. The fact that the slow release fertilizer is being used to burn field lines shows that a high percentage of the fertilizer is not slow release. In order to achieve the desired ratios, a slow release straight nitrogen source (without phosphorus and potassium) could be applied as an extra application in late July to increase nitrogen application rates.

6.2.5 Fertilizer Application

Overall fertilizer application was good and appeared to be consistent, with the exception of one region where fertilizer had been applied with a walk behind broadcast spreader due to the fact that the usual machine used for application was under repair. The application was not spaced properly resulting in over application to some areas and no application to others. In the middle of the over applied areas fertilizer burn was evident (Figure 5). Some fields in the same region also appeared to have fertilizer damage down the middle of the field possibly from application with the piece of equipment that needed repair. This is evidence of a need for back-up equipment as the loss of equipment being repaired resulted in an increased potential for human error in the application of fertilizer. Proper calibration and operator training is essential to insure even and consistent fertilizer application from field to field. With the ban on chemical herbicide use, avoiding the damage from misapplication becomes more crucial as it will be harder to eliminate weeds that invade the weakened turfgrass areas. In addition, the use of better quality SCU or alternate slow release form of nitrogen may reduce the likelihood of misapplication resulting in fertilizer burn.



Figure 5. Irregular fertilizer application patterns.

6.3 Irrigation

Although a small percentage of fields are irrigated, proper maintenance of the irrigation system is essential. **Many irrigation heads were below the surface level resulting in improper coverage. Other heads appeared not to be functioning at all or were set to run at odd times of the day due to an unknown program running within the controller.** Regular irrigation audits will determine coverage inefficiencies and significantly improve turfgrass quality of the irrigated fields.

One field visited had an issue with an irrigation head and after investigation it was found out that the issue had already been called in for repair. Depending on the number of irrigated fields, it may be cost effective to designate and train one or more irrigation technicians to perform regular maintenance checks and system audits to insure that this infrastructure is maintained and utilized to its greatest potential.

6.4 Aeration

Aeration is performed to reduce thatch by mixing soil into the thatch and providing microbes more oxygen to break down the thatch. Aeration can also be used to reduce surface compaction and provide germination sites for overseeding. Aeration on athletic fields is generally recommended for both purposes, with thatch management being the primary value of aeration in low traffic areas and compaction reduction being the primary value of aeration in high traffic areas.

Evidence of core aeration was observed during field assessments. It appeared that it was being performed properly. **Some of the fields were severely compacted and it is doubtful that traditional core aeration would be effective, particularly in the goalmouth areas.** In severely compacted areas, solid tining may be necessary to break up soil compaction, allow for overseeding in the bare areas and possibly allow for better water infiltration. While slicing machines can be effective a higher density may be needed and this could be achieved with a vibrating solid tine or similar machine. These machines are slow and may not be best suited for an entire field but may be effective in goal mouths and on center lines prior to overseeding.

Some fields appeared to have excessive thatch and these fields need to be targeted for additional aeration. This aeration needs to be in addition to regular maintenance practices currently being implemented. Most fields have acceptable thatch layers, and the manager should assess thatch levels in different areas of the fields and determine which fields and areas of those fields should be targeted for additional aeration for thatch control. Similarly, managers should identify severely compacted fields and areas of fields and target them for additional aeration in high use areas to relieve the compaction.

6.5 Topdressing

The topdressing material used on the sand based field at Mohawk Sports Complex was analyzed and the sand material appeared to be similar to the sand based fields, although quality checks should be made to assure that the amount of small gravel is within satisfactory limits. **The 60% sand / 40% soil mix appears to be of sufficient quality for topdressing soil based fields.** It is important to avoid using soil based topdressing on fields with sand rootzones as the resulting layer could result in a reduction in water infiltration, limiting the effectiveness of the sand based rootzone. This was observed on one of the sand based fields, although the field has had sufficient wear that continued aeration, overseeding and topdressing with the appropriate mix may alleviate the problem.

Aggressive hollow tine aeration is also an effective topdressing technique because it uses the existing soil and therefore reduces the likelihood of layering. Hollow tine aeration is essential in a topdressing program to alleviate layering.

6.6 Overseeding

Evidence of overseeding was prevalent on high use athletic fields. Often overseeding was performed in both directions and this practice is encouraged if time and equipment allows. The predominant grass observed in the overseeding lines was perennial ryegrass. Current practices focus on overseeding primarily in the fall as this is the best time to establish grass and recover from the summer playing season particularly in unirrigated fields. In previous years, this has been effective because weed populations could be controlled to limit weed interference with the turfgrass establishment.

Current limitation of herbicide use make it essential to overseed throughout the year to compete with the weeds as continuous traffic and wear open up spaces for seeds to germinate. **In order to overseed effectively, a much greater amount of seed must be purchased and more man hours and equipment time must be put into overseeding.** Overseeding at rates of 2 kg per 100 m² or greater a minimum of three times a year is recommended, although studies have shown that the more seed that can be put down on a regular basis the better the field quality will be particularly under high use situations.

6.7 Field Lining and Standards

The lining of the fields is a new challenge under the provincial pesticide ban. In previous years, glyphosate has been used to kill the grass along the field lines. This was effective because it reduced the costs associated with line marking. It also has no long term effect, although after many years erosion and compaction may occur because of a lack of turfgrass cover and present a tripping hazard. Currently some regions are experimenting with burning the lines with fertilizer. While this is effective, it poses problems with the residual effect as this burn is essentially a salt burn. Using salt or fertilizer will have a lasting effect on soil quality and should be avoided. Also if a large rain event follows application wash out is more likely to occur with the fertilizers as opposed to the herbicide, this could result in a large area of damaged turf with poor soil quality.

Ideally lines should be painted regularly. In some regions lines were painted although it looks as though they were painted freehand and the practitioner would have benefited from using a post and line method. Although lining does not affect the agronomics of the field it can have a profound effect on the user groups' perception of the maintenance being performed. **Many municipalities have agreements with user groups putting them in charge of the marking of the fields.** Agreements like this may already exist within Hamilton and they should be exploited to the fullest to relieve some of the labor burden placed on the staff trying to maintain lines.

Many of the goal standards were rusted and in need of repair or replacement. A few football standards appeared to be leaning and possibly may pose a safety risk.

6.8 Equipment

It appeared as though there may be a limited number of tractors with turf tires available throughout the region. The large number of ball diamonds that require grooming may limit the availability of tractors for processes such as overseeding and aeration. As the practices move to more frequent overseeding this will limit the crew's ability to perform prescribed maintenance. **In addition some redundancy of equipment must be built in to allow for continued proper management when equipment breaks and is in need of parts and repair.** Turf tires are important for equipment being used on fields as the damage caused by improper tires on turfgrass can be costly to repair and often the field cannot be fully restored to its original quality due to weed invasion.

7.0 Summary of Recommendations

- a. Use new field construction standards for various classes of fields and closely monitor new field construction projects to insure standards are being met.
- b. Conduct independent testing of construction materials and insure approval of sod used for new fields as well as field rehabilitation.
- c. Enforce restrictions on use of new fields prior to proper establishment.
- d. Improve field scheduling, user group education and enforcement to reduce excessive use of high profile fields. More evenly distribute field use across the system.
- e. Classify high use fields to determine drainage characteristics as part of the development of an enhanced field closure policy.
- f. Install properly designed subsurface drainage systems on higher use fields to improve drainage and minimize period that fields are subject to increased wear damage after rainfall events.
- g. Develop a sufficient sports field inventory to permit rest and rehabilitation periods to be incorporated into field scheduling.
- h. Remove old sod or thatch prior to any resodding of fields.
- i. Increase availability of back-up equipment to reduce instances of fields been left unmown for excessive periods of time.
- j. Increase mowing frequency on premier fields.
- k. Increase nitrogen application rates on higher use and sand based fields.
- l. Reduce the amount of phosphorus applied from a 1:2 to a 1:5 phosphorus to nitrogen ratio.
- m. Reduce the amount potassium applied (1:2 potassium to nitrogen ratio).

Summary of Recommendations (continued)

- n. Investigate the use of alternative, higher quality slow release nitrogen sources.
- o. Provide proper calibration, operator training and back-up equipment to insure proper application of fertilizer.
- p. Provide staff training, regular system inspections and audits of irrigation systems to insure effective use.
- q. Increase frequency and rate of overseeding to combat weed infestation throughout the season on heavily used fields.
- r. Refrain from using fertilizer to burn field lines – investigate alternative lining methods.
- s. Inspect and repair or replace any deteriorating goal standards.
- t. Insure all tractors used on turf areas are properly equipped with turf tires.

Report prepared by:

Eric Lyons, B.Sc., Ph.D.

Rob Witherspoon, B.Sc. (Agr.), M.Sc.

Guelph Turfgrass Institute – Consulting Services Division
328 Victoria Road South, Guelph, Ontario, Canada N1H 6H8
robwith@uoguelph.ca www.guelphurfgrass.ca

CITY OF HAMILTON

**Outdoor Recreation Facilities
& Sports Field Provision Plan**

**ATTACHMENT X: COMPARISON OF MUNICIPAL FIELD RENTAL RATES &
ALLOCATION STANDARDS**

RENTAL RATES

Hourly Rental Rates – Soccer Fields (Prime Adult Rates)

Municipality	Lit 'A' / Primary / Premium Field	Unlit 'A' / Primary / Premium Field	Senior / 'B' / Secondary Field	'C' Field	School Field	Mini Field
Hamilton		\$30.25	\$21.00	\$ 3.26		\$ 2.25
Burlington	\$75.08**	\$43.53**	\$27.79**			
London	\$48.69		\$37.10	\$11.01	\$ 7.21	
Markham	\$21.00	\$ 7.20	\$ 7.20	\$ 5.65		
Mississauga	\$58.96*	\$35.58*			\$23.38*	
Vaughan	\$45.22	\$31.26	\$36.26 (lit) \$22.51 (unlit)			\$26.25

Hourly Rental Rates – Soccer Fields (Prime Youth Rates)

Municipality	Lit Senior / 'A' / Primary / Premium Field	Unlit Senior / 'A' / Primary / Premium Field	Intermediate / 'B' / Secondary Field	'C' Field	School	Mini Field
Hamilton		\$15.25	\$11.00	\$ 2.00		\$ 1.50
Burlington	\$44.69**	\$23.15**				
London	\$37.10		\$25.50	\$ 8.12	\$ 4.12	\$10.00 (irrigated)
Markham	\$11.00	\$ 4.10	\$ 3.60	\$ 3.60		
Mississauga	\$26.55*	\$11.24*		\$43.71*		
Vaughan	\$45.22	\$31.26	\$36.26 (lit) \$22.51 (unlit)			\$26.25

Hourly Rental Rates – Football Fields (Prime Rates)

Municipality	Valleys (Adult)	Schools (Adult)	Valleys (Youth)	Schools (Youth)
Mississauga	\$58.96*	\$43.71*	\$26.55*	\$43.71*

*Taxes (GST or HST) not included; assume others include applicable taxes.

**Different rates apply after July 1, 2010 due to the HST. Rates shown above are to June 30, 2010 and are per game, not hourly.

Hourly Rental Rates – Ball Diamonds (Prime Adult Rates)

Municipality	Lit Premium / 'A' / Primary Field	Unlit Premium / 'A' / Primary Field	Senior / 'B' / Secondary Field	Junior / 'C' Field	School
Hamilton		\$30.25	\$21.00	\$ 3.26	
Burlington	\$75.08**	\$43.53**	\$27.79**		
London		\$17.50	\$12.07		
Markham	\$28.20	\$21.00	\$7.20	\$ 5.65	
Mississauga	\$58.96*	\$35.58*			\$23.38*
Vaughan	\$77.82	\$49.76	\$68.84 (lit) \$41.29 (unlit)	\$28.79	

Hourly Rental Rates – Ball Diamonds (Prime Youth Rates)

Municipality	Lit Premium / 'A' / Primary Field	Unlit Premium / 'A' / Primary Field	Senior / 'B' / Secondary Field	Junior / 'C' Field	School
Hamilton		\$15.25	\$11.00	\$ 2.00	
Burlington	\$33.12**	\$23.15**	\$15.20**		
London		\$ 7.50	\$5.24		
Markham	\$15.10	\$11.00	\$3.60	\$ 3.60	
Mississauga	\$26.55*	\$11.24*			\$43.71*
Vaughan	\$77.82	\$49.76	\$68.84 (lit) \$41.29 (unlit)	\$28.79	

Hourly Rental Rates – Artificial Turf Fields (Prime Rates)

Municipality	Adult	Youth
Hamilton	\$105.00	\$105.00
Burlington	\$91.04**	\$59.17**
Mississauga	\$79.66 / \$89.63*	\$49.92 / \$54.91*
Vaughan	\$117.19 (lit) \$89.18 (unlit)	

*Taxes (GST or HST) not included; assume others include applicable taxes. Rates are provided for Iceland, Huron, Courtneypark Fields / Hershey Sports Zone Fields.
 **Different rates apply after July 1, 2010 due to the HST. Rates shown above are to June 30, 2010.

FIELD ALLOCATION

The formula for field allocation varies between municipalities, making direct comparisons difficult. Each municipality utilizes a different formula to calculate field allocation; these are listed below for the Towns of Markham and Oakville and the City of London (Note: HL = house league; U = under; and Rep = representative/competitive). To facilitate analysis, each age group’s allocation of field/diamond time is broken down to a comparable statistic of ‘1 hour per X participants’.

City of London (sports fields and ball diamonds)

Games: total youth registered ÷ 15 (average # of youth per team) = one 2-hour game field per team per week

Practices: total youth registered ÷ 30 (2 teams can practice at a time on each field) = one 2-hour practice field per 30 youth per week

Town of Markham (sports fields and ball diamonds)

Step 1. Players/division ÷ players per team = number of teams

Step 2. Number of teams x by entitlement = total entitlement

Step 3. Total entitlement ÷ number of teams = hours per week per team

Town of Markham (soccer and football fields)

Age Group	Weekly allocation	1 hour per X participants
HL Soccer U5	1 hour per 6 participants per week	6
HL Soccer U10	1.5 hours per 9 participants per week	6
HL Soccer U13	3.7 hours per 13 participants per week	3.5
HL Soccer U21	2.25 hours per 15 participants per week	6.7
All-Stars Soccer	3 hours per week	N/A
HL Soccer 21+	1 hour per 14 participants per week	14
Travel Soccer 21+	2 hours per 14 participants per week	7
Rep Soccer U10	2.3 hours per week	N/A
Rep Soccer U13	2.7 hours per 10 participants	5.3
Rep Soccer U21	3 hours per 16 participants	5.3
Rep Soccer 21+	3 hours per 16 participants	5.3
HL Football	3 hours per 15 participants	5
Rep Football	6 hours per 26 participants	4.3

Town of Markham (ball diamonds)

Age group	Weekly allocation	1 hour per X participants
HL 4-7 years	0.75 hours per 12 participants per week	16
HL U12	1.5 hours per 12 participants per week	7.5
HL U19	1.6 hours per 12 participants per week	7.5
HL 19+	0.75 hours per 14 participants per week	18.7
Rep 8-14 years	4 hours per 12 participants per week	3
Rep U18	4 hours per 12 participants per week	2.7
Rep 19+	4.5 hours per 14 participants per week	3.1

Town of Oakville

Town of Oakville (soccer fields)

Age group	Weekly allocation	1 hour per X participants
U6	2.5 hours per 10 participants per week	4
U10	3.5 hours per 13 participants per week	3.7
U18	4 hours per 16 participants per week	4
Adult	2 hours per 20 participants per week	10

Town of Oakville (other field sports)

Age group	Weekly allocation	1 hour per X participants
Youth field lacrosse	4 hours per 16 participants per week	4
Adult field lacrosse	2 hours per 20 participants per week	10
Youth football	8 hours per 50 participants per week	6.25
Adult football	4 hours per 50 participants per week	12.5
Youth U14 field hockey	3 hours per 12 participants per week	4
Youth 14+ field hockey	3 hours per 18 participants per week	6
Adult field hockey	2 hours per 18 participants per week	9

Town of Oakville (ball diamonds)

Age group	Weekly allocation	1 hour per X participants
U6 Hardball	2.5 hours per 13 participants per week	5.2
U13 Hardball	5 hours per 13 participants per week	2.6
U18 Hardball	7 hours per 14 participants per week	2
Adult Hardball	2.5 hours per 15 participants per week	6
U8 Softball	2.5 hours per 10 participants per week	4
U18 Softball	5 hours per 14 participants per week	2.8
Adult Softball	2 hours per 14 participants per week	7