

ISL Engineering and Land Services

# Buena Vista/Sir Wilfrid Laurier Park Master Plan

Concept Review Workshop, June 23, 2012  
Evaluation Results

Jan Bloomfield  
7/3/2012

# Buena Vista/Sir Wilfrid Laurier Park (BVLP) Concept Review Workshop

## Evaluation Results, June 23, 2012

---

### BACKGROUND

Participants at the Buena Vista / Sir Wilfrid Laurier Park (BVLP) Concept Review Workshop were asked to complete an evaluation survey. Approximately half (86) of the estimated 160 participants completed all or part of the evaluation. An exact number of participants is unavailable since not everyone stayed for the full workshop. Some people came and went at varying times throughout the workshop.

The survey was divided into two parts. In the first part, respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed with a series of statements, and in the second part, they were asked to provide some demographic and use information. The results are presented below, with percentages reflecting those who completed the evaluation.

### PART I: LEVEL OF AGREEMENT WITH A SERIES OF STATEMENTS

#### 1. The information presented at the Workshop today was clear and easy to understand.

6 (7%)	49 (57%)	15 (17%)	4 (5%)	2 (3%)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure

- The majority of respondents (55 or 64%) indicated they agreed or strongly agreed that information presented at the Concept Review Workshop was clear and easy to understand.
- Not everyone agreed, with 19 (22%) indicating they disagreed or strongly disagreed, and two noting they were unsure.
- Ten individuals (12%) skipped the question.

#### 2. The information presented at the Workshop today was appropriate for my needs.

7 (8%)	53 (62%)	8 (9%)	6 (7%)	1 (1%)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure

- A total of 60 or 70% of participants who completed the evaluation agreed or strongly agreed that the information presented was appropriate for their needs.
- Fourteen (16%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, and one was not sure.
- Eleven individuals skipped the question.
- A total of 26 individuals provided specific comments to explain their response.

#### Concepts / Questions Confusing

- Concepts were confusing if first introduction.
- Too many questions could not be answered. The rating is skewed incorrectly. Somewhat support should be after support.
- Got confusing with so many options.
- There were a few elements of the concepts that were confusing. i.e. what difference was between parking in off leash areas (difference between concepts).

- Some concepts hard to identify/ understand by concept plan only, so good to have additional interpretation and discussion.

#### Time / Too Much Information

- Really not enough time to consider everything.
- Not enough time. Statements asked more than one question
- There was a lot of info covered.
- Too much information for 3.5 hours!

# Buena Vista/Sir Wilfrid Laurier Park (BVLP) Concept Review Workshop

## Evaluation Results, June 23, 2012

---

- Too much info in a short period of time
- There were too many ideas and concepts to really understand and comment on them all, but it was presented as well as possible.
- Introduction took too long to go through
- First workshop. Seemed well organized, lot's to take in.

### Visuals

- Good visuals, some explanations of pathways and roads are very confusing.
- Except for pathway designations. Visuals were hard to see.

### Need More Information

- I needed more background (synopses of proposed stages e.g. vision, usage etc.)
- Not enough options presented. Lots of elements that I had never heard of before. Not enough explanation.
- More detail would have been good.
- Some clarification of what's available between plans, e.g., like paths in 2 and 3 with area in 1.
- There has been NO input from traffic/ parking division to address issues from Buena Vista.

### Concerns were addressed

- My needs/concerns re development were addressed
- Merci pour le service bilingue/ Thanks for the bilingual service.
- Answered some questions I had. Provided necessary information I was seeking

### Representation

- No- the process is flawed in that so called off leash users are not properly represented. They are a type of user but not represented easily by only one person. Off leash users are public users like anyone else who chooses to walk in the park but much more intensive user than any other

### Venue

- Darker room for better Power Point use required. To compare/ contrast opinions required.
- Concerns that Decisions Already Made
- It was clear that the changes were predetermined to happen and that this was just a formality.
- Many users feel that these plans are a fail accompli- There is a lot of confusion.

### 3. There were good opportunities for discussion with others throughout the session.

17 (20%)	54 (63%)	3 (3%)	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure

- Almost all respondents (71 or 83%) agreed or strongly agreed that there were good opportunities for discussion with others during the session.
- Only 4 (4%) disagreed or strongly disagreed, and one individual was not sure.
- Ten individuals skipped the question.

### 4. The facilitators encouraged everyone to participate.

35 (41%)	40 (47%)	2 (2%)	0	0
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure

- All respondents except two agreed or strongly agreed that the facilitators encouraged everyone to participate in the discussion.
- Nine skipped the question.

**Buena Vista/Sir Wilfrid Laurier Park (BVLP) Concept Review Workshop  
Evaluation Results, June 23, 2012**

---

**5. I feel a wide range of opinions have been considered in creating the concepts.**

12 (14%)	40 (47%)	11 (13%)	8 (9%)	6 (7%)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure

- Almost two thirds of respondents (52 or 61%) agreed or strongly agreed that a wide range of opinions have been considered in creating the draft concepts.
- About one fifth (19 or 21%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, and six respondents indicated they were not sure.
- Nine individuals skipped the question.

**6. We were given sufficient time to review, discuss and provide input on the concepts.**

5 (6%)	39 (45%)	18 (21%)	10 (12%)	2 (2%)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure

- Half of the respondents (44 or 51%) agreed or strongly agreed that they were given sufficient time to review, discuss and provide input on the concepts.
- One third of respondents (28 or 33%) disagreed or strongly disagreed with this statement, and two were unsure.
- Twelve skipped the question

**7. Participating in this session was a good use of my time.**

19 (22%)	43 (50%)	2 (2%)	2 (2%)	8 (9%)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure

- Almost three quarters of respondents (62 or 72%) noted that they agreed or strongly agreed that participating in the session was a good use of their time.
- Only 4 (4%) of respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed, and 8 (9%) were not sure.
- Twelve skipped the question.

**8. The venue was appropriate.**

25 (29%)	47 (55%)	0	1 (1%)	0
Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Sure

- All but one respondent agreed or strongly agreed that the venue was appropriate.
- Thirteen skipped the question.

# Buena Vista/Sir Wilfrid Laurier Park (BVLP) Concept Review Workshop

## Evaluation Results, June 23, 2012

---

### 9. Please provide any other comments or suggestions you may have regarding the Buena Vista / Sir Wilfrid Laurier Park Master Plan Public Involvement Process.

Specific comments were received from 42 respondents. These are listed below, sorted by themes.

#### Workshop Design Concerns

- There should have been a Q&A session before and after!!! (x2).
- Process- need to ensure that every interested user has a say.
- Questions from the floor did not work well because most of us could not hear them.
- Many people taking discussion off topic with questions so perhaps only Q's in groups next time. People were so angry about changes! Surprising! Perhaps address change management to deal with this.
- Scale- 1-5 scale was confusing to some participants.
- The survey scale was messed up. Hope it doesn't skew results. 2- support and 3- somewhat support.
- The three issues should have been dealt with separately. Three different issues.
- How do you know when there is a consensus?
- Whether participating in the session was a good use of my time depends on whether the resulting plan reflects our views!
- re: The facilitators encouraged everyone to participate: To a point, facilitation was difficult for all the strong feeling.
- I would like to hear from the interest groups for 5-7 min each at the next meeting. Not pontificating but thoughtful input. The dog off leash users are a passionate caring group who are concerned about our natural park and safety and we don't want to upset others but we are proud and happy to have something rare- we want to keep it!

#### Good Process

- Excellent facilitation at our table!
- Nice participating in the democratic process.
- Good job.
- I found it fun! Facilitators are great!
- Well done. Supported the decision to cut off early questions... perhaps do it sooner. Thanks!
- Venue temperature was comfortable.

#### Visuals

- The picture that was used for the post-and-rail fence may not have effectively communicated its utility in reducing dog-cyclist conflict.

#### Concern Decision Already Made

- Open dialogue- people were feeling that a direction had been established. Need to be able to clearly distinguish what has been decided vs. what is still open for discussion.
- Concept had a fundamental plan at inception with combination of BV Park and SWLP. I feel that city designers did not complete usage studies prior to design concepts. This implies an agenda held by the design group that does not respect user demands.
- Some of the possibilities were off the table.

#### Information / Time

- So much information!
- Not enough time to look at all the elements in each concept!
- Elements to consider were very complex and detailed. very difficult to present and discuss in a large group format. Fig. 2-6 and 8 were better than overall concept drawings to present essential differences of alternatives.
- For review, it would have been helpful to have a "before" map for comparison.
- I don't feel we were given enough time to discuss everything.
- Lasted a long time, but that's inevitable given all that needed to be covered.
- Could always use more time, but maybe keeping it shorter keeps it focused.
- Event should have allowed more time, perhaps over 2 days.
- As for the City of Edmonton as a whole. I honestly feel more "research" may/ or might have been valuable as to how "off leash areas" and being a dog friendly city is utilized and works well.

#### Specific Design Comments

- What about benches, garbage bins and dispensers throughout the park
- Lighted main paths.

## Buena Vista/Sir Wilfrid Laurier Park (BVL) Concept Review Workshop Evaluation Results, June 23, 2012

- Lighted pathways. Dog accessible water fountains.
- Even better off-leash boundaries. More parking. Viewpoint is great. Develop Yorath house, Don't disturb the bottom/ lower grassed area. No "loo" through it.
- I am most concerned about traffic control on Buena Vista Road.
- Do not need new playground at Laurier park. Use natural playground. Increase parking.

### Yorath House

- Keep the existing Yorath house, with upgrades in any of these concepts.
- Ensure Yorath is re-developed.

### Representation

- The whole process is disingenuous because it insists not recognizing the majority user group. They brought in stakeholders that don't use the park very often giving input on major changes.
- This seems to be all about dogs and not so much about families and children. Let's hope that more consideration is given to improving the PARK area... without dogs.

- The statement at the beginning of the meeting that it's ok that dog walkers are not proportionally represented set a bad note for the whole meeting!
- Major use group (dog walkers) are presented with options that all diminish their use. Proportionate representation (80% users are dog walkers). By far the best dog park in the city. This should be the "anchor feature". The process allows a tiny minority (cyclists) to disproportionately influence the plan.

### Keep As Is

- Please allow this park to remain natural, and a wonderful place for dogs to be allowed to be. Thanks!
- Please don't destroy a beautiful, natural, unique space by developing it. It is perfect the way it is.
- Why are we spending tax dollars on something that works now? Seems a complete waste of time and money.

## PART II: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONS SUMMARY

The Survey also asked participants to share some information about themselves to help the Project Team determine if we are engaging with a representative cross-section of Edmontonians.

The following provides a summary of responses to these questions.

### 10. On average, approximately how often do you visit Buena Vista / Sir Wilfrid Laurier Park?

39 (45%)	19 (22%)	8 (9%)	5 (6%)	2 (2%)	1 (1%)	0
Daily	2-4 times a week	Weekly	Once or twice a month	Regularly on a seasonal basis	Once or twice a year	Never

- Twelve individuals skipped the question.
- Four indicated other amounts of time, including:
  - I can count on one hand the days in a year that I do NOT go to the park.
  - I am exposed to the good and bad concerning that I live on the park edge I use it every day. I see all activities and live with the traffic.
  - I would like to visit more often but live in the north end
  - I'm a senior and do not feel safe after being knocked off my bike by dogs and also lunged at by dogs. I still use Laurier sometimes.

**Buena Vista/Sir Wilfrid Laurier Park (BVLP) Concept Review Workshop  
Evaluation Results, June 23, 2012**

---

**11. What type of activities do you do when you visit the park (check all that apply):**

40 (47%)	57 (66%)	12 (14%)	34 (40%)	11 (13%)	15 (17%)	5 (6%)	0 (0%)	17 (20%)	7 (8%)
Walk /Run	Walk my Dog	X- Country Ski/ Snowshoe	Cycle	Picnic	Family/ Other Events	Visit Rowing Club	Visit Paddling Centre	Visit Zoo	Other

- The majority of respondents (50 or 58%) indicated that they participate in more than one type of activity when they visit the park, reflecting that most participants at the workshop represented various park user interests.
- Of these multi-use visitors, 12 (14%) indicated they participate in 2 activities, 20 (23%) in 3 activities, 9 (10%) in 4 activities, 4 (5%) in 5 activities, 3 (3%) in 6 activities, and 2 (2%) in 7 activities.
- Of the 26 (30%) respondents who indicated they only participate in one activity, dog walking only was noted most often (20 or 23%), followed by cycling (4 or 5%), and walking and zoo (1 or 1 % each).
- Ten respondents skipped the question.

**If you said Other, please specify:**

- Canoe/ kayak launch (private)
- Nature viewing
- Kayaking. Would like to rollerblade/ bicycle.

**12. Please tell us how you heard about the session today? (Circle all that apply)**

4 (4%)	34 (26%)	0 (1%)	1 (1%)	9 (31%)	12 (14%)	6 (14%)	27 (36%)	10 (17%)	2 (10%)
Website	E-mail	Twitter	Face Book	Roadside Signs	Poster	Newspaper Ads	From Someone Else	Community League or Other Organization	Other

**Other organizations included:**

- Edmonton Rowing Club (3)
- Edmonton Bicycle Commuters
- Off leash users informal group (2)
- Sign at off leash bulletin board/dog park info kiosk (2)
- Dog walkers email list
- Business Facebook page
- Can't remember
- No idea a website even existed

**Buena Vista/Sir Wilfrid Laurier Park (BVLP) Concept Review Workshop  
Evaluation Results, June 23, 2012**

---

**13. In what neighbourhood or community do you live?**

Community/Neighbourhood	Number	Community/Neighbourhood	Number
Buena Vista	2	Mill Creek	1
Castledowns	1	Millwoods	1
Crestwood	6	North Glenora	2
Donsdale	1	Parkallen	2
Elmwood	2	Parkview	7
Fulton Place	1	Patricia Heights	1
Garneau	2	Prince Rupert	2
Glenora	6	Riverbend	1
Grovenor	5	Rutherford	1
Idylwyld	1	Strathcona County	1
Jamieson	1	Terwillegar	1
Jasper Park	1	Valleyview	2
Laurier Heights	8	West Jasper	1
Lynnwood	5	Westmount	3
McKernan	1	Windsor Park	1
McQueen	1		

**14. What are the first three digits of your postal code?**

Postal Code	Number	Postal Code	Number	Postal Code	Number
T5G	2	T5T	1	T6K	1
T5M	5	T6A	1	T6M	2
T5N	16	T6E	3	T6R	1
T5P	2	T6G	4	T6V	1
T5R	29	T6H	3	T6W	1

**15. What is your gender?**

- Half of the respondents identified themselves as female (43 or 50%).
- About one third identified themselves as male (31 or 36%), and twelve skipped this question.

**16. Please circle your age group:**

0	0	5 (6%)	7 (8%)	10 (12%)	22 (26%)	15 (17%)	15 (17%)	1 (1%)
<15 yrs	15 - 19 yrs	20 - 24 yrs	25 - 34 yrs	35 - 44 yrs	45 - 54 yrs	55 - 64 yrs	65 - 74 yrs	75+ yrs

- Respondents represented a range of age groups from 20 to 75+ years.
- Almost two thirds (52 or 60%) of respondents were between 45 and 74 years of age.
- One quarter of respondents (22 or 26%) were in the 20 to 44 year age range.
- Eleven respondents did not answer this question.