

**Minutes of Meeting
Planning and Environment Committee
Board of Parks and Recreation**

DATE OF MEETING: September 16, 2003

LOCATION: Kerrisdale Community Centre

ATTENDEES: **Park Board Commissioners**
Commissioner Eva Riccius, Chair
Commissioner Suzanne Anton
Commissioner Lyndsay Poaps
Commissioner Loretta Woodcock

Park Board Staff

Piet Rutgers, Director of Planning and Operations
Michel Desrochers, Park Planner
Liane McKenna, Director of Queen Elizabeth District
Bill Manning, Manager of Operations, Queen Elizabeth District

Consultants

Peter Kreuk, Durante Kreuk Ltd.
Thomas Gould, Durante Kreuk Ltd.

Public

Approximately 225 people attended the meeting

The meeting was called to order at 7:10 p.m.

INTRODUCTION

Commissioner Eva Riccius welcomed all to the meeting of the Planning and Environment Committee and the Commissioners introduced themselves. The Chair noted that the only agenda item for this evening's meeting was the proposed improvements for Quilchena Park.

PRESENTATION BY STAFF

Michel Desrochers, Park Planner, and Peter Kreuk, landscape architectural consultant, gave a presentation of the proposed improvements, touching on the following topics: drainage, pathways, entry features into the park, trees and shrubs, benches, picnic shelter, skateboard area, basketball court, off-leash dog area, and disc golf course. Also presented were the highlights of the public open house held on June 18, 2003.

PRESENTATION BY RESIDENTS AND PARK USERS

The following individuals were invited to present their views about the proposed improvements to the audience:

- Michael Demner from the Kerrisdale Soccer Club
- Michael McRae from the Disc Golf Association
- Maureen Hole as a dog owner and regular user of the off-leash area
- Aaron Orlando from the Vancouver Skatepark Coalition
- Alistair Reynolds as a local residents who skateboards
- Lauren Caldwell as a local resident living near the park and
- Louise Clement as a local resident living near the park.

Because of the high level of interest caused by the proposal to build a skateboarding facility at Quilchena Park, Inspector Dave Jones from the Vancouver Police Department was invited to discuss the relationship between skateboarding and potential criminal activity, a topic that had been brought up as a concern by many nearby homeowners.

ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS

The audience was invited to discuss and write down comments on the following questions at each of the 12 tables:

- what are the park's key qualities?
- what are the park's key deficiencies?
- general comments about proposed changes
- alternate locations for skateboard area?
- alternate locations for picnic shelter?
- pros and cons of perimeter pathways?
- pros and cons of picnic shelter?
- pros and cons of skateboard area?
- pros and cons of basketball court?
- pros and cons of reorganizing off-leash dog area?

The responses to these questions are attached to the minutes.

REPORT BACK TO LARGE GROUP

A member from each of the 12 tables was asked to summarize the discussion at their table.

CONCLUSION

Commissioner Riccius thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and putting forth their ideas and comments.

Meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Appendix A
Planning and Environment Committee
Board of Parks and Recreation
September 16, 2003

QUILCHENA PARK - PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS
COMMENTS WRITTEN AT EACH TABLE

What are the park's key qualities?

- Table 1: Open space feel; views; clean; maintain green space.
- Table 2: Open space; trees, grass; children, families, dogs (daily meeting place for owners and dogs); sports (games); community feeling; space to congregate.
- Table 3: Open green space, trees, quiet, alternative to urban landscape. The park's sheer size lends itself to many uses, skateboarding included, at 7.7 hectares, this should not pose a problem. There is ample space for many activities to take place. Perhaps a covered area needs to be carefully placed - in some corner away from residential housing. Quilchena Park is an extremely large park, allowing somewhat loud activities being able to be practised with minimal residential disturbance. Neighbourhood park catering to nearby residents, not the rest of the residents of the West Side.
- Table 4: Size. Location. Quiet. Safe.
- Table 5: Views. Greenery (lots of trees). Tranquillity. Co-existence of activities. Size. Well-used park.
- Table 6: Good size. Good location. Used by wide cross section of people. No busy streets. Great slopes for winter sliding. Playing fields for soccer, ultimate and baseball.
- Table 7: Location / position. Size: big park. Multi-use. Accessibility. Visibility. Trees. Peaceful.
- Table 8: View - SE corner is best view. Expansiveness of park. Sense of community created by team sports. Bird species - natural habitat for birdwatching. Trees - good. Green space in an urban area.
- Table 9: Pastoral, community park. Green spaces. Multiple activities. Open green spaces. Well used. Very picturesque. Meets the needs of various groups. Big, desirable green space. Historical value. Current uses are well-integrated (i.e. lack of noise, disruption).
- Table 10: Green spaces. Views. Sports fields. Playground. Size. Tree buffer. Mixed use compatible.
- Table 11: Close to homes. Close to many schools. Loves hearing the sports, the cheering. Likes location of children's park (away from roads).
- Table 12: Trees. Views. Open green space.

What are the park's key deficiencies?

- Table 1: Very poor drainage interferes with all activities; limited facilities in children's playground; improvements for all ages of playground equipment instead of basketball court and picnic shelter; not very interesting vegetation and trees.
- Table 2: Poor drainage; no parking; security at night; poor lighting; traffic congestion (poor access for emergency vehicles); bike lockups; money to program the skateboard area.
- Table 3: Poor drainage on fields and passive areas. No designated parking for skateboarders that come from other area outside this neighbourhood which the park is intended for. For size, it is under-utilized.
- Table 4: Drainage. Lack of skateboard facilities. Walking path.
- Table 5: Drainage! Relatively under-utilized. Nothing for youth. Lack of pathways. Lack of shelter. Lack of benches. No public phone in park for emergencies. No visual access to skatepark.
- Table 6: Poor drainage. Poor access from east side. Bottom of 29th has drug & alcohol problems. Soccer fields not proper size. Planting of trees need to be more open. Washrooms would be better located off Valley Drive between fields. Caretaker is not seen outside - no one there since February. Could use the putting green again! (artificial OK). Parking problems during sporting events. No soccer bleachers.
- Table 7: Park entries - some dangerous. Concern about railway tracks. Growth of brambles along tracks. Coyotes live in park. No amenities for teenagers. Lack of pathways. No division of space.
- Table 8: Some trees old/sick & need to be replaced. 1/2 of forested trees. More natural vegetation. Drainage insufficient. Accessibility - poor distribution of visitors. Not safe: attack Aug. 14. Lack of skateboarding facilities. Lack of security. Already very busy - traffic & cars.
- Table 9: Drainage - partly unusable in rainy season. Too much space allocated to baseball. Walking paths. Poor toilet facilities - often locked. Out of 10 people, two persons are satisfied with park as it is.
- Table 10: Drainage. Lack of pathways. Lack of maintenance of house and washrooms. Speed and parking on 33rd Avenue.
- Table 11: Top north end of the park is a problem (e.g. drinking, fires, drugs, fights).
- Table 12: Drainage.

General comments about proposed changes

- Table 1: Improvements to play area not discussed; basketball and skateboarding don't go together; basketball court not supported; skateboard parks needed on West Side; too many walkways, breaks up the park too much; seasonal pond not discussed; no money spent on park entrance signage.
- Table 2: Will there be adequate clean-up, garbage disposal for the picnic area? Picnic garbage removal from site? How often will garbage be removed? Picnic garbage might attract rats, mice and coyotes. Parking. Noise. Skateboard park not big enough (need more).
- Table 3: Much needed for those of us who live near the park but not close enough to enjoy it as a giant beautiful backyard for the perimeter property owners whose view is subsidized by the rest of the taxpayers! Drainage needed before any work is done. Perception that skateboarding is connected to vandalism, graffiti, etc. is incorrect. Graffiti exists without boarding: boarders are not all vandals.
- Table 4: Skatepark is a good idea.
- Table 5: About time that something is done. Finally a skateboard park in the West Side (is this the only reason for building it?). Should be a planning process in place to look at all possible locations for skateboard park. Will expand usage of park for youth. Fear of problems associated with skatepark (litter, graffiti). Proposed skateboard park is moderate in size. Will proposed skatepark affect drainage in that area?
- Table 6: Trails landscaping should not create unsafe places for women. Boarders like the skateboard park plan. Yes to jogging trail - include distance markers or make it 1 km. Bring back putting green. Lose the picnic shelter. Should clean out north-east corner: low or no planting - as it is now, it fosters drug use and danger to the young users of the park. Needs to be all weather landscaping. Basketball 1/2 could have mini-walls to facilitate street hockey use.
- Table 7: In favour of proposed changes to drainage. Skateboard park good idea as part of West Side skateboard plan. Possible relocate to schools. Don't need covered picnic area. Make the park safe and secure / take care of right of way. Concern about additional noise. Who will enforce the curfew. Will there be additional clean up staff? Each neighbourhood could use a skate park.
- Table 8: Explore all sports for use of parks - tennis, lacrosse, field hockey, badminton, volleyball. Poor location for skateboard park. Good location for skateboard park. Re-location of picnic area. Pro dog off-leash area.
- Table 9: Changes unnecessary. Skateboard facility - not many skaters at too great expense. Agree with majority of changes (written down twice). Agree with changes - not including skateboarding, basketball, picnic shelter (written down twice). Agree with majority of changes, especially drainage, walkways, skateboard, picnic shelter. Agree with changes not including picnic shelter.
- Table 10: Picnic shelter not a great idea! Pathways not necessary on perimeter: Valley Drive only. Drainage: a must. Skateboard principal a good idea - Quilchena Park in question as a prime location! Which came first - the money or the idea for the skateboard park? It feels like the \$ have driven the skateboard idea - we have the money and must spend it.
- Table 11: Should get the skateboard park. Better access for ambulance to skateboard park. Skateboard park will be too close (to) kids area (younger kids hearing bad language). Drainage - excellent idea. Pathways - excellent idea.
- Table 12: Most will improve use of park.

Alternate locations for skateboard area?

- Table 1: OK where it is - farther away from children's play area?
- Table 2: Prince-of-Wales Park. Just a first park. Pt.-Grey/Kerrisdale Arena Area. Kerrisdale Community Centre.
- Table 3: Queen Elizabeth Park (near tennis courts). Stanley Park. Spanish Banks area. Jericho Beach. UBC grounds. School grounds.
- Table 4: Kits Beach.
- Table 5: Chaldecott Park. Queen Elizabeth Park. Kitsilano Park. Vanier Park. Angus Lands. Jericho Park. Back of Prince-of-Wales.
- Table 6: Dunbar Community Centre. Kerrisdale Community Centre. Maple Grove Park.
- Table 7: Schools. CP right-of-way.
- Table 8: Review all other parks in city of Vancouver for all recreation activities. More urban location.
- Table 9: Local schoolyards. Cyclone Taylor Arena (Kerrisdale skating). Covered facility/concession (year-round): school or community centre.
- Table 10: Behind the Kerrisdale Arena. Kerrisdale Community Centre. Balaclava Park.
- Table 11: Prince-of-Wales South. Move skateboard park area to southwest corner because parking, access medical whatever, visibility for security. Away from washrooms and drinking area, may impact disc golf and dog off-leash area.
- Table 12: Prince-of-Wales.

Alternate locations for picnic shelter?

- Table 1: Nowhere in park.
- Table 2: N/A
- Table 3: We don't need one anywhere. Picnics on the grass are real picnics.
- Table 4: N/A
- Table 5: Further away from Hellenic Centre (to avoid spill out). Will it even get used by residents? Or just by people from the centre?
- Table 6: Area need further thought and review.
- Table 7: N/A
- Table 8: Closer to SE corner & view.
- Table 9: N/A
- Table 10: None.
- Table 11: Do we need a covered shelter area? Covered areas attracts late night partiers and others.
- Table 12: Northeast corner.

Pros of perimeter pathways?

- Table 1: Good idea; better use of space; gravel is a good idea.
- Table 2: Great for walking and running (healthy activity). Unleashed dogs should be behind a fence.
- Table 3: As a dog walking - very much needed.
- Table 4: Woodchips and gravel: good for walking and running.
- Table 5: Provide exercise. Easier to get around park. Reduce damage to grass.
- Table 6: Jogging. Access to playing fields.
- Table 7: N/A
- Table 8: Accessibility. Distribution of people. Handicap access.
- Table 9: 10 in favour.
- Table 10: Damage to field when wet. Boggy friendly. Jogger friendly.
- Table 11: Asphalt for bike riders and rollerbladers.
- Table 12: More use of park.

Cons of perimeter pathways?

- Table 1: N/A
- Table 2: N/A
- Table 3: N/A
- Table 4: None.
- Table 5: Depends on how it is done. As long as it doesn't fall apart.
- Table 6: N/A
- Table 7: N/A
- Table 8: No blacktop please.
- Table 9: N/A
- Table 10: Change of feeling in park (too formal).
- Table 11: Wood chips - slivers if you fall down. Rollerbladers on hard surface pathways conflicting with walkers.
- Table 12: N/A

Pros of picnic shelter?

- Table 1: None.
Table 2: N/A
Table 3: None.
Table 4: Sit down and rest. Get away from the rain.
Table 5: Provide shelter when it rains. Suitable for family picnics.
Table 6: Dry place for soccer players - but too far from fields.
Table 7: N/A
Table 8: Gives people in apartments an outdoor space to go. Please no rentals of picnic areas.
Table 9: Park is useless on rainy days - refuge in rain. Shelter for smokers - cater to all community members.
Table 10: None.
Table 11: N/A
Table 12: Make park more usable during foul weather.

Cons of picnic shelter?

- Table 1: Covered late night drinking space is a bad idea.
Table 2: Attract late night users from Hellenic Centre. Encourages night time congregating. Partying people. Garbage build-up. Garbage removal. Large crowds, inadequate parking. Traffic. Rats, mice (eating garbage). Fear of barbequing & fire.
Table 3: N/A
Table 4: Late night abuses of substances. Party goers.
Table 5: Worries over after-hours use. Another location for this shelter in the park.
Table 6: Concerns over overnight use.
Table 7: Noisy gatherings after hours.
Table 8: Doesn't enhance natural beauty. Will the neighbours use it? Has a survey of neighbours been done? Late night partying has been a problem in the park - also murder & several assault occurred.
Table 9: Unnecessary. Expensive. Encourage illegitimate use of park. Late-night use.
Table 10: Late night party (outsiders), etc. Changes fundamental use of park.
Table 11: N/A
Table 12: After hours - potential target of mischief.

Pros of skateboard area?

- Table 1: Safe environment for skateboard; builds a community; a space for creativity.
- Table 2: Availability. Positive activity. Healthy past-time.
- Table 3: Mothers won't have to drive many kilometers to watch for hours kids skateboarding at skateparks in other areas. Increase park utilization. Great idea. Additional activity to keep kids off the streets and away from idleness. Much needed on West Side; currently skateboarders have to skate downtown and deal with security guards or drive half hour or more just for a 2 hour session.
- Table 4: Provides local area to skateboard. Meeting area. Convenience of location. Safe environment. Training space for future pros. Access to opportunity.
- Table 5: Safety for kids. Provide facility for youth. Amenity to families with teenagers. Exercise opportunity for youth. Keep kids in their neighbourhood.
- Table 6: Entertainment watching boarders perform. Get kids off street boarding. Social activity crosses age groups.
- Table 7: Place and activity for local youth. Good way to divert youth away from criminal activity. Healthy exercise.
- Table 8: Finally, won't have to drive to skateboard at a park. There are many kids of all ages skateboarding in our community, they would be well served to have somewhere close to go to where they are welcomed.
- Table 9: Keeps young people from playing in street. Safety. Keep youth home in West End out of East Side. Would be sanctioned place. Encourage healthful, positive activity.
- Table 10: Healthy activity for neighbourhood kids. Keeps kids safe to skate off street. Legal skating.
- Table 11: N/A
- Table 12: Lack of facilities currently on West Side.

Cons of skateboard area?

- Table 1: Should it be so close to children's play area? More separation may be a good idea.
- Table 2: Too close to children's area.
- Table 3: 700 signatures from as far away as Pt. Grey (a 2 mile drive) for kids to skateboard at this "non-destination", "strictly neighbourhood" facility: noise, traffic, etc., etc. Reality is there'll be skateboarders from the whole West Side congregating at Quilchena Park - parking? traffic?
- Table 4: Noise. Proximity to playground.
- Table 5: Disturbance of other uses. Possible change in demographics in park. Will drainage be affected by proposed skatepark?
- Table 6: Possibly scary for young kids in playground. Liability issues.
- Table 7: Noise.
- Table 8: Poor location - too close to residential area. Review all parks for facilities with public input. Concerns about proximity to children's playground. Not sure it reflects all neighbourhood children - concern of high use from children & youth outside the area.
- Table 9: Not ideal location (skatepark is OK but not well located). No more concrete. Noisy. Graffiti - cost of removal.
- Table 10: Location and size. Dogs and skating not a great mix. Possible increase in garbage. Question: maintenance of.
- Table 11: N/A
- Table 12: Increased use of roadways / paths in area for transport via boarding to park.

Pros of basketball court?

- Table 1: Not necessary - why do we need it.
- Table 2: Other areas to play basketball. Makes more noise than skateboarding.
- Table 3: There are already lots of hoops in the area. Is the added noise justified?
- Table 4: Youth activity.
- Table 5: Increase activity for youth. Same points as skatepark.
- Table 6: Need fence to stop balls on missed shots. Good location - why 1/2 court?
- Table 7: Place and activity for local youth.
- Table 8: Please Parks Board, security for night and evening use.
- Table 9: N/A
- Table 10: N/A
- Table 11: N/A
- Table 12: None.

Cons of basketball court?

- Table 1: Not supported. Better to have a skateboard park only. Already lots of basketball courts in area.
- Table 2: N/A
- Table 3: N/A
- Table 4: Enough basketball courts already.
- Table 5: Same as skatepark. 3 schools with basketball courts nearby.
- Table 6: Noise.
- Table 7: Noise.
- Table 8: 1/2 court not as useful. Not sure it is needed.
- Table 9: Duplication - already at all schools. More asphalt.
- Table 10: Unused school courts. Open gyms. Not needed.
- Table 11: There are already enough at the school.
- Table 12: Already enough courts in area.

Pros of reorganizing off-leash dog area?

- Table 1: Good idea to have an outside boundary.
Table 2: A runway that is fenced. For people who fear and don't trust an animal. Is next to children's playground - no good.
Table 3: Another space for the ever growing population of canines. Is perhaps the only way to preserve the green space for everyone.
Table 4: Good for dogs and dog owners.
Table 5: Creates boundaries.
Table 6: This is a better shape than the present one.
Table 7: N/A
Table 8: With full public input.
Table 9: 10 in favour.
Table 10: N/A
Table 11: Good idea so that areas for other users can be respected.
Table 12: Great.

Cons of reorganizing off-leash dog area?

- Table 1: N/A
Table 2: N/A
Table 3: N/A
Table 4: Interferes with other activities.
Table 5: Will there still be enough room for dogs if it is reorganized?
Table 6: N/A
Table 7: N/A
Table 8: How will dogs be kept in designated area? Will it be big enough for all neighbourhood dogs?
Table 9: N/A
Table 10: N/A
Table 11: N/A
Table 12: None.