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Section 1: Introduction

Purpose of the Master Plan

In 2010, the Municipality of Brighton completed its Vision for Recreation, Trails and Green Space Master Plan that included 60 recommendations regarding indoor sports and recreation facilities, arts and culture facilities, scheduled outdoor facilities, programs and activities, park planning, green space management, trails, recreation and tourism, policies, procedures, and capital and operating budgets. Within a number of these areas, reference was made to the need for a comprehensive examination of the future of King Edward Park and its associated indoor and outdoor recreation facilities. This Indoor Recreational Facilities Master Plan builds upon the 2010 Vision document in providing a needs analysis with respect to the provision of the following indoor facility types across the Municipality of Brighton:

- ice pads;
- curling sheets;
- gymnasiums;
- youth space;
- multi-purpose space;
- senior’s space; and
- a basic review of library and cultural space.

Recommendations regarding scope, timing and, estimated high-level costs, have emerged through the assessment phase of the study, building upon past studies, demographics, usage data, targeted research, and input from staff and stakeholders. The Indoor Recreational Facilities Master Plan is accompanied by the King Edward Park Master Plan, which identifies the vision for the King Edward Park and its outdoor amenities, as well as the inclusion of conceptual facility designs and park layouts based in part on the data and analysis found herein.

Study Context

King Edward Park, located at the corner of Elizabeth Street and Pinnacle Street South, is the marquee recreation site within the Municipality and includes the following amenities: one ice pad; community centre; one full-size lit soccer field, one intermediate soccer field, and two mini soccer fields; two lit baseball diamonds; two lit tennis courts; skateboard park; picnic pavilion; curling facility (including 4 curling sheets); several play structures; a concession/washroom facility; and a picnic pavilion. In addition to King Edward Park, the Municipality is also home to an additional five parks that include a total of 3 ball diamonds, 5 play structures, and 4 pavilions/gazebos. The Brighton Public Library has two branches – Codrington Community Centre and at the Municipal Office Building. Brighton is a vibrant community that hosts a number of events (e.g., Winterfest, Applefest, etc.) and is home to a variety of community organizations that provide a range of events and programs.
Report Organization

The King Edward Park and Indoor Recreational Facilities Master Plan is organized as follows:

Section 1: Introduction
Describes the purpose of the Master Plan and the general study context.

Section 2: Community Profile
Contains an overview of the Municipality’s demographic characteristics and population projections.

Section 3: Trends in Parks & Recreation
Contains an overview of relevant facility and activity trends with discussion regarding their significance for the Municipality of Brighton.

Section 4: Consultation Summary
Summarizes the input received from key stakeholders that utilize the King Edward Park, its facilities, and others within the Municipality.

Section 5: Indoor Recreational Facility Inventory and Assessment
Provides inventories of the Municipality’s existing indoor recreational facilities, as well as assessments of each relevant facility type and recommendations regarding the Municipality’s current and future needs.

Section 6: King Edward Park Concept Plan
Provides rationale and conceptual design and layout drawings for the preferred components of the King Edward Park.

Section 7: Capital Cost Estimates and Implementation Plan
Contains capital cost estimates for facility development, high-level operating budget recommendations, and the scope, timing, and phasing to enable the implementation of a multi-use recreational facility.
Section 2: Community Profile

In order to provide the Municipality of Brighton with a comprehensive and community-specific assessment of indoor recreational needs, it is imperative to first gain an understanding of the community’s residents through an analysis of its demographics (e.g., ages, incomes, ethnicities, etc.).

Regional Location and Population

The Municipality of Brighton is located within Northumberland County in Central Ontario, bordering on Hastings County to the east, the Township of Cramahe to the west, the Municipality of Trent Hills to the north, and Lake Ontario to the south. The Municipality was created as a result of the amalgamation of the Town of Brighton and Brighton Township and had a 2006 Census population of 10,255. The Municipality’s location is between Toronto (approximately 2 hours west) and Kingston (approximately 1.5 hours east) with access to the 401, providing for convenient travel opportunities for residents and visitors alike.

The 2006 Census records the Municipality’s population as 10,255, which represented an 8.5% increase over the 2001 population and there has been some population growth over the past 20 years (21% total growth between 1991 and 2006).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>8,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>9,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>9,449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10,255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada Census, 1991-2006; does not include Census undercount; 1991 and 1996 populations were calculated by adding recorded Census populations for the former Town of Brighton and Brighton Township.

The Municipality’s 2010 Vision for Recreation, Trails and Green Space (prepared by Dillon Consulting and Mehak, Kelly & Associates, Inc.) conducted a population forecasting exercise based upon the Municipality of Brighton’s Official Plan Final Draft (July 13, 2010). Therefore, to ensure consistency with the existing Vision document, the following population projections will be used:
In order to better identify the needs of the immediate community in the King Edward Park area of Brighton, an analysis of the Brighton Public School and East Northumberland Secondary School populations was undertaken. The Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board provided the results of its recently completed projection exercise for future enrolment, as well as average daily enrolment for the past five school years at Brighton Public School and East Northumberland Secondary School (note: this is not total school population, but average daily attendance over the entire school year):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>Brighton Public School</th>
<th>East Northumberland Secondary School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006-2007 (actual)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-2008 (actual)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>1,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-2009 (actual)</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>1,323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010 (actual)</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>1,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011 (actual)</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-2012 (actual)</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>1,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-2013 (projected)</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>1,126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-2014 (projected)</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>1,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-2015 (projected)</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>1,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-2016 (projected)</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>1,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-2017 (projected)</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>1,007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board.

The table above shows a sharp increase in students projected for the 2012-2013 school year at Brighton Public School, which reflects the addition of the extended French immersion program at the grade 5 level next year. With respect to the distribution of students in specific grades, Brighton Public School has had a fairly constant number of students in kindergarten (junior and senior) for the past 6 years, with approximately 35-40 new students each year. The school has also seen a small increase in 8-12 year olds (grades 3-7), which is attributed to students from families that are transferred to Canadian Forces Base Trenton; these students are often at Brighton Public School for a few years and then their families are transferred. Brighton Public School is the only public elementary school in the Municipality that draws students from in town, as Spring Valley and Smithfield cover the rural areas of Brighton. Essentially, this means that there are very young children (4-5 years old) and older children (8-12), with a bit of a gap in the first through third grade age children. While the Brighton Public School population has fluctuated over the past 5 school years, with the 2010-2011 average daily enrolment representing a 5 year high, the ENSS population appears to have been in steady decline over the same time period.

Sources: Municipality of Brighton Official Plan Final Draft (July 13, 2010) and Municipality of Brighton Vision for Recreation, Trails and Green Space Background Report (September 13, 2010).

Source: Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board

The Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board’s projections for Brighton Public School show some growth (approximately 115 students) between 2006-2007 and 2016-2017, while the East Northumberland Secondary School Population is anticipated to steadily decline through 2016-2017. It is anticipated that the continued growth at the elementary levels may be reflected in the secondary school population in time.

**Age Profile**

Age plays an important role in determining the types of activities that residents are likely to pursue. For example, children and youth are more likely to participate in active sports (e.g., soccer, skateboarding, etc.) than older adults, many of whom prefer more passive activities such as personal fitness or hiking. However, it should be noted that there is a growing trend among today’s older adults to continue participate in active sports later in life, albeit at a lower intensity.

**Comparison of Populations by Age Cohort, Brighton and Ontario, 2006**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Cohort</th>
<th>Population (2006)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>#</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-64</td>
<td>3,840</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,255</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Statistics Canada Census, 2006; does not include Census undercount.

According to the 2006 Census, the median age within the Municipality of Brighton is 46.5 years, which is significantly higher than the provincial average of 39 years. Further, the Municipality’s median age in
2001 was 42.7 years, suggesting that Brighton as a whole is aging. This is a common trend across Ontario, and may impact the types of facilities and programs offered by communities.

As the table above illustrates, the Municipality of Brighton has significantly fewer adults between the ages of 20 and 39 (18.8% compared to the provincial figure of 26.5%) and a significantly higher percentage of older adults aged 65 and over (23.2% compared to the provincial figure of 13.6%). Overall, the Municipality of Brighton has an older age profile than the province as a whole. The lower percentage of adults has a direct impact on the number of children in a community as fewer adults in the child-bearing years exist.

**Income, Education and Ethnicity**

Research suggests that income and education are variables which tend to influence participation in physical and social pursuits. Generally speaking, the higher the level of income and education attained, the more likely a person is to participate in leisure activities. The 2006 Census found the Municipality’s median income of $54,278 for all private households to be lower than the provincial average of $60,455 and the median income of persons 15 years or over ($23,574) to be below the provincial average ($29,335) as well; this could suggest that leisure participation in Brighton may be lower than average based solely on level of income. This correlation may be offset to some degree by a lower cost of living in Brighton relative to the provincial average, as evidenced by the average value of owned dwellings in Brighton ($208,325) and Ontario ($297,479) in 2005.

Research compiled by Statistics Canada shows that a person’s income tends to increase with age, with the highest incomes being associated with the 55 to 65 age cohort. This group includes members of the ‘Baby Boom’ generation, who are generally wealthier than past generations of older adults, and will likely have accrued sufficient savings to pursue their chosen recreation and leisure activities. The Municipality of Brighton’s high percentage (23.2%) of the population aged 65 and over may influence the impact of this statistical category on recreational participation. In addition, older adults are participating in recreation much later in life and in more activities in which they have been involved throughout their lives (e.g., hockey, soccer, etc.).

### Median Income of All Private Households, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Brighton</th>
<th>Ontario</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons 15 years and over with income</td>
<td>$23,574</td>
<td>$29,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All private households</td>
<td>$54,278</td>
<td>$60,455</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Statistics Canada Census, 2006.*
The level of education attained can also impact participation rates, with many studies correlating increased participation levels with higher degrees of education. The 2006 Census reported that the Municipality of Brighton’s levels of education attained are similar to that of the provincial average, with the exception of those that have earned a University certificate, diploma or degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level Attained</th>
<th>% of Population (15 years and over)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No certificate, diploma or degree</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school certificate or equivalent</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apprenticeship or trades certificate or diploma</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, CEGEP or other non-university certificate or diploma</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University certificate or diploma below the bachelor level</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University certificate, diploma or degree</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The 2006 Census reported that 12% of the Municipality’s residents are immigrants, compared to 28% of the provincial population. This suggests that the residents of Brighton can generally be expected to seek traditional leisure activities and facilities. Even so, the Municipality should be prepared to receive requests regarding the provision of non-traditional activities (e.g., cricket, ethnic cooking classes, etc.).

Each of these areas of demography must be reflected upon in concert with the others, as well as with the existing participation patterns, and input from stakeholders and staff; therefore, while one may indicate a higher propensity for participation and another may indicate lower, the community of Brighton’s unique demographic profile must be considered as a whole.
Section 3: Trends in Parks & Recreation

Throughout the years, a variety of trends have emerged with respect to the provision of recreation and parks activities, participation levels within these areas of interest, and park design. These trends are explored below, including discussion of the local context in each case.

Recreation Activity Participation Trends

Aging Population

Members of the ‘baby boomer’ demographic are quickly reaching retirement age, resulting in 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 have greater amounts of disposable income and be 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 some that reflect the historical interests for seniors, such as curling, card playing, and carpet bowling, 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 million\(^1\).

Local Context

The Municipality of Brighton’s population is, on average, older than the province as a whole. The 2006 Census reported that 23% of Brighton’s population was 65 years and older, and the Municipality’s average age was 46.5 years, nearly 4 years older than the provincial median. The Municipality does not offer direct programming, but there are a few organizations within Brighton oriented to older adults, including the Probus Club, Thursday Night Old-Old Timers Hockey, Lions Club, Kin Club, etc.

Emerging Recreation Activities

Across Ontario, there are numerous recreation and leisure activities that are increasing in popularity and are providing rationale for the inclusion of such facilities in municipal inventories. Brief descriptions of some of these activities follow:

- **Skateboarding** is one of the country’s fastest growing sports and demand for skateboard parks is high. Skateboarding is becoming a mainstream sport as more municipalities are providing skate parks as a basic level of service.
- **BMX / trick cycling** has also become a growth area in recent years and this activity can share many of the same facilities used by skateboarders.
- **Inline Skating** has increased in popularity as skaters can make use of paved infrastructure such as roads, sidewalks and trails, as well as skateboard parks for those desiring to add an ‘extreme’ element to the sport.

---

\(^1\) CBC News. (2007). *Boomers to reshape what it means to be a senior*. Available online at www.cbc.ca.
• **Mountain biking** is another form of cycling that has gained popularity – municipalities, especially those with significant natural open spaces and different terrain, are increasingly providing designated mountain biking areas and parks which can also help protect sensitive environmental areas by discouraging unregulated use through the provision of a regulated area in which the activity can take place safely.

• **Beach Volleyball & Pick-Up Basketball** remain popular amongst youth and young adults as activities that can be played in a flexible, non-structured environment.

• **Eco-tourism** and outdoor passive recreation is a growing market segment as people become increasingly aware of environmental issues. Trips to conservation areas continue to increase in popularity, as individuals and families take an interest in natural heritage (activities such as bird watching, wildlife viewing, hiking have strong growth profiles).

**Local Context**
The Municipality of Brighton currently provides one skateboard park at King Edward Park, which is made up of non-permanent, modular elements. The Municipality is home to the Brighton Waterfront Trail, which travels through a freshwater dune system and wetlands. Additional local non-municipal supply of trails and eco-tourism locations can be found in Presqu’ile Provincial Park, just south of the Municipality.

**Arts and Cultural Trends**
Arts and culture have long been recognized as providing a multitude of benefits to those involved by allowing individuals to creatively express themselves, diversify the level of cultural understanding for themselves and others, provide inspiration, and recognize significant community contributions. Nationwide, absolute attendance for most arts and culture events has increased over the past two to three decades; however, these increases have not generally kept pace with population growth. The ‘baby boom’ generation may create renewed interest in the arts and cultural sector due to greater amounts of free time and increased disposable incomes. Art and cultural classes have been reduced in many schools, thereby shifting the provision responsibility for these opportunities to the municipality and the community.
Local Context
The Municipality of Brighton has a number of cultural organizations, as well as an Arts Council that is open to artists of all disciplines and those who support them. The group meets monthly and participates in a number of community events and facilitates arts shows and sales for local artists. In addition, the Municipality is home to the Brighton Barn Theatre, Proctor House Museum, Proctor Simpson Agriculture Museum, and Memory Junction Railway Museum. The primary cultural events hosted in Brighton are Winterfest and Applefest. Winterfest includes dinners, sport exhibitions, traditional winter activities (e.g., snowman building and hay rides), concerts, and social events. Applefest is held in September and includes dances, children’s activities, a street fair, arts and crafts, car show, and a parade.

Increased Inactivity and Obesity

The Government of Canada undertook the Canadian Fitness Survey (CFS) in 1981, and released the results of the updated Canadian Health Measures Survey (CHMS) in early 2010. Comparisons made between the two studies showed that overall results were “more favourable in the earlier survey, implying that the fitness of the nation has declined over the past two decades.” In 2006, it was reported that the proportion of obese children had increased threefold in the preceding 25 years, and less than half of all Canadian children were active enough to achieve optimal growth and development.

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. The number of overweight and obese Canadians has tripled (quadrupled in some age groups) between 1981 and 2009. Additional concerns include the progressive decrease in aerobic fitness values with age – the CHMS reports that approximately 25% of adults between the ages of 20 and 39 had aerobic fitness values in the very good/excellent range, but “by ages 60-69 years, only 10% of males and fewer than 5% of females remained in this category.”

As well, young Canadian adults have exhibited decreased fitness levels between 1981 and 2009; only 5% of men and 6% of women between the ages of 20 and 39 were considered at high risk for health problems in 1981, but those percentages had increased to 21% of men and 31% of women by 2009. Health risks of obesity include Type 2 diabetes, stroke, mental health problems (e.g., depression, low self-esteem), high blood pressure and stroke. Regular physical activity and sport participation can serve as preventive measures for these diseases, and help reduce health care costs, as physical inactivity costs Canadians $5.3 billion annually in direct and indirect costs.

Local Context
The Municipality of Brighton is not a direct provider of sport and recreation programming, but does have an arena, sports fields, and multi-purpose space available for rental for these activities. Minor sports teams receive discounted rental fees, which promotes the use of these facilities by children and

---


6 Ibid.


youth in the community. The YMCA of Northumberland also has a satellite site in Brighton that provides access to fitness equipment and fitness classes for its members, including specialized instruction for youth between the ages of 11 and 15.

**Lack of Free 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 creating the need to have leisure services open later and the need to promote drop-in opportunities. Similarly, the changing face of the Canadian family, with many lone-parent families, is putting significant time pressures and 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. The average Canadian has only 6 hours of free time a day (including 2 hours devoted to TV) and is presented with an unprecedented range of opportunities in the marketplace (e.g., the 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 age cohort have the least (3 hours per day). This supports the notion that casual and unstructured activities, as well as events and programs for older adults, will offer the greatest opportunity for growth.

**Local Context**

The Municipality of Brighton has a number of parks and trails that provide opportunities for drop-in recreation and leisure activities, which allow residents to participate when they have time, rather than on a schedule set by a service provider. Youth in Brighton have access to The Beacon Youth Drop-in Centre on Alice Street, which provides a place for youth to hang out and meet new friends, and The Friendly Drop-in Centre offers twice weekly drop-in time for adults at the Municipal Administration Offices. In addition, the Codrington Community Association offers some opportunities at the Codrington Community Centre, including a weekly breakfast, social times, and open mic nights.

**Income and Affordability of Recreation and Leisure Opportunities**

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 an increase in their income by 14%, 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 Municipality of Brighton has a median income ($54,728) that is lower than the provincial average ($60,455), which may impact participation in leisure. The Municipality does not participate in the direct delivery of services, but does provide contact information on its website about a number of social service agencies that operate in Brighton and Northumberland County, including: Northumberland County Community & Social Services; Big Brother and Big Sisters Northumberland, Brighton Community Access Program; Community Advocacy Services; Brighton Fair Share Food Bank; Community Living; Career Edge; and Watton Employment Services. These organizations, among others, help the residents of Brighton to maintain a high quality of life and access programs and services in the community.

**Facility Trends**

**Aging Infrastructure**

A 2007 study by Parks and Recreation Ontario identified that 30-50% of recreation facilities in Ontario are near the end of their useful life. In fact, infrastructure province-wide is chronically under-funded, though these pressures were somewhat alleviated through the Recreational Infrastructure Canada (RInC) funding that was launched as an element of Canada’s Economic Action Plan in May 2009 and provided $500 million for construction-ready infrastructure projects that were to be completed by March 31, 2011.

**Local Context**
The Municipality of Brighton’s existing indoor recreational infrastructure includes the King Edward Park Community Centre and the Codrington Community Centre. In addition, the Brighton & District Curling Club operates out of a municipally owned facility. Each of these facilities is over 30 years old, and in need of repairs and/or renovation now or in the near future to remain safe and available for use. Each facility will also need to be retrofitted to adhere to AODA standards within the next 15 years, which may require extensive redesign. The Municipality recently constructed an addition to the King Edward Park Community Centre, which includes accessible changerooms and a community centre.

**Multi-use Facilities**

Communities are moving away from single-purpose, stand-alone facilities in favour of multi-use facilities that integrate numerous activities and offer economies of scale with respect to construction, maintenance, staffing, scheduling, etc. Multi-use facilities are often designed with flexible spaces (e.g., meeting rooms, gymnasiums, etc.) and the potential to expand and easily respond to changing trends and demands of future users. In addition, the ability to offer cross-programming opportunities (e.g., ice, fitness, gym space, community space, libraries, etc.) and their responsiveness to limited free time that most families have available make them an attractive ‘one-stop shopping’ destination. Many users are

---

increasingly expecting aesthetically pleasing and comfortable facilities, with sitting areas, open concepts designs, and accessible viewing areas for amenities such as pools and arenas. In some municipalities, there is a growing trend of locating a number of other services at larger complexes, such as municipal offices and bill payment kiosks, community supports and resources (e.g., employment centres, counselling services, food distribution, etc.), library services, healthcare (e.g., walk-in clinics, physiotherapy, etc.). While multi-use facilities are recommended in most municipalities, it is also necessary to ensure reasonable geographic accessibility for rural residents in communities like Brighton. This can be accomplished by maintaining existing single-use facilities to satisfy geographic distribution requirements for community space.

Local Context
Following the recent construction of the addition at the King Edward Park Community Centre, the Municipality now has two multi-use leisure facilities. The King Edward Park Community Centre has a single-pad arena and a community centre, and the Codrington Community Centre has a hall and library branch. Each of these facilities is also co-located with outdoor recreation facilities.

Accessibility

The Ontarians with Disabilities Act has been amended to require each municipality to update their Disabilities/Accessibility Plan every year. The purpose of the Act is to “improve opportunities for persons with disabilities and to provide for their involvement in the identification, removal and prevention of barriers to their full participation in the life of the province”\(^\text{10}\) (c.32, s.1). Barriers are defined to include anything that prevents a person with a disability from fully participating in all aspects of society because of his or her disability, including physical, architectural, informational, communicational, attitudinal, technological, or policy/practice barriers. For recreation and parks facilities, this could include accessibility to facilities, ramps to entrances, proper lighting, clearly marked identification signs, removal of barriers from the pedestrian path (e.g., garbage bins) and hand rails.

The provision of family change rooms is also a new trend in accessibility, largely driven by the need for caregivers to access spaces where their children or those with special needs require a separate changing area. For example, shifts in family structures and work patterns have created instances where a single caregiver needs to assist their child who is of the opposite sex but too old to enter into the change area accessible to the caregiver. Similarly, family change rooms may be equipped with specialized chairs or restroom facilities to better assist those with disabilities.

Local Context
Although some areas of Brighton’s existing arena are not accessible to all, the recent arena expansion is fully accessible, as the new community centre and changerooms were designed to allow for wheelchair access. The Codrington Community Centre is also understood to be fully accessible.

Public-Private Partnerships

Municipalities are facing ever-increasing expectations from their residents. There is a growing realization, however, that municipalities cannot be everything to everyone. 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 day and age to effectively and efficiently provide for the leisure needs of citizens. Not only is there growing interest in public-private partnerships (P3s), but also in arrangements with Trusts acting on behalf of community organizations and formal operating or cost-sharing relationships with school boards as well as user/community groups.

A 2006 survey that investigated the level of support amongst Canadians for P3’s, 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 services. Furthermore, 72% agree that P3s should be used in the Recreation sector to improve or create new facilities and programs (the sector with the highest support for P3s). 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.

A report investigating P3s conducted for the Ontario Ministry of Citizenship, Culture and Recreation observed that several municipalities are engaged in relationships with private interests without a general framework or pre-established protocol to guide the partnership processes. In the absence of a framework, knee-jerk decisions became commonplace causing difficulty in effectively creating a successful relationship. Municipal officials expressed a strong desire for a standardized approach for the evaluation of partnership strategies, the selection of partners and to ensure that the risks and benefits of the partnership are mutually shared.

Local Context
The Municipality of Brighton, as a facilitator rather than direct service provider, is reliant on a variety of organizations to supply its residents with recreation opportunities. For example, the Municipality provides contact information for a number of organizations on its website to educate its residents about existing opportunities in the community. In addition, the Municipality has an agreement with the Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board to utilize school sports fields for community use in non-school hours. Organizations like the Codrington Community Association, PROBUS Club, and the Winterfest and Applefest organizing committees utilize municipal facilities to provide community programming. These relationships are beneficial to all as the community has access to recreation and leisure opportunities without the Municipality realizing high program staffing costs; the Municipality, in turn, provides access to its facilities, maintenance of same, and promotion of these opportunities to its residents.
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Park Design and Utilization Trends

Environmental Stewardship

The importance of environmental protection is being increasingly recognized by society. As the population ages and people become more aware of the benefits of environmental protection, demand for passive settings that connect people to nature is increasing. Municipalities are placing a greater emphasis on the ‘development’ of passive park spaces. 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.

Local Context

The Municipality of Brighton is located just north of Presqu’ile Provincial Park, which is a popular site for viewing migrating birds and monarch butterflies. The Friends of Presqu’ile is a non-profit, charitable organization that is dedicated to supporting and enhancing the educational and interpretive aspects of Presqu’ile Provincial Park. The group is an important environmental stewardship organization that promotes the ecological wellbeing of the area.

Safety and Security

Park design is one method by which safety and security can be fostered. Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) is an approach through which criminal behaviour is deterred in part through the design and layout of the built environment. The elimination of areas within public spaces that are conducive to criminal activity can help to reduce this type of behaviour. The presence of good signage/gateway features is the first impression that a park user will have of the park and the parks system as a whole. The presence of signage is an important element in promoting recognition and stewardship in the community. Without proper and consistent signage, park users may be confused about the property’s ownership. A good sign is clear, attractive and designed in context to its surroundings (in this case, parks and open spaces). Often, the addition of lighting throughout a park, reduction in the number of hidden areas, location of parks near other amenities and sidewalks, providing one identifiable point of entry, and incorporating aesthetically pleasing landscaping, trees and design to entice positive use, are all methods through which CPTED can deter negative behaviours within parks.

Local Context

The Municipality of Brighton’s main park – King Edward Park – is visible from the surrounding streets (although the tennis courts do obstruct part of the view into the park), provides a great deal of open space with few ‘hidden’ areas. The skateboard park has been the site of some graffitti, but the Municipality has attempted to make it as visible space as possible through the use of short chain link fencing. In addition, the parking lot is large and well-lit, and there are two primary points of entry to the park. The playground located at Codrington Park is set back near the woods, which is not an ideal location in terms of safety and security, but the rest of the park is quite open and the entire park is visible from the street.
Increasing Usage

A number of methods can be utilized in order to increase the amount of usage that can be scheduled on sports fields and courts. These include the addition of lighting and irrigation, as well as providing use opportunities year round. Lighting increases the number of bookings possible in a day (e.g., soccer games can be scheduled at 6:30 and 8:30pm, doubling the use of an unlit field), as well as opening up early evening slots for younger age groups. Irrigation is becoming a standard feature in sports field development. While recent long, dry summers have been a definite factor, irrigated fields can handle more participants, as a lack of irrigation leads to field compaction, field degradation and possibly injuries. Current initiatives regarding pesticide management may also be significant issues for field management. While the majority of park usage occurs in the summer months, many municipalities are creating year-round opportunities within their park systems. For example, park-based recreational infrastructure such as hard surface courts (e.g., tennis or basketball) can be flooded during the winter to provide outdoor ice skating while integrating berms or hills can be used for tobogganing. In addition, special events in the fall and winter can be hosted in community parks. Multi-season use of outdoor facilities that are designed to be used for specific seasons may, however, reduce the lifespan of infrastructure. Designing parks and open spaces to function as multi-seasonal facilities can provide year-round outdoor recreation choices.

Local Context

The Municipality of Brighton has incorporated lighting into both sports field and tennis court design. At the King Edward Park, one soccer field and both baseball diamonds are lit making it possible to schedule multiple games in one evening; on some days, the ball diamonds are hosting three games per evening. In addition, the tennis courts at King Edward Park are lit, allowing for play to continue into the evening and providing access for more users than unlit courts. The Municipality of Brighton’s two major festivals – Winterfest and Applefest – both make use of King Edward Park in the fall and winter seasons, which are not traditionally high usage times of year. During Winterfest, outdoor skating is provided in King Edward Park if the weather allows.

Public Spaces

The use of public outdoor spaces has become increasingly popular and growing in demand in a number of communities. High quality urban spaces face the greatest demand for socialization and passive unscheduled recreation and cultural activities; therefore, recognizing the importance in not only supplying the appropriate spaces to the community, but ensuring these spaces are flexible in design and maintained allow parks and open spaces to remain suitable for a range of uses. Public spaces should be inviting, accessible, bright, and safe. These spaces can also provide drop-in access for members of the community, within which they can participate in non-programmed, unscheduled, and spontaneous
recreation activities (e.g., picnics, kicking a ball around, family get-togethers, playing Frisbee, etc.). Community groups and other stakeholder often desire public spaces as the location to hold community programs and special events (amphitheatres or pavilions) in parks and urban settings such as downtown or other open spaces. Integrating parks and open spaces in urban areas such as downtowns or main streets have become a key component in providing liveable urban spaces for communities to come together, while also softening the streetscape with green amenities. In addition to providing spaces within which the community is able to participate in casual and planned events, comfort and convenience are also important for users of public space. As such, it becomes important to provide access to washrooms, water fountains, rest areas, and parking within many public spaces.

Local Context
The Municipality of Brighton recently constructed a new pavilion in King Edward Park, which is able to host large gatherings, special events, and casual summer usage by families. The covered pavilion also provides refuge from inclement weather for park users, and washrooms are available year round either at the concession or at the arena. There is also an accessible gazebo at Memorial Park in downtown Brighton, a small covered pavilion at Codrington Park, and a shelter at Peace Park. These sites provide opportunities for informal gathering and celebrations by residents of Brighton.

Increased Interest in Trails
A survey conducted by the American National Association of Homebuilders found that trails are the most desired feature in a community, especially in new subdivisions. Respondents indicated that they would choose a new community based on the type and extent of the trail system. For a municipality, trails are a cost-effective method to increase physical activity levels and support positive interaction between the community and the natural environment. In an Ontario survey, 28% of respondents stated that a lack of pleasant places to walk or bike is a barrier to participation. In addition to trails gaining in popularity, a 2005 study from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention found that “creating or enhancing access to parks led to a 26.5% increase in the percentage of people exercising more than 3 times per week.” The provincial government released a report that indicated that “growing research points to a number of land-use components that influence human activity, facilitate health and mental well being and promote social interaction and inclusion, including: layout, design, connectivity and maintenance of sidewalks, roads and non-motorized transportation, paths and trails.” The current trend of provision of trails as a base service in most municipalities is one that may serve as a positive factor in the promotion of physical activity, including purposeful use of trails to access work, shopping, and schools.

Traditionally, trail development has been under funded; however, municipalities are seeing the value of trail expansion and many are allocating more resources to trail construction and maintenance. Planning for outdoor facilities such as trails presents several challenges, as Ontario experiences a dichotomy in temperatures with cold winters and very hot summers. This hinders the ability of most outdoor facilities to achieve operational efficiencies, as their open season is relatively short. However, trail development can plan for multi-season usage (e.g., running/hiking/biking/horseback riding in summer, and cross-
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country skiing/snowmobiling in winter) by considering the type of surface that is best suited to the anticipated uses. For example, paved trails might be ideal for running and biking, but are not well suited for the wear and tear of horseback riding. Consideration of the long-term effects of trail uses in the design phase can greatly decrease maintenance requirements.

Local Context
The Municipality of Brighton’s Waterfront Trail is 6.2 kilometres long, and allows cycling, hiking and walking. The trail includes sections of asphalt and stonedust, and runs along roadways and waterways. The trail travels through both urban and rural areas, including shops, wetlands, sand dunes, and Presqu’ile Provincial Park. The Municipality has developed several multi-use pathways in lieu of sidewalks that provide access to the downtown core, as well as a walking path within a segment of the Butler Creek valley system. Consultation undertaken for the Municipality’s 2010 Vision for Recreation, Trails and Green Space revealed that trails are important to residents of Brighton. The following findings emerged with respect to existing usage patterns: 67% use walking trails; 72% use sidewalks; 38% use multi-use trails. When asked what upgrades and improvements were required to parks, trails, natural areas or public green spaces, 42% of respondents wanted more unpaved walking trails and 32% wanted more paved multi-use trails. Only the need for more benches, pathways, and seating areas, and better maintenance also received support from over 30% of respondents.
Section Four: Consultation Summary

The current study builds upon the public consultation conducted for the Municipality’s Vision for Recreation, Trails and Green Space in 2010: online survey of residents; online survey of primary stakeholder groups; email/mail survey of other user groups; focus groups; interviews with municipal officials, staff and other agencies; and a public open house.

In order to ensure that the data collected during the 2010 planning process is still accurate, the current study has employed the following data collection methods: brief interviews with key stakeholder groups to confirm participant data and discuss current and anticipated future needs directly related to the facilities at King Edward Park as well as indoor facility needs; a workshop with Council to discuss the direction and priorities for the Master Plan; a community search conference to discuss the strengths, weaknesses and opportunities related to recreation and King Edward Park; Municipal staff interviews, and a public open house (scheduled for November 15, 2011) at which time input from the general public will be solicited regarding the recommendations, conceptual park/facility design, and preferred layout.

Stakeholder Group Summaries

The Consulting Team was provided a list of 29 King Edward Park user groups by the Municipality; each of these organizations was contacted, with 14 interviews completed. Each group’s input is summarized below.

Ice Users

**CRC Men’s Hockey League**
The league has 6 teams with 12-13 players per team, which will likely remain stable for at least the next five years. The league draws from Brighton (50%), Quinte West (40%), Cramahe and the rest of the County. The construction of the new changerooms at the arena has satisfied their needs.

**Thursday Night Old-Old Timers**
The Thursday Night Old-Old Timers is a group of approximately 25 men between the ages of 55 and 73 that play pick-up hockey on Thursday nights at Brighton Arena. The group has been around for 18 years thus far and also raise a bit of money for local minor sport organizations and run one tournament per year. The group uses the ice surface and the upstairs facility at the Arena (rather than the new community centre space) during its annual tournament so that friends, family and players can watch the action on the ice. The group draws from Brighton, Belleville, Prince Edward County, Wooler, and Trenton, and has no plans to expand or reduce in size. With respect to the recently renovated arena facility, the Thursday Night Old-Old Timers are pleased with the new dressing rooms and showers, but would like to see closed circuit televisions in the community centre and lobby so people can watch the action on the ice. The Thursday Night Old-Old Timers indicated a willingness to play during the day instead of their current slot at 9pm on Thursday nights as the majority of players are retired.

**Brighton and District Curling Club**
The Brighton and District Curling Club has 140 members (75% from Brighton) that play in a variety of leagues that run throughout the week at Club’s facility at King Edward Park. In addition, the group has noted that the curling facility is used for a secondary school program, a junior program, people who pay-
as-they-go and for various bonspiels on most weekends, The Curling Club building was constructed in 1965 as a single block cement structure that is now owned by the Municipality, with the organization paying the insurance. The group indicates that growth is possible for the organization as Brighton is a retirement community and curling is a popular sport among older adults. The Club would like to see the Municipality use the facility for summer programs. The actual facility has a few issues that concern the Curling Club: by 2020 the refrigerant system they use (134A) will no longer be in production, with the replacement costs estimated at $134,000; the washrooms and facility as a whole are not fully accessible, which would be expensive to upgrade; the ice surface area is not insulated; and the Club could not afford to pay to repair any major unexpected breakdowns. Ideally, the Brighton and District Curling Club would like to have repairs and upgrades undertaken to the existing building as they feel the Club is an integral part of King Edward Park and the building is structurally sound. The Club would be in favour of connecting the curling facility with the arena and community centre. The group suggests that there are not any existing municipal sites that are large enough to house the facility if it were to be moved.

Skate Canada Brighton
Skate Canada Brighton currently has approximately 80 skaters, and has been this size for the past few years. The club is hoping to grow, but feels that it does not have enough ice to be able to do so. In addition, Skate Canada Brighton suggested that the seating and viewing areas within the arena at King Edward Park are dated and not accessible to all. The organization would like to see a multi-purpose facility constructed to complement the new public school and outdoor track and sports field at the high school.

Outdoor Sport Organizations

Brighton Men’s Soccer Team
The team is pleased with the Municipality’s upkeep of the soccer fields at King Edward Park, but feels they are overused. It was suggested that an additional field be built elsewhere.

Brighton Baseball Association
The Brighton Baseball Association has 120 players between the ages of 3 and 18, 98% of whom live in Brighton, which play on a total of seven teams. The league is unsure about future growth but anticipates consistent numbers for the 2012 season. Parking at King Edward Park is at a premium,
especially when there are soccer games on as well, and the league could use a better storage facility. The Brighton Baseball Association feels that the diamonds in Codrington are too far away and need too many improvements to be fit for use, but would like more diamonds. In addition, the fact that the canteen is run by minor hockey, even in the summer, is an issue because the baseball fans and parents are the ones making the purchases.

Brighton Slo-Pitch League
The Brighton Slo-Pitch League has been in existence for over twenty years, providing co-ed slo-pitch to residents of Brighton and the surrounding areas. The league has had 12 teams for the past number of seasons, but is hoping to expand to 16 teams next season. There is a concern, however, that there is not enough diamond time available, particularly since ball participation at both minor and adult levels is expanding. The Brighton Slo-Pitch League would be willing to use a diamond at Codrington Park if the quality is improved.

Brighton Tennis Club
The Brighton Tennis Club utilizes the Municipality’s only two tennis courts, which are located at King Edward Park, immediately adjacent to the skateboard park. The skateboard park is distracting to the tennis players at times. There are times (e.g., mornings) when courts are over capacity (10 people at a time) and a third court would be ideal. While the Brighton Tennis Club likes the current geographic location of the courts, the Club is open to moving to another site in the Municipality, as long as it is visible to reduce vandalism. The Tennis Club performs day-to-day maintenance and scheduling of the existing courts and the Municipality conducts larger projects (e.g., repairing cracks, replacing lights, etc.); this is viewed as a positive relationship.

ENSS Track Committee
East Northumberland Secondary School (ENSS) is located across the street from King Edward Park; its students make use of the park for physical education classes and some co-curricular sporting activities (e.g., soccer, javelin, etc.). The ENSS Track Committee was formed in September 2008 with the vision of
creating a track and sportsfield facility on the school’s property that would also provide community access. The estimated cost of the project is $850,000, with $791,000 having been raised to date (Municipality of Brighton - $200,000; school board - $140,000; Quinte West and Cramahe have also donated). The project has just gone to tender and the facility will include a 6-lane polyurethane track with natural grass field, long jump, shot put, and triple jump. Rugby and soccer will be the primary users of the field, aside from gym classes.

Ladies Softball League
This league just finished its inaugural season with four teams, and is planning to expand to six teams next season. Each team has 12-13 women registered, with only approximately 20% from Brighton, and the additional players travelling from Quinte West (approximately 60%) and Belleville (approximately 20%). The League finds that the fields are well maintained, and like having the playground on-site for the kids. It was suggested that it may be worth putting up netting to catch foul balls for increased safety.

Indoor Sport Organization
Brighton and District Carpet Bowling Club
Carpet bowling is a social game similar to lawn bowling, but played indoors, most often by older adults. The Brighton and District Carpet Bowling Club has 36 members, but anticipates expanding due to the aging population. The new space at the Community Centre is larger than the space used previously, which has allowed the Club to add 1-2 carpets to its set-up. The only concern the Club has is that the carpets are quite large and take up a great deal of storage space at the Community Centre.

Cultural and Community Organizations
Brighton Arts Council
The Brighton Arts Council is an organization that serves as an ‘umbrella’ organization over the visual, literary, and performing arts, as well as supporters of the arts. The organization is 5 years old, has 160 members, and is evolving from grassroots to a more structured entity that is expected to continue to grow. The Brighton Arts Council is often present at larger community or group events (e.g., Canada Day, Spotlight on Brighton, etc.), as well as hosting 20 meetings per year at which 60-70 members are entertained by a guest speaker and show and tell. The primary issues for the Council are that there is no storage available to the organization at the Community Centre, and that performing artists may be looking for halls in which to perform at some point, as well as locations for lessons. The wish list for this group includes a gallery within which to display its members’ artwork.

Kin Club of Brighton
The Kin Club of Brighton currently has 8 adult members, most of whom live within the Municipality of Brighton, although the organization anticipates its membership will increase in the future. The Kin Club of Brighton is involved in a number of events each year, including: Canada Day pancake breakfast; bingo at Applefest; and fundraising for minor sports, Brighton Kin Cedar Street Park, and other community projects. The primary facility used is the new community centre, and the group finds the facilities to be in excellent order.
Lions Club of Brighton
The Lions Club of Brighton has 29 adult members, and is hoping to maintain or increase its membership in the next five years. Almost all members of the Lions Club live within the Municipality of Brighton. The Lions Club used to have a dedicated hall at the King Edward Park site (where the new community centre now stands), and is finding it difficult to host events and activities out of the community centre, largely due to the lack of a dedicated bar, lack of storage space, a smaller kitchen than they had hoped for, and the loss of their own dedicated space. The Lions Club currently hosts a number of events, including meetings and bingo nights, from which they are not generating the same level of income as they did when they had their own facility.

Probus Club
The Probus Club has 200 members and is a social club for retired persons that does not undertake any fundraising activities. The Club uses the Community Centre meeting space twice monthly for functions at which organizational business is discussed, snacks are provided, and guest speakers give talks. There are also side groups (e.g., cards, single diners, Scrabble, etc.) and bus trips (e.g., St. Jacobs market, theatre, organizations of interest, etc.). The Probus Club has had to cap its membership at 200 people, but there is space for the 100-120 that attend meetings at the Community Centre. The group’s main concern is the lack of dedicated seniors’ space in Brighton, particularly since the community is aging and is a popular retirement destination. The group would like to see a dedicated seniors centre in downtown Brighton.

The following organizations did not complete interviews:

- Ice Sport Organizations
  - Brighton and District Figure Skating Club
  - Brighton and District Minor Hockey
  - Cold Creek Girls Minor Hockey
  - ENSS Teachers Hockey
  - Sunday Morning Men’s League
  - Sunday Night Men’s League

- Outdoor Sport Organizations
  - Brighton Minor Soccer
  - Skateboard Park

- Indoor Sport Organization
  - Shuffleboard group

- Cultural and Community Sport Organizations
  - Applefest Committee of Brighton
  - Cultures and Events Committee
  - Rotary Club of Brighton
Council Workshop

A workshop was held with members of the Municipality of Brighton’s Council on September 20th, 2011. Council members were asked to discuss what is special about King Edward Park, as well as its challenges, and their vision of what the park should be in the future. The input received at this consultation event has been incorporated where appropriate throughout this report.

Community Search Conference

A community search conference was conducted by MONTEITH BROWN PLANNING CONSULTANTS on September 20, 2011 at the Brighton & District Community Centre. The purpose of the Search Conference was to provide an opportunity for members of the community to share ideas, listen to the perspectives of others and work together to identify pressing needs and think about creative solutions. Attendees were selected and invited by the Municipality based on their contribution to the local leisure sector; the session was also open to the public. The session was attended by 21 people, many of whom were representatives of approximately 8 groups, as well as Municipality staff, Council and Steering Committee members.

Participants were seated at tables with other stakeholders and a facilitator; each table was asked to respond to a series of questions. Participants were asked the following questions: what they like about King Edward Park; perceived challenges of the park; what elements they would like to have stay at the park and what should be removed; and what amenities are not currently in the park, but should be considered. In addition, participants were asked about what they think King Edward Park should look like in ten years. Results have been summarized below.

1. What do you like about King Edward Park?

The central location of the park near schools and the downtown core was mentioned as a positive attribute, as well as the variety of amenities and activities available at the site (e.g., arena, municipal and community based activities, community centre, greenspace, etc.). The fact that the park is open to everyone was valued, as was the cleanliness and quality of maintenance efforts put into the King Edward Park by the Municipality. Participants felt that the park complements the planned track at ENSS and proposed splash pad nicely.

2. What are the challenges of King Edward Park?

Participants felt that the park was lacking adequate parking, paved access to the outer edges of the park, and summer access to changerooms. The quality of outdoor lighting was raised as an issue, as was the dated playground finishes. Graffiti and vandalism at the skate park was raised as a concern, as was a perceived Municipality-wide lack of large meeting space and community halls. The need for updating the Curling Club was also mentioned, as well as a desire for a pool and the need for more ice for the skating club. Participants also discussed the constraint of the creek running through the property as well as the lack of available space left in the
park.

3. What elements would you like to see stay at King Edward Park?

Responses to this question were varied, but included the majority of the amenities currently found in the park (e.g., arena, community centre, sports fields, skate park). Participants felt that there is wasted space in the park and that a better layout could create new space, particularly if some components are relocated. The Public Works yard was raised as a concern, but it was suggested that the lands be remediated.

4. What elements should be removed from King Edward Park?

Participants suggested that the Public Works yard, skate park, and tennis courts should be removed. It was also suggested that the canteen be relocated closer to the arena.

5. What amenities are not currently in the park, but should be considered?

The following amenities were mentioned for consideration (number in brackets represents the number of mentions):

- Splash pad with plastic features and buckets, change rooms and washrooms, and utilizing grey water (12);
- Twin pad arena (12);
- Fitness facility – partnered with the YMCA (9);
- Change rooms / canteen (5);
- Expansion of the space (3);
- More parking (2);
- Storage (1);
- Addition of one washroom by soccer fields;
- Purchase of east property next to the park;
- Walking trail link to No Frills;
- Expansion of the hall for more multi-use and multi-sport activities;
- Larger skate park;
- Bike park;
- Place to rent equipment;
- Covered spectator seating and player seating; and
- Better playground lighting.

With respect to the vision of King Edward Park, participants mentioned the importance of the park being about the community and multi-purpose. There was also a desire for the park to be better organized and rationalized. More children’s areas and senior’s activities were also requested.

Public Open House

A public open house was held on November 15, 2011 to present and discuss the future vision of King Edward Park and the Indoor Facility Master Plan. The open house was attended by a good number of people interested in both the recommendations relating to indoor facilities and with regard to the future vision for King Edward Park. The following is a brief summary of comments received:
• General agreement with the Indoor Facilities Master Plan recommendations;
• Preference for the children’s spray pad to be located in the same area as the existing creative play equipment;
• A preference to maintain only one central focus for young children (as opposed to creating a second play area);
• Support for the ultimate re-location of the tennis courts to facilitate the expansion of the skate park with BMX biking capabilities;
• Inquiry about whether the Parks Building and Yard could be relocated to the industrial area;
• Ensuring sufficient parking for the range of indoor and outdoor uses;
• Providing walkways / pathways that allow for improved accessibility to park facilities and amenities; and
• Maintaining the arena use at the Park was preferred over relocating to another site.
Section 5: Indoor Recreational Facility Inventory and Assessment

The Municipality of Brighton provides a number of indoor and outdoor parks and recreation facilities, as well as providing space within which outside organizations and private citizens operate programming opportunities and events. Discussion on each of the facility types have been developed, including application of trends, stakeholder input, and market-driven targets that utilize predefined standards of play, capacity of facilities to accommodate appropriate usage, and experience in other communities. Market-driven targets have become a well established measure of service provision in most of the recreation projects prepared by MBPC. Per capita targets will be utilized in situations where registration figures are not available or not appropriate.

Both per capita and market-driven targets should not necessarily be considered steadfast standards, but rather, they represent a point where the Municipality of Brighton would need to consider the justification and priority of additional investment in specific facilities. For example, after achieving a target, the Municipality should consider the application of the following criteria prior to confirming the need for new facilities:

- historical increases in growth and overall population growth;
- evidence of latent demand (e.g., waiting lists);
- usage patterns and capacity available at existing venues;
- physical condition of existing facilities; and
- capacity of the Municipality to fund, operate and maintain new infrastructure.

**Indoor Recreation Facility Supply**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Municipal Supply</th>
<th>Current Per Capita Provision (2011 Pop. = 11,193)</th>
<th>Location / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ice Pads</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 : 11,193</td>
<td>King Edward Park Arena</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasiums</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Relies on School Gyms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centres / Multi-purpose Spaces</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 : 5,597</td>
<td>King Edward Park Community Centre; Codrington Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Facilities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 : 5,597</td>
<td>King Edward Park Community Centre; Codrington Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Branches</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 : 5,597</td>
<td>Brighton Municipal Building; Codrington Community Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curling Rink*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 : 11,193</td>
<td>Brighton and District Curling Club</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: facility is owned by the Municipality and operated by the Brighton and District Curling Club.*
Ice Rink & Curling Sheets

King Edward Park is home to one municipal arena and one curling facility, the latter of which is leased to the Brighton & District Curling Club who are responsible for operations. The arena was constructed in 1977 and includes a slightly undersized rink (by NHL standards) measuring 180’ x 85’ complemented by 6 change rooms, two of which were added as part of the community centre expansion in 2009 (that consisted of a new hall and entrance way to the arena). The curling facility was originally constructed by the Municipality in 1965, and is now in need of substantial upgrades to prolong its useful life and meet accessibility requirements.

The 2010 Vision for Recreation, Trails and Green Space made the following recommendation regarding the arena:

In anticipation of the need to replace the arena, prepare an indoor facilities feasibility study to determine needed facility components in a twin pad arena, the potential to incorporate a curling rink as part of the complex, and the need for other complementary facilities such as a multipurpose municipal gym, meeting space, new multi-purpose program space, and designated space for community arts, culture and heritage programming.

The feasibility study will determine the required facilities, outline a preliminary space program and a preferred combination/configuration, to establish an overall building size and footprint. Location and site options should be included as part of the feasibility study, and consider:

- as a first preference, the feasibility of developing a recommended facility at King Edward Park, including any opportunities for site expansion, and/or reorganization and redevelopment of the site facilities.

- potential need to find an alternate site for indoor facility development, and community program and meeting space.

The 34 year old existing arena at King Edward Park, according to the Vision for Recreation, Trails and Green Space, is in need of approximately $230,000 in due/overdue replacement costs plus up to another $400,000 in replacement costs for the roof and ice slab (each of which have a 25 year life expectancy). For the curling facility, the Curling Club reports that its refrigerant system will be obsolete by 2020, requiring $143,000 to replace, as well as its washrooms and facility requiring upgrades to comply with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act.

The following pages will present discussions on the actions necessary to meet the need for arena and curling-related activities in the Municipality of Brighton.

Ice Rinks

Discussions with the Municipality and arena users suggests that prime time hours are well utilized, though there is ample capacity during non-prime hours (a common trend that is applicable to the majority of arenas in the province). Analysis of two representative weeks of ice time allocation for the current season in November 2011 and February 2012 shows that the Municipality of Brighton’s existing ice rink is booked to capacity during prime-time hours.\(^\text{15}\) An average of 34.5 hours of non-prime time was available, with an average of 72 hours of overall ice time booked in a given week.

\(^{15}\) defined in the Vision document as 4pm – 11pm Monday through Friday, and 8am – 11pm on Saturdays and Sunday
Further examination was conducted to determine the extent of market demand into the prime time capacity, based largely on rental rates and the number of local participants. The following table illustrates that the Municipality of Brighton’s hourly ice rental fees are considerably more affordable than those found in neighbouring communities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Prime Youth Rate</th>
<th>Prime Adult Rate</th>
<th>Non-Prime Adult Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Belleville</td>
<td>$154.53</td>
<td>$176.85</td>
<td>$114.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarington**</td>
<td>$175.15</td>
<td>$206.23</td>
<td>$155.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough*</td>
<td>$167.00</td>
<td>$193.25</td>
<td>$123.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent Hills**</td>
<td>$113.00</td>
<td>$158.20</td>
<td>$55.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE</td>
<td>$152.42</td>
<td>$183.63</td>
<td>$112.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$132.50</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Municipality of Clarington and the City of Peterborough offer special rates for rentals after 11pm.
** The Municipality of Trent Hills charges a $25.00/hr premium for non-resident rentals while the Municipality of Clarington charges a 10% premium for non-residents.

Notes: Prices include HST

Calls made to these municipalities in the region suggest that most have some prime time ice capacity available in their arenas (Clarington was the exception, with its arenas fully booked). As such, it is very likely that Brighton’s operating philosophy to focus on the provision of affordable ice rates is a major contributor to its prime ice times being fully booked. In fact, it is plausible that there is a high degree of non-resident usage occurring at King Edward Park Arena given that there are 709 estimated registered arena users who belong to groups operating out of Brighton; a typical ice rink can accommodate between 700 and 800 players.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Weekly Prime Hours Booked</th>
<th>Estimated Participants</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighton &amp; District Minor Hockey</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Source: 2010 Vision document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton &amp; District Figure Skating Club</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Source: 2010 Vision document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC League</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Source: Master Plan consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old-Timers Hockey</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Source: 2010 Vision document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Canada</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Source: Master Plan consultations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday Morning Men’s League</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Estimated participation based on 22 players per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Pick-Up (various teams)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Estimated participation based on 22 players per hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>709</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: the remaining primetime hours are allocated to public skating (1.5 hours/week) and unbooked time slots (3 hours/week).

Based upon this assessment, the Municipality’s affordable ice rental rates have underpriced the market; this is excellent in the sense that this subsidization may encourage participation in the sport, particularly among households having lower disposable incomes. Conversely, the below-market average rates encourage organizations to book more times than they might actually need. It is quite plausible to expect that if local ice rental rates were adjusted upwards closer to the market average, the Municipality would in fact see surplus hours during prime times as groups might make better use of their scheduled ice times (by putting more players on the ice at one time, reducing the amount of ice turned back, etc.). As the population ages, pressures for prime ice times could be further lessened if older adult arena users could be encouraged to utilize non-prime times during the day (particularly if the Municipality were to implement a non-prime adult rate). Prime time spots formerly used by older adult
groups would then become available to other users. With a relatively stable youth population but an overall aging trend, projecting demand in the future would not support the provision of a second ice pad in the municipality.

As a result of available data, this Master Plan finds insufficient local needs to warrant the provision of a second municipal ice rink during the study period (i.e., until the year 2021). Based upon general observations of the existing King Edward Park Arena, the core elements of the facility appear to be in satisfactory condition to sustain operations for at least another decade, so long as scheduled capital maintenance continues to occur as required. As a result, the Municipality should continue to run the existing arena for as long as it possibly can, with the view of cost-effectiveness (i.e. so long as the costs to maintain the existing rink are generally acceptable to offset investment in a new rink). Lifecycle cost information prepared by the Municipality that anticipates replacement costs totalling $565,000 over the next ten years and another $803,000 between the years 2025 and 2030. The Municipality should look at less expensive capital alternatives for certain components needing to be replaced, such as treating or patching the roof instead of a whole replacement.

By continuing to operate the existing arena in a manner that generally sustains its lifecycle without major capital expenditures (e.g. replacing the slab), and recognizing that a new arena will be required in the long-term, possibly in fifteen years from now, a capital planning process should be initiated as soon as possible. The Municipality should investigate options to start saving for the future arena by looking at alternative revenue streams to fund a future arena such as through annual contributions to a capital reserve fund, implementation of an ice surcharge or non-resident fee, etc. (all of which should be set aside specifically for a new arena and/or land acquisition that may be required).

It is important to note that, beyond King Edward Park, the Municipality does not own a parcel of land large enough to accommodate a new arena, particularly if it is developed (or planned for) in a multi-pad format. The Municipality, therefore, would either rebuild the existing arena at King Edward Park and potentially have to twin the facility plus add sufficient parking (it would have to come at the expense of an existing outdoor facility at King Edward Park, most likely one or both of the ball diamonds) or assemble new lands large enough to accommodate the future facility.

That said, arena needs should be re-evaluated every five years to determine whether latent demands at fair market rates warrant consideration for a second ice rink in Brighton. To this end, the Municipality should annually collect registration information from all arena users to determine the number of participants in any given year, including if they are residents or non-residents; such information will assist the Municipality in observing and forecasting trends.

\[16\] Lifecycle replacement costs provided by the Municipality suggest that nearly $1.4 million is required by the year 2030 for the arena. Major costs in the next ten years include a new roof and compressors ($275,000 and $100,000, respectively) while major longer-term costs include a new pad and boards/glass by the year 2025 ($600,000 and $125,000, respectively). These costs and timing should be confirmed through a Building Conditions Audit that evaluates the arena’s structural and mechanical systems.
Curling Sheets

The Brighton & District Curling Club has a long history of providing curling ice within the community. The Curling Club currently has 140 members that use the facility with an estimated one-third using the facility at least three times a week, one-third using the facility twice a week and the remaining one-third using the facility once per week during the season. Leagues are hosted at the Club four nights per week, bonspiels and special events are often held on weekends, and a social event is held on Friday evenings. There is also use for a secondary school program and a junior program. The Curling Club is run by a Board of Management in partnership with the Municipality; the Club schedules and operates the facility and pays the insurance on the building, while the Municipality performs maintenance and repairs and maintains ownership of the building.

Curling does not typically fall under the core service mandate of most municipalities in Ontario, although some have taken over curling facilities (many of which became unsustainable for groups to operate and maintain due to decreasing participation in the sport) and assumed responsibility for major capital repairs while leasing the facilities to community-based clubs for day-to-day operations. In Brighton, the Municipality originally provided the land for the existing curling club facility, however, the Curling Club experienced significant financial challenges and could not afford to pay its property taxes, leading to the Municipality taking the facility over. The Municipality has provided a low-interest loan to the Curling Club (approximately 6 years remain, with the agreement expiring in the year 2018) as a means to alleviate financial pressures associated with the Club’s outstanding debts.

The decision whether to reinvest in the existing curling facility or invest in a new one comes down to whether the Municipality chooses to be involved in the ‘business of curling’. As mentioned, very few municipalities are direct operators/programmers of curling services. To better define the local market, the following points are offered for consideration.

- Nationally, curling is popular among the 35 to 64 year age group, a segment that is most prominent in Brighton’s community profile as recorded by the 2006 Census; furthermore, aging population trends could suggest greater interest among the local population as older adults and seniors form a greater proportion of the overall population.

- Conversely, aging population trends are resulting in net declines in the membership and associated dues received, where older members who are unable to play due to health or physical limitations are not being replaced by younger participants.

- Many clubs are attempting to bolster youth participation through introduction of junior programs, with the national association placing a core focus on the youth market to leverage success gained at the 2010 Olympics; the local Curling Club dedicates one evening per week to junior programs.
• It is estimated that between 1% and 3%\(^*\) of Canadians curl; with 140 curlers at the Brighton & District Curling Club, the local participation rate is just over 1%.

• Research conducted by the City of Toronto suggests that based on provincial and national trends, curling sheets can support 100 to 125 players per sheet; based upon the number of members at the local Curling Club, a maximum of 1.5 curling sheets is required, resulting in a surplus of 2.5 curling sheets. This surplus is not expected to be fulfilled over the planning period due to modest population growth, historical trends in the local participation rate, and the fact that curling largely serves a niche market at present.

• While the Curling Club’s revenue stream is limited, they do generate some cash from non-core activities such as providing bartending services at their facility as well as at King Edward Park Community Centre, thereby reducing costs to hall patrons (in terms of insurance and liquor license fees). While the amount of cash is nominal in the relation to the Club’s operating budget, the Municipality would have to explore whether it is worth it to take over these services if the Curling Club cannot continue onsite or if another community group or service club is willing to take over bartending services.

A review of curling operations in the region (i.e. Belleville, Trent Hills, Quinte West, Peterborough, and Brighton) is summarized in the following table. It shows the regional facilities offer a varying level of service, from a low of 1 sheet per 34 members (Brighton) to a high of 1 sheet per 95 members (Quinte Curling Club), none of which come close to the provision standard range of 1 sheet per 100 to 125 members as outlined in the City of Toronto’s Staff Report on Curling Facilities in Toronto.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>Private (Brighton &amp; District Curling Club)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trent Hills</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private (Campbellford &amp; District Curling &amp; Racquet Club)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>175 curling users (350 members for entire club)</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>Approx 200-300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td>Private (Trenton Curling Club)</td>
<td>Private (Trenton Curling Club)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>Private (Peterborough Curling Club)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville / Quinte West</td>
<td>Private facility on municipal land (Quinte Curling Club)</td>
<td>Private (Quinte Curling Club)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Capacity defined subjectively by what each curling club believes they can accommodate in their respective facilities

Note: The municipalities of Belleville and Quinte West each played a part in the formation of the Quinte Curling Club that is located in Belleville.

Based upon the table above, the Brighton market has the lowest membership rate and highest level of service per sheet. Discussions with local municipalities revealed capacity at all five regional curling

---

\(^*\) The 2009 Physical Activity Monitor, published by the Canadian Fitness & Lifestyle Research Institute records 1% of the Canadian population participates in curling, while the Print Measurement Bureau estimated the curling market to be 2.8% of the Canadian population for the year 2008.
facilities, suggesting that in the absence of a local curling club, residents of Brighton wishing to curl would have ample opportunity to do so in the regional market.

Considering all of the points articulated above, the Municipality of Brighton will need to make a choice of whether it considers the provision of curling facilities to be part of its core service delivery mandate as it moves forward. The following scenarios are presented, from which the Municipality will need to make a decision.

i. Continue to invest in the provision of dedicated curling facilities that are leased to the community, recognizing that local market trends and the unsustainable membership trends currently being experienced suggest that any such facility would require a considerable operating subsidy (the degree to which would need to be determined through business planning based upon enhancements to the existing curling club or construction of a new curling facility).

ii. Divesting all municipal responsibility associated with the provision of curling facilities and programs, and instead working with surrounding municipalities and curling clubs to ensure Brighton’s curlers have access to regional facilities.

Should the Municipality of Brighton decide to proceed with the first scenario, it will need to decide whether or not to replace the existing curling club facility. To this end, a building conditions audit exploring structural, mechanical and electrical systems in the facility should be undertaken so that the Municipality understands the financial impacts and timing of capital expenditures required to keep the existing curling facility running. It may be beneficial to keep this facility going as long as possible, without major capital expenditures, to a point if/when a new municipal ice rink is justified. At that time, co-location of the curling facility with a new arena should be considered either at King Edward Park or through assembly of new land. It should be noted that the existing curling facility may not have sufficient useful life remaining until when a new ice pad is warranted, therefore, the Municipality will have to be prepared by either constructing a new facility or proceeding with the divestiture scenario identified in this Master Plan.

To help define what the municipal role should be, the Municipality should have the Brighton & District Curling Club prepare its own business plan articulating how it could become more financially sustainable. A five year target could be given to the Club to demonstrate that it is turning its operations around (i.e., demonstrating membership growth, membership retention, strengthening its financial position, sustainability, etc.) after which the Municipality could absolve itself of facility responsibilities. Under the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act (AODA, 2005), at some point before the year 2025, all municipal facilities will be required to be fully accessible. The exact year of compliance for the built form physical accessibility standard has not yet been identified by the Government of Ontario, but will likely be between 2015 and 2025. Given that the Brighton & District Curling Club facility is already in need of physical upgrades to achieve accessibility, the Municipality should ensure that the time frame within which the Curling Club is required to show evidence of growth in membership does not exceed the compliance date for the AODA built form accessibility standard. Clearly it would be easier for the Club to attract new players if it had an updated facility, however, as curling is a non-core service mandate for the Municipality, the ‘build it and they will come’ philosophy represents a tremendous risk for Council. Instead, the Club could be tasked with leveraging internal funding (through grant applications, membership fee increases, fundraising, etc.) to undertake selective improvements such as updating change rooms or the lobby area. The five year target also aligns with the recommended reassessment of local arena needs and could tie into the justification process for investment in a new arena, of which a curling facility could be integrated into the concept.
RECOMMENDATIONS – Ice Rinks & Curling Sheets:

1. A new indoor ice rink is not recommended over the next ten years. Instead, the Municipality should continue to operate the existing King Edward Park Arena in a cost-effective manner that ensures quality of play but avoids major capital works, where possible, in recognition that a new arena will be required in the future term extending beyond this current master planning period.

2. Recognizing that a new arena will be required once the existing King Edward Park Arena reaches the end of its useful life (estimated beyond the current master planning period), the Municipality should examine and implement alternative revenue generation tools that will generate capital reserves that can be used to partially fund a future arena. It is recommended that such tools be implemented as soon as possible to start building sufficient funds through annual contributions to a capital reserve, possibly implementing an ice surcharge, creating an arena capital reserve fund, and/or charging a non-resident fee, proceeds of which should be allocated towards a new arena in the future term.

3. The Municipality of Brighton must determine and define its role with respect to the provision of curling facilities. If it intends to remain in the business of providing curling facilities, it must either enhance existing facilities (i.e., the existing curling facility or pebbling ice at a municipal arena) or construct a new facility altogether.

   If the Municipality decides that involvement in curling facilities is not part of its core service delivery mandate, or if involvement is unsustainable/unfeasible, it should divest itself of the existing curling club at a time when capital costs associated with the facility’s upkeep and/or meeting AODA requirements become prohibitive to warrant future investment.

4. The Municipality of Brighton should provide the Brighton & District Curling Club with a three year period to demonstrate that it can grow its membership and strengthen its financial position, prior to making a decision to continue to provide municipal curling opportunities or whether to divest of curling operations altogether. The time frame for providing evidence of growth should provide ample time for the Municipality to undertake necessary facility upgrades/renovations to achieve compliance with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities built form accessibility standards. If the Club is successful (to a degree acceptable to the Municipality), a new curling facility could be considered as part of a new arena facility that may be justifiable in the longer-term or enhancements could be undertaken to the existing facility. To this end, a building conditions audit exploring structural, mechanical, and electrical systems in the existing curling facility at King Edward Park should be undertaken to understand the fiscal requirements associated with continued operation of this building.
Seniors’ Space

The Municipality of Brighton does not currently provide any senior’s facilities, although groups that primarily serve older adults make use of municipal facilities for meetings, events, and social gatherings.

Between 2006 and 2026, the number of Canadian seniors is expected to increase from 4.3 million to 9.8 million.\(^{18}\) Many members of the ‘Baby Boomer’ demographic (generally between the ages of 45 and 64) are quickly reaching retirement age, contributing to a significant ‘greying’ of the population and placing greater demand on 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 may include yoga, pilates, fitness, walking, and even more rigorous activities, such as hockey. As ‘new seniors’ reach a point where they physically cannot participate in more intensive activities, there will still be some that reflect the historical interests for seniors such as card playing and carpet bowling, but this will represent a small portion of the total senior population.

The Municipality of Brighton had a much higher proportion (44%) of adults age 50 and older than the province of Ontario as a whole (32%), as well as a median age that was 8 years older than the provincial median age of 39 in the 2006 Census. This older than average age profile, as well as the overall aging of the province, suggests that the needs of the Municipality of Brighton’s older adult and senior population should be considered. The Municipality has taken steps in this direction in 2011 with Council’s establishment of a Seniors Centre Ad Hoc Committee to explore the needs of seniors within Brighton. The Committee was formed following an expression of interest by a group of older adults from the community. In the summer of 2011, the Ad Hoc Committee conducted a simple survey to gather input by asking participants whether they would like to see a seniors centre in Brighton, whether they were older or younger than 50 years of age, and whether they were a resident of Brighton, as well as allowing for comments. A total of 648 responses were received, with 588 (91%) stating they would like to see a seniors centre in Brighton, and 561 (87%) stating they were over the age of 50. The Seniors Centre Ad Hoc Committee has also undertaken an informal inventory of activities for seniors in Brighton (which they hope to post on the Municipality’s website in the near future), but highlighting a lack of meeting space in general.

Due to the high percentage of the population that is age 50 and older, the lack of senior’s space in the Municipality, and the input of the community, it is recommended that the Municipality of Brighton pursue the addition of seniors’ space. Targeted consultation with older adults and seniors should be

---

undertaken examining the needs and expectations of this population. The Seniors Centre Ad Hoc Committee should be included in the administration of this consultation, as its members have already undertaken preliminary consultation into this matter.

Many of Brighton’s older adults currently utilize space at King Edward Park Community Centre and Codgrington Community Centre as members of community groups. The activities in which they participate include meetings, dinners, games, shuffleboard, carpet bowling, guest speakers, etc. Some of these more active offerings could be better accommodated in a wellness/fitness space with a wood sprung floor, proper lighting and mirrored walls to allow for technique monitoring and adjustment. In addition, many seniors’ spaces also include a sitting area within which members can lend and borrow books, read, visit or participate in programming such as book clubs, workshops, and crafts. The Ad Hoc Committee received a number of comments on its survey from respondents, which focused on an interest in more traditional seniors activities (e.g., cards, bingo, and socializing); however, there was some interest in fitness programs and space as well. As such, any seniors’ space in Brighton should include: a multi-purpose room that includes sinks, tables and chairs for crafts and workshops; a fitness room with a wood sprung floor and mirrored walls; and a sitting area with bookshelves and comfortable chairs for reading and visiting. In addition, natural lighting and accessibility were raised as issues through the Ad Hoc Committee’s survey, suggesting that any new seniors’ space should be well-lit with natural light and be fully accessible.

RECOMMENDATION – Seniors’ Space:

5. The provision of space appropriate for use by seniors should be pursued, preferably co-located with other indoor recreation facilities (e.g., library, multi-purpose space, etc.) to provide opportunities for cross-programming. The Seniors Center Ad Hoc Committee should be involved in this process, particularly through the administration of consultation. The King Edward Park Community Centre is one potential location for such space.

Youth Space

The Municipality of Brighton does not operate any youth space, although there is a drop-in youth space located half a kilometre from King Edward Park at the faith-based Beacon Youth Centre. This youth centre is open for lunch hours during the school year and evenings year round, offering movie nights, table games, opportunities for making friends and hanging out.

Youth between the ages of 10 and 19 comprised 12% of Brighton’s population in the 2006 Census, which is slightly lower than the provincial figure of 14%. As discussed in Section 2 of this Master Plan, the Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board’s projections for Brighton Public School show some growth anticipated through 2016-2017, while the East Northumberland Secondary School population is anticipated to steadily decline through the same time period. It is, however, anticipated that the continued growth at the elementary levels may be reflected in the secondary school population in time. In the recent past (between the school years of 2006-7 and 2010-11), the average daily attendance at East Northumberland Secondary School has risen to a peak of 1,323 students, and is currently at a 5 year low of 1,208 students.
National trends suggest that the number of youth engaged in unstructured, drop-in types of activities is increasing, while youth participation in organized sports is generally declining. The availability of leisure opportunities is a critical component in providing a high quality of life for this age segment. Research has shown that youth who are involved in recreation and leisure activities are more likely to exhibit positive social behaviours, perform better in educational settings, and are generally physically healthier. As such, there is a role for the Municipality to play in encouraging positive opportunities for play.

Defining the Municipality’s role is based upon a number of factors. In fact, the Municipality already facilitates youth-based activities through the provision of its arenas and sports fields, the skateboarding park at King Edward Park, and certain unstructured outdoor areas which are used as ‘hang out spots’ in parks. At these locations, the community is able to deliver effective programs targeted to youth such as minor sports, 4H, Scouts and Guides, martial arts, dance and an array of other activities. With respect to the provision of municipal youth space, however, there are a number of factors that should be considered:

- The space should be accessible by non-motorized means (e.g. walking, cycling, skateboarding, etc. and thus connected by sidewalks and/or trail routes);
- Located in proximity to a large concentration of youth (e.g. near schools, in neighbourhoods with high populations of youth);
- Proximity from other youth centres; and
- Combined with other youth-oriented facilities and services to create a hub of youth activity.

With this in mind, King Edward Park would be a good candidate site for a youth space given the presence of the skateboard park and the schools across the street. The Beacon Youth Centre, however, is about a five minute walk from King Edward Park which would suggest that this space would service the area around the park quite well. While there are some concerns that as a faith-based institution, some youth may not gravitate to that site, the Municipality would be best served by continuing to regularly dialogue with the Beacon Youth Centre to determine ways in which to enhance that space to attract a greater degree of usage.

That said, the King Edward Park Community Centre should be looked at as a venue that already provides multi-generational opportunities. This does not necessarily imply the provision of space for youth, but instead looking at how existing and future multi-purpose spaces could be oriented to accommodate a limited amount of drop-in youth programming. For example, multi-use spaces could make use of portable elements such as stages and sound systems, multi-media, or add sinks for art programs. If, for example, library space were to be added to the site, provision of a ‘teen zone’ or sharing a computer lab with senior’s space are all options as well. Such actions would complement the multi-generational outdoor activities at King Edward Park.

If population growth trends change over time to include a greater proportion of youth, or if community-based youth centres cease to exist, the Municipality may need to consider provision of a youth space at that time. Similarly, a youth space may be considered in a municipal facility if a community-based partner is willing to contribute capital and/or operating resources towards the space.
RECOMMENDATION – Youth Space:

6. Based upon existing and forecasted population trends, along with the supply of community-based spaces and services for youth, provision of a municipal youth centre is not recommended during this master planning period. Instead, existing and potentially additional multi-purpose spaces should be flexibly utilized to allow a range of drop-in youth programming to complement other multi-generational uses that are intended for such spaces.

Gymnasiums

The Municipality of Brighton does not currently provide any municipal gymnasiums, although 5 school gyms were inventoried through the 2010 Vision for Recreation, Trails and Green Space. The inventory included 3 elementary school gyms, 1 single secondary school gym, and 1 double secondary school gym. Since the Vision document was finalized, the gym at Brighton Public School has been replaced with a larger double elementary gymnasium.

In general, gymnasiums provide flexible space within which a variety of activities can be scheduled for all age groups. Most often, gymnasiums are used for sports activities like basketball and volleyball, but can also be used for other active programming (e.g., aerobics, dance, etc.), arts (e.g., theatre, concerts, etc.), and various special events (e.g., community meetings, receptions, etc.). Provision targets for gymnasiums vary greatly between municipalities due to the availability of non-municipal gyms (such as those in schools), and geographic distribution of the population, but tend to be in the range of 1 gymnasium per 20,000 to 50,000 residents. Locally, gymnasium needs appear to be met at present and are expected to continue to be met throughout the planning period based upon the following:

- the double gym located at East Northumberland Secondary School (ENSS) is extremely well used, and is also home to a school-based theatre program;
- the existing relationship between the Municipality and the Kawartha Pine Ridge District School Board appears to be positive, thereby allowing access to school gyms;
- the need for gymnasiums was not expressed to a high or even moderate degree through public consultations undertaken for the Master Plan; and
- the existing population of 11,193, that is projected to grow to approximately 15,000 persons by 2031, does not suggest that growth-related needs will be sufficient to generate demand for a municipal gymnasium.

Instead of constructing a municipal gymnasium, the Municipality would be best served to continue to work with local school boards to formalize joint use agreements (similar in place to the one regarding use of the track and field site and sports field located at ENSS) in order to ensure ongoing access to school gymnasiums over the long term.

RECOMMENDATION – Gymnasium:

7. The provision of a municipal gymnasium is not recommended during the master planning period, but rather the Municipality should continue to work with the local
school boards to ensure that satisfactory community access is available at elementary and secondary schools.

**Indoor Aquatics & Fitness Centres**

Indoor aquatics needs in Brighton are largely served by the Quinte West YMCA, a facility that also contains a fitness centre. This is a facility that serves a large regional market that includes Brighton, thus it would be difficult for the Municipality to compete with such a regional presence. Coupled with the fact that the local population base is well below what is required to reasonably support an indoor pool (and by reasonable, this would imply an operating deficit of at least $200,000), an indoor aquatic centre is not recommended.

Similarly, the provision of a municipal fitness centre is not deemed to be a high priority need as it would represent a significant risk to the Municipality. Since such a service is not part of the core municipal mandate, there is no basis for program, staffing and infrastructure models to draw from. Fitness centres would be competing with a private sector that is well established, able to easily leverage funds for equipment and program enhancements, and saturated in the market. Both the Brighton and Quinte West YMCA offers affordable memberships (targeted to a price point that a municipality would offer) while private sector groups such as Curves (located in the strip commercial plaza next door to King Edward Park) round out the spectrum. It is not recommended that the Municipality of Brighton compete with the regional fitness providers throughout the course of the master planning process.

**RECOMMENDATION – Indoor Aquatics & Fitness Centres:**

8. The provision of an indoor aquatic facility and/or a fitness centre is not recommended over the master planning period.

**Library Branches**

The Brighton Public Library has 2 branches, located the Municipal Offices Building in Brighton and at the Codrington Community Centre, which are owned by the Municipality and operated by the Brighton Library Board. The Brighton Branch is open for 43.5 hours per week, and includes children’s and reference areas, but is limited in terms of space, thus reducing programming options. The Codrington Branch is open for 12 hours per week, providing service to Brighton’s rural communities.

Much has been written and discussed about the changing role of libraries in the information age and there is substantial debate as to where libraries are headed in the future. One thing is clear: libraries are quickly transforming in the 21st century. As part of the evolution of libraries, many communities are re-orienting them as community gathering places and hubs that not only provide traditional library services, but also act as a venue for social interaction, community learning, and expression.

Although books still represent a large part of their core service, more and more libraries are finding creative ways to use space for other forms of inspiration, learning, sharing, and community engagement. In general, this means more ‘people space’, such as teen and seniors’ lounges, gaming zones, coffee

---

19 The Library Board consists of 9 voting members and one non-voting secretary
shops, laptop counters, study rooms, and seating areas. While some of these features are being incorporated into modern community centres, a library is much more. At their core, libraries are places that teach people how to access information (knowledge building) and that provide a social outlet for the community (knowledge sharing). They are increasingly being integrated with multi-use community facilities to improve operating efficiencies and cost sharing through the sharing of common areas, storage space, programming rooms, and facility management services. More importantly, libraries within recreation centres provide added convenience to residents through cross-programming and “one-stop shopping” opportunities.

The 2010 Vision for Recreation, Trails and Green Space recommended that future studies undertaken by the Library Board consider the “community-wide need for complementary small program and meeting space, and heritage archives.” In 2010, the Brighton Public Library initiated a strategic planning process that “charts a course for the future based on a solid understanding of our community and the changing influences affecting library services.” The Draft Brighton Library Strategic Plan focuses on three key strategies: maintaining and enhancing services; managing existing library space; acquiring more space for the library; and developing a succession plan.”

At present, the planning for library space suggests an expansion for the existing Council complex site, as it would maintain the existing ‘community hub’ location of the Brighton branch. The King Edward Park & Indoor Recreation Facilities Master Plan defers to the ongoing Brighton Library Strategic Plan, recommending that the Municipality continue to work with the Library Board to evaluate future space requirements, including potential co-location of municipal meeting space with expanded or new construction of library space. This would allow for shared operational costs (e.g., janitorial, utilities, maintenance, etc.) and visibility of these compatible spaces, as well as providing opportunities for the provision of arts and cultural activities, gatherings, rentals, library programs, etc.

**RECOMMENDATION – Library Branches:**

9. **Continue to work with the Library Board to evaluate future space requirements, including potential co-location of municipal meeting space with expanded or new construction of library space.**

**Multi-Purpose Space**

The Municipality of Brighton provides two municipally operated indoor multi-purpose spaces – King Edward Park Community Centre and Codrington Community Centre. In addition, the Brighton & District Curling Club provides space for rent in its off-season in a facility that is owned by the Municipality and operated by the Curling Club. There are also private (e.g., golf course) and community (e.g., Legion, Masonic Temple, etc.) organizations that offer spaces for rent. The Municipality also has a number of heritage properties, including Hilton Hall, which is currently available for meeting space rentals, but may be converted to better and higher uses in the near future.

The provision of multi-purpose space is a core service in most municipalities, as it allows residents the opportunity to have access to reasonably priced, well-maintained, and flexible spaces within which to host special events, gatherings, and meetings. In addition, the geographic distribution of these multi-purpose spaces across a municipality is an important element in their provision, as this offers access to a
greater number of residents. The Municipality of Brighton covers a broad geographic expanse of approximately 223 kilometres, which includes a number of former hamlets (including Codrington), but the ‘drive-to’ nature of these facilities suggests that most residents do not expect to be able to walk to these multi-purpose spaces.

The Municipality of Brighton’s current indoor multi-purpose spaces are each located within multi-purpose facilities: King Edward Park Community Centre includes the new community centre space and the single-pad arena (as well as being co-located with a variety of outdoor facilities); and Codrington Community Centre includes both the Codrington Branch of the Brighton Public Library and the meeting space, which has a capacity of 120 people, a kitchen, and storage. The Municipality’s multi-purpose spaces are available for rental by individuals and organizations, ranging from $46.10 for a half weekday to $230.50 for a full day with kitchen privileges on the weekend. A number of organizations that were consulted for this Master Plan reported satisfaction with the new community centre space at King Edward Park, aside from the limited storage and a lack of a dedicated bar room for events. Discussions with a number of groups did, however, reveal a perceived lack of meeting space overall within the community.

**RECOMMENDATIONS – Multi-Purpose Space:**

10. Any expansion to existing municipal recreation facilities or construction of new municipal recreation facilities should include multi-purpose space as a core component.

**Cultural Space**

The emergence of the ‘Creative City’ ideology, wherein the benefits of arts, culture and heritage are celebrated, has emerged over the past few decades, placing culture in the spotlight. These benefits include: increased tourism; stimulation of creativity amongst residents; encouragement of social interaction; and the promotion of a healthy and well-rounded lifestyle. Despite these benefits, cultural space is not often provided as a municipal service, although multi-purpose spaces are often equipped to support arts and cultural programming. For example, the co-location of library and visual arts space make sense in terms of space needs, as library programs often include arts and crafts components, which require space in which the primary furnishings include a sink, tables, and chairs. For performance arts, gymnasiums and other large spaces may be equipped with portable stages, additional lighting and sound systems, or soundproofing materials. These actions on the part of a municipality and/or a partnering community group can provide broad exposure to arts and cultural programming without requiring the municipality to invest large sums of money into specialized facilities (e.g., theatres, art studios, etc.).
The 2010 Vision for Recreation, Trails and Green Space recommended that this Master Plan “should incorporate an investigation of need for facilities to also support community arts, culture and heritage programming.” The 2010 Vision also recommends “in the longer term a separate study will be required to determine facility needs and the appropriate scale for a separate, community arts and culture centre for Brighton.” The consultation undertaken for the 2010 Vision found that “while there is considerable interest in expanding the supply of arts facilities and programs, there is limited space.” This has been a common issue raised by a variety of cultural, sport and community organizations that were consulted for this Master Plan in regards to multi-purpose, meeting and arts and culture friendly space. With only two main municipally owned and operated multi-purpose spaces, Brighton is definitely lacking this type of facility. Therefore, it is recommended that any new or expanded multi-purpose space(s) be equipped to accommodate arts and cultural activities. For example, including sinks in all multi-purpose rooms enable their use for painting and arts and crafts programming; adding a woodsprung floor to a program room can enhance spaces for yoga or dance classes; adding a temporary stage and high quality sound and lighting systems can allow community centre space to be used for some theatre uses. In addition, co-locating multi-purpose space at a library can also provide cross-programming opportunities. These examples should be considered for any future multi-purpose space. As previously mentioned, the determination of need for a cultural space in Brighton was recommended in the 2010 Vision to be undertaken by way of a separate study, a recommendation supported by this Master Plan. Such a study should include extensive consultation with the cultural community, with input from the Brighton Arts Council, which has seemingly become the centralized body for the community in Brighton. The cultural facility study should examine (at a minimum): the need for such a facility; potential partners; anticipated capital and operating costs; the potential components within the facility; possible locations; pertinent policies; etc. The 2010 Vision recommended the facilitation of workshops with the cultural community to determine an inventory of existing cultural groups and their programs and facilities, as well as a preliminary discussion of needs; a recommendation which is supported by this Master Plan. However, at present the focus of need should be in the form of multi-purpose meeting space that provides the amenities (storage, sinks, etc.) to facilitate a range of arts and cultural opportunities.

RECOMMENDATIONS – Cultural Space:

11. Should the Municipality pursue new multi-purpose leisure space(s), multi-purpose space that is equipped to accommodate arts and cultural activities (e.g., including sinks, woodsprung floor, adding a temporary stage, etc.) should be included.
Section 6: King Edward Park Concept Plan

Part of the Terms of Reference for the Master Plan is to include a conceptual plan for the redesign of King Edward Park. While the analysis of indoor facility needs contains a number of recommendations, it also contains a number of options and points of decision for the Municipality to consider.

The following is a summary of indoor facility needs:

- **Ice Pad / Arena** – while the analysis of ice pads has identified the need for only one ice pad (as currently provided in Brighton), the Request for Proposals for this project asked that any concept plan for the provision of a twin pad facility in the event that demand increases to a point where a second ice pad is needed.

- **Curling** – the current facility (with 4 sheets) is under-utilized as membership numbers indicate a need for only 1.5 curling sheets. The Concept Plan will include continued provision of a curling facility although the Indoor Facilities Master Plan recommends a membership monitoring process, a facility audit, and an ultimate decision to be made by the Municipality as to whether they should be in the business of providing a curling venue.

- **Senior’s Space** – the Indoor Master Plan recommends that space appropriate for use by seniors should be provided in the Municipality and should be co-located with other community facilities (e.g., community centre, library, etc.). The King Edward Park Community Centre could be a potential location for the addition of such space.

- **Youth Space** – youth space is not recommended in the Indoor Master Plan but providing additional opportunities for youth-based activities in any expanded recreation facility is suggested. If additional space is provided at the King Edward Park Community Centre, the space should be designed to be flexible to also accommodate a range of youth-based activities.

- **Gymnasium** – a gymnasium is not recommended in the Indoor Master Plan as seeking and maintaining access agreements with the School Boards is a preferred approach to meeting the community’s gymnasium needs.

- **Indoor Aquatics and Fitness Centre** – Brighton’s population is considered too small to reasonably support an indoor aquatics facility so the Indoor Master Plan does not recommend the Municipality enter into this level of service. With regard to a fitness centre, although the Indoor Master Plan recommends that if new or additional recreation space is added in the community that it should be designed to be flexible (including sprungwood floor, etc.), rather than the Municipality developing a full service “fitness centre”.

- **Library Branches** – the Brighton Library is currently undertaking a strategic planning process that will identify library space needs. As such, for the King Edward Park Master Plan, it is assumed that the Library Board will provide recommendations on space and location (which is currently contemplated to remain in the downtown area), so no accommodation of library space is made for the Park.
- **Multi-Purpose Spaces** – the Indoor Facilities Master Plan recommended that the provision of any new / additional community space (i.e. at a community centre, library, etc.) should be provided; mostly associated with flexible meeting rooms with amenities (e.g. storage, sinks, etc.) to allow for a wider range of activity / program opportunities.

- **Cultural Space** – the Indoor Facilities Master Plan viewed the provision of the above-noted multi-purpose spaces as one in the same as these spaces would provide the amenities required for certain arts and cultural activities / programs. The Master Plan did not include a needs assessment for larger dedicated spaces such as a theatre, art gallery, etc.

### Existing Conditions & Uses

King Edward Park is located at 75 Elizabeth Street in the Brighton Urban Area. As per the parkland classification system established in the 2010 *Vision for Recreation, Trails, and Green Space*, King Edward Park would be classified as a “Community Park” since it:

- exceeds the 4 hectare minimum size;
- typically focuses on active recreation and generally serves the entire municipality with amenities such as sports fields, playgrounds, tennis courts, parking, etc.; and
- is located along an arterial road and in proximity to schools.

The Park is intensively programmed with a number of facilities onsite, most notably:

- the King Edward Park Community Centre;
- the Brighton & District Curling Club;
- two ball diamonds and four soccer fields;
- two tennis courts
- a skateboard park
- a playground area
- pavilion, storage and concessions/washroom structures; and
- parks works building and yard.

Marked parking areas are located in a north lot fronting Elizabeth Street, east adjacent to the green space, a central lot in the interior courtyard space in between the community centre and the curling club, and some limited spaces located west of the arena. Overflow/informal parking is located along Pinnacle Street (adjacent to the hardball diamond) as well as some unmarked areas throughout the park site. Vehicular circulation is defined through paved laneways connecting the parking areas, with primary access gained through two driveways along Elizabeth Street (at Pinnacle Street as well as an access just west of the tennis courts) and an access off Pinnacle Street (in between the arena and hardball diamond). It is noted that there are no marked pedestrian circulation routes, though a sidewalk is provided around the east side of the community centre that connects the north and south (see maps on the following two pages, which illustrate existing conditions and circulation plan, respectively).

In terms of natural heritage features, there is a creek that bisects King Edward Park along with a naturalized open space buffering the parks works building and yard and sports fields from the railway line to the south. There are also a number of mature trees located on site.
Existing Conditions at King Edward Park
Surrounding Land Use and Location Plan
**Surrounding Land Uses**

King Edward Park itself is designated as Community Facilities and Open Space under Schedule A2 of the Municipality’s Official Plan. This land use designation also applies directly across the street on both sides of Terry Fox Drive where there are two schools. In addition, the Applefest Lodge is situated north-east of the Park and commercial uses are located immediately across the street (Elizabeth Street) from the King Edward Community Centre (see map of land use and location on the previous page).

The lands situated immediately to the east of King Edward Park comprise low density residential along Pinnacle Street, with a Core designation applied to the strip commercial plaza at the south-east intersection with Elizabeth Street. The lands immediately to the west are designated for medium density residential, though at present a single detached dwelling exists there.

**Site Selection**

When the Municipality decides to acquire additional lands for parks and recreation purposes, the following characteristics should be among those considered:

- Size of the site area should be able to accommodate the necessary park and/or facility, as well as associated amenities (e.g., parking, buffer, etc.);
- Accessibility to the site from major roadways;
- Visibility of the site from major roadways for the purposes of attracting users as well as safety;
- Environmental impacts should be limited;
- Servicing should be readily available;
- Compatibility with surrounding land uses (e.g., residential, industrial, commercial);
- Compliant with Official Plan designation and zoning; and
- Availability of the site for development.

This is not an exhaustive list, but does provide the main issues to take into account when considering potential sites for the expansion of the Municipality’s parks and recreation inventory.

**Opportunities & Constraints**

King Edward Park is ideally situated in close proximity to the core of the Brighton Urban Area. It provides multi-use, multi-generational opportunities for residents thereby solidifying its role as a hub or destination for leisure activity. As a “Community Park”, its size and function are conducive to a range of services, facilities and program opportunities; for example, the 2010 Vision indicates that a Community Park may also contain spray pads, multi-use courts, event space, seating/picnic areas, floral displays, walkways, etc. thus posing opportunities for other considerations at King Edward Park. Furthermore, the Park is located in a serviced portion of the Municipality, thus allowing the opportunity to readily incorporate facilities electrical, water or sewer requirements (though with the latter, sewers would need to be extended into the interior of the site if necessitated by facilities such as a spray pad – a three inch water line currently exists in between the arena and the hardball diamond).
Notable constraints associated with King Edward Park also stem from the abundance of activity occurring onsite. Parking is the largest concern with the degree of use, as significant parking requirements can take place when all sports fields are in use along with events happening at the community centre, curling club and/or arena (parking is largely compounded in the early spring and fall, when indoor facility utilization is taking place concurrent to outdoor facility utilization). The addition of any new facilities to King Edward Park will surely exacerbate parking constraints, particularly if existing parking space is lost to accommodate new facilities.

The vast number of uses and their associated facilities has also constrained the Municipality's ability to integrate new facility components; in essence, the park is largely "built out" and addition of new facilities would ideally preferably result in the relocation or removal of others. The parks works building and yard demonstrates this fact clearly; it is a valuable asset to have onsite (centralizing park maintenance crews) though it serves no public benefit in terms of utilization. Its relocation to an alternative site could be considered and thereby open up a large area for park uses.

A second identified constraint is the current configuration of the Park, particularly with regard to the location of certain facility components/amenities. The Municipality has been proactive in ensuring that it provides needed facilities for its residents, however, King Edward Park has often been seen as the place in which new amenities are "added". As a result of historical decisions to place facilities here, a piecemeal approach has been utilized to largely place facilities where they “fit” and have resulted in some conflicting/incompatible uses being too close to each other. A good example of this is the skateboard park, that has provided a much needed place to encourage skateboarding/BMX, but is located adjacent to the tennis courts and playground pocket (and in fact is hidden from street visibility due to the windscreens on the tennis courts, creating the potential for undesirable behaviours). User comforts have been compromised to a point where it is a potential barrier where tennis players and parents of young children are placed in an uncomfortable situation due to the impacts emerging from use of the skateboard park. A more coordinated approach to planning could consider placing youth-oriented activities in a segment of the park (e.g. skateboard park, basketball courts, etc.) that is separated from family-type activities (e.g. playgrounds, spray pad, etc.).

The natural heritage features onsite could be seen as both an opportunity and constraint to the site. From an ecological perspective, the creek is an important element while the mature trees provide some habitat opportunities to selective species of wildlife. On the other hand, the natural areas (particularly the southern portion of the park, abutting the railway line) are not of particularly high quality consisting of brush type terrain with noise impacts associated with rail and parks works operations. The creek that bisects the property also constrains the Municipality’s ability to locate certain facilities, though solutions have been considered as in the case of engineering the channel to run below the softball diamond (recognizing that such solutions come at an added financial cost).
Outdoor Facility Recommendations from the 2010 Vision

In addition to the indoor facility needs identified in this Master Plan, the 2010 Vision for Parks, Trails and Open Spaces made a number of recommendations to the Municipality’s supply of outdoor facilities, notably:

- the provision of one new soccer field (to replace the northern most diamond at the Codrington Community Centre);
- no new ball diamonds (in fact, the removal of one diamond at Codrington Community Centre would reduce the municipal supply);
- provision of a spray pad, to be located at King Edward Park;
- additional basketball/multi-purpose playing courts, an outdoor skating rink, and ‘playgrounds’ for seniors;
- expanding the skateboard park at King Edward Park; and
- no additional tennis courts or lawn bowling greens.

While the 2010 Vision for Parks, Trails and Open Space contained a variety of recommendations (some of which were specific to King Edward Park), the ability to properly “fit” these uses along with existing uses is a critical decisions in the ultimate concept for the park. Any removal or expansion of existing facilities and/or amenities could have a related impact on the remaining park. For example, as lack of sufficient parking has been identified through the consultation process, the provision of additional parking and its proper location(s) could impact whether existing or proposed uses can reasonably and comfortably be located in the park.

Vision Statement for King Edward Park

In developing the King Edward Park Master Plan, an initial stage involved developing a “Vision Statement” for the park. Largely based upon the public consultations conducted for this study and taking into account the information and consultations conducted for the 2010 Vision for Parks, Trains and Open Space, the following Vision Statement has been crafted to guide the Concept Design for King Edward Park:

“King Edward Park is a highly valued place that showcases the Municipality’s commitment to providing high quality multi-use recreation and leisure services to its residents and visitors of all ages.”

Guiding Principles for King Edward Park

In support of this Vision Statement, a number of Guiding Principles have been established. King Edward Park will:
• Serve as a multi-seasonal destination for active and passive recreational uses geared to a variety of age and interest groups.
• Recognize its role of serving the local neighbourhood and the Municipality as a whole.
• Showcase high quality park designs through landscaping, floral displays, and innovative configuration of facilities.
• Act as the eastern gateway to the Brighton Urban Area core.
• Promote safety, security and accessibility through design, while effectively planning the placement of facilities in order to minimize conflicting uses.

**Conceptual Designs**

Over the course of this Study, a number of concepts were discussed for King Edward Park. These concepts looked at a range of alternative approaches from modest changes/improvements to more significant changes/improvements. There were many decisions that needed to be made with regard to a preferred design for the long-term development / re-development of King Edward Park. As such, the Committee focused on two concepts:

**Concept A**

The implementation of this concept would involve the relocation of the existing ball diamonds to another parcel of land to be acquired by the Municipality at a later date (approximately 10 acres required). Concept A includes: community event space; a children’s zone with playground, spray pad, teeter-totters, swings, and climbing equipment: outdoor recreation opportunities at the existing soccer field and relocated tennis courts; and an expanded skateboard and BMX park. The children's zone and skatepark will remain centralized and provide access to parking and washrooms at either the concession stand or the facility. This concept allows for the replacement of existing aging ice infrastructure in the longer-term, as well as the provision of improved parking options. As mentioned, Concept A would require the purchase of an additional 10-acre parcel of land at which the Municipality could relocate the two existing ball diamonds, with associated parking.

The benefits of Concept A include the establishment of a large community gathering / special event area to accommodate a wide range of activities from Canada Day celebrations to picnics to casual activities. The creation of a defined pathway system that improves accessibility for people of all ages and abilities will improve pedestrian circulation while allowing for a variety of activities, including walking, biking, and inline skating. Although this concept requires the relocation of the ball diamonds to another site, Concept A allows for the replacement of the ice pad at its existing location.

The challenge with this concept is that the replacement of the ice pad (in the longer-term) will be made more difficult by the need to maintain the existing ice pad until the new pad is fully developed and becomes operational. The close proximity of these two pads would be a challenge during the construction phase and would likely have a significant impact on the existing park during this construction time frame. The relocation of the ball diamonds to another site would simply be a replacement of an existing asset that appears to function well at its current location, including the ability to share the washroom/concession building with the remainder of the outdoor uses, thereby improving the financial viability of this building.
Concept B (Preferred Concept)

Concept B is the preferred concept as it calls for the creation of two community focal points; each possessing positive attributes that contribute to the vitality of the community and provide a range of active and passive uses. The long-term relocation of the ice to another site opens up King Edward Park to provide significantly improved parking, which was one of the most noted problems identified by the public and the stakeholder/user groups. The concept maintains the recently constructed King Edward Park Community Centre, which will allow in the longer term for some of this existing space (such as the change rooms) to be converted to multi-purpose rooms for a variety of activities for various age groups and interests. The concept creates a small area adjacent to the existing community centre for the provision of outdoor community event and passive use space. This concept (similar to Concept A) would also involve the relocation of the existing playground equipment, as well as the addition of a spray pad, and the expansion of the existing skate park into a skate and BMX park. The expansion of the skate park will require the relocation of the tennis courts to an alternate location to be determined by the Municipality.

This concept creates a new site for arena replacement, creating a new opportunity for other uses such as community gathering/special event space and possibly a dog park. The concept provides long-term relief to King Edward Park by relocating the heavy ice users to another site while also maintaining King Edward Park with a wide range of outdoor activity space (including the continued provision of two ball diamonds, the existing soccer fields, an expanded skatepark and the provision of a children’s splash pad integrated into a modified children’s play zone with the creative play equipment.

The benefits of Concept B include the creation of a new focal point for residents and visitors, as well as negating the need for a complicated addition to the existing arena. The implementation of Concept B will allow the Municipality to maintain the focus of King Edward Park on outdoor recreation opportunities and community programming. The possible addition of future space or adaptation of existing space to the existing community centre would provide additional opportunities for use by residents of all ages, community groups, and leagues. The creation of youth and children’s zones, as well as maintaining youth-friendly sports facilities (e.g., soccer fields and ball diamonds), will strengthen the profile of King Edward Park as a hub for community events for all residents, as well outdoor sports pursuits.

For some, the relocation of the arena component may be viewed as changing the history of the park. However, the creation of a separate arena site will allow for King Edward Park to become enhanced and address the majority of the challenges currently faced by the site, including lack of parking, conflicting uses, and limited site opportunities to meet future needs (e.g., a dog park).

Both Concepts A and B call for the Municipality to purchase approximately 10 acres of new parkland to accommodate the proposed re-design of King Edward Park.
Section 7: Implementation

The King Edward Park & Indoor Recreational Facilities Master Plan provides guidance and direction for decision-makers involved with the planning of King Edward Park and its associated facilities. Municipality Staff will be required to establish a strategic implementation approach with Council based on available resources and funding. The recommendations then can be prioritized over the life of the Plan, and should be used for reference for capital planning, development charge studies and other related planning exercises conducted by the Municipality. The recommendations are separated into those that apply to the indoor recreational facilities assessments and the King Edward Park Master Plan.

**Indoor Recreational Facilities Recommendations**

The following table summarizes the recommendations from the Indoor Recreational Facilities Master Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility Type</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arena</td>
<td>1. A new indoor ice rink is not recommended over the next ten years. Instead, the Municipality should continue to operate the existing King Edward Park Arena in a cost-effective manner that ensures quality of play but avoids major capital works, where possible, in recognition that a new arena will be required in the future term extending beyond this current master planning period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Recognizing that a new arena will be required once the existing King Edward Park Arena reaches the end of its useful life (estimated beyond the current master planning period), the Municipality should examine and implement alternative revenue generation tools that will generate capital reserves that can be used to partially fund a future arena. It is recommended that such tools be implemented as soon as possible to start building sufficient funds through annual contributions to a capital reserve, possibly implementing an ice surcharge, creating an arena capital reserve fund, and/or charging a non-resident fee, proceeds of which should be allocated towards a new arena in the future term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curling</td>
<td>3. The Municipality of Brighton must determine and define its role with respect to the provision of curling facilities. If it intends to remain in the business of providing curling facilities, it must either enhance existing facilities (i.e., the existing curling facility or pebbling ice at a municipal arena) or construct a new facility altogether. If the Municipality decides that involvement in curling facilities is not part of its core service delivery mandate, or if involvement is unsustainable/unfeasible, it should divest itself of the existing curling club at a time when capital costs associated with the facility’s upkeep and/or meeting AODA requirements become prohibitive to warrant future investment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. The Municipality of Brighton should provide the Brighton &amp; District Curling Club with a three year period to demonstrate that it can grow its membership and strengthen its financial position, prior to making a decision to continue to provide municipal curling opportunities or whether to divest of curling operations altogether. The time frame for providing evidence of growth should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facility Type</td>
<td>Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>provide ample time for the Municipality to undertake necessary facility upgrades/renovations to achieve compliance with the Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities built form accessibility standards. If the Club is successful (to a degree acceptable to the Municipality), a new curling facility could be considered as part of a new arena facility that may be justifiable in the longer-term or enhancements could be undertaken to the existing facility. To this end, a building conditions audit exploring structural, mechanical, and electrical systems in the existing curling facility at King Edward Park should be undertaken to understand the fiscal requirements associated with continued operation of this building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior’s Space</td>
<td>5. The provision of space appropriate for use by seniors should be pursued, preferably co-located with other indoor recreation facilities (e.g., library, multi-purpose space, etc.) to provide opportunities for cross-programming. The Seniors Center Ad Hoc Committee should be involved in this process, particularly through the administration of consultation. The King Edward Park Community Centre is one potential location for such space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Space</td>
<td>6. Based upon existing and forecasted population trends, along with the supply of community-based spaces and services for youth, provision of a municipal youth centre is not recommended during this master planning period. Instead, existing and potentially additional multi-purpose spaces should be flexibly utilized to allow a range of drop-in youth programming to complement other multi-generational uses that are intended for such spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
<td>7. The provision of a municipal gymnasium is not recommended during the master planning period, but rather the Municipality should continue to work with the local school boards to ensure that satisfactory community access is available at elementary and secondary schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics &amp; Fitness</td>
<td>8. The provision of an indoor aquatic facility and/or a fitness centre is not recommended over the master planning period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Space</td>
<td>9. Continue to work with the Library Board to evaluate future space requirements, including potential co-location of municipal meeting space with expanded or new construction of library space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose Space</td>
<td>10. Any expansion to existing municipal recreation facilities or construction of new municipal recreation facilities should include multi-purpose space as a core component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Space</td>
<td>11. Should the Municipality pursue new multi-purpose leisure space(s), multi-purpose space that is equipped to accommodate arts and cultural activities (e.g., including sinks, woodsprung floor, adding a temporary stage, etc.) should be included.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phasing of King Edward Park Master Plan Recommendations

This subsection also includes a breakdown of potential phasing options for the King Edward Park Master Plan, including timing and estimated resource requirements. Section 6 of this report identified two concepts for consideration, with Concept B being the preferred future layout for King Edward Park. The following table identifies the actions to be taken within each phase for Concept A and Concept B (note: some actions, particularly those in Phase One, will be the same for both concepts).

Phase One – Applicable to both Concept A and Concept B

Phase One will involve the same projects regardless of which concept is ultimately selected: relocation of select components of the existing children’s playground equipment to allow for the integration of a children’s splash pad; the addition of shade shelter feature(s) and seating to support the new splash pad; and the installation of an accessible pathway system to provide greater access to the parking area and other amenities within the park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase One - Recommendations</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Estimated Resource Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relocate select children’s playground equipment to allow for the integration of a children’s splash pad.</td>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>Total for Phase One for both Concept A and Concept B is estimated at $350,000 to $375,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add shade shelter feature(s) and seating</td>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Install accessible pathway system that ties in parking area to children’s zone</td>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase Two – Applicable to both Concept A and Concept B

Phase Two would also include the same tasks regardless of which concept is selected:

- development of a beautification and gateway point along Elizabeth Street;
- expansion of the accessible pathway system established in Phase One;
- modest improvements to the parking area;
- the completion of a Site Evaluation and Selection exercise to acquire additional parkland to accommodate existing and future recreation/parkland needs (most importantly the relocation of ball diamonds in Concept A and the arena in Concept B); and
- the evaluation of the future of the curling facility.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Two - Recommendations</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Estimated Resource Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop floral garden / gateway along Elizabeth Street</td>
<td>3 to 5 years</td>
<td>$25,000 to $35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand accessible pathway system to include areas to the east including linkage to the floral garden / gateway area and the soccer fields</td>
<td>3 to 5 years</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modest improvements to parking area</td>
<td>3 to 5 years</td>
<td>Will be determined by market driven land values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake a Site Evaluation and Selection exercise to acquire additional parkland to accommodate existing and future recreation / parkland needs</td>
<td>3 to 5 years</td>
<td>Staff and Council time; co-ordination with Curling Club</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase Three – Applicable only to Concept A

The work that is recommended for Phase Three – Concept A includes:

- relocation of the existing ball diamonds to newly acquired parkland (see Phase Two recommendations);
- rehabilitation of the existing lands upon which the ball diamonds currently sit at King Edward Park;
- relocation of tennis courts to the southwest corner of King Edward Park;
- expansion of the skateboard facility (including BMX biking features);
- expansion of the accessible pathway to create a loop around the new community event space; and
- the improvement and expansion of parking.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Three – Recommendations (Concept A)</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Estimated Resource Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relocate the ball diamonds to the newly acquired parkland</td>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate King Edward Park diamonds to passive / event use</td>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocate tennis courts within park</td>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand skateboard facility with BMX biking features</td>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand accessible pathway to create a loop around new Community Event Space</td>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve and expand parking</td>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase Three – Applicable only to Concept B

The work that is recommended for Phase Three – Concept B includes:

- relocation of tennis courts to newly acquired parkland or an alternative site to be determined at a later date;
- expansion of the skateboard facility (including BMX biking features);
- expansion of the accessible pathway to create a link to the western portion of King Edward Park; and
- the improvement and expansion of the parking area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Three – Recommendations (Concept B)</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relocate tennis courts to newly acquired parkland or alternative site</td>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>$145,000 to $175,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand skateboard facility with BMX biking features</td>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td>$275,000 to $325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand accessible pathway to create link to western portion of King Edward Park</td>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve and expand parking</td>
<td>6 to 10 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase Four – Applicable only to Concept A

The work recommended for Phase Four – Concept A would include:

- replacement of the needed single pad ice facility to the east of the existing ice pad, but remaining connected to the existing Community Centre;
- improvement and expansion of parking and circulation; and
- expansion of the accessible pathway to create links to the facility and adjacent streets.

### Phase Four – Recommendations (Concept A)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replace needed single pad ice facility to the east of the existing ice pad</td>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>$8,000,000 to $8,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>but remain connected to the existing Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve and expand parking and circulation</td>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand accessible pathway to create link to facility and adjacent streets</td>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase Four – Applicable only to Concept B

For Phase Four – Concept B, the recommended work includes:

- relocation of the needed ice facility to newly acquired parkland (see Phase Two recommendations);
- expansion and/or modification of space associated with the existing King Edward Park Community Centre to include senior’s, arts & culture, and meeting space;
- development of a small outside gathering area; and
- improvement and expansion of parking and circulation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Re-locate needed facility to newly acquired parkland</td>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>$8,000,000 to $8,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand and/or modify space associated with the existing King Edward Park Community Centre to include senior’s, arts &amp; culture and meeting space</td>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td>$1,000,000 to $1,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a small outside gathering area adjacent to facility</td>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve and expand parking and circulation</td>
<td>10+ years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>