

Summer 1971



BUREAU OF  
MUNICIPAL  
RESEARCH

*A bulletin issued by the Bureau of Municipal Research*

---

CIVIC AFFAIRS

---

SUMMER 1971

TORONTO

4 RICHMOND ST. E.

---

*Urban Open Space:  
Parks, People and Planning*

URBAN OPEN SPACE

*Parks, People and Planning*

© COPYRIGHT, 1972

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

Executive Director: Susan A. Fish

Research Associate: Sarah D. Gibson

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

STANDARDS AND USER-BEHAVIOUR .....	6
A STUDY OF USER-BEHAVIOUR IN TORONTO .....	10
URBAN PARK CHARACTERISTICS .....	12
URBAN PARK-USER CHARACTERISTICS .....	13
SUMMARY .....	19
DISTANCE .....	21
SUMMARY .....	27
FREQUENCY OF USE .....	28
SUMMARY .....	33
ACTIVITIES .....	33
SUMMARY .....	40
NEIGHBOURHOOD PARKS .....	41
USER SATISFACTION .....	46
POLICY AND PLANNING IMPLICATIONS .....	47
RESOURCES AND ACQUISITION TECHNIQUES .....	48
LAND RESOURCES .....	48
ACQUISITION AND CONTROL TECHNIQUES .....	50
FINANCIAL RESOURCES .....	54
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	57
APPENDICES .....	59

## *This Bulletin in Brief—*

The Spring, 1971 issue of *Civic Affairs — Urban Open Space — Luxury or Necessity?* — dealt with two main questions: what is the present open space situation in a major Canadian city (Toronto) and why is urban open space important? Research into the first question revealed not only that the total amount of publicly-owned open space falls far short of Toronto's own open space goals (and of other well-known standards for open space), but also that most areas of the City fall *very* short. The investigation of the second question showed that urban open space is not useless, left-over space, but is space that performs a variety of important functions for the citizens of the city.

As soon as the need for urban open space is recognized, three further questions arise: (1) what type of open space does a city need; (2) what implications does this have for the planning of open space; and (3) how can the necessary open space be obtained? This issue of *Civic Affairs* deals with these questions, specifically in terms of urban parks. In discussing the first question, emphasis is placed on user-behaviour (i.e., how people actually use parks) as an appropriate basis for planning and developing urban parks. In discussing the second question, ways of incorporating this information into the planning process are suggested. And in discussing the third question, possible land resources, financial resources and techniques of acquisition and control are briefly outlined.

# Urban Open Space: Parks, People and Planning

## STANDARDS AND USER-BEHAVIOUR

How much open space — and what type of open space — does an urban area need? These are questions that are constantly being asked by politicians, planners and other open space policy-makers. And they are questions which lead naturally to a discussion of and a search for “standards” upon which open space policy can be based.<sup>1</sup> Rather than being simply a measure of the amount of money or land immediately available, the standard should be a measure of what is required to provide “adequate open space”. Open space policy, however, must deal with the questions of money and land available and should be directed toward developing the best means to attain the standard that has been set. The discussion of standards in this bulletin focuses on only one type of urban open space — urban parks.

Parks standards have been discussed for many years by a wide variety of individuals and organizations concerned with outdoor recreation. The most recent report on parks and recreation standards published by the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA)<sup>2</sup> of the United States, which has been concerned with such matters since the beginning of this century, suggests that there are basically three standards: *percentage-of-area standards*; *population ratio standards*; and *user characteristics or demand projections*.

The Bureau suggests that the third standard — user characteristics — should not be separate from the first two standards, but should be the major basis for them — or any other standards that might be proposed. *User behaviour*, i.e., how people actually use parks and other types of outdoor recreation space, should be the major determinant of urban park standards (except for such special-purpose parks as historical sites and urban beautification projects).

The *percentage-of-area-standard* relates the park area to total land area. Probably the most frequently suggested percentage standard is 10%, although some suggestions have been as high as 20%-30% park or open space in cluster developments and new towns<sup>3</sup> and as low as 5%.<sup>4</sup> This type of standard is probably the least adequate for urban areas because it does not vary according to the population density, and urban areas, of course, tend to have very high population densities. If a simple area standard of 5% is compared with the widely quoted population ratio standard of 10 acres per 1,000 population, we find that the two standards call for the same amount of parkland when the density is 20 people per acre. Above that density, the percentage standard provides less and less parkland than the population ratio standard. Many urban resi-

<sup>1</sup>“Standard” here (as in most writings dealing with open space) is defined as a measure of the amount, type and/or location of open space needed to provide space adequate to fulfill various agreed-upon open space goals. It may or may not be expressed quantitatively.

<sup>2</sup>Robert D. Buechner, ed., *National Park Recreation and Open Space Standards*, (Washington, D.C.: National Recreation and Park Association, 1971?), p. 20.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 22.

<sup>4</sup>The Planning Act of Ontario states that in the case of a subdivision, the Minister of Municipal Affairs may require up to 5% of the land to be subdivided to be conveyed to the municipality for public purposes other than highways.

dential areas have densities much higher than 20 people per acre. (For example, the proposed St. James Town West project in Toronto would have about 236 units per acre and about 400 people per acre). Furthermore, simple area standards rarely provide any guideline for the size or location of the space. The space could be composed of small pieces of land located on the edge of the development, away from the centre of the residential population.

The *population ratio standard* relates parkland requirements to population density and sometimes to travel distance as well — either to absolute distance (e.g., 2.5 acres neighbourhood park per 1,000 people living within ½ mile walking distance) or to travel time (e.g., 5 acres of regional park per 1,000 people living within ½ hour driving time). The population ratio is probably the most frequently used standard (with the distance modification being less frequently used). A scanning of the various standards used<sup>5</sup> shows that there seems to be a fairly widespread adoption of the idea of a “parks hierarchy” which generally progresses from “local” (neighbourhood), to “district” (community), to “regional” (large urban) to “provincial”, to “national” parks. And various population ratio standards have been developed for each park type (except “national”, which is resource-based and therefore dependent on the location of superb natural areas rather than on the location of population).

Because this study deals with only parks located within city boundaries, its primary emphasis will be on “local”,

“district”, and to a lesser extent “regional” parks. These three types of parks are referred to in the City of Toronto Official Plan Part I, which sets population ratio standards for each; but which, as *Urban Open Space: Luxury or Necessity?* pointed out, never defines the terms.

Probably the most widely quoted population ratio standard — or any urban outdoor recreation standard — is the NRPA standard of 10 acres per 1,000 population, which, although undergoing certain changes and refinements over the years, has remained essentially the same. The most recent description states that this standard refers only to public recreation areas located within or adjacent to population centres; that it includes 2.5 acres of neighbourhood park per 1,000 population within ¼-½ mile; 2.5 acres district park per 1,000 population within ½-3 miles; and 5.0 acres large urban park per 1,000 population within ½ hour driving distance. The 10 acres does not include space for playlots or vest pocket parks, nor does it include a recommended 20.0 acres of regional park per 1,000 population within 1 hour driving time.<sup>6</sup> The basic 10 acres per 1,000 population standard has formed the basis for standards set by many cities across the continent.

In the past decade or so there has been increasing dissatisfaction with “standards”, which have been criticized (by the NRPA itself and others) as being arbitrary and potentially inflexible. Any standard, which is by definition a generalized measure, is bound to be arbitrary to a certain extent. But the question is, at what point should this necessary, arbitrary judgment be made? The extreme to which arbitrariness

<sup>5</sup>For an idea of the types of standards developed and/or adopted by a wide variety of individuals, organizations and governments, see:

Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, *Outdoor Recreation Space Standards*, (Washington, D.C.: Department of the Interior, revised April 1967 and reprinted March 1970);

Community Programs Division, Ontario Department of Education, *Standards and Definition of Terms used in the planning of public parks, public recreation areas, public recreation structures*, (Toronto: Department of Education, no date);

American Society of Planning Officials, *Standards for Outdoor Recreational Areas*, Planning Advisory Service, Report 194 (Chicago, Illinois: ASPO, January 1965);

NRPA, 1971 Report, *op. cit.*

<sup>6</sup>NRPA, 1971 Report, *op. cit.*, p. 12, 21.

has been carried is illustrated by the following passage which describes how the NRPA standard of 10 acres per 1,000 was originally determined:

Quite early in the century someone proposed that a municipality should provide ten acres of recreation space per thousand of the population. The actual origin of this standard is not known; however, the National Recreation Association accepted the ten acres per thousand figure and promoted it as a desirable standard. Because it was reasonable, and no doubt, partly because of its simplicity, the figure was widely accepted in this country (U.S.A.), and is still the most generally accepted standard.<sup>7</sup>

The NRPA, of course, was not alone in this arbitrariness. Each of the cities which adopted this standard without re-examining it in light of their own city was equally arbitrary. And, as discussed in *Urban Open Space: Luxury or Necessity?*, the various Toronto standards are of equally mysterious origin. Clearly, *the amount of arbitrariness contained in any standard should be reduced as much as possible*. Although the NRPA, among others, has recognized the need to review and update old standards, the most recent attempts at updating have still been rather arbitrary, relying on consultations with parks and recreation officials (who, presumably, have been brought up on the old 10 acres per 1,000 standard) about what they consider to be adequate parks and facilities and how much space they believe is required for such facilities.<sup>8</sup> It did not rely on empirical investigation of these parks and facilities (for example, by systematically observing and interviewing the people using them).

Lack of attention to how people actually use parks and other recreation areas

(how far children or adults or old people travel to get to a park; what they do, and so forth) when developing standards and designs for areas that are "user-oriented" (such as neighbourhood and district parks) has come under fire increasingly in recent years. User behaviour advocates suggest that recreation standards (and, by extension, park plans) should vary according to such population characteristics as age, income, education, occupation, residence, and mobility. This position has been stated in the following strong terms:

This article presents a brief description of the types of standards being used today in recreation planning and attempts to prove that they are variable, conflicting and generally unrelated to serving the actual recreation needs and interests of a community. For example, the commonly used acreage or population standard has been proven by many municipalities to be inappropriate because of varying local factors, primarily socio-economic, which have a direct influence on the amount and kind of recreation programs and areas which are necessary to meet local needs and interests . . . The general lack of consideration of socio-economic and physical data in formulating standards has been particularly detrimental to good recreation planning.<sup>9</sup>

This new approach reflects the recognition that too often in park planning, as in other planning, the behaviour of the people who will (or are supposed to) actually use the parks (or the shopping centres, or the streets, or the housing projects) have been either not known or disregarded. As a result, the parks created have too often been inappropriately located (e.g., too far away from or inaccessible to the supposed users) or inappropriately designed (e.g., the wrong

<sup>7</sup>NRPA, *Outdoor Recreation Space Standards*, (New York: NRPA, 1965), p. 10.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 3-5. NRPA, 1971 Report, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

George D. Butler, "Recreation Area Standards" in *Recreation*, vol. LVI, no. 1 (January 1963), p. 30-33.

<sup>9</sup>Arthur H. Mittelstaedt, Richard G. Ward and Raymond F. Lowery, "An Appraisal of Recreation Standards" in *Parks & Recreation*, vol. 4, no. 7 (July 1969), p. 20.



facilities for the supposed age group or ethnic group). And, consequently, the parks provided have too often been unused or under-used and have too often left a portion of the public ill-served or not served at all. Involving people in analyzing user-behaviour and planning areas according to the results is one way of bringing people into the planning process while creating better areas, and making a more efficient use of resources — after all, an unused playground is a waste of scarce resources.

Many people and organizations have pointed out that population characteristics are significant for parks standards. But they have, unfortunately, not been precise in spelling out just *how* these characteristics relate to user-behaviour and, consequently, to standards for the size, location, and type of parks.

The major empirical work on the demographic variables and park-use and recreation demand was done by the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission of the United States (ORRRC).<sup>10</sup> Although the ORRRC did exten-

sive research and gave useful insights into some of the variables which affect recreation demand, their research was focused not on local, urban parks and recreation activities but on non-urban parks and activities, such as camping, boating, skiing and horseback riding. As was pointed out in *Urban Open Space: Luxury or Necessity?*, the ORRRC research is of only limited relevance to urban recreation since the ORRRC did not consider many activities which are of particular importance in urban recreation (such as playing field sports, using playgrounds or just sitting); and it did not consider several variables which exert a significant influence on urban recreation (such as housing type and ethnic background).<sup>11</sup>

In sum, relatively little work has been done on urban parks standards. Most of what has been done has been criticized as being arbitrary, inflexible, simplistic, basically irrelevant and potentially dysfunctional (since it can cause limited resources to be diverted from the major needs) for filling the real park and recreation needs of people who live in cities.

<sup>10</sup>Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, *Outdoor Recreation For America*, (Washington, D.C.: ORRRC, 1962).

<sup>11</sup>The ORRRC research, however, has formed the basis of much of the subsequent work on user-behaviour and recreation demand. H. Douglas Sessoms, for example, makes the reasonable points that social trends (such as increased income, leisure and mobility) are causing changes in recreation patterns, thus rendering old, arbitrary standards obsolete; and that socio-economic conditions and geographic characteristics must be considered when a recreation area is planned. But he cites only the major ORRRC findings to demonstrate how these factors affect recreation patterns. When he comes to "inner city" recreation needs, he only lists some of the relevant social variables and makes the general statement:

Their (inner-city, poor) needs also serve as a reminder of the inflexibility and questionable use of current facility standards which do not take into consideration the role and impact of such social variables as economics, residence, age, race, and educational attainment. (p. 29, 30 of "New Bases for Recreation Planning", in *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, February 1964.)

He does not go beyond this to say *how* these variables affect local use. Another example of reliance on ORRRC findings to determine recreation needs was the study of a regional parks system in System Plan — Maricopa County, Arizona.

One departure from this reliance on ORRRC data and emphasis on regional recreation was a study of "Users of Local Parks" reported by Herbert P. Bangs and Stuart Mahler in the September 1970 *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*. Their study was designed to test the "largely intuitive" Baltimore, Maryland, standards for provision of small, local parks by developers in subdivisions, against actual use of the space, in order to see if the original recommendations for size and location were correct. The study, however, was not designed to test how socio-economic and demographic characteristics affect park-use (the researchers specifically tried to hold all of these, except age, constant, comparing only similar row house neighbourhoods). The study was designed to reveal how size, shape and location of the park affect its use.

User-behaviour seems to offer a more reasonable basis for parks standards and development. Although some work has been done on user-behaviour and recreation preferences, most of that work has been done with regard to non-urban, regional parks and recreation, and not with regard to urban parks and recreation. Consequently, the lack of information about these small, actively and intensively

used areas located within city boundaries constitutes a major theoretical and practical gap in the understanding of parks. The purpose of the next section, "A Study of User Behaviour in Toronto" is to shed some light on this aspect of urban open space, in order to reveal a more rational and desirable basis for urban parks standards, design and planning.

## A STUDY OF USER-BEHAVIOUR IN TORONTO

*User-behaviour* is the result of the interaction of three basic factors: *the people* (i.e., population characteristics such as age, income, and dwelling type), *the park* (i.e., its size, location, design and facilities), and *the area* (i.e., external features around the park, such as the nearby location of transit facilities, or of other recreation areas, or of a major traffic artery). This bulletin concentrates on analysis of *the people* factor.

In order to investigate user-behaviour, the Bureau conducted a survey of nearly 250 people at [12 locations] in 11 different parks in the City of Toronto, supplemented by 83 short interviews in 4 of these parks; and a survey of 88 people during lunchtime in specifically "downtown" (i.e., central business district) areas. The discussion below deals mainly with the first of these surveys. Interviews in this survey were conducted during August and early September on different days of the week (week-day and week-end); at different times of day (morning, lunch, afternoon and evening); and in a variety of types of parks (ranging from small gardens to large multi-purpose areas) located in a variety of neighbourhoods (low density and high density; low, middle and upper-income; Anglo-Saxon and non-Anglo-Saxon, and so forth).<sup>12</sup>

This is not a definitive discussion of user-behaviour, because, of necessity, there were a number of limitations. First, the size of the sample (244) was small —

particularly when cross-tabulated by 12 locations or 7 age groups, and so forth. The analysis that follows, therefore, is *descriptive* (i.e., describes general patterns), rather than necessarily statistically significant. Nevertheless, we believe that the descriptive analysis does provide useful insights into user-behaviour.

Second, where necessary, the interview relied heavily on open-end questions (such as "What do you plan to do today?") rather than on closed-end questions (such as "Do you plan to play tennis? Yes— No—"). This was done to allow the respondent a full range of answers and to discover, without leading him, his likes, dislikes, and plan for activity. This type of questioning, however, makes the data more difficult to analyze because the responses to the questions are more diverse and therefore the percentages for each "activity" or "like" etc. are quite small and because the answers are affected by the memory and articulacy of the respondent. Some of the questions, such as those relating to socio-economic status and mode of travel were closed-end.

Third, the Bureau had to choose between interviewing people in parks or people at home. Park-users were chosen because more relevant and accurate information about activities, distances travelled and actual park-use could be collected in less time by this method, than could be collected by interviewing people at home

<sup>12</sup>See Appendix I for a description of the parks where interviewing was conducted and Appendix II for more details on the days of the week and times of day when interviews were conducted.

who may or may not use parks. A survey of people at home, however, would be valuable for a more complete understanding of *who doesn't use parks*, as well as *who does*.

Fourth, the interviewing was limited to people who were either sedentary or willing to stop. The short interviews, however, partly compensated for this limitation by asking more mobile people (such as children at play or people walking dogs) their address, mode of travel, type of dwelling and age.

And fifth, like all interviewing, this interviewing was limited to those willing or able to be interviewed. Some groups seemed to be difficult to contact: e.g., Italian card players (who were technically breaking the law on gambling and were therefore suspicious of outsiders) and immigrant groups in general. But carefully unobtrusive observation is also a helpful tool for studying user-behaviour and one that we tried to employ as accurately as possible to ensure that a cross-section of users was interviewed and to determine what groupings occur and what effect design has on park-use.

There are also two major limitations to the use of this data for developing standards. First, user behaviour is dependent to a certain extent on "what is". As we stated at the outset, user behaviour is a function of the people, the park and the area. Although this discussion of user-behaviour emphasizes the people factor (e.g., how activities vary according to a person's dwelling type; or how distance travelled to the park varies according to age, or to mode of travel); the other two factors — the park and the area — must also be borne in mind. A person's behaviour is limited not only by what he wants to do, but also by what facilities are available to him in the park. To give two obvious examples, a child can't play on a playground if there isn't one; and an adult probably won't say that he visited a park to "commune with nature"

if there are virtually no vestiges of "nature" evident. Similarly, his behaviour is affected by external conditions in the area around the park. For example, he can't come by subway if there is no subway nearby; or a young child alone probably won't use a playground if it is separated from him by a major traffic artery. Caution must be exercised, therefore, when analyzing the data — particularly when looking at *totals* not broken down by park location. In the discussions that follow, we have kept these things in mind and have tried to point out where they might have an influence on the survey findings. Furthermore, a brief discussion of each park where interviews were conducted is contained in Appendix I.

The second limitation on developing standards is that there is no measure provided by this data for determining when a park is *crowded*. Such a measure of crowding would be essential before standards for park *sizes* could be determined. Developing such a measure, however, would be extremely difficult. The number of people that can be accommodated by a tennis court can be determined. But it is much more difficult to determine when a picnic area or a beach or a nature area is crowded, since factors other than the sheer physical capacity of the land to hold people are involved. Certain ethnic groups for example, seem to feel "crowded" by fewer people than others. The Bureau survey data, however, is extremely helpful in determining the *location* (based on how far people of a certain type, in a certain area, doing certain things will travel to go to a park) and the *type* (based on what types of activities certain types of people seem to like) of parks that are desirable.

Given all the inherent problems associated with developing quantitative standards for park sizes, it is possible that "service area" standards<sup>13</sup> may in fact be the most reliable quantitative standards that can be set. As our survey indicates,

<sup>13</sup>"Service area" standards are standards for the location of different types of parks relative to the population to be served. They should be based on how far people will travel to use the parks.

it is relatively easy to measure how far different types of people will travel to engage in different activities in parks; but it is sometimes difficult to determine when an area is crowded.

User-behaviour is obviously a complex phenomenon and one about which it is difficult to generalize. This discussion represents only the beginning of an understanding of user-behaviour; but, despite the limitations discussed above, it does give some useful insights and indicates trends that should be considered when both generalized standards are set and individual parks are planned.

#### URBAN PARK CHARACTERISTICS

The first Bulletin on urban open space identified eight characteristics which distinguish urban open space — particularly urban parks — from other types of open space. These included smallness, intensive use, daily use, multiple use, local nature, fragmentation, competition for survival and conflicting surrounding uses. Of these eight characteristics, three — *daily use*, *multiple use*, and *local use*, — were derived mainly from our observation and from our surveys of used behaviour.

The *daily use* (as opposed to the primarily week-end or vacation use of non-urban open space) was readily apparent: 66% of the respondents said they came on “no special day of the week”; while only 19% said they came only on week-days, and 14% came only on week-ends.<sup>14</sup> It is also interesting to note that 56% of the respondents came at no particular time of day.

The *multiple use*, (the use of the parks for many different activities in a relatively small area), was also easily seen. (See, for example, Appendix I which lists the size and various facilities available in the parks where interviewing was conducted). Most respondents mentioned several acti-

vities when asked what they planned to do in the park.

The *local nature* of the urban parks<sup>15</sup> was also evident — but this characteristic is a little more complicated to describe, since it involves several different behavioural characteristics, including mode of travel, distance travelled, frequency of use and user's evaluation of “neighbourhood park”. Most users interviewed had *walked* to the park (65% of those responding to the long interview and 93% of those responding to the short interview) while only 13% had travelled by public transit and 18% by automobile. It is interesting to note that while 50% of all the respondents (and children were among the respondents) either owned or had the use of an automobile, only 18% actually drove to the park where they were interviewed. In the future, therefore, even if more people do own cars, the increased car-ownership will probably have little, if any, influence on urban park use, since most car owners will walk to their parks.

Most people *travelled relatively short distances* to reach the park. For example, 50% of the respondents to the long interview and 80% of the respondents to the short interview travelled less than ½ mile.<sup>16</sup> In addition, 45% of the respondents to the long interview and 66% of the respondents to the short interview answered that the park where they were being interviewed was the closest one to their home (or place of work, or last activity).

Most people used the park on a *regular and relatively frequent* basis: 63% used it at least once a week (and, of these 41% used it more than 3 times per week). Furthermore, 66% said that they used the park where they were being interviewed more frequently than any other park.

And finally, more than half the people

<sup>14</sup>But this 14% of all respondents equals 72% of those interviewed on the week-end. Perhaps the week-end and week-day users are different types?

<sup>15</sup>The statistics cited are for *all* respondents in *all* parks. As indicated below, there is significant variation between different types of parks. However, these generalizations are significant.

<sup>16</sup>Distance is the shortest distance between the respondent's address and the park as measured along streets. Short cuts are not taken into account.

(54%) regarded the park where they were being interviewed as their "neighbourhood park". But further discussion of neighbourhood parks will be delayed in this report until after the discussion of user characteristics and other aspects of user behaviour (distance travelled, frequency of use and activities engaged in) is completed. The section on Neighbourhood Parks functions as a summary of this study on user behaviour since it integrates information compiled in each of the earlier sections.

#### URBAN PARK USERS' CHARACTERISTICS

Who uses urban parks? This is, of course, one of the major questions that must be answered. The following discussion is based entirely on the sample of park-users interviewed. It is difficult to determine how representative this group is of all park-users. Although we tried to interview all types of people in all types of parks,<sup>17</sup> we may have unwittingly over-represented some groups, and under-represented others. For example, as we pointed out earlier, our sample includes only people who could speak at least some English. The following discussion does at least indicate who we spoke to. And the sample is, we think, reasonably representative of the users in the parks where we interviewed.

The characteristics discussed are ones which we believed might well influence and help to explain urban park-user behaviour. In addition to such obvious characteristics as age, dwelling type and income, are more esoteric ones, such as urban/rural origin, cottage-ownership, and membership in recreation clubs. Each variable is discussed in general terms (i.e., the distribution of the total sample); where necessary, it is broken down by location, to indicate what variations occur between individual parks; and, where possible and significant it is compared with general population characteristics. (Unfortunately comparative figures were often

non-existent, out-of-date, and/or not exactly comparable).

Sex \_\_\_\_\_

Half of the people interviewed in the long In-Park survey were male (61% of those in the short In-Park survey) and half were female (39% of those in the short survey), which is similar to the sexual distribution of the general City population (48.7% male; 51.3% female in 1966). There were wide variations between parks, however. For example, 61% of those interviewed in Rosedale, 64% in Rosehill, and 78% in Greenwood were female, probably reflecting the large number of mothers and nurses who use these parks on week-days; while 61% of those in Trinity-Bellwoods and 75% of those in Willowvale were male, reflecting in Trinity-Bellwoods a high percentage of older men and in Willowvale a high percentage of younger men.

Marital Status \_\_\_\_\_

Of the total sample, 27% of those over 20 (and 43% of all respondents) were single, 62% were married, 5% separated or divorced and 6% widowed. There are variations among the parks: ranging from Craighleigh with only 33% married to Riverdale with 92% married.

Age \_\_\_\_\_

The age distribution was as follows (with short interview figures in parenthesis): 9% aged 8-15 years (65%); 15% aged 16-20 (4%); 30% aged 21-29 (7%); 16% aged 30-39 (13%); 11% aged 40-49 (0%); 9% aged 50-64 (2%); and 10% aged 65 and over (2%). The most numerically important group, therefore is aged 21-29 years; but the difficulty of interviewing younger children (partly rectified by the short interview) must be taken into consideration when trying to identify which age groups use urban parks most. Most age groups are similar to the general City-wide figures,<sup>18</sup> except the following four significant differences: 16.5% of the City

<sup>17</sup>See Appendix II to find out how many people were interviewed; when; and where.

<sup>18</sup>DBS 1966. And, Metropolitan Toronto Planning Board, *Metro Key Facts (1968)*, Table 9.

population in 1966 was 0-9 years old (0% of the long survey); only 7% of the City population was 15-19 years (15% of the long survey fell in the 16-20 group); only 15.9% of the City population was 20-29 (30% of the long survey was 21-29); and 15.4% of the City population was 50-64 (only 9% of the long survey was 50-64). The lack of representation of the very young has already been mentioned. The relatively large representation of the 16-20 year olds is reasonable, since most people in this group are active, and have a lot of free time. If the short interview, which was aimed mainly at children, is considered in the comparison as well as the long, the 8-15 group becomes much larger (for reasons similar to those explaining the presence in force of the 16-20 group). The large 21-29 year old group includes young mothers with children of playground age; low-level white collar workers; and active sports enthusiasts — all of whom use urban parks frequently (see Frequency of Use and Activities). The relatively low level of 50-64 year olds is not accounted for. Again, there was considerable variation among the parks. For example, 30% of those in Rosedale and 40% of those in Wellesley Park were 8-15; and 33% of those in Craighleigh Gardens (a lovely garden-park) were 65 and over. As is discussed in the Activities section, the age of the population to be served is an important factor to be considered when planning a park.<sup>19</sup>

#### Household Composition \_\_\_\_\_

The distribution according to household composition is as follows: 40% lived in households with no children; 23% lived alone — compared with 18% of the 1966 City population; 4% lived with roommate(s); and 13% were married with no children at home. Meanwhile, 60% lived in households with one or more children (39% had one or more

children *under* 8 years old; and 39% had one or more children *over* 8). Again there are many variations among parks. For example, 67% of those interviewed in Craighleigh Gardens lived alone and 78% had no children; while 67% of those in Eglinton had children under 8 and 67% of those in Wellesley had children over 8.<sup>20</sup>

#### Dwelling Type \_\_\_\_\_

43% of the respondents to the long interview lived in single family detached houses (39% of the combined long and short survey respondents); 18% lived in semi-detached, row houses or duplexes (25% of the combined respondents); 31% lived in apartments (29% of the combined); 7% in rooms (6% of the combined); and 1% in other accommodations. According to the 1966 census data, 26% of the households in the City of Toronto were in single-detached houses (compared with 43% of the long survey and 39% of the combined surveys); 36% in semi-detached, row houses and duplexes (compared with only 18% of the long and 25% of the combined surveys); and 38% in apartments, flats, and other types (compared with 39% of the long and 37% of the combined surveys).

It is obvious that the major deviations from the City norm are the high percentage of respondents living in single, detached houses; and the relatively low percentage of respondents living in semi-detached, row and duplexes. The apartment and other group is similar to the City figure. There are large variations between the parks. For example, 78% of the Rosedale Park users lived in single, detached dwellings, compared with only 11% of those in Craighleigh Gardens; 60% in Wellesley Park lived in semi-detached etc. dwellings compared with only 6% in High Park North; and 89% in Craighleigh lived in apartments compared with only 20% in Wellesley. And

<sup>19</sup>Both Rosedale and Wellesley Parks are "active neighbourhood parks", as we discuss later in the section on Neighbourhood Parks.

<sup>20</sup>Eight years old seemed to be the dividing point between children who went to parks accompanied by an adult or older child and those who went by themselves.

there are some large variations between the park-users' and immediate area residents' dwelling characteristics. For example, 57% of High Park North users lived in single, detached dwellings, compared with 36% of the households in the surrounding area. *But*, with three exceptions (High Park North, Willowvale, and Riverdale)<sup>21</sup>, the patterns of users' dwelling types reflected the *basic relationships* — if not the exact percentages — of the surrounding area dwelling composition (i.e., if the largest group of dwellings in the area are apartments, the largest group of the park-users live in apartments; if the largest group of residents lives in single, detached houses, so does the largest group of park-users). The closest fits between park-users and area characteristics are Rosehill, Rosedale and Greenwood. (See Figure 1, User Dwelling Characteristics Compared With Area Dwelling Characteristics).

The fact that the percentage of park-users who live in single detached dwellings is consistently higher than that of area residents of other dwelling types seems to contradict one park planning standard which states that less land relative to population should be set aside for parks in single, detached house areas than in higher density areas,<sup>22</sup> because people living in these lower-density areas use parks less. The findings for the semi-detached, row and duplex group are puzzling, although it should be noted that much of the deviation is accounted for by two parks, one of which has a zoo as its main attraction.<sup>23</sup> And the similarity of the apartment group to the City norm indicates that this group does use parks;

therefore, when apartments are built, additional outdoor recreation space, proportional to the new population should be provided.

#### Education \_\_\_\_\_

The educational distribution over-represents the highest education group. Only 16% of the respondents over 20 years old had stopped their formal education at elementary school (compared with 46% of the 1961 City population classified in the census as "not attending school"); 51% of the park-users had attended or completed high school (similar to the 1961 City figure of 46%); and 33% had attended or completed university (compared with only 8% of the 1961 City population). While some of this difference can be accounted for by the location of the parks, the upper education levels are still heavily emphasized, with few exceptions (such as Greenwood Park where 60% of the users had elementary education, compared with 69% of the area residents; 40% had high school compared with 28% of the area residents; and 0% had university compared with 3% of the area residents). For example, in Rosedale Park, 0% of the park-users over 20 had just attended elementary school, compared with 12% of the residents in the area; 36% of the park-users had attended high school, compared with 53% in the area; and 64% of the park-users had attended university, compared with 36% in the area. Part of the difference may also be accounted for by the survey technique employed. A long interview tends to favour the upper-education levels, because people with more educa-

<sup>21</sup>These parks are later classified as Not Neighbourhood Parks on the Neighbourhood Park Grid I in the section on Neighbourhood Parks.

<sup>22</sup>George D. Butler, *Introduction to Community Recreation*, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., third ed., 1967), p. 184 states that "requirements for this type of area (neighborhood park) are far greater in residential neighborhoods of high density than in those composed of large individual home sites. For example, the American Public Health Association has proposed 2 acres of park per 1,000 persons in neighborhoods with a multiple-family development, as contrasted with 7/10 of an acre per 1,000 in neighborhoods with one- or two-family dwellings."

<sup>23</sup>See the section on Frequency of Use which indicates that although the semi-detached, row and duplex group is smaller than the city average, and the other groups, a larger percentage of the group use the parks very frequently (57% use their park more than 3 times a week).

FIGURE 1

USER DWELLING CHARACTERISTICS COMPARED WITH  
AREA DWELLING CHARACTERISTICS

Park	Single Detached	Semi-Detached Row, Duplex	Apartment, Other
High Park North*	36% 57%	16% 6%	**48% 38%
High Park East	27% 34%	20% 25%	53% 38%
Rosedale Park	68% 78%	4% 0%	28% 22%
Craigleigh Gardens	23% 11%	6% 0%	71% 89%
Trinity-Bellwoods Park	13% 17%	66% 50%	22% 34%
Rosehill Park	46% 43%	8% 11%	46% 47%
Willowvale Park*	22% 38%	**54% 19%	24% 38%
Greenwood Park	30% 22%	47% 56%	23% 22%
Eglinton Park	49% 75%	10% 0%	40% 25%
Wellesley Park	8% 20%	53% 60%	39% 20%
Riverdale Park*	8% 31%	**53% 25%	39% 44%

00% — area characteristics based on 1966 census

00% — park-user characteristics, based on Bureau long survey

\* — deviation of park-user pattern from area pattern

(\*\*placed next to category which should, but doesn't, predominate)



tion tend to be more willing to be interviewed and to give their opinions.

But, the great difference also could indicate that park-use rises with education. This, in fact, was a finding of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, which stated that "Education shows a strong relationship with outdoor activity, the higher educated being greater participants . . . (with) one exception to this generalization. Men with a college education participate less than men who are high school graduates."<sup>24</sup> The Bureau survey of specifically urban areas (as opposed to the ORRRC study of non-urban areas), seems to confirm the first part, but not the second part of the ORRRC findings.<sup>25</sup> The trend toward rising education would indicate that park use will also increase.

#### Occupation \_\_\_\_\_

Two occupation questions were asked — one asking the occupation of the respondent and the other asking the occupation of the head-of-household. The distribution of occupation of respondents was as follows: 30% were white collar; 13% blue collar; 44% other (including 18% housewife and 23% student), and 12% retired or unemployed. The most important respondent occupation groups were, therefore, student and housewife. The distribution of occupation of heads of households was as follows: 47% white collar; 32% blue collar; 8% other; and 13% retired or unemployed. Again, there is considerable inter-park variation: e.g., 96% of Rosedale Park users and 89% of Rosehill Park heads-of-household were white collar; while 87% of Wellesley Park and 66% of Greenwood Park were blue collar; and 33% of Craighleigh Gar-

dens, 28% of Trinity-Bellwoods, and 20% of High Park North heads-of-household were retired or unemployed. No readily comparable occupation figures were available.<sup>26</sup>

#### Income \_\_\_\_\_

The over-all income distribution of park-users under-emphasizes the middle-income range, while over-emphasizing the upper: 18% of all respondents had an annual household income of under \$5000 (and 24% of all those respondents who gave their income); 33% had an income of \$5000-\$9999 (41% of all those who gave their income); and 25% had an income of \$10,000 or more (34% of all those who gave their income). The general income distribution is roughly, 25% under \$5000, 50% \$5000-\$9999, and 25% \$10,000 or over. Again, there is considerable variation: 38% of all High Park East respondents had less than \$5000; 44% of the Willowvale users had \$5000-\$9999; and 46% of the Rosehill users had \$10,000 or more. Although appropriate comparative figures are not available<sup>27</sup> the income of park-users tends to reflect that of the surrounding areas, the exceptions being Craighleigh Gardens and High Park East which have more lower-income users than the surrounding area.

#### Ethnic Origin \_\_\_\_\_

51% of the park-users interviewed were born in Canada (compared with 58% of the 1961 City population) and 49% were born outside Canada (compared with 42% of the 1961 City population). There are, again, variations among the parks (74% of those interviewed in Rosedale Park and 67% in

<sup>24</sup>ORRRC Study Report 21, *Participation in Outdoor Recreation: Factors Affecting Demand Among American Adults* (Washington, D.C.: ORRRC, 1962), p. 11.

<sup>25</sup>Although the lower education groups were under-represented, those who were interviewed said that they used their parks very frequently. See the section on Frequency of Use.

<sup>26</sup>ORRRC also found that the "higher status" occupations, such as professional, had a higher participation rate in outdoor recreation than did the lower ones.

<sup>27</sup>Average Income of Household by Planning District, 1967, based on 1961 census, prepared by the City of Toronto Planning staff.

Wellesley Park were born in Canada; while only 19% in Willowvale, 37% in High Park North and 39% in Trinity-Bellwoods were born in Canada). While most parks reflect the general ethnic composition of the surrounding area (e.g., Rosedale: 74% of both users and area residents were born in Canada; Trinity-Bellwoods: 39% of users and 42% of area residents born in Canada; and Wellesley: 67% of both users and area residents born in Canada), there are some extreme deviations (e.g., Willowvale, where only 19% of the respondents, compared with 42% of the area residents, were born in Canada). In only two areas was the native-foreign ratio actually reversed: in High Park North where 37% of the users (and 51% of the residents) were born in Canada, while 63% of the users (and 49% of the residents) were foreign born; and in High Park East, where 43% of the users (and 51% of the residents) were native born, while 57% of the users (and 49% of the residents) were foreign born. High Park is a large, multi-purpose park, which may have a special attraction for "foreigners". One additional point is that in every case where there was a deviation from the area percentage, the balance was in favour of the foreign born.

Besides these socio-economic characteristics, there are several other variables which we felt might influence park use.

#### Rural-Urban Origin \_\_\_\_\_

The analysis of urban-rural origin did not reveal any clear pattern. As we discussed in *Urban Open Space: Luxury or Necessity?*, although park users raised in the country or in small towns showed a slightly stronger affinity for nature, the overwhelming majority of users classified themselves as being of "large town or urban" origin (74%, compared with 16%

"rural or small town" and 10% "both"). This indicates that parks will continue to be important even when more and more people are born and raised in cities. Although there were some variations between the parks (e.g., 28% of those in Trinity-Bellwoods and 27% in Wellesley were rural, compared with 0% in Riverdale; and 25% of those in High Park East and 33% in Craighleigh classified themselves as "both", compared with only 9% of those in High Park North and 4% in Rosedale),<sup>28</sup> by far the majority of users were of large town or urban origin.

#### Automobile Ownership/Use \_\_\_\_\_

Do automobile-owners use parks? Two conclusions can be drawn from the fact that 50% of all park-users interviewed (and 56% of all those 16 years and over) did own or have the use of a car. First, that both car-owners and non-car-owners use urban parks and second, that despite the fact that a large number of people own cars, most walked to the park. Only 18% of the park users had driven to it. This leads to the conclusion that even if car ownership does increase in the future, this increase won't have much effect on park-use in the city and that parks should continue to be located within walking distance of the people they are meant to serve. There were variations between the parks (69% of the High Park East, 78% of the Trinity-Bellwoods and 80% of the Wellesley Park users do not have the use of cars, probably reflecting the ethnic and/or low-income character of the users, since, as the survey showed, foreign-born park-users—such as those in High Park East and Trinity-Bellwoods—are less likely to have cars than native-born users; and low-income people—such as those in Wellesley Park—are, of course, less likely to have cars than high-income people).

<sup>28</sup>The fact that urbanites frequented the Riverdale zoo area (88% of Riverdale users were "large town or urban" and 12% were "both"), suggest that a zoo should be kept in the downtown area.

### Summer Cottage Use \_\_\_\_\_

Does summer cottage-use and/or ownership affect park use? Only 27% of the people interviewed had the use of summer cottages (unfortunately, no comparative figures were available). Two parks did have a high percentage of cottage-users (48% in Rosedale and 41% in High Park East), leading to the conclusion that cottage-owners do in fact still use urban parks.<sup>29</sup> It is interesting to note that these two parks are completely different in character — High Park East being a large, natural area and Rosedale a relatively small, active sports area.

### Summer Weekends \_\_\_\_\_

The use of a park seems to vary in direct relation to the number of summer week-ends spent outside of the city: 24% of those interviewed spend no week-ends away; 21% spend 1 or 2 a summer away; 16% spend 1 a month away; 15% spend 2 a month away; and 14% spend 3 or 4 a month away. A relatively large number, however, do go away frequently (29% went away 2 or more week-ends a month), while still using urban parks. The relation between week-ends and frequency of use is discussed in the section on Frequency.

### Club Membership \_\_\_\_\_

And finally, very few people interviewed in the parks were members of private outdoor recreation clubs (11%). This fact leads us to the conclusion that increase in private recreation club membership might reduce pressure on urban parks. But, there is real doubt whether such a trend will in fact develop since maintaining such clubs, which must pay taxes, is expensive. Reduced membership in these private clubs may in fact be a more likely trend — which would increase pressure on parks. It will be shown

later that although relatively few club-members use parks, those who do use them, use them frequently.

### Summary \_\_\_\_\_

In summary, this section, based on the Bureau surveys, has shown who uses urban parks of various types and in various locations. In some cases the distribution of all park-users was similar to that of the general City population (e.g., sex, ethnic origin, and automobile ownership); and in some cases it was different (e.g., age and education); but both the similarities and differences are helpful in understanding park-use. Similarly, in most cases the sample of users in each park seemed to reflect the characteristics of those people living in the surrounding area (e.g., dwelling type, income, and ethnic origin); and in some cases it over-represented one or more groups (e.g., age and education); but, again, the comparisons are useful.

This study has found that there are basically *three types of variation*: variations in use *between parks in different areas*; *between parks in a single area* (e.g. Wellesley and Riverdale Parks. See Figure 2); and *between different parts of the same park* (e.g., High Park. See Figure 3). Clearly then, although analysis of the general distribution of all users in all parks is useful, *analysis of individual parks is essential*. Furthermore, the variations indicate that planners cannot assume that the mere location of a park in an area ensures that the residents of that area are in fact being adequately served. And finally, these variations all support the earlier contention that *general standards which do not take into consideration local variations are inadequate*. The following sections discuss more specifically which characteristics seem to affect user-behaviour and how this might influence park planning.

<sup>29</sup>See the sections on Distance and Frequency of Use for descriptions of the surprising effects of cottage-ownership on park-use.

**FIGURE 2**  
**COMPARISON OF USERS OF PARKS IN THE SAME AREA**

Selected Characteristics	Wellesley Park	Riverdale Park	
Male .....	47%	63%	D
8-15 years .....	40%	13%	D
21-29 years .....	13%	43%	D
Semi-detached, Row, Duplex .....	60%	25%	D
Apartment .....	13%	44%	D
Elementary School (over 20 years old) .....	20%	0%	D
University (over 20 years old) .....	0%	33%	D
Head-of-Household, Blue Collar .....	87%	38%	D
\$5,000-\$9,999 .....	33%	38%	S
Born in Canada .....	67%	63%	S
Rural, Small Town Origin .....	27%	0%	D
Large Town, Urban Origin .....	67%	88%	D
Use of Car (over 15 years old) .....	33%	86%	D

D — Parks Different with respect to this characteristic  
S — Parks Similar with respect to this characteristic

**FIGURE 3**  
**COMPARISON OF USERS OF THE SAME PARK**

Selected Characteristics	High Park North	High Park East	
Male .....	54%	63%	D
65 years or older .....	23%	13%	D
Household With Children .....	57%	47%	D
Single detached house .....	57%	34%	D
Apartment .....	38%	38%	S
Elementary School (over 20 years old) .....	28%	26%	S
Completed High School (over 20 years old) .....	19%	48%	D
Respondent — Housewife .....	20%	3%	D
Head-of-Household—Blue Collar .....	37%	34%	S
Under \$5,000 .....	20%	38%	D
Born in Canada .....	37%	43%	D
Large Town, Urban Origin .....	74%	56%	D
No Use of Car (over 15 years old) .....	43%	68%	D
Use of Summer Cottage .....	14%	41%	D

D — Parks are Different with respect to this characteristic  
S — Parks are Similar with respect to this characteristic

## DISTANCE

How far do people travel to use a park? In order to locate parks so that they serve people properly, and to develop standards that reflect user-behaviour, it is essential to answer this question. The distances cited in the following discussion are based on measuring the distance along roads between the park and the respondents' residence (or place of work, whichever is appropriate). The distance, therefore, is not a radius of a circle or necessarily a straight line; nor does it take into account short-cuts through driveways, across school yards and so forth, which were undoubtedly taken by some respondents. The distance measured, therefore, while being more accurate than a straight line measurement, may well be *longer* than the actual distance travelled.

The pattern of distance travelled by all respondents to the In-Park survey (short In-Park survey figures are in parenthesis) is as follows: 21% (30%) travelled less than  $\frac{1}{8}$  mile; 9% (29%) travelled  $\frac{1}{8}$  to less than  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile; 20% (21%) travelled  $\frac{1}{4}$  to less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile; 4% (7%) travelled  $\frac{1}{2}$  to less than  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile; 5% (4%) travelled  $\frac{3}{4}$  to less than 1 mile; 35% (10%) travelled 1 mile or more; and 7% (0%) gave no answer. Emphasis, therefore, is on both the *short distances* (50% of the long survey respondents and 80% of the short having travelled less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile) and the *long distance* (35% of the long survey — but only 10% of the short — having travelled 1 mile or more). There is a distinct gap in the middle distances (since only 9% of the long and 11% of the short travelled between  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile and 1 mile).

The even greater emphasis on short distances in the short survey is obvious and can be partly accounted for by the fact that the brevity of the interview made it possible to interview less stationary — but not atypical — users, such as boys playing soccer and adults walking through.

While the pattern of *all* respondents is useful to know, it is also important to

point out that there are great variations between parks. For example, 47% of those interviewed in Wellesley Park, 43% in Rosehill, 33% in Trinity-Bellwoods and 32% in Civic Square had travelled less than  $\frac{1}{8}$  mile (compared with 21% of all respondents in all parks); while, at the other extreme, 81% of those in Riverdale, 69% in High Park North and 56% in Craleigh Gardens had travelled 1 mile or more (compared with 35% of all respondents). The parks can be divided into two basic types — those that attract (and therefore “serve”) people from short distances (such as Wellesley), and those that attract (or “serve”) people from long distances (such as Riverdale). No parks seem to attract (or “serve”) a large number of people from the middle distances, although some attract a large number of people from both short and long distances (e.g., High Park East, where 47% had travelled less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile and 44% 1 mile or more; or Willowvale, where 44% had travelled less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile and 38% 1 mile or more).

These variations reinforce the comments made earlier in the section on Park-User Characteristics, which showed that there are three basic types of variation: between parks in different areas of the City; between parks in the same area of the city (e.g., Wellesley, which attracted 47% of its users from less than  $\frac{1}{8}$  mile, compared with Riverdale which attracted none from that distance); and between different parts of the same park (e.g., High Park North which attracted only 20% of its users from less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile, compared with High Park East, which attracted 47% from that distance).

The major implications of these findings for park planning is that parks should not be located  $\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 mile away from the intended users. Parks expected to serve people living  $\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 mile away (e.g., “district parks” in the City of Toronto Official Plan) will not in fact do so. The important question of how far apart local parks should be located, is a little more difficult to answer. For two reasons, we support the Official Plan implication that

$\frac{1}{4}$  mile walking distance is an appropriate distance. First, a substantial proportion of park-users (e.g., 30% of all long survey respondents and 59% of all short survey respondents) travel less than  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile. Second, in response to the question "What do you like about this park?", 26% replied that they liked its closeness or proximity. When "liking proximity" was cross-tabulated by distance travelled, the following pattern emerged: 41% of those who had travelled less than  $\frac{1}{8}$  mile mentioned proximity; 48% of those who had travelled  $\frac{1}{8}$  to less than  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile; 29% of those who had travelled  $\frac{1}{4}$  to less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile; and so on down to 12% of those who had travelled 1 mile or more. Not only does liking proximity, therefore, vary (with one exception) indirectly with distance travelled (as is to be expected); but also, the major drop in mentioning proximity occurs between  $\frac{1}{4}$  and  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile (from 48% to 29%). The  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile distance, for these reasons is recommended by the Bureau as the best standard for spacing of local parks.<sup>30</sup>

The above general findings also constitute an excellent example of why parks standards should be based on analysis of user behaviour rather than on vague notions derived from "experience". This analysis of user-behaviour demonstrates that few people will in fact travel  $\frac{1}{2}$  to 1 mile to use a park. But, one commonly quoted parks standard has been that a "community park" would "serve a radius of at least one mile". The Bureau study indicates that such a park would serve only those people living within  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile walking distance.<sup>31</sup>

#### Activities \_\_\_\_\_

First, the type of activity engaged in influences the distance travelled. Activities  $\times$  Distance (Figure 4), compiled by cross-tabulating answers to "What do you plan to do here today?" with distance travelled, shows the marked variation between activities. The activities are ar-

ranged according to the percentage of respondents travelling less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile, ranging from a high of 65% of those using playgrounds to a low of 18% of those visiting a zoo.

Several other variables, in addition to activities, seem to influence distance travelled to use a park.

#### Mode of Travel \_\_\_\_\_

Not surprisingly, one of the most important variables is the mode of travel: e.g., 71% of those who had walked and 77% of those who had bicycled, had travelled less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile; while only 3% of those who had used public transit and 2% of those who had driven a car had travelled less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile. Conversely, 89% of those who had driven and 87% of those who had taken public transit had travelled 1 mile or more, compared with 20% of those who had walked and 2% of those who had bicycled.

#### Sex and Marital Status \_\_\_\_\_

In general, males were somewhat more mobile than females. For example, 55% of all males, compared with 45% of the females, travelled 1 mile or more; while 56% of the females, compared with 44% of the males, travelled less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile. Furthermore, married respondents travelled further than unmarried, with 41% of those over 20 years who were married having travelled 1 mile or more, compared with 30% of the single respondents. While both married and female respondents (of all ages) travelled further than single respondents, married males were more mobile than married females (49% of the married males, compared with 35% of the married females having travelled 1 mile or more).

#### Age \_\_\_\_\_

Does age influence distance travelled? As was expected, the youngest park-users interviewed (8-15 years) tended

<sup>30</sup>For further discussion, see section on Neighbourhood Parks.

<sup>31</sup>Ontario Department of Education, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

FIGURE 4  
ACTIVITIES X DISTANCE

*ACTIVITIES	Total	Less than 1/8 mile	1/8 to less than 1/4 mile	1/4 to less than 1/2 mile	(Cumulative row %) less than 1/2 mile	1/2 to less than 3/4 mile	3/4 to less than 1 mile	1 mile or more	No answer
Playground .....	47	9	5	17	31	2	0	14	0
Row % .....	100%	19%	10%	36%	65%	4%	0%	30%	0
Play with, watch children .....	53	13	3	16	32	2	1	16	2
Row % .....	100%	24%	5%	30%	59%	4%	2%	30%	4%
Sit .....	71	18	8	15	41	3	5	18	4
Row % .....	100%	25%	11%	21%	57%	4%	7%	25%	6%
**Social Activities	66	18	9	10	37	5	2	19	3
Row % .....	100%	27%	14%	15%	56%	8%	3%	29%	5%
Fields .....	23	6	3	4	13	1	0	8	1
Row % .....	100%	26%	13%	17%	56%	4%	0%	35%	4%
***Phys. Health Activities .....	32	8	5	5	18	2	2	8	2
Row % .....	100%	25%	15%	15%	55%	6%	6%	25%	6%
****Mental H'lth	28	5	2	8	15	2	2	7	2
Row % .....	100%	18%	7%	28%	53%	7%	7%	25%	7%
Pools .....	44	9	1	13	23	2	0	18	1
Row % .....	100%	20%	2%	30%	52%	5%	0%	41%	2%
Walk .....	53	14	5	7	26	4	2	21	0
Row % .....	100%	26%	9%	13%	48%	8%	4%	40%	0%
*****Solitary Activities .....	40	6	4	9	19	3	3	12	3
Row % .....	100%	15%	10%	23%	48%	8%	8%	30%	8%
Spend leisure .....	21	1	3	5	9	0	3	8	1
Row % .....	100%	5%	14%	24%	43%	0%	14%	38%	5%
Enjoy nature .....	28	8	1	2	11	1	1	14	1
Row % .....	100%	28%	4%	7%	39%	4%	4%	50%	4%
Zoo, animals .....	32	3	2	1	6	0	2	24	0
Row % .....	100%	9%	6%	3%	18%	0%	6%	75%	0%
All respondents	244	51	23	48	122	9	11	85	17
Row % .....	100%	21%	9%	20%	50%	4%	5%	35%	7%

\*Activities are ranked in descending order of per cent frequency according to the less than 1/2 mile distance

\*\*Social Activities include such activities as meeting friends, playing cards, going on a date

\*\*\* Physical Health Activities include breathing fresh air, exercising, and so forth

\*\*\*\* Mental Health Activities include such activities as enjoying a change of pace, getting away from it all, and so forth

\*\*\*\*\* Solitary Activities include reading, knitting, sitting alone, and so forth

to travel the shortest distance.<sup>32</sup> 73% (81% of the short survey) of the 8-15 group travelled less than ½ a mile (and 41% of the long and 62% of the short, travelled less than ¼ mile); while only 9% (4% of the short) travelled 1 mile or more. On the other hand, a much higher percentage of the oldest group (65 and over) travelled a longer distance than had been expected, with 44% of this group having travelled 1 mile or more. Only one other group — the 30-39 year old group — had as high a percentage in that distance group. The long distances travelled by many of the old respondents was surprising. This could be partly accounted for by the fact that this group — consisting of retired and unemployed people — has the most free time and, particularly in the case of the poorer members, may occupy some of that time by taking walks, which are inexpensive. It is interesting to note that the second to oldest group — 50-64 years old — had the highest percentage in the shortest distance group, with 32% having travelled less than ¼ mile.

#### Household Composition \_\_\_\_\_

Does household composition influence distance travelled? Although there was not much difference in distances travelled between those in households with and those in households without children (50% of those with children and 52% of those without children travelled less than ½ mile; and 36% of those with and 34% of those without children travelled 1 mile or more), there were some noticeable variations between the different household groups. For example, 70% of those with roommates and 63% of those with children only aged 16-20, compared with only 36% of those with children 8-15 and 16-20, travelled less than ½ mile. And 43% of those with children only under 8 years and 40% of those

living alone, compared with only 10% of those with roommates, travelled 1 mile or more. The large number of those with children only under 8 years old who had travelled quite far (43%) was surprising.

#### Dwelling Type \_\_\_\_\_

Does dwelling type influence distance travelled? A higher percentage of park-users living in semi-detached, row houses and duplexes and in apartments travelled short distances (66% of the former and 61% of the latter travelled less than ½ mile), than did park-users living in single detached houses or in rooms (45% of each having travelled less than ½ mile). Since semi-detached or row houses and apartments are more likely to be the predominant dwelling types of the urban future (given the necessity for high density development which will reduce the number of single detached houses), there should be increasing emphasis on the location of parks at short distances from dwellings.<sup>33</sup>

#### Education \_\_\_\_\_

Does education influence distance travelled? No, education level attained appears to exert little influence on the general pattern of distance travelled: e.g., 48% of those (over 20 years old) who had only elementary school travelled less than ½ a mile to use a park; 46% of those with at least some high school and 49% of those with at least some university education travelled less than ½ mile. Education does exert some influence at the extremes of education and distance: 34% of the elementary group (compared with 29% of the high school and 28% of the university group) travelled less than ¼ mile. And 43% of the university group (compared with 38% of the elementary and 35% of the high school groups), travelled 1 mile or more.

<sup>32</sup>Under 8 years of age, children are usually accompanied by an adult or older child. The 8-15 year old group, therefore, is the youngest group of park-users who go to a park on their own.

<sup>33</sup>See also the section on Policy and Planning Implications.



## Income \_\_\_\_\_

Does income influence distance travelled? The distance patterns created by different income groups were as follows: 38% of the under \$5000 annual household income group, 53% of the \$5000-\$9999 group and 42% of the \$10,000 or more group travelled less than ½ mile; and 49% of the less than \$5000 group, 36% of the \$5000 to \$9999 group, and 43% of the \$10,000 or more group travelled 1 mile or more. There is, therefore, at least a superficial similarity between the lowest and highest income groups: both have a somewhat low percentage travelling the shorter distances (only 38% and 42% travelled less than ½ mile compared with 50% of all respondents) and a somewhat high percentage travelling the longest distance (49% and 43% travelled 1 mile or more as compared with only 35% of all respondents).

While the patterns may be similar, the reasons for the patterns may differ. The low-income group (which had an unexpectedly high number who travelled long distances) may have travelled long distances for at least two basic reasons. They may have walked because walking is an inexpensive but relatively pleasant form of recreation. But more likely, they may have *had* to walk further to get to a park (i.e., they may have had no choice, because they lived far away from parks). On the other hand, the upper income group, which is more mobile (having cars) and has more money to spend on recreation, may have travelled the long distance from *choice*, rather than necessity. Within the upper income group, however, the \$10,000 to \$14,999 group tended to travel further than the highest, \$15,000 or more (53% of the former and 30% of the latter travelled 1 mile or more). Perhaps the highest income group is more likely to have summer cottages and therefore pursues "special outdoor recreation activities" there, rather than relying on city parks for these activities.<sup>34</sup>

We should also note that a very high percentage (71%) of the "Don't Know" income group, which is composed largely of children, travelled less than ½ mile.

## Occupation \_\_\_\_\_

Does occupation influence distance travelled to use parks? Some occupations do seem to influence distance travelled. The major variations of occupation groups from the general distance pattern are: that 58% of the managerial group, 44% of the professional, and 42% of the skilled labour but only 28% of the student group travelled 1 mile or more (compared with 35% of all respondents); 33% of the clerical, secretarial and sales group travelled less than ⅛ mile — probably for lunchtime park-use — (compared with 21% of all respondents). The other groups were either too small (such as the unskilled labour and sitter or nurse groups) to provide useful information, or were similar to the general pattern (such as the housewife or retired and unemployed groups).

## Ethnic Origin \_\_\_\_\_

Does ethnic origin affect distance travelled to parks? Of those born in Canada, 26% travelled less than ¼ mile (compared with 35% of those born outside Canada); and 32% travelled 1 mile or more (compared with 38% of those born outside Canada). This general comparison, which shows that relatively more non-Canadian born than Canadian born park-users travelled both the shortest and longest distances, masks some of the interesting differences between ethnic groups. First, within the group of Canadian-born users, there are differences: 43% of the Toronto-born users travelled less than ½ mile (compared with 56% of the other Canadian-born respondents) and 38% travelled 1 mile or more (compared with 27% of the other Canadians). Second, there are differences between the

<sup>34</sup>See also the discussion below about the relation of cottage use to distance travelled and frequency used.

other ethnic groups as well. For example, 32% of the British travelled less than  $\frac{1}{8}$  mile, compared with only 11% of the Central and Eastern Europeans; 63% of the Northern Europeans and 62% of the Southern Europeans travelled less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile, compared with only 33% of the Central Europeans. On the other hand, 59% of the Central Europeans<sup>35</sup> and 42% of the "Other Foreign-Born" travelled 1 mile or more, compared with 22% of the Southern Europeans. It should be noted that while relatively large numbers of both Canadian-born groups and some Foreign-born groups travelled long distances, more Canadians had the use of cars (59% of those over 15) than did Foreigners (39% of those over 15); therefore, Canadians probably tended to *drive* long distances (over 1 mile) whereas Foreigners did not.<sup>36</sup>

#### Length of Residence \_\_\_\_\_

Does familiarity with a city, as measured by length of residence in that city, affect distance travelled to parks? An unexpected pattern emerged: 55% of those who had lived in Toronto less than 2 years, 62% of those who had lived there between 2 and 10 years and 44% of those who had lived there more than 10 years travelled less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile; and 34% of the less than 2 years group, 25% of the 2-10 years group, and 40% of the more than 10 years group travelled 1 mile or more. Those who had lived in Toronto for the shortest time (16% of all respondents) showed the least deviation from the general pattern. Those who had lived there the longest (53% of all respondents) did, as was expected, have the largest percentage of users who had travelled the longest distance (40% travelled 1 mile or more). But, those who had lived there the middle length of time (26% of all respondents) — who presumably were nearly as familiar with the

city as the 10 years or more group — had the highest percentage of users who had travelled the shortest distances (31% less than  $\frac{1}{8}$  mile, 42% less than  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile and 62% less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile). This was a deviation from the hypothesis that distance would vary directly with familiarity with the city (e.g., the shorter the residence, the shorter the distance travelled).

#### Rural-Urban Origin \_\_\_\_\_

Does rural versus urban origin affect distance travelled to a park? While the distance pattern of the large town, urban origin group (by far the largest, comprising 74% of all respondents) was similar to the pattern of all respondents (49% of the urban group travelled less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile and 36% 1 mile or more); the rural, small town group emphasized the short distances (29% travelled less than  $\frac{1}{8}$  mile; 40% less than  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile; 58% less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile; and only 26% 1 mile or more); and the "both" group emphasized the long distances (44% travelled 1 mile or more).

#### Automobile Ownership/Use \_\_\_\_\_

Does car ownership or use influence distance travelled? The answer seems to be yes (particularly at the longest distance) since 41% of those who owned or had the use of a car travelled one mile or more; compared with only 29% of those who do not own or have the use of a car. Nevertheless, it should be re-emphasized that car owners did not necessarily use their cars to travel to the park. As mentioned previously, only 18% of all respondents actually drove to the park where they were interviewed. The small percentage who did drive, however, tended to drive long distances (89% of those who travelled by car, travelled 1 mile or more).

<sup>35</sup>A large number of this group visited High Park. Are they attracted to a large natural park and therefore went to High Park? Or, do they like walking and therefore went a long way, ending up in High Park?

<sup>36</sup>See also the discussion of Automobile Ownership/Use below.

### Summer Cottage Use \_\_\_\_\_

Does cottage ownership or use influence distance travelled? Again, the answer seems to be yes, but in an unexpected way. 59% of those who own or have the use of a summer cottage (65, or 27% of all respondents) travelled less than ½ mile, compared with only 47% of those without a cottage; and, conversely, only 29% of those with a cottage travelled 1 mile or more, compared with 39% of those without a cottage. In other words, contrary to expectations, those having a cottage (and presumably being more mobile and prone to travel) tended not to travel as far to urban parks as those not having a cottage. Why? Perhaps those having cottages simply are better served by parks, and consequently, don't *have to* go as far as those not having cottages. But, and perhaps more probably, those without cottages may use urban parks for different reasons from those who do have cottages and may therefore travel different distances. Those who have cottages can rely on them for special recreation needs and therefore tend to use urban parks for more "everyday" outdoor recreation — such as using a playground, throwing a football, or sitting in the sun for a few minutes. People tend to travel shorter distances for such everyday activities. People who do not have cottages, on the other hand, rely more on urban parks for *all* types of recreation — special as well as everyday — and therefore, a higher percentage of this group may well be willing to travel a long distance to engage in such activities as swimming, enjoying nature, taking the children to the zoo.

### Summer Weekends \_\_\_\_\_

Does the number of week-ends spent away affect distance travelled? The answer seems to be yes. The following pattern emerged: those spending the fewest week-ends away (none or only 1 or 2 a summer) had the lowest percentage of those travelling less than ½ a mile (41% and 46% respectively) and the highest travelling 1 mile or more

(37% and 39%); those spending a moderate number of week-ends away (one a month) had the largest percentage travelling less than ½ mile (75%) and the smallest travelling 1 mile or more (21%); and those spending the most week-ends away (2 a month or 3 and 4 a month) fell between the other groups (54% each travelled less than ½ mile; and 35% of the 2 week-end and 31% of the 3 and 4 week-end group travelled 1 mile or more). Like cottage-owners, those who spent a moderate to a large number of week-ends away (1 or more a month) tended to travel shorter distances to parks than did those who spent few, if any, week-ends away.

### Club Membership \_\_\_\_\_

And, finally, does membership in a private outdoor recreation club affect distance travelled? For reasons similar to those discussed for cottage ownership and week-end frequency, the answer seems to be yes. Those belonging to a private club (only 12% of all respondents) rely more on the short distances (with 64% having travelled less than ½ mile) and less on the long distances (with 29% having travelled 1 mile or more) than do those who do not belong to a private club (51% having travelled less than ½ mile and 35% 1 mile or more). If more private recreation facilities become available in the future, pressure on "special parks" may be eased. But if, as seems more likely, fewer private facilities become available, pressure may be increased.

### Summary \_\_\_\_\_

Those who came to parks to use a playground, to bring children or to play with them, to sit, to engage in social activities, to use playing fields, to enjoy nature or to take a walk, tended to travel short distances. Consequently, facilities for these activities should be located close to the users. On the other hand, those who came to parks to visit a zoo and those who were sight-seeing tended to travel long distances, and facilities for these activities can therefore be more

widely spaced. Those who walked or rode a bike tended to travel short distances, while those who took public transit or drove a car tended to travel long distances. Females tended to travel shorter distances than males. The youngest group (8-15 years) and the 50-64 years group tended to travel short distances, while the 30-39 year and 65 and over groups tended to travel the long distances.

Those who lived in semi-detached or row houses or duplexes and those who lived in apartments tended to travel short distances, while those in single detached houses and rooms tended to travel long distances. Education did not have much influence on distance travelled. Those who had a low income (under \$5000) and those who had a high income (\$10,000 or more) tended to travel long distances. The high level white collar groups and the skilled labour group tended to travel long distances. The British, the Northern Europeans and the Southern Europeans tended to travel short distances while the Central Europeans tended to travel long distances. Those who had lived in Toronto for less than 10 years tended to travel short distances, while those who had lived there for more than 10 years travelled long distances. Those from rural areas or small towns tended to travel short distances. Cottage owners or users, those who went away for a moderate number of week-ends (1 per month) and members of private recreation clubs all tended to travel short distances; while non-cottage owners and infrequent week-enders tended to travel long distances. Other types of park-users travelled distances similar to the overall distance pattern.

Despite all the variations from the general pattern, it is important to recall that pattern: 21% travelled less than  $\frac{1}{8}$  mile; 9%,  $\frac{1}{8}$  to less than  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile; 20%,  $\frac{1}{4}$  to less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile; 4%,  $\frac{1}{2}$  to less than  $\frac{3}{4}$  mile; 5%,  $\frac{3}{4}$  to less than 1 mile; and 35%, 1 mile or more. Because of the users' obvious preference for short distances, planning emphasis should be on the short distances; and because of the users' lack of enthusiasm for the middle

distances, planning should not emphasize this  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile to 1 mile range.

#### FREQUENCY OF USE

How often do people use parks? The answers to this question are less easily applied to the development of park standards than are the answers to the previously discussed question, how far do people travel to use parks. But the answers to the question of frequency of use are, nevertheless, of indirect help in measuring crowding. If planners know that certain types of parks are used more frequently than others, or that certain types of people use parks more frequently than others then park planning can be adjusted accordingly to prevent overcrowding or under-use.

As we stated earlier, most of the park-users who were interviewed used parks frequently: 41% used the park where they were interviewed more than 3 times per week; 22% used it 1-3 times per week (for a combined total of 63% who used their park at least once a week); 16% used it 1-3 times per month; and 21% used it less than once a month. There are, as expected, significant variations between the parks: e.g., 74% of Rosedale, 67% of Trinity-Bellwoods and 67% of Wellesley users visited their park more than three times per week; compared with 0% of Riverdale and 26% of High Park North users. Two basic types of variations discussed earlier are reconfirmed: variation between parks in different areas and variation between different parks in the same area. Variation within one park is also demonstrated (e.g., 29% of High Park North compared with 9% of High Park East users came 1-3 times per month), but it tends to be less extreme than the other two types.

#### Activities \_\_\_\_\_

Does frequency of use vary according to the activity engaged in? Yes, people do tend to use parks more frequently for some activities than for others. Figure 5, Activities x Frequency (in which activities

FIGURE 5

## ACTIVITIES X FREQUENCY

*ACTIVITIES	Total	More than 3 times per week	1-3 times per week	Weekly use	1-3 times per month	Less than once per month
Playground .....	47	26	13	39	4	4
Row % .....	100%	55%	28%	83%	9%	9%
Lunch .....	25	13	7	20	5	0
Row % .....	100%	57%	28%	80%	20%	0%
Spend Leisure .....	21	13	3	16	2	3
Row % .....	100%	62%	14%	76%	10%	14%
Play with, watch children .....	53	25	14	39	8	6
Row % .....	100%	47%	26%	73%	15%	11%
Solitary activities ..	40	21	7	28	8	4
Row % .....	100%	53%	18%	71%	20%	10%
Fields, organized games .....	23	11	5	16	5	2
Row % .....	100%	48%	22%	70%	22%	9%
Pools (wading, swimming, etc.) .....	44	23	7	30	6	8
Row % .....	100%	52%	16%	68%	14%	18%
Social activities .....	66	30	15	45	14	7
Row % .....	100%	45%	23%	68%	21%	11%
Enjoy nature .....	28	9	9	18	5	5
Row % .....	100%	32%	32%	64%	18%	18%
Walk .....	53	20	16	36	8	9
Row % .....	100%	38%	30%	68%	15%	17%
Sit .....	71	29	15	44	12	15
Row % .....	100%	41%	21%	62%	17%	21%
Mental health .....	28	7	10	17	8	3
Row % .....	100%	25%	36%	61%	29%	11%
Physical health .....	32	12	7	19	7	6
Row % .....	100%	38%	22%	60%	22%	19%
Zoo, animals .....	32	5	4	9	3	20
Row % .....	100%	16%	13%	29%	9%	63%
Total .....	244	100	53	153	39	52
Row % .....	100%	41%	22%	63%	16%	21%

\* Activities are ranked in descending order according to frequency of weekly use

are arranged in descending order according to the percentage of those who engaged in each activity who used the park at least once a week), shows the variation (from 83% of playground users to 29% of animal and zoo visitors). It should be noted, however, that only one activity, visit animals/zoo, fell substantially below the over-all weekly-use total of 63%.<sup>37</sup>

What other factors are related to frequency of use?

#### Mode of Travel \_\_\_\_\_

Mode of travel is closely related. For example, 51% of the walkers and 89% of the bicycle riders visited their parks more than 3 times a week, compared with only 19% of the public transit users and 11% of the car drivers. And related to mode of travel is distance travelled. Not surprisingly the distance travelled tends to be directly related to frequency of use (e.g., the shorter the distance, the more frequent the use). For example, 72% of those who used the park more than 3 times per week travelled less than ½ mile, compared with 47% of those who used it 1-3 times per week, 41% of those who used it 1-3 times per month and only 18% of those who used it less than once a month. And, conversely, only 15% of those who used the park more than three times per week travelled one mile or more, compared with 34% of those who used it 1-3 times per week, 43% of those who used it 1-3 times per month; and 67% of those who used it less than once a month.

#### Sex \_\_\_\_\_

Females (46% of whom used their park more than 3 times per week) tended to use parks a bit more frequently than males (36% of whom used it more than 3 times per week), although their weekly-use was very similar (64% of the females and 61% of the males used their parks at least once a week).

#### Age \_\_\_\_\_

Does age influence frequency of park use? As was expected, the youngest group and the oldest group — both of whom have the most free time — used parks most frequently. Of the 8-15 year old group, 78% used the park 3 or more times a week and 83% used it at least once a week. And of the 65 and over group, 52% used it more than 3 times per week and 76% used it at least once a week. The age groups using it least frequently were the 21-29 and the 40-49, with 52% of each of these having visited their park at least once a week. But, in absolute numbers, the 21-29 group was still the most important group.

#### Household Composition \_\_\_\_\_

Does household composition influence frequency of park-use? In general terms, there is not much difference in frequency of use according to presence or absence of children in a household: 66% of those with no children and 61% of those with children used their park at least once a week. The range, by household groups, is from 45% of those having children only 8-15 years to 70% of those with roommates (a small group of 10); but no clear pattern emerged. Factors other than just household composition influence frequency of park-use.

#### Dwelling Type \_\_\_\_\_

Does housing type influence frequency of park-use? Yes, there are significant variations according to housing type: 57% of the single detached house group; 87% of the semi-detached, row house, duplex group; 52% of the apartment group; and 83% of the room group used their park at least once a week. It would seem, then, that the single detached and apartment groups are similar; and the semi-detached, row, duplex and room groups are similar. Although, as shown

<sup>37</sup>One other activity, not listed because of the small number who mentioned it, fell substantially below 63%, "sight see". Only 9% of sightseers came to the park once a week. (i.e., 1 of 11 respondents).

in the section on Park Users Characteristics, fewer of the park-users interviewed lived in semi-detached, row or duplexes (only 18% of all respondents), those semi-detached, row and duplex residents who did use parks, used them frequently (57% more than 3 times a week). The differences between the single, detached group and the semi-detached, row and duplex group may be partly accounted for by the fact that although a large percentage of both groups planned to use parks for their children<sup>38</sup> the semi-detached, row or duplex group came more frequently because many of them have only a small backyard. Generally backyards of this sort of housing are not as adequate for outdoor activities as the larger backyards of many single detached houses. Apartment dwellers, of course, are less likely to have children and therefore tend to use parks for other reasons. Room dwellers, although also generally childless, do tend to have more free time, and a low-income (see below) and therefore tend to spend more time in parks. (This complements the findings in education, income, occupation and age).

#### Education \_\_\_\_\_

Does education influence the frequency of park-use? Education seems to exert a definite influence on frequency of use, with the lowest education group (elementary) using parks much more frequently than either the high school or university groups (whose frequency pattern is very similar): 52% of the elementary group used the park 3 or more times a week, compared with 39% of the high school and 33% of the university; 83% of the elementary group used the park at least once a week, compared with 59% of the high school and 58% of the university groups; and only 7% of the elementary, compared with 25% of both high school and university groups, used the park less than once a month. It should be empha-

sized, however, that despite these frequency differences, more than half of both upper education groups used their parks at least once a week.

#### Occupation \_\_\_\_\_

Does occupation influence frequency of park-use? The general frequency pattern of the occupations of respondents was as follows: 56% of the white collar group, compared with 72% of the blue collar group and 64% of the "other" group used the park where they were interviewed at least once a week; and 28% of the white collar group, compared with 13% of the blue collar group and 20% of the "other" group, used their park less than once a week. But this summary masks some of the most significant variations. For example, only 8% of the managerial/financial/proprietary group and 19% of the professional/semi-professional group used the park more than 3 times per week, compared with 42% of the other white collar group, clerical/secretarial/sales (most of whom were interviewed during lunch in parks near their place of work). Other groups which tend to use parks frequently were: retired and unemployed (60% used the park where interviewed more than 3 times a week); housewives (48% used their park more than 3 times a week); and students (46% used their park more than 3 times a week). Another group, which is very small (only 6) but which used parks frequently is the baby-sitter/nurse group (67% of whom used the parks more than 3 times a week). The relatively large percentage of retired and unemployed and of students fits well with the findings already discussed about age differences—i.e., that both old and young tend to use parks frequently.

#### Income \_\_\_\_\_

Does income influence frequency of park-use? The income differences were as

<sup>38</sup>See Activities section below which shows that 26% of the single detached group and 27% of the semi-detached, etc. group used a playground; 30% of the single and 20% of the semi group used a pool of some sort.

follows: 58% of those having an annual income of under \$5000, 66% of those having \$5000-\$9999, and 51% of those having \$10,000 or more, used the park where they were interviewed more than 3 times a week; (as did 63% of the Don't Know/Not Applicable group and 83% of the No Answer group); while 21% of both the under \$5000 and \$5000-\$9999 groups used it less than once a month, compared with 31% of the \$10,000 or over group (and 26% of the Don't Know/Not Applicable and 4% of the No Answer groups). Generally, therefore, the upper income groups used parks less frequently than the middle and lower groups.

There are variations within the broad income classes: 70% of the under \$3000, compared with 44% of the \$3000-\$3999 and 45% of the \$4000-\$4999; 72% of the \$5000-\$5999 compared with 63% of both the \$6000-\$7999 and \$8000-\$9999; and 63% of the \$10,000-\$14,999, compared with only 42% of the \$15,000 or more, used the park at least once a week. The high percentage of low income respondents who used parks frequently fits in with the earlier findings that roomers, old people, people with a lower education and retired and unemployed people (not numerically large groups) used parks frequently. The high percentage of frequent use by middle income groups may help explain the frequent use by semi-detached dwellers (who have children, but probably less money than single-detached house dwellers). And the relatively less frequent use by upper income groups (particularly the highest, \$15,000 or more, group) fits in with the earlier findings that single-detached and upper-white collar and upper education groups tend to use parks less frequently.

#### Ethnic Origin \_\_\_\_\_

Does ethnic origin influence frequency of park-use? Respondents who had grown up in Canada tended to use parks slightly less frequently than those who had grown up outside Canada (38% of

the former and 45% of the latter used the park where they were interviewed more than 3 times per week; and 25% of the former and 17% of the latter used it less than once a month). Although about the same percentage of both groups went at least once a week (61% of the Native group and 65% of the Foreign group); the differences at the extreme frequencies are even more pronounced when only respondents over 15 years old are analyzed: 30% of the Native over 15 group (compared with 45% of the Foreign over-15 group) said they used the park more than 3 times a week; whereas 29% of the Native over-15 group (compared with 17% of the Foreign) used the park less than once a week. The Foreign group includes all those brought up outside Canada — whether in Britain or Italy or Poland and so forth — and therefore it does not distinguish between different ethnic groups.

#### Automobile Ownership/Use \_\_\_\_\_

Does car ownership or use influence frequency of park-use? Those park-users who own or have the use of a car tended to use parks less frequently than those who didn't: 33% of the car-owner group compared with 49% of the non-car-owner group used their park more than 3 times a week; while 27% of the car-owner group compared with only 16% of the non-car-owner group used them less than once a month. (Although there are significant differences at the extreme frequencies, there are only small ones at the middle frequencies; and it should be noted that over half — i.e., 58% — of the car-owner group did use their parks at least once a week, (compared with 64% of the non-car group). Some of the difference between native and foreign may be accounted for by the fact that native Canadian park-users are more likely to own or have the use of a car than are foreign park-users (58% of the former compared with 42% of the latter).

#### Rural-Urban Origin \_\_\_\_\_

Does rural-urban origin influence fre-



quency of park-use? 72% of the rural users compared with 59% of the urban users visited the park where they were interviewed at least once a week and 24% of the urban compared with 11% of the rural used it less than once a month. But 40% of both those who grew-up in rural or small town areas and of those who grew up in large town or urban areas, used it more than three times a week.

#### Summer Cottage Use \_\_\_\_\_

Does cottage ownership or use influence frequency of park-use? Yes, it does bear an unexpected relationship to frequency of park-use: i.e., those having cottages tended to use the parks where they were interviewed relatively more frequently than those without cottages (48% of those with cottages, compared with only 40% of those without cottages, used their park more than 3 times a week); however, this difference is eliminated when weekly use is considered (i.e., 64% of those with and 65% of those without cottages used the park at least once a week). This frequency pattern complements the distance pattern of cottage-users and non-users. Cottage-users tended to travel shorter distances than non-cottage-users.

#### Summer Weekends \_\_\_\_\_

Does the number of week-ends spent outside of Toronto influence frequency of park use? Yes, it seems to, with the major break between less frequent and more frequent use being between those who spend 3 or 4 week-ends a month away (51% of whom used their parks at least once a week) and all other groups (72% of the no week-end, 65% of the 1 or 2 a summer, 74% of the 1 per month and 70% of the 2 per month group used their parks at least once a week). In other words, those who most often spent week-ends outside the city tended to use urban parks less frequently than those who went away less often. It should be noted, however, that, despite the difference, more than half of those who spend 3 or 4 week-ends a month away still used their park at least once a

week. We should also note that the second to highest week-end frequency group in fact had the highest percentage of the most frequent users. This leads to the conclusion that even in a "Leisure Age", with frequent week-ends spent outside the city, urbanites will still exert considerable pressure on urban, and particularly on local, parks.

#### Club Membership \_\_\_\_\_

And finally, does membership in a private recreation club influence frequency of park use? It is interesting that such membership does not reduce the frequency of use of parks by those club-members who also use parks (64% of the club members, compared with 67% of non-club-members, used their park at least once a week). In fact, for some reason, relatively more club members (57%) used their park more than 3 times a week, than non-club-members (42%).

#### Summary \_\_\_\_\_

This section has shown that the following types of park-users tended to use parks most frequently: those who used parks for activities associated with children; the walkers and bicyclists; females; the very young and the very old; the dwellers in rooms or in semi-detached and row houses or duplexes; the least educated; the retired and unemployed, the students, the housewives or the secretaries; the low and middle income urbanites; the person of foreign up-bringing; the non-car-user; the cottage users; the people who spend a low to moderate number of week-ends outside the city; and the private recreation club member.

#### ACTIVITIES

What do people actually do in parks? In order to plan and design the best parks, it is obviously imperative to know exactly what people do in them. As we pointed out earlier, at present the major study of outdoor recreation activity is the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission report. This report, however,

emphasized non-urban areas and many activities (such as camping, skiing, and riding) which are not urban. It also ignored other, more specifically urban activities (such as using playgrounds, pools and just sitting in the sun). The Bureau study therefore asked urban park-users what they planned to do. We have already discussed how far park-users travelled and how often they used the parks for different activities. This section

deals briefly with what people do and some of the factors that influence their choice of activities.

Two questions about activities were asked:<sup>39</sup> "What do you plan to do here today?" (coded "Activities Today") and "On other visits to this park what sort of things have you done?" (coded "Other Activities"). Figure 6, Activities, ranks the responses to both questions. It is particularly interesting to note that the

FIGURE 6  
ACTIVITIES

Activities Today Only	Number	% of All Respondents	Activities Today and Other Days	Number	% of All Respondents
Sit	71	29%	Social Activities	99	41%
Social Activities	66	27%	Picnic, Snack	98	40%
Picnic, Snack	64	26%	Walk For Pleasure	93	38%
Watch, Play With Children	53	22%	Sit	80	33%
Walk For Pleasure	53	22%	Wading, Other Pools	76	31%
Playground	47	19%	Spectate, Attend Special Events	75	31%
Wading, Other Pools	44	18%	Watch, Play with Children	66	27%
Solitary Activities	40	16%	Nature	62	25%
Physical Health Activities	32	13%	Playground	56	23%
Zoo, Animals	32	13%	Zoo, Animals	52	21%
Nature	28	11%	Solitary Activities	51	21%
Mental Health Activities	28	11%	Winter Activities	49	20%
Spend Lunch	25	10%	Playing Fields	47	19%
Playing Fields	23	9%	Physical Health Activities	44	18%
Spend Leisure Time	21	8%	Skating	36	15%
Enjoy the Weather	21	8%	Mental Health Activities	29	12%
Spectate, Attend Special Events	14	6%	Enjoy the Weather	27	11%
Sightsee	11	5%	Spend Lunch	25	10%
Walk Dog	9	4%	Spend Leisure Time	24	10%
Family Outing	4	2%	Sightsee	14	6%
Bike	4	1%	Walk Dog	10	4%
Other	3	1%	Family Outing	5	2%
			Bike	6	2%
			Other	12	5%
Total	244	100%	Total	244	100%

<sup>39</sup>One problem with the survey technique employed is that sometimes people don't think of certain actions, such as sitting or enjoying nature or soaking up sun, as "activities", and therefore the survey may underestimate the importance of some of these types of activities.

five most frequently mentioned “activities today” (and the four top combined “activities today” and “other activities”) sitting, social activities, picnicking or eating a snack, bringing and/or playing with children, and walking for pleasure — although perhaps related to other activities which do require elaborate equipment — do not themselves require much elaborate equipment. *Space is the major requirement.*

As expected, there are great variations between the locations because some areas lack such facilities as playgrounds and playing fields or gardens.<sup>40</sup> Figure 7, Activities x Location indicates some of the variations and also confirms the three basic types of variation frequently referred to in this report: variation between areas, variation between parks in the same area, and variation within the same park.

What other factors influence park activities? Several of the “activities today” were cross-tabulated with several variables which we thought might well influence choice of activities by park-users. These variables were: age, household composition, dwelling type, income, education, and occupation.

Age \_\_\_\_\_

The age of the respondent, as expected, exerted a distinct influence on some activities.<sup>41</sup> For example: 56% of those aged 30-39 (generally mothers with young children) mentioned bring/play with children, compared with 0% of the 8-15 year old group, 5% of the 50-64 and 8% of the 65 or over groups; similarly, 41% of the 30-39 year old group (again, many of whom are mothers) and 36% of the 8-15 year old group mentioned using a playground as an activity, compared with 0% of the 50-64 and 4% of the 65 and over (usually nurses or grandmothers) groups. Or, 36% of the 8-15 group mentioned spending leisure time as an activity, compared with

0% of the 50-64 and an unexpectedly low 12% of the 65 and over group, the other group with a lot of free time. The high response of the youngest group may be partly explained by the fact that “hanging around” (i.e., spend leisure) is an easy response for the young group to think of and say.

Other expected results that were confirmed include: relatively high percentage of old people who mentioned nature (28% of the 65 and over group, compared with the next highest, 15%, of the 30-39 year old group); the relatively high percentage of old people who mentioned sitting (45% of the 50-64 and 44% of the 65 and over groups) and relatively low percentage of young children who mentioned sitting (4% of the 8-15 group); the relatively low percentage of old people who mentioned pools (18% of the 50-64 and 12% of the 65 and over groups); and the general tendency of young children to think “actively” and, consequently, to mention such quiet or “passive” activities as physical health, mental health, solitary activities, nature, walking and sitting infrequently. This active-passive distinction is particularly important and is discussed in detail below. Other unexpected results were: the relatively high percentage of old people who mentioned walking (36% of the 50-64 group and 48% of the 65 and over group; the only other group that mentioned walking relatively frequently was the 30-39 group, 26% of whom mentioned walking); and the relatively low percentage of older people who mentioned physical health activities. Although the 3 oldest groups did mention physical health activities relatively more — ranging from 18% to 22%, compared with the 0% to 13% of the younger groups — it was surprising that there wasn’t a more marked difference since older people tend to have more physical problems and interest in their health than younger people.

<sup>40</sup>See Appendix I for a list of the facilities available in each park.

<sup>41</sup>See *Urban Open Space: Luxury or Necessity?*, *op. cit.*, for a discussion of social and solitary activities.

FIGURE 7  
\*ACTIVITIES AND LOCATION  
LOCATION

*ACTIVITIES	All Respondents	High Park North	High Park East	Rosedale	Craleigh	Trinity-Bellwoods	Rosehill	Willowdale	Greenwood	Eglinton	Civic Square	Wellesley	Riverdale
Sit	71	11	5	2	2	11	9	6	5	5	11	4	0
Col. %	29%	31%	16%	9%	22%	61%	32%	38%	56%	42%	36%	27%	0%
Social Activities	66	15	3	11	3	6	6	3	2	2	12	3	0
Col. %	27%	43%	9%	48%	33%	33%	21%	19%	22%	17%	39%	20%	0%
Picnic, Snack	64	22	7	0	1	1	7	1	2	1	13	1	8
Col. %	26%	63%	22%	0%	11%	6%	25%	6%	22%	8%	42%	7%	50%
Watch, play with children	53	12	1	9	0	4	9	2	5	5	1	5	0
Col. %	22%	34%	3%	39%	0%	22%	32%	13%	56%	42%	3%	33%	0%
Walk	53	16	19	1	0	3	10	1	0	0	0	3	0
Col. %	22%	46%	59%	4%	0%	17%	36%	6%	0%	0%	0%	20%	0%
Playground	47	8	2	12	0	2	6	2	5	3	0	7	0
Col. %	19%	23%	6%	52%	0%	11%	21%	13%	56%	25%	0%	47%	0%
Pools	44	3	3	6	0	2	6	5	4	4	6	4	1
Col. %	18%	9%	9%	26%	0%	11%	21%	31%	44%	33%	19%	27%	6%
Solitary	40	7	8	2	6	3	6	0	0	3	5	0	0
Col. %	16%	20%	25%	9%	67%	17%	21%	0%	0%	25%	16%	0%	0%
Physical Health	32	6	2	0	2	3	9	0	1	1	7	1	0
Col. %	13%	17%	6%	0%	22%	17%	32%	0%	11%	8%	23%	7%	0%
Zoo, Animals	32	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	14
Col. %	13%	11%	41%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	0%	0%	88%
Total	244	35	32	23	9	18	28	16	9	12	31	15	16
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

\* Activities are the 10 most frequently mentioned "Activities Today"  
 Column Percentages do not add up to 100% because Respondents could mention more than 1 Activity.

## Household Composition \_\_\_\_\_

Household composition, which is related to the age of respondents, also affects choice of activities and reflects the age comments just made. For example, as expected, three activities were distinctly related to the presence of young children in the household: bringing children (57% of those with children only under 8 years and 35% of those with children under 8 and 8-20, with no other group having come close to equalling these percentages); using a playground (46% of the group with children under 8 years and 35% of the group with children under 8 and 8-20); and pools (in this case, generally wading pools: 30% of the under 8 years and 28% of the group with children under 8 and 8-20). Two other activities related to the presence of children in a household are "spending leisure time" (23% of the group with children 8-20 years old, with the next highest being the 13% of the group with under 8 and 8-20 year olds); and sitting, which is associated with young mothers (37% of the group with children only under 8 years) and to the groups with no children (34% of those living alone; 50% of those living with roommates, but this is a very small group; and 34% of those who are married with no children at home). Most of these people with no children fall into the upper age groups, which, as expected, had large numbers mentioning sitting.

Other results which complement the age results are: the relatively high percentage of those living alone (many of whom are older people) who mentioned physical health (26%; the only other group with a large number, 30%, was the small roommate group); and the relatively high percentage of those living alone (32%) or married with no children (28%) who mentioned walking. We were not surprised by the high percentage of the married with no children group, 34%, who mentioned mental health activities (presumably many

of these are older married couples); although we were surprised by the low percentage of the groups with children who mentioned mental health activities, since we had expected more "to get away from the kids" responses than we received. The high percentage of the alone, roommate and married with no children groups who mentioned sitting has already been pointed out.

## Dwelling Type \_\_\_\_\_

Dwelling type is another variable related to choice of park activities. Figure 8, Activities x Dwelling Type, shows, for selected activities, which activities seem to vary according to housing type<sup>42</sup> (e.g., bringing children, which was mentioned by 30% of those who lived in single, detached houses; 20% of those in semi-detached, row or duplexes; 16% of those in apartments; and 0% of those in rooms). The table also shows which activities do not seem to vary much according to housing type (such as nature activities, which were mentioned by 13% of those in single detached, 9% in semi-detached etc., 11% in apartments and 11% in rooms; or visiting animals and/or zoo, which was mentioned by 14% of both the single detached and semi-detached etc. groups, 11% of the apartment and 17% of the room groups).

Figure 9, Activities Ranked Within Dwelling Type, which ranks each activity from "most frequently mentioned" to "least frequently mentioned" by the members of each dwelling type and which also ranks each activity on an "active to passive" scale, indicates the relative importance of each activity for each group. The most general finding is that single, detached house and semi-detached, row house and duplex dwellers tended to favour "active" activities in parks (e.g., use of playgrounds, pools, fields) and that apartment and room dwellers tended to favour "passive" activities (e.g., sitting,

<sup>42</sup>*Urban Open Space: Luxury or Necessity?*, *op cit.*, discussed in detail the variations according to housing type of social activities, solitary activities, and "like nature" (because many more park-users mentioned "like nature" than "nature activities").

FIGURE 8  
ACTIVITIES X DWELLING TYPE

Activity	Total	% of Single Detached House	% of Semi-Detached, Row or Duplex	% of Apartment	% of Room
Sit .....	29%	24%	32%	31%	39%
Social .....	27%	30%	20%	21%	56%
Children .....	22%	30%	20%	16%	0%
Walk .....	22%	19%	23%	21%	39%
Playground .....	19%	26%	27%	11%	0%
Pools .....	18%	20%	30%	11%	6%
Solitary .....	16%	12%	11%	25%	17%
Skating* .....	15%	21%	14%	9%	6%
Physical Health .....	13%	10%	7%	20%	11%
Zoo, Animals .....	13%	14%	14%	11%	17%
Nature .....	11%	13%	9%	11%	11%
Mental Health .....	11%	8%	9%	17%	17%
Playing Fields .....	9%	10%	23%	4%	0%
Leisure .....	8%	6%	18%	6%	11%

\* Skating was the only "Other Activity" included in this table. All others are "Activities Today"

FIGURE 9  
ACTIVITIES RANKED WITHIN DWELLING TYPE

Single Detached House	Semi-Detached, or Row House, Duplex	Apartment	Room
Children, A 30%	Sit, P 32%	Sit, P 31%	Social, AP 56%
Social, AP 30%	Pools, A 30%	Solitary, P 25%	Sit, P 39%
Playgr'nd, A 26%	Playgr'nd, A 27%	Walk, AP 21%	Walk, AP 39%
Sit, P 24%	Walk, AP 23%	Social, AP 21%	Solitary, P 17%
Skating*, A 21%	Playing	Physical	Mental
Pools, A 20%	Fields, A 23%	Health, P 20%	Health, P 17%
Walk, AP 19%	Children, A 20%	Mental	Zoo,
Zoo, Animals, P 14%	Social, AP 20%	Health, P 17%	Animals, P 17%
Nature, P 13%	Leisure, AP 18%	Children, A 16%	Physical
Solitary, P 12%	Skating*, A 14%	Nature, P 11%	Health, P 11%
Playing	Zoo,	Playgr'nd, A 11%	Nature, P 11%
Fields, A 10%	Animals, P 14%	Pools, A 11%	Leisure, AP 11%
Physical	Solitary, P 11%	Zoo,	Pools, A 6%
Health, P 10%	Nature, P 9%	Animals, P 11%	Skating*, A 6%
Mental	Mental	Skating*, A 9%	Children, A 0%
Health, P 8%	Health, P 9%	Leisure, AP 6%	Playgr'nd, A 0%
Leisure, AP 6%	Physical	Playing	Playing
	Health, P 7%	Fields, A 4%	Fields, A 0%

\* Skating was the only "Other Activity" included in this table. All others are "Activities Today"

A — "Active"  
P — "Passive"  
AP — "Active or Passive"

solitary, physical and mental health activities). This tendency can be easily demonstrated by contrasting the two extreme dwelling types, single detached houses (which are relatively spacious and usually have a private yard) and rooms (which are usually small and lack a yard). For the single detached house dwellers, 3 of the top 5 activities are "active", 1 is "active/passive" and 1 is "passive"; while 3 of the bottom 5 activities are "passive", 1 is "active/passive" and only 1 is "active". For the room dwellers, however, 3 of the top 5 activities are "passive" and 2 are "active/passive", while the bottom 5 activities are "active".

Two factors seem to be of particular importance in explaining this basic difference: the presence or absence of *children* and the presence or absence of a *backyard*.

The important effect the presence or absence of *children* in a household on the choice of active or passive park activities has already been indicated in the discussions of age and household composition. It is repeated here because, at present at least, the presence or absence of children is related to the type of dwelling — with children usually living in a single detached house, semi-detached house or in row housing, much less frequently in apartments, and very rarely in rooms. This pattern — particularly the low rate of children in apartments — is not the only possible one, but it is the current one. The relative importance of activities shows that active activities associated with young children (such as bringing or playing with children, and using playgrounds) are progressively less important for each housing group; being ranked 1st and 3rd by the single detached group; 3rd and 6th by the semi-detached, row and duplex group; 7th and 9th by the apartment group; and last by the room group. Furthermore, the single detached and the semi-detached, row, duplex groups are quite similar when all *active activities* (including skating, using pools, using playing fields, in addition to the above-mentioned bringing and playing with children and using playgrounds) are con-

sidered; the apartment group falls in the middle-range; and the room group falls at the lower extreme. These active activities tend to be associated with children. If in future more children were to be accommodated in higher density apartments (either low-rise or high-rise), more active facilities would have to be provided.

And second, the presence or absence of a *backyard* is an important factor which may help to explain the choice of active or passive park-use. *Urban Open Space: Luxury or Necessity?* discussed at length the influence the presence or absence of an adequately spacious and private backyard has on the relative need of the dwellers for social contact and private retreat. Backyards also seem to exert a more general influence on active and passive park-use. If a dwelling has a good backyard (as most, single, detached houses and many semi-detached and row houses do), then this yard can be used for such passive activities as sunbathing, reading or simply getting out of the house. On the other hand, since many of the active pastimes, such as using a playground, or playing baseball, or skating, require more space and often more elaborate equipment than is available in the average city backyard, the people with backyards will tend to use parks for active recreation. For people without a backyard, however, (apartment and room dwellers), and consequently no place for passive recreation, passive park-use will be relatively more important than it is for house dwellers.

It is useful to note at this point that, contrary perhaps to expectations, many people who have backyards do use both their backyards and the parks (rather than using one or the other). Of the respondents with backyards, 73% said that they did use them. Presumably (as indicated above), they used yards and parks for different purposes. Apartment dwellers, on the other hand, simply do not have areas equivalent to yards and only 32% of the apartment dwellers said that they did use the area around their apartment. Presumably this lack of use is

because such areas either do not exist or are unsuitable for the occupants' needs.<sup>43</sup> If apartment areas in the future were to provide adequate passive (and active) areas, some of the pressure would obviously be taken off parks.

#### Income \_\_\_\_\_

The annual household income seems to influence some activities and not others. The major variations by income occur in the activities associated with young children and in each case, frequency of mention rose with income: 7% of the under \$5000, 25% of the \$5000-\$9999, and 31% of the \$10,000 or more groups mentioned bringing/playing with children; 2% of the under \$5000, 18% of the \$5000-\$9999, and 28% of the \$10,000 or more groups mentioned using a playground; and 5% of the under \$5000, 12% of the \$5000-\$9999 and 30% of the \$10,000 or more groups mentioned using a pool. This rise according to income may be partly explained by the fact that families with children, at least in the lower income groups, may have higher incomes than those without children. This does not account, however, for the distinct difference between the middle and upper income groups. The difference is also related to the dwelling type discussion since higher incomes tend to be associated with houses rather than with rooms or apartments. Three other activities which showed relatively large variations between income groups were social activities (discussed at length in *Urban Open Space: Luxury or Necessity?*) which decreased with increase in income (35%, 22%, 18%); visiting animals or zoo which decreased with increase in income (23%, 18%, 8%);<sup>44</sup> and sitting, which also decreased with increase in income (37%, 30%, 21%). The other activities tested — physical and mental health, solitary, nature, leisure, and walking — did not vary much according to income.

<sup>43</sup>This is partly confirmed by the fact that apartment-area-use increased with income — 23%, 28%, and 44% — presumably because the areas were more pleasant.

<sup>44</sup>This is another piece of information which suggests that an inner-city zoo is appreciated and should be maintained when the Scarborough Zoo is completed.

#### Education \_\_\_\_\_

Only four activities seemed to vary according to education: social activities, which declined with education and solitary activities, which rose with education (both discussed at length in *Urban Open Space: Luxury or Necessity?*); walking, which dropped for those with high school education (34% of the elementary school group, 18% of the high school group, and 32% of the university group); and sitting, which decreased with an increase in education (48%, 33%, 19%). The other activities tested — physical and mental health, nature, playground, pools, zoo, children, and leisure — did not vary much. The lack of variation for the activities associated with young children and the nature activities is of particular interest for park planning, since it indicates that these are important in all areas.

#### Occupation \_\_\_\_\_

And finally, there were some distinct variations according to the occupation of the respondent. For example, as was expected, particularly in light of the earlier discussions of age, dwelling, education, and income, high percentages of the housewife group mentioned children (69%), playgrounds (47%), pools (29%), and sitting (44%); high percentages of the retired, unemployed group mentioned social activities (43%), sitting (43%), walking (30%), solitary (27%), and nature and mental health activities (23% each); a high percentage of the student group mentioned social activities (29%); and a high percentage of the clerical, secretarial and sales group mentioned spending lunch in the park (36%).

#### Summary \_\_\_\_\_

This section has shown that the five most frequently mentioned urban park activities were: sitting, engaging in social



activities, having a picnic or snack, bringing or playing with children, and walking. Although sometimes related to other activities which do require elaborate equipment, these five activities require space rather than expensive equipment. There was considerable activity variation among the parks. Selected activities were cross-tabulated by age, household composition, dwelling type, income, education and occupation. Age exerted a distinct influence on many activities. For example, 56% of the 30-39 year olds (many young mothers) mentioned bringing or playing with children compared with 0% of the 8-15 year olds and only 8% of the 65 and over. Household composition differences generally complemented the age differences. The dwelling type differences were grouped generally into "active" activities which were associated with living in single detached houses and in semi-detached houses, row houses or duplexes; and "passive" activities which were associated with living in apartments or rooms. Only certain activities seemed to vary according to income (particularly the activities associated with children); education (social and solitary activities, walking, and sitting); and occupation (housewives with child-centred activities; unemployed or retired with social and a variety of passive activities; students with social activities; and low-level white collar workers with lunch in downtown parks). Park planners should take the activity differences discussed in this section into consideration when locating and designing new parks.

#### NEIGHBOURHOOD PARKS

As the section on Urban Parks Characteristics mentioned, more than half the people interviewed in the long survey (54%) regarded the park where they were being interviewed as their "*neighbourhood park*". What is a neighbourhood park? Since many people refer to neighbourhood parks when discussing park needs and standards and since the Official Plan of the City of Toronto — as both Bureau bulletins on open space

have pointed out — does not define "local park" (which appears to mean "neighbourhood park" since it is at the bottom of the park hierarchy discussed in the Plan), this is an important question to answer. It is also a complex one. In fact, it involves all the aspects of parks discussed so far and provides a good way of summarizing many of the Bureau's findings. The definition developed by the Bureau is based on the *users' perception* of what parks constitute "neighbourhood parks". Each respondent was asked "Do you consider this your neighbourhood park?"; his answer was cross-tabulated with several other variables to discover what user behaviour characteristics are associated with neighbourhood parks. The users' perception of "neighbourhood parks" seems — not unexpectedly — to be strongly related to *mode of travel*, *distance travelled* and *frequency of use*.

Of those who regarded the park where they were interviewed as their neighbourhood park, 81% had walked to the park, while only 6% had biked, 6% had taken public transit and 7% had driven. Also, 67% of all those who had walked to the park and 89% of all those who had bicycled regarded the park which they had visited as their neighbourhood park; while only 25% of those who had taken public transit and 20% of those who had driven regarded the park as their neighbourhood park. Walking and bicycling is obviously closely associated with the users' perception of "neighbourhood park".

The users' perception of "neighbourhood park" is also related to distance travelled: 27% of those who regarded the park where they were interviewed as their neighbourhood park had travelled less than  $\frac{1}{8}$  mile, 42% had travelled less than  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile and 71% less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile. One problem that arises with regard to distance is what distance should form the cut-off point for a neighbourhood park. Although a relatively large percent of those regarding the park as a neighbourhood park travelled  $\frac{1}{4}$  to less than  $\frac{1}{2}$  mile, (29%), for reasons already discussed (see Distance section)  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile

walking distance seems to the Bureau to be the best cut-off distance for "local" parks.

And finally, of those who regarded the park where they were interviewed as their neighbourhood park, 57% said that they used that particular park more than three times per week in the summer and 27% said they used it 1-3 times per week, while only 13% used it 1-3 times per month and 4% less than 1 time per month. Thus 84% of those who perceived the park where they were interviewed as their neighbourhood park used that park every week. Similarly, 75% of those who used the park more than three times a week and 66% of those who used it 1-3 times per week regarded the park in question as their neighbourhood park; while only 44% of those using it 1-3 times per month and 10% of those using it less than 1 time per month regarded the park as their neighbourhood park. Frequency of use, therefore, is also directly related to the users' perception of "neighbourhood park."

In summary, the users' perception of what constitutes a "neighbourhood park" is closely related to mode of travel, distance travelled and frequency of use, with a person who has walked less than  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile and who uses a park more than 3 times a week being far more likely to regard the park as a neighbourhood park than is a person who has driven a car more than a mile to get to the park and who uses it less than once a month.

Although most urban parks are neighbourhood parks, not every one is. In Toronto, for example, the percentage of respondents stating that the park where they were being interviewed was their neighbourhood park ranged from 10% (Civic Square) to 94% (Trinity-Bellwoods). How can urban parks be classified as neighbourhood or non-neighbourhood parks? Using the *behavioural characteristics* associated with neighbourhood parks, a grid can be constructed which lists these characteristics and marks which parks have them and which do not have them. The result is Neighbourhood Park Grid I-Behavioural Characteristics (Figure

10) for parks in the city of Toronto. The percentages used in the characteristics column are the average for all respondents (e.g., 54% of all people interviewed stated that the park where they were being interviewed was their neighbourhood park; 65% of all people interviewed walked to the park, and so forth). If the percentage of respondents in a particular park is higher than the average of all parks for the characteristic, the box is marked.

While almost all parks are used to some extent as neighbourhood parks, it is obvious that there are basically three groups of parks: those that have a low-level of use as neighbourhood parks (High Park North, Craigleigh Gardens, Willowvale, Eglinton and Riverdale); those that have a moderate-level of use as neighbourhood parks (High Park East and Civic Square), and those that have a high-level of use as neighbourhood parks (Rosedale, Trinity-Bellwoods, Rosehill, Greenwood and Wellesley). Other characteristics of neighbourhood parks could probably be developed and marked on a similar grid, especially because both the characteristics and the percentages might well vary from city to city. This way of defining neighbourhood parks according to the specified overt behavioural characteristics of the user (such as mode of travel) is in some respects superficial, since it does not explain the behaviour. But it does provide a useful method of categorizing neighbourhood parks.

Explanation, however, is difficult. It is evident that there is no simple explanation for the behavioural characteristics mentioned. First, size alone does not determine whether or not a park will be used as a neighbourhood park: some small parks are used primarily as neighbourhood parks (e.g., Wellesley Park which is 5.7 acres) and some large parks are used primarily as neighbourhood parks (e.g., Trinity-Bellwoods which is 36.3 acres); some small parks are used relatively little as neighbourhood parks (e.g., Craigleigh Gardens which is 8.8 acres) and some large parks are used relatively little as neighbourhood parks (e.g., High Park North which is part of 397.8 acre

FIGURE 10  
 NEIGHBOURHOOD PARK GRID I  
 BEHAVIOURAL CHARACTERISTICS

CHARACTERISTICS	All Respondents	PARKS															
		High Park N.	High Park E.	Rosedale	Craigleigh	Trinity-Bellwoods	Rosehill	Willowvale	Greenwood	Eglington	Civic Square	Wellesley	Riverdale				
This park is Neighbourhood Park .....	54%																
Walk .....	65%																
Walk or Bicycle .....	69%																
Use this park most frequently .....	66%																
Use this park more than 3 times per week .....	41%																
Use this park once per week .....	63%																
This park closest .....	45%																
Travelled less than 1/8 mile .....	21%																
Travelled less than 1/4 mile .....	30%																
Travelled less than 1/2 mile .....	50%																
Like proximity .....	26%																
Total .....		2	5	9	3	11	8	2	10	0	5	11	0				
Neighbourhood park classification .....		NN	MP	NP	NN	NP	NP	NN	NP	NN	MP	NP	NN				
Size (in acres) .....		397.8	397.8	7.5	8.8	36.3	47.7	21.9	15.7	22.8	2.8	5.7	62.9				

NN — Not Neighbourhood Park  
 MP — Moderate Neighbourhood Park  
 NP — Neighbourhood Park

High Park). And different parts of the same park are used differently (High Park North as opposed to High Park East).

Second, we can try to find an explanation by categorizing the parks *according to activities*. But this is a very complicated task. The range of things that people do in local parks varies considerably (contrast the busy tourist and lunch-time use of downtown Civic Square with the quiet and relatively private use of High Park East). Nevertheless, some activities seem to be particularly closely associated with “neighbourhood parks”, others with “not neighbourhood parks”, and others with neither. The activities which do seem to be most closely associated with users’ perception of “neighbourhood park” are the following (in order of closeness of association): use of playing fields (78% of those who mentioned playing fields said they were in their neighbourhood park); playgrounds (72%); watch, play with children (68%); spend leisure (67%); enjoy nature (64%); and engage in mental health activities, such as enjoy a change of pace (64%). The activities which are most closely associated with a response of “not neighbourhood park” (ranked in order of closeness of association) are the following: lunch (76%); zoo (63%); and picnic or snack (52%).

Neighbourhood Park Grid II-Activities (Figure 11) was constructed on the basis of these activities. If the percentage of respondents who mentioned the activity in a particular park is higher than the percentage of all respondents who mentioned the activity, the box is shaded. For example, since the percentage of respondents who mentioned athletic fields/organized games in High Park North is higher than 9%, the box is shaded.

The first six activities are associated with the users’ perception of “neighbourhood park”, and the last three are associated with the users’ perception of “not neighbourhood park”. It becomes evident that the neighbourhood park activities can be divided into *active* (the first three — fields, playgrounds and children) which are more strongly related to the “neigh-

bourhood park” concept, and *passive* (nature and mental), which are less strongly related to the “neighbourhood park” concept, with leisure falling between the two (sometimes active, sometimes passive). From this we can derive a three-fold classification based on activities: *active neighbourhood park* (e.g., Rose-dale), *passive neighbourhood park* (e.g., High Park East), and *not neighbourhood park* (e.g., Riverdale). Some parks combine two or three of these basic categories (e.g., High Park North and Rosehill each are used as all three types of park; High Park East is used as both a passive neighbourhood park and as a not-neighbourhood park; and Trinity-Bellwoods and Wellesley are used as both active and passive neighbourhood parks).

It is evident that the activities used to classify the parks are not necessarily the most frequently mentioned activities. In fact, three of the five most frequently mentioned activities — sit (mentioned by 29% of all the respondents), social activities (27%) and walk (22%) — are not included on the activity grid. Other frequently mentioned activities also not located on the grid include: wading and swimming pools (18%), solitary activities (16%), and physical health activities (13%). These activities are not included on the grid, not because they are not important activities (clearly they *are* important, because they are frequently mentioned), but because they are not as closely associated with the users’ perceptions of “neighbourhood park” and “not-neighbourhood park” as the grid activities are. In other words, the frequently mentioned activities that are not on the grid, seem to be important in *both* types of parks; thus when new parks of any type are planned, opportunities should be provided for these activities.

It is also evident that some activities which might have been expected to be closely related to “neighbourhood” or “not neighbourhood” park responses, were not so related. For example, spectating and special events might have been expected to be more closely related to “not-neighbourhood park” than it was; and

FIGURE 11  
NEIGHBOURHOOD PARK GRID II  
ACTIVITIES

ACTIVITY	All Respondents	PARK															
		High Park N.	High Park E.	Rosedale	Craileigh Gardens	Trinity-Bellwoods	Rosehill	Willowdale	Greenwood	Eglinton	Civic Square	Wellesley	Riverdale				
Athletic Fields, Organized Games ..	9%																
Playgrounds .....	19%																
Watch/play with children .....	22%																
Spend leisure .....	9%																
Nature .....	12%																
Mental .....	12%																
Lunch .....	10%																
Zoo, animals .....	13%																
Picnic, snack .....	21%																
Classification .....		AN, PN, NN	PN, NN	AN		AN, PN	AN, PN, NN	AN	AN	AN, NN	NN	AN, PN	NN	NN			

Activities Associated With "Neighbourhood Park"

Activities Associated With "Not Neighbourhood Park"

Active Neighbourhood Park Activity  
Passive Neighbourhood Park Activity  
Not Neighbourhood Park Activity

AN — Active Neighbourhood Park Classification  
PN — Passive Neighbourhood Park Classification  
NN — Not Neighbourhood Park Classification

physical, social and solitary activities might have been expected to be more directly related to "neighbourhood park" than they turned out to be.

Finally, some activities which do seem to be closely related to neighbourhood and not neighbourhood park responses were not included on the grid because they were only mentioned a few times. For example, bicycling seems closely related to "neighbourhood park" and sight-seeing (not surprisingly) to "not neighbourhood park".

When the Activity Grid is compared with the Behaviour Grid (which also divided the parks into three categories), some interesting differences emerge. High Park North, which is not classified as a neighbourhood park on the behaviour grid, falls squarely into that category in the activity grid. The explanation must be, therefore, that although it is used as both a neighbourhood park and non-neighbourhood park, relatively fewer users (than in "pure" neighbourhood parks), fall into the appropriate mode, frequency and distance categories. The reverse is true for Civic Square, which is classified as a "neighbourhood park" (in the first grid on the basis of its users' behavioural characteristics), but not on the second, activity grid. This is easily explained by the fact that workers tend not to regard the park they use during office hours as a "neighbourhood park", because they associate "neighbourhood" with place of residence, not place of work. (This explanation would also account for the "non-neighbourhood" use of Rosehill Park, which is also located near office-workers).

The activity grid also complements and helps to explain some of the earlier findings about the other parks: e.g., that High Park East has not only a moderate level of use as a neighbourhood park, but also a moderate level of use as a passive neighbourhood park; that Rosedale Park has not only a high level of use as a neighbourhood park, but also a high level of use as an active neighbourhood

park; that Riverdale is not only a "non-neighbourhood park", but a specialized (zoo) non-neighbourhood park, and so forth.

The neighbourhood park grids, which reveal considerable variation between various park locations, also reconfirm the three basic types of variation discussed throughout this study of user behaviour: variation between different areas of the city (Civic Square as opposed to Trinity Bellwoods); between different parks in the same area (Wellesley Park as opposed to Riverdale); and between different parts of the same park (High Park North as opposed to High Park East).

#### USER SATISFACTION

Before discussing some of the policy and planning implications of this type of user-behaviour study, we should briefly mention the responses given to three general opinion questions. An open-ended question asking for general comments ("Do you have any general comments [praise, criticism, suggestions for improvement] about the parks and other types of open space in Toronto?") revealed that, in general, park-users were satisfied with the parks — 32% gave positive comments compared with only 2% who gave negative ones. Also, 28% said that they felt parks are important and/or that more parks are needed in the City. In response to "Some people think that there are enough large parks in Toronto. Do you agree?", 38% agreed and 39% disagreed, with the remaining 23% being undecided. And in response to "Some people think that there are enough small parks in Toronto. Do you agree?", 28% agreed and 40% disagreed, with 32% being undecided. Since only people who were actually *in* parks were interviewed, it is fair to assume that the level of dissatisfaction for both questions might well be substantially higher if other people, not in parks, had been interviewed — people who, for example, lived far

away from any park.<sup>45</sup> It is interesting to note that there was greater disagreement with the statement about small parks than with the one about large parks.

#### POLICY AND PLANNING IMPLICATIONS

What policy and planning implications does all this information about user-behaviour have? A great deal of detailed information about park-use has been discussed in the previous sections of this report. In these sections detailed information has been presented to provide specific help to those interested in park planning. By contrast, only general implications are discussed here.

The distance information collected indicates first that small ("local" or "neighbourhood") parks should be located within ¼ mile walking distance of all city residents. Second, the distance information (coupled with the "frequency of use" and "activities" information about the local use of Wellesley Park, contrasted with the regional use of near-by Riverdale Park), shows that just because a park is located in an area does not mean that that park serves the local needs of the people around it. The City of Toronto Official Plan provision that local parks need be provided only for those people living more than a ¼ mile walking distance from a regional park, is, therefore, not adequate. In many cases a regional park may also act as a local park (e.g., High Park), but not always. And third, the distance information emphatically shows that parks meant to serve people living ½ to 1 mile away do not in fact serve these people — and therefore should not be expected to do so.

Many parts of the survey indicate that policy and planning emphasis should be on the development of small, local parks. This fact is emphasized by, for instance,

the short distances travelled by the majority of users interviewed; the frequent use of nearby parks (contrasted with the less frequent use of more distant parks); and the greater concern about the shortage of small parks, than of large parks (as demonstrated by the higher disagreement with the statement that there are enough small parks, than with the statement that there are enough large parks). This emphasis on smaller areas, of course, fits in with the financial constraints and availability of land constraints discussed in *Urban Open Space: Luxury or Necessity?*

User-behaviour, as has been emphasized throughout this report, should be the major determinant of individual park design; i.e., each park should be designed to suit the particular needs of the residents in the area. For example, if there are many old people, passive areas should be created and if there are many young people, active areas should be created; or if there are many roomers, passive areas should be designed and if there are many house-dwellers, active areas should be designed; and so forth. Much information of this sort has been discussed. But much more research is still needed — particularly research into who does not use parks and why.

And finally as we emphasized in the initial discussion of standards, participation by residents in decisions about their environment, is (and will continue to be) important. A survey such as that conducted by the Bureau provides one, albeit indirect, method of participation. At least two other, more direct methods are possible. First, the local parks department (in this case, the Parks and Recreation Department of the City of Toronto) could employ one or more parks experts to work with area residents in designing their parks. These parks department representatives would be charged not only

<sup>45</sup>Agree/Disagree responses are related to distance travelled, with the level of dissatisfaction tending to increase with the distance travelled. For example, only 29% of those who agreed that there were enough large parks had travelled one mile or more, compared with 42% of those who disagreed; and 32% of those who agreed that there are enough small parks had travelled one mile or more compared with 46% of those who disagreed.

with responding to sporadic demands for participation, but also with encouraging steady continuing participation. A second, (perhaps even more direct) complementary method, would be the creation of ward (and/or sub-ward) residents committees, perhaps initiated and chaired by a local alderman. The committees would be designed to elicit resident opinions about present and potential parks (for example, they might conduct user and non-user surveys); and to work with the

local parks department representative who would give professional advice (or, they might even hire their own professional, if funds were available) to develop specific plans for their parks. Larger committees, consisting of representatives from several wards, could be created to discuss regional park development. Together, these two methods would co-ordinate the functional and geographic aspects of parks planning.

### RESOURCES AND ACQUISITION TECHNIQUES

The final major question remaining to be answered, now that we have some idea of the need for urban parks and open spaces, is, given the land and financial constraints, *how* can this need be filled; how can the appropriate open spaces be acquired and preserved? Much has been written in recent years on open space resources and techniques of acquisition and control.<sup>46</sup> This final section will briefly and in general terms summarize some of the resources and techniques that may well be suitable for the development of open space in Canadian cities. The material is divided into the following general headings: land resources; acquisition and control techniques; and financial resources.

#### LAND RESOURCES:

Limited land resources, particularly in the central areas of cities, is a constraint that is often mentioned. And there can be no doubt that it is a definite constraint. Only relatively small individual areas are available. *But*, as many writers, planners and landscape architects have pointed out in recent years, it is not as great a hindrance to open space development as is frequently asserted, because there are,

in fact, many unused and under-used open space resources.

While the need for parks is great, there is generally speaking, no shortage of available land in the city. For instance, the amount of open space in downtown Toronto, not taken by buildings or roads is 41% of the total area. The problem is related to the ineffectual use of space, and a lack of co-ordination between various public and private agencies that control it, which results in the sterilization of much potentially usable land.<sup>47</sup>

These resources can be roughly divided into new areas and unused or underused areas. *New areas* would include such areas as *man-made* land (e.g., much of Toronto Island, Ontario Place — and the proposed island off the Western Beaches — are all land-fill areas, as was part of Expo 67 in Montreal); and the use of *air rights* (e.g., the creation of buildings and parks over highways, as in the UN complex over the East Side Drive in New York, or over railroads); or even *platforms* extended over *water* (e.g., the recent proposal for New York's West Side

<sup>46</sup>Development Control is the subject of a forthcoming Bureau Bulletin which will analyze some of these techniques in much greater detail than is possible here.

<sup>47</sup>Michael Hough, *The Urban Landscape* (Toronto: Conservation Council of Ontario, July, 1971), p. 4. This is a good recent analysis of the resources available in Toronto. Other books of interest on the subject are William H. Whyte, *The Last Landscape* (Garden City: Doubleday and Co., 1968); and Whitney N. Seymour, *Small Urban Spaces* (New York: New York University Press, 1969).



Highway which would project out over the Hudson River and include recreation areas).

The *unused and underused areas* form the bulk of the resources and include a wide variety of areas. One potentially lucrative resource for many cities is the *right-of-way*. For example, *streets* can, at the very least, be more pleasingly designed,<sup>48</sup> at most, they can be closed-off to vehicular traffic and converted into pedestrian malls<sup>49</sup> or incorporated as open space into superblock developments. Abandoned *railroads*, such as Toronto's CNR Belt Line,<sup>50</sup> various *utility rights-of-way*, particularly hydro lines,<sup>51</sup> and *excess subway and highway lands* are all additional resources.

Areas around non-residential buildings (*set-backs*, such as the publicly-used, grassed areas around the Toronto Dominion Centre and the private garden at Bell Canada's office building on University Avenue in Toronto) are plentiful in many city centres, although frequently unusable. And areas around apartment buildings ("*landscaped open space*") are often large, but unused (and unusable).<sup>52</sup> In Toronto, for example, many of the large developments leave 65% or more of the site open. Unfortunately, these open areas are often fenced-off and/or unattractively or inappropriately landscaped. Nevertheless, with proper design, set-backs could provide "usable" open space.

In some lower density, older residential areas (such as Toronto's South of St. Jamestown area), there are large, often

unkempt, *block interiors* which could be developed (as a community improvement project) as communal open space. And, in new *cluster developments* (which were discussed and advocated in *Urban Open Space: Luxury or Necessity?*) communal open space is also created.

*Institutions* of various types own great amounts of urban land and provide another rich, potential open space resource. *Schools* are frequently suggested as active recreation resources. School playing fields and playgrounds are sometimes, but not always, open to the public. To ensure the fullest use of resources, cooperation between city parks departments and boards of education is particularly important. Similarly, universities and private educational institutions are large resources. *Churches* are also often land-rich. In Toronto lease arrangements have been worked out between various churches and the City Parks and Recreation Department in which the City maintains the area as a park which the public can use (e.g., Metropolitan United Church). Churches themselves often plant beautiful grounds and are increasingly developing playgrounds and play programs for inner-city children. *Hospitals* provide a potential resource for quiet, passive recreation areas. And *government buildings* have land that should be open for public enjoyment.

Many cities have a surprising number of *vacant lots* which can be developed into small, vest-pocket parks which can fill needs for sitting areas, playgrounds and other "local" needs. Very creative

<sup>48</sup>Bernard Rudofsky, *Streets for People* (Garden City and Toronto: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1969), gives many examples and ideas for creating more beautiful and livable streets.

<sup>49</sup>See, for example, Bureau of Municipal Research, "The Yonge Street Mall — Good Environment Equals Good Business", *BMR COMMENT* No. 125 (Toronto: Bureau of Municipal Research, June 1971).

<sup>50</sup>See, for example, Bureau of Municipal Research, "The Future of the CNR Belt Line — Public Park or Private Property", *News Brief* No. 117 (Toronto: Bureau of Municipal Research, August 1970).

<sup>51</sup>Hough, *op. cit.*

<sup>52</sup>For examples of creative use of open space around high density housing developments see: "Riis Plaza: Three Acres Filled With Life" in *The Architectural Forum* July/August, 1966; M. Paul Freidberg, *Playgrounds for City Children* (Washington, D.C.: Association for Childhood Education International, 1969); and Whitney North Seymour, *Small Urban Spaces*, *op. cit.*

things have been done with very small areas — ¼ acre or less.<sup>53</sup>

Roofs too provide a tremendous amount of "land" for development as gardens, pools, tennis courts, playgrounds, restaurants, cafes, and so forth. The upper level of cities could be transformed from dull grey roofing into green gardens and lively playgrounds and cafes.

Parking lots are another rich resource. These could, at the very least, be made more visually attractive (by planting trees and greenery around the periphery, painting colourful murals on the blank walls of adjoining buildings, and paving the surface with more imaginative materials and patterns) and made accessible to the public (providing potentially attractive walkways). At best, they could simply be made into parks, either by constructing a park deck over the parking area (as in Toronto's Civic Square) or by substituting a park for a parking lot.<sup>54</sup>

Other large open spaces often found in urban areas that provide potential publicly-used open space are *reservoirs* (which can be decked-over and grassed to create a fine park as are Toronto's Rosehill and Churchill park reservoirs); *golf courses* (which can be made more open to non-golfers by providing pedestrian rights-of-way open to the public); *cemeteries* (many of which are beautifully landscaped); *waterfronts* (once active,

but at present run-down and abandoned); and *watershed areas* (such as Toronto's magnificent ravine system which threads through the heart of the City).

It seems clear, from the above brief cataloguing of urban open space resources, that there is open space available in urban areas, if there is the political will to use and preserve it. Municipalities should make surveys of all their potential open space resources. To encourage this and to make it financially feasible, the Provincial government should make urban open space planning grants available to municipalities, (just as they, and the federal government, at one time made urban renewal planning grants available).

#### ACQUISITION AND CONTROL TECHNIQUES

There are many techniques that can be employed to preserve the various types of urban open space. They can be roughly divided into *acquisition techniques* (such as outright purchase, leasing arrangements, and gifts) and *land use control techniques* (such as subdivision and zoning controls). There is however, some overlap between the two (e.g., the subdivision requirement of the dedication of land to a municipality). Some of the most frequently discussed techniques that may well be useful in Canadian cities are outlined here.<sup>55</sup> But more detailed analysis

<sup>53</sup>See for example, "A Play Space Any Place" in *The Architectural Forum* (November 1968); and *New Parks for New York* (New York: The Park Association of New York City, 1963); and "Parks are not for Planners" in *Progressive Architecture*, (March 1966).

<sup>54</sup>For examples of creation of park decks over parking lots, see "Recreation: A Chance for Innovative Urban Design" in *Architectural Record* (August 1967). And, for examples of the transformation of parking lots into vestpocket parks, see *New Parks for New York*, *op. cit.*

<sup>55</sup>The following books and articles contain good discussions of these techniques: William H. Whyte, *The Last Landscape*, *op. cit.*; William H. Whyte, *Cluster Development* (American Conservation Association, 1964 New York); William H. Whyte, *Securing Open Space for Urban America: Conservation Easements* (Washington, D.C.: Urban Land Institute, 1959); Ann Louise Strong, *Open Space for Urban America* (Washington D.C.: Housing and Home Financing Agency 1965); Charles E. Little, *Challenge of the Land* (New York: Open Space Action Institute, Inc., 1968); Shirley Adelson Siegel, *The Law of Open Space* (New York: Open Space Action Institute, Inc., 1968); Shirley Adelson Siegel, *The Law of Open Space* (New York: Regional Plan Association, Inc., 1959); Norah Johnson and Joyce Tyrrell, "Problems and Techniques of Land Acquisition" in *Resources for the Future*, vol. 2 and J. B. Milner, *Tentative Proposals for the reform of the Ontario law relating to Community Planning and Land Use Controls* (Toronto: Ontario Law Reform Commission, 1967) and *Development Control — some less tentative proposals* (Toronto: Ontario Law Reform Commission, 1969).

of their application in the Canadian and Ontario contexts is required.

The best way to preserve open space and land for parks or conservation and other open space purposes is, of course, to purchase it outright — that is to *buy the fee simple*. It is also the most expensive way; but in some instances it may be the only way to ensure that a piece of land remains open (e.g., a prime piece of downtown land) and can be used as a public park. There are many ways that the fee simple may be obtained by municipalities in Ontario, including:

- (1) the local municipality may purchase the land on the open market;
- (2) the local municipality may expropriate the land “for public purposes”, such as parks;
- (3) the local municipality may benefit from transfers of land from other levels of government;
- (4) a condition may be imposed on the approval of a plan of subdivision that the subdivider dedicate to the local municipality 5% of the land being subdivided “for public purposes other than highways”, such as parks, or donate cash-in-lieu;
- (5) the local municipality may buy land on the instalment plan, if the owner is willing;<sup>56</sup>
- (6) the local municipality may buy the land and lease it back to the original owners or to another person, to use for specified purposes, such as farming;<sup>57</sup>
- (7) the local municipality (or the province) may accept gifts of land to be used as parkland.

Another useful technique, which is neither an acquisition nor a control tech-

nique but which will probably be used more and more, is the *leasing* of land for parks purposes. Winnipeg has tried an interesting leasing technique. The City has worked out lease arrangements with owners of properties that are expected to be redeveloped in the future and which would otherwise be used as parking lots in the interim. The rent paid by the City is enough to defray taxes for the owner, but is less than it would cost if the land were rented as a parking lot. In order to help pay for the leasing and furnishing of the little parks, the City has persuaded private companies to pay for the cost of the lease and, in return, the companies can — discretely it is hoped — work some advertising into the decorating of the park. Some of the areas are furnished with prefabricated mobile park equipment which can be moved from one area to another as needed. This technique can be a good public relations act for the companies and can provide — albeit temporary — downtown parks for the city. The City of Toronto has worked out a number of lease arrangements, for example with churches and apartment developers, whereby, for a nominal sum, the City can develop and use land as parks. The advantage to the City is that it obtains the use of land for a very low cost (and, depending on the agreement, may also still receive taxes from the land); the advantage to the developer is that, aside from creating good public relations, he does not have to develop or maintain the land. One disadvantage, of course, is that the lease may be terminated and the City lose the use of land.

While acquisition of the fee simple is often the best way to preserve open land, it is not always the only one. Another frequently discussed, less expensive tech-

<sup>56</sup>Whyte, in *The Last Landscape*, *op. cit.*, p. 68, mentions the “option-agreement plan” used by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, in which the Commission makes an agreement with an owner to buy a certain number of acres a year for a given number of years. The owner can continue using the land, but no longer pays taxes. The Commission is assured of purchasing the land, although only putting down a fraction of the total cost at the outset and also freezes the cost of the land, with the last acres purchased costing the same as the first.

<sup>57</sup>This lease-back technique has been used extensively for the Ottawa green belt.

nique (that hitherto has been little used in Canada) is the purchase of certain rights in the land — i.e., *easements*. Property should be regarded as a bundle of rights. Public purchase, expropriation or reservation of certain rights in privately-owned property, such as easements for sewers, roads, and utilities is common in Canadian cities. The *conservation easement*, which takes away the property owner's right to develop his land, has not been used. Under the negative easement system the owner continues to live on or farm his land; but he has sold his right to develop or transform it. Although it is unlikely that this device would be successful or particularly useful in prime downtown locations, where the purchase of development rights would be nearly as expensive as the purchase of the fee simple, there are circumstances under which it could be used. For example, it would work well with areas such as steep lands or marsh land which, for physical reasons, do not have great development potential, but which would be nice to preserve as open space. In Toronto, for example, some ravine lands remain in private ownership. Although these owners (and frequently residents) may be unwilling to sell their land, since they wish to remain living on it, they may well be willing to sell their development rights to ensure that the area remains in its present natural state. Perhaps the most effective way to do this would be to persuade a whole group of the residents to all agree to sell (or, even, donate) their development rights to the City, on the condition that the land remains in its present natural state. There are also many circumstances on the urban fringes when the use of conservation easements would probably be appropriate.<sup>58</sup> Other types of easements, such as preserving public pedestrian rights-of-way across golf courses or across private ravine land, are possible.

In the discussion of both fee simple and easement purchase, the possibility of

gifts has been mentioned. In some areas, such as the New York Metropolitan Area, where an aggressive, informative approach has been taken to encourage land-owners to make gifts either to the government or a non-profit trust, the campaigns have been remarkably successful. Canadian cities might be equally successful if they adopted a similar approach.<sup>59</sup>

In addition to these acquisition techniques, which usually involve the expenditure of public funds, there are a variety of land use control techniques that can also be employed to aid in the *preservation* of open space. In Ontario, in addition to the general Official Plan statement, there are two main, direct land-use controls, *subdivision* and *zoning* (restricted area bylaws).

Using Toronto as a case study, *Urban Open Space: Luxury or Necessity?*, pointed out that mere designation of land as open space on the *Official Plan* does not ensure that the area in question will remain as open space. This designation does not mean that the land is also zoned as parkland. And therefore, the land may be developed to the full extent of the zoning. The Official Plan is basically a policy statement, with a general restrictive effect on any zoning, subdivision or development proposed *after* the approval of the plan. This does not mean, however, that the policies (e.g., to acquire parkland) will in fact be implemented or that any zoning bylaw enacted prior to the Official Plan approval will be amended to conform to the Official Plan. While it is helpful to have strong Official Plan statements and to have land designated on it as open space, it is clearly not sufficient to ensure that the open space policy is implemented.

Two aspects of *subdivision* are of particular interest for open space. First, the validity of *subdivision agreements* between Ontario municipalities and developers, which may require that the subdivider contribute land or money for parks purposes, is recognized in the

<sup>58</sup>Whyte, *The Last Landscape*, *op. cit.*, and *Conservation Easements*, *op. cit.*

<sup>59</sup>See Little, *Challenge of the Land*, *op. cit.*, which gives details of the approaches used.

Planning Act. Furthermore, the Minister may require such subdivision agreements and may require that up to 5% of the land or cash-in-lieu be conveyed to the municipality for "public purposes other than highways" (such as parks), as a precondition of approval. While the 5% of the land is a help, the amount of land should be more directly related to the population density of the development and the cash-in-lieu should be directly related to parkland acquisition.<sup>60</sup>

Second, cluster subdivisions (and zoning), in which houses can be grouped more closely together, leaving relatively large open spaces, was advocated in the first bulletin and is mentioned here as another means of preserving open space. A variety of ways of holding the communal space have been suggested, ranging from conveyance to the municipality to covenants among the land-owners. On a larger scale, ways have been developed in some cities to link such cluster subdivisions in order to provide an admirable open space system.<sup>61</sup>

*Zoning* (i.e., restricted area by-laws which limit the permitted uses of land) is the other major land use control in effect in Ontario and across Canada. A variety of types of zoning have been suggested in order to help preserve urban open space, including: flood plain, wetlands and/or conservation zoning (which restricts building on the key conservation areas); open space zoning; large lot zoning (which states, for example, that a 1 acre or 10 acre lot is required for each house; but which has tended to encourage urban sprawl, has not been particularly successful in preserving open space in those areas which are experiencing intense development pressures, and certainly has not helped preserve public open space); density or cluster zoning (discussed ear-

lier under cluster subdivision heading); and set-back provisions in various zoning categories (the "landscaped open space" around apartment and office buildings which, if appropriately designed, could provide areas for both active and passive recreation).

The subdivision controls discussed earlier may be of help in many urbanizing areas. But they are not effective in some highly developed areas, such as the City of Toronto, where subdivisions are rare, but rezoning applications are frequent. It is precisely in the areas where there is the greatest need that there is the least control. Professor J. B. Milner, who analyzed various development control techniques, felt that, with regard to financial contributions toward necessary public services, there is "no difference between subdivision exactions in cases of horizontal subdivision and in cases of vertical subdivisions". The first, covered by subdivision agreements, is authorized in the Planning Act. But the second, which forms the bulk of urban redevelopment, covered by rezoning bylaws, site plan and other development agreements, is not authorized by the Planning Act. Despite the lack of special legal authority, many Ontario municipalities — operating under the pragmatic presumption that a developer desiring to develop will be willing to go along with certain municipal requirements in order to win approval for his rezoning application, and will be unlikely to take his case to court — have required that developers, in order to obtain rezoning approval, must convey land (or cash-in-lieu) to the municipality for such use as parks. Underlying this action is the fact that developments may create excessive pressure on existing open space. The municipality is, in effect, requiring the developer to provide open space

<sup>60</sup>This was discussed earlier in *Standards and User Behaviour*.

<sup>61</sup>William H. Whyte, *The Last Landscape, op. cit.*, pp. 221-223, described the master plan worked out by planner Edmund Bacon for the development, in a series of linked clusters, of northeast Philadelphia. The developers did follow the plan quite closely. Don Mills, Ontario and other planned communities have also adopted a modified cluster principle.

necessary to serve the increased population that has resulted from his development. The City of Toronto has not required this sort of "park levy" for rezoning approval. But Toronto, like other municipalities, has made development agreements and site-plan bylaws, in consultation with developers; as a result of these agreements the developers have conveyed land for park purposes. But all these agreements are voluntary and binding only on the original parties. Given the similarity between horizontal and vertical subdivisions in terms of servicing requirements and the increasing need for parkland (particularly in the face of rapid, high-density redevelopment in core areas), it seems reasonable to recommend that the Planning Act be amended to permit municipalities to require as a condition of enacting a bylaw which permits an increase in the number of people living in an area that land be dedicated or money paid for park purposes on the same basis as in the case of the subdivision of land.<sup>62</sup> Furthermore, the agreement should be binding on future owners of the land. Any other development control techniques given provincial approval should pay similar attention to ensuring that adequate safeguards are made for the provision of usable open space.

One final way of encouraging, rather than requiring, developers to provide well-designed, adequate open space is through a *bonus system*, which may specify precisely the type of open space desired and which grants bonuses in the form of additional allowable density, or permission to cover additional land with buildings if the open area is well-designed. This system can operate in both residential and non-residential areas — although,

Toronto, for example, has only a residential bonus system.

## FINANCIAL RESOURCES

This is another very complicated subject. The discussion here is, of necessity, brief, and is focused on the City of Toronto which, as a large and highly developed urban centre, is experiencing pressures and problems that may well be felt increasingly by other centres across the province.

In the City of Toronto the bulk of both operating and capital expenditures on parks and recreation is financed out of the general tax levy (i.e., is based on the property tax). On occasion, money for parkland acquisition comes from the Capital Assets Fund. Some grants are received from other levels of government (discussed below), and a small amount of money is received from concessions and the leasing of land and/or facilities. There is no general parks levy, as there is in some other municipalities.<sup>63</sup>

Two possible additional sources of funds at the municipal level for capital works (such as parkland acquisition) are suggested here. But both, in addition to their advantages, have limitations and possible disadvantages. The first is the use of "*special capital levies*" (i.e., special levies on property owners whose property adjoins the improvement or is in the wider area of the improvement) to develop small, local parks. The Local Improvement Act authorizes a municipal council (with the assent of the electors) to initiate or respond to petitions for a levy to finance the capital cost of local improvements, such as public parks or squares of not more than two acres. And the Municipal Act

<sup>62</sup>The authority to require a developer to provide park land or cash-in-lieu, is not by itself sufficient to "solve" the open space problem in redevelopment areas. One possible side-effect of such requirements is the raising of housing costs, because the developer can be expected to pass the cost along to purchasers or tenants. When considering the use of park levies, municipalities should take into consideration this possible side-effect. In some instances however the increase might not matter and in some instances this levy may be the only way of procuring the space.

<sup>63</sup>This technique merits additional investigation.

authorizes municipal councils to make capital expenditures for municipal services (such as parks) and to levy the cost against property owners who derive special benefit from the project (either those adjoining or those in the area, depending on the particular improvement). Although these special levies would not be appropriate or reasonable in all areas (such as low-income areas deficient in parks, where the residents could not afford to pay the levy for the park), they might work under special circumstances. For example, in downtown areas, pedestrian malls or vest-pocket parks might be financed by special levies, since businesses in the area derive direct benefit from the presence of these areas which attract and cater to present or potential customers and employees.<sup>64</sup> One ideological barrier must be broken through—in future, parks should be regarded not as an amenity (or a nice local improvement), but as a basic service. Basic services have benefited from the use of this technique in the past. Sewers, for example, which are not an amenity but are a necessity, have been financed under the local improvement schemes.<sup>65</sup> There is no reason why parks cannot be financed in the same way.

The second potential source of municipal funds (or services) is the *levy on developers* to provide land and/or money for parks and open space purposes as a prerequisite of development approval. This type of levy has already been discussed (see Acquisition and Control Techniques). Although this levy would help reduce some of the tremendous

pressures on municipal services caused by high-density redevelopment, it also has some disadvantages and limitations. First, the cost would be passed on to the buyers or tenants, raising purchase or rental costs. Second, the levy is dependent on redevelopment (and, in fact, might even be used by some to encourage higher-density development). And, third, it is limited to only those areas undergoing redevelopment, and does not help alleviate park deficiencies in other areas. Nevertheless, since high-density redevelopment is occurring at present, and at a rapid rate, and since this redevelopment is putting additional strains on already strained resources, the Bureau believes that authorization (in the Planning Act) for a levy on developers is justified and would help alleviate the park shortage.

Although municipalities, by reordering their priorities could afford to increase the amounts of money used for their public open space system<sup>66</sup> and by using the levies discussed here, could raise additional funds, it is still clear that municipal financial resources are limited. New sources of funds must be found.

No argument has to be made for the entry of the province into the field of open space. The province has been involved for years in regulating and funding various aspects of urban open space.<sup>67</sup> The problem, therefore, is not to devise a persuasive rationale for the participation of the provincial (or federal) government in urban open space; but how to make that participation more effective. At present, the number and diversity of departments and legislative acts relating

<sup>64</sup>An example of the direct benefits to business is contained in *The Yonge Street Pedestrian Mall*, BMR COMMENT No. 125 (June 1971). See also *New Parks For New York*, *op. cit.*

<sup>65</sup>This scheme merits additional investigation.

<sup>66</sup>This was discussed at some length in *Urban Open Space: Luxury or Necessity?*

<sup>67</sup>If necessary, however, a cogent argument could be made: (a) that parks, which are used by people of all ages and all income groups—and particularly the very young and the very old—are “redistributive” services and therefore should not be financed by the property tax; (b) that open spaces perform various environmental services (such as conservation and pollution control); (c) that open spaces perform various health and education services (such as providing places for physical exercise and study of ecology); (d) that open space performs redevelopment/renewal services (such as providing playgrounds in housing projects and pedestrian malls in downtowns); all of which leads to the conclusion that urban open space is a proper area of concern for upper levels of government.

to urban open space is incredible. Departments as diverse as Lands and Forests, Food and Agriculture, Education and Housing (through the Ontario Housing Corporation) are all involved in one way or another with outdoor recreation and open space. And legislation as diverse as the Parks Assistance Act (which offers assistance to municipalities for the acquisition and development of "approved parks"); the Conservation Authorities Act (which provides assistance for the purchase and development of certain conservation lands and for various conservation programs); the Community Centres Act (which provides money for various recreation facilities); the Ontario Heritage Foundation Act (which gives assistance for the preservation of historical sites); and so forth, all deal with urban open space. The first problem facing municipalities is to discover exactly what kinds of provincial assistance are available. As a first step toward developing an effective urban open space program, the Bureau recommends that the province write and distribute a report which briefly describes all the grants and programs offered by the various provincial departments and agencies that deal directly or indirectly with urban open spaces. This would provide at least a measure of direction and coordination among the relevant departments and programs.

A second problem facing municipalities (and Toronto in particular) is that some of the present legislation is simply not applicable to urban open space. The limitations of the Conservation Authorities Act for developed urban centres were discussed in *Urban Open Space: Luxury or Necessity?*, which pointed out that, while helpful for Metropolitan Toronto as a whole, nearly all the conservation (and Metro Parks) land in Metro Toronto is located *outside* the City and therefore has limited outdoor recreation value for City residents.

Perhaps the best example of the limited applicability of provincial open space legislation is the Parks Assistance Act, which gives assistance to municipalities for the acquisition and/or development

of an "approved park". The act is intended to aid "passive" recreation pursuits. But the assistance made available is of virtually no help to a city like Toronto. First, an "approved park", according to the regulations, must have such facilities as overnight camping, overnight trailer camping, and entrances controlling admission to the park. Obviously, such a park must be large. No downtown, passive recreation areas (such as a neighbourhood sitting park, a garden, or a vest-pocket park in the shopping area) would qualify for this assistance. Second, the ceiling for land acquisition assistance is \$25,000 (to be matched by the municipality). In a city like Toronto, where land costs as much as \$500,000 an acre, this ceiling is obviously far too low — and it is probably too low for other cities as well. And third, no operating funds are made available. The Bureau recommends that, as a second step toward developing an effective urban open space program, provincial legislation affecting urban open space be re-examined in light of urban needs, and more appropriate provisions for grant and loan assistance be brought forward.

The Federal government is also becoming increasingly involved in urban problems. It has, for example, through its urban renewal and low-income housing programs made substantial assistance available to municipalities — assistance that has been and can be increasingly used for the development of urban open space. A case in point was the recognition last winter that federal money could be used for outdoor recreation area developments in federal-provincial public housing projects (such as Toronto's Regent Park).

But improvements to public housing developments are not a sufficient mechanism for providing federal assistance for the acquisition and development of urban open space. The provision of neighbourhood open space is an important element in the provision of good housing in general. Both the land assembly and urban renewal provisions of the National Housing Act should be revised to reflect the real need for federal assistance to urban areas for the provision of open space.



## Conclusions and Recommendations

In the discussions in both Bureau bulletins about urban open space priorities, problems and possible solutions, it has become increasingly clear that the underlying problem — and basic solution — is the lack of the *political will* to reorder priorities and seek solutions. There seems, however, to be a change, and there is evidence of increasing concern among many citizens and their representatives about the quality of life in the urban environment. *Urban Open Space: Luxury or Necessity?* was devoted to setting out the problems and to helping to create the necessary political will by analyzing why urban open space is important for the healthy functioning of cities. *Urban Open Space: People, Parks and Planning* has been devoted to exploring some potential answers to the problems, both the problem of exactly what kind of space people really use and how and why they use it and the problem of how to fill the need. But the solution is ultimately dependent on the existence of that political will at all levels. If it exists, then these techniques, or other better techniques, will be developed and used.

In the course of this report, the Bureau has made a number of recommendations, some very general and some very specific; they are summarized here.

Open space standards and policies — like other planning standards and policies — have not always been directly related to the way people behave. As a consequence, they have sometimes led to the improper location and development of open spaces; one example is the location of a playground across a major traffic artery from the majority of its potential users. This is both a waste of public resources and an annoyance to improperly served citizens. Much of this bulletin has been devoted to reporting the findings of an exploratory study of user behaviour in a variety of parks in the City of Toronto. As a general principle of park

planning, the Bureau recommends that *user-behaviour information should be adopted as a major basis for developing urban park standards and guiding urban park policy and planning.*

Both the information presented about financial and land constraints and about various aspects of user behaviour lead to the conclusion that *urban open space policy emphasis in the City of Toronto should be on the development and coordination of relatively small, local spaces, located within ¼ mile walking distance of urban residents.* This policy emphasis may well be needed in other municipalities — particularly older and densely developed ones.

In line with the last recommendation and with the information collected that the location of parks in an area does not ensure that they are used as local parks or that they necessarily serve the needs of local residents, the Bureau recommends that *the City of Toronto Official Plan be amended to read that local parks be located with ¼ mile walking distance of all City residents (not just those living more than a ¼ mile from a regional park).*

Studies of user behaviour provide an indirect form of residents' participation in decisions affecting their environment. This bulletin has also suggested other more direct methods of participation such as the hiring of Parks and Recreation personnel to respond to and encourage local participation in park planning, and the creation of ward or sub-ward residents' committees to work with parks professionals and to plan their local parks. The Bureau recommends, generally, that *local participation in park planning be actively encouraged and implemented.*

Despite the limitations on the availability of large tracts of land in urban areas, there are many potential new or underused areas which could be preserved and used for open space purposes. The Bureau recommends therefore that *muni-*

*icipalities make careful studies of all their potential land resources; and, to encourage and make this type of study financially possible, that the provincial government make urban open space planning grants available to municipalities.*

At present, cities such as Toronto are experiencing high-density redevelopment which often imposes severe pressure on present municipal services such as parks. Municipalities, however, have no legal authority to make binding agreements with developers which require the developers to provide land or money for parks as a precondition for rezoning, site-plan or development approval. What is more, the Minister of Municipal Affairs does not have authority to require such contributions as a precondition to his approval. Since such authority does exist for subdivision approval; since redevelopment can be regarded as "vertical subdivision" in terms of servicing problems; and since these developments do create servicing problems, the Bureau recommends that *the Planning Act be amended to permit municipalities to require as a condition of enacting a by-law which permits an increase in the number of people living in the area that land or money be donated for park purposes on the same basis as in the case of the subdivision of land.*

The discussion of standards and user-behaviour pointed out the necessity of relating park standards to the density of population to be served. At present the standard used in the Planning Act is based on the amount of land to be subdivided rather than on the number of people to be accommodated in the development (i.e., 5%). The Bureau recommends, therefore, that *the Planning Act be amended so as to establish as the criterion for the amount of land to be*

*dedicated or money to be paid in lieu thereof, the number of people to be accommodated in the property subdivided or redeveloped rather than the amount of land being subdivided or redeveloped.*

Various potential financial resources for municipalities were discussed. But it is clear that additional resources, not dependent on the property tax, are necessary. A coordinated, substantially funded provincial *urban open space program* is needed. The Bureau, therefore, recommends that as a first step *the Province write, distribute and mount an information campaign based on a report which briefly describes all the grants and programs offered by the various provincial departments and agencies that are related to urban open space.* As a second step, we recommend that *provincial legislation affecting urban open space be re-examined in the light of urban needs, and that more appropriate provisions for grant and loan assistance be brought forward.*

Finally, the Federal government has become increasingly involved in urban problems and has, for example, recently recognized the importance of well-designed, usable open space by authorizing the use of low-income housing funds for the development of outdoor recreation areas. But improvements to public housing developments are not a sufficient mechanism for providing federal assistance for the acquisition and development of urban open space. The provision of neighbourhood open space is an important element in the provision of good housing in general. We recommend, therefore, that *the land assembly and urban renewal sections of the National Housing Act be revised to reflect the real need for federal assistance to urban areas for the provision of open space.*

## APPENDIX I

## DESCRIPTION OF PARKS WHERE INTERVIEWS WERE CONDUCTED

- High Park** — Area: 397.759 acres (including Grenadier Pond).  
 Facilities: Outdoor swimming pool, wading pool, artificial ice rink, baseball, soccer field, tennis courts, lawn bowling, cricket field, supervised senior playgrounds, boat rental, fishing area, bicycle road, racing course, cross country and barrier race courses, sitting-out areas, 31 picnic areas with 490 picnic tables, snack bars, gardens, walks, Summer Music Festival, public parking area for 831 cars.  
**High Park North:** Easy access to playground, pools, field benches and tables, snack bar, walks and parking lot.  
**High Park East:** Natural area of park. Benches and tables.
- Rosedale Park** — Area: 7.561 acres.  
 Facilities: Junior playground, wading pool, artificial ice rink, tennis courts, baseball, soccer-football fields, sitting-out area with 5 picnic tables.
- Craigleigh Gardens** — Area: 8.754 acres.  
 Facilities: Sitting-out area, gardens, access to Ravine.
- Trinity-Bellwoods** — Area: 62.981 acres.  
 Facilities: Senior playground, wading pool, indoor swimming pool, artificial and natural ice rinks, tennis courts, volleyball courts, baseball, soccer-football fields, bocci courts, box lacrosse courts, Recreation Centre, arboretum and sitting-out area with 3 picnic tables, Summer Music Festival, public parking area for 30 cars.
- Rosehill/David Balfour** — Area: 47.668 acres.  
 Facilities: Junior playground, wading pool, 2 day camp sites, 2 picnic areas with 28 picnic tables, sitting-out area, garden, walks into Ravine, Summer Music Festival.
- Willowvale Park** — Area: 21.885 acres.  
 Facilities: Senior playground, wading pool, outdoor swimming pool, natural ice hockey rinks, baseball, soccer-football fields, sitting-out area with 6 picnic tables, gardens, Summer Music Festival, public parking area for 71 cars.
- Greenwood Park** — Area: 15.655 acres.  
 Facilities: Senior playground, wading pool, outdoor swimming pool, artificial ice rink, tennis courts, baseball, soccer-football fields, sitting-out area, Summer Music Festival.

## APPENDIX II (continued)

- Eglinton Park** — Area: 22.772 acres.  
Facilities: Senior playgrounds, wading pool, outdoor swimming pool, Arena, indoor-outdoor artificial ice rink, tennis courts, baseball, soccer-football fields, cricket fields, sitting-out areas with 12 picnic tables, Summer Music Festival, public parking area for 141 cars.
- Civic Square** — Area: 2.823 acres.  
Facilities: Artificial ice rink, sitting-out area, reflecting pool, flowers, snack bar, Summer Music Festival.
- Wellesley Park** — Area: 5.715 acres.  
Facilities: Senior playground, wading pool, sitting-out area with 3 picnic tables, Summer Music Festival.
- Riverdale Park** — Area: 62.981 acres.  
Facilities: Zoo, snack bar, 2 baseball, soccer-football fields, junior playgrounds, outdoor swimming pool, artificial ice rink, natural ice rink, tennis courts, lawn bowling, running track, cricket field, toboggan run, sitting-out area with 6 picnic tables, Summer Music Festival. (Interviewing done in the area around the Zoo, in the sitting-out area, snack bar area and baseball, football-soccer field.)

## APPENDIX II

## LOCATION, TIME AND DAY OF INTERVIEWS

<b>Location</b>	<b>Number of Long Interviews</b>	<b>Number of Short Interviews</b>
High Park North .....	35	
High Park East .....	32	
Rosedale Park .....	23	
Craigleigh Gardens .....	9	
Trinity-Bellwoods Park .....	18	27
Rosehill/David Balfour Park .....	28	19
Willowvale Park .....	16	
Greenwood Park .....	9	31
Eglinton Park .....	12	
Civic Square .....	31	
Wellesley Park .....	15	6
Riverdale Park .....	16	
Total .....	244	83

## Time of Day When Interviews Were Conducted

Morning — 56

Lunch — 65

Afternoon — 111

Evening — 12

## Day of Week When Interviews Were Conducted

Weekday — 197

Weekend — 47

11.27  
13-06

Folio #9



## BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH

---

Founded in 1914 as a non-profit research agency staffed by well qualified personnel, the Bureau of Municipal Research maintains continuous study of the problems facing municipalities and their residents.

Long an advocate of responsive and responsible government, the Bureau has gained wide recognition for the high calibre of its quarterly *Civic Affairs*, its monthly *BMR Comment*, its information and advisory services, and the participation of its staff in the public discussion of issues.

The Bureau is an independent agency supported by a broad cross-section of business and professional firms, organizations, governments, and individuals.

*your inquiries are invited:*

---

BUREAU OF MUNICIPAL RESEARCH  
Suite 406, 4 RICHMOND ST. E., Toronto 1, 363-9265

---