



## Engage Resource Unit

### Albert Park and Radisson Heights Community Facility Final Summary Report – February 2016

#### Project Background

Albert Park Radisson Heights is a community of approximately 6,500 residents in Calgary's South East Corridor. The Albert Park-Radisson Heights community association facility is in disrepair. The estimate for repairing the building is approximately \$1.6 million. This project is currently unfunded.

There are three options on how to what to do with the community association building:

- Repair the facility
- Demolish the current facility and build a new or different facility;
  - on the current site; or
  - as part of the multi-family building on another site in the community
- Demolish the current facility and do not rebuild anything in its place

#### Engagement Objectives

We are looking for input from the community for what to do with a building that is in disrepair. What services do the community currently use, what would they like in the future? It is possible that services could be offered to the community in a facility that is similar to what currently exists, or a different type of community association operation. Input from the public will be used to determine how and where programs and services should be offered for the community of Albert Park and Radisson Heights.

#### Stakeholders

- Residents and potential residents of Albert-Park and Radisson Heights
- Community Association Board
- Community support service providers
- Local businesses

#### Engagement Overview

Engagement with residents of Albert Park and Radisson Park occurred in two phases. Phase 1, November-December 2015 and Phase 2, January-February 2016. In Phase one, residents were invited to share their thoughts about how they use the existing community association facility and what they would like to be able to do in the future.

In phase 2 of the engagement we asked residents about how these programs and services could be delivered in the community, and what they see as the benefits or challenges of 3 different community options. Options that were considered were:

- No Land or Facility
- Land with Amenities, No Building
- Community Association Facility Leased from the City of Calgary



## Engage Resource Unit

Albert Park and Radisson Heights Community Facility  
Final Summary Report – February 2016

### Phase 1

DATE	EVENT	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
November 18, 2015	Community Association Meeting	10
November 19, 2015	Seniors Breakfast	80
Nov 19-Dec 18, 2015	Online Survey	176
November 26, 2015	Money Table Community Dinner	60
December 2, 2015	Conversation Cafe	40

### Phase 2

DATE	EVENT	NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS
January 12, 2016	Community Working Group Meeting	8
January 20, 2016	Community Association Meeting	13
January 25, 2016	Open House	20
January 25-February 7	Disqus Online Feedback	10

\*Numbers of participants is typical of engagement processes with communities of this age and size.

## Engagement Input

### November – December 2015

Themes –What do you currently do or would like to be able to do in your community	Examples of feedback received
<b>Special Events</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>community events - Stampede breakfast, craft &amp; bake sale, community cleanup</li> <li>I come for the indoor garage sale</li> <li>Musical events</li> </ul>
<b>Educational Programming</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reading / writing clubs for those who came from different cultural background</li> <li>Programs - employment related programs</li> </ul>
<b>Organized Sports</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>indoor sports (volleyball, badminton, etc)</li> <li>baseball</li> <li>soccer</li> </ul>
<b>Recreational Programming</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>seniors exercise</li> <li>yoga</li> <li>hobby clubs</li> </ul>
<b>Socializing Activities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bingos</li> <li>Darts</li> <li>Seniors Breakfast</li> </ul>



## Engage Resource Unit

Albert Park and Radisson Heights Community Facility  
Final Summary Report – February 2016

January – February 2016

Summary of Themes by Option		
Option	Benefit	Challenge
1. Community Association with no land or facility	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change</li> <li>• Cost/Funding</li> <li>• Use</li> <li>• Maintenance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Change</li> <li>• Sense of community</li> <li>• Lack of amenities</li> <li>• Site/location</li> </ul>
2. Community Association with land and amenities, no building	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sense of community</li> <li>• Cost/Funding</li> <li>• Maintenance</li> <li>• Ease of use</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use</li> <li>• Change</li> <li>• Sense of community</li> <li>• Lack of amenities</li> </ul>
3. Community Association facility leased from the City of Calgary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use</li> <li>• Sense of community</li> <li>• Programming/Events</li> <li>• Site/Location</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use</li> <li>• Cost/Funding</li> <li>• Space</li> <li>• Maintenance</li> </ul>

### Questions/Comments

- Taking sports out of community centres has hurt communities in general
- What are the community demographics? i.e. number and ages of children
- Challenging to reach out to all residents
- What can dollars buy, capital versus operational?
- What is the process for giving facility back to the City?
- Current facility is central and visible
- Involvement and marketing is a challenge
- What happens to the community in the interim?
- How do you get people involved?
- What would happen to the land? Would it remain parkland/public space or redeveloped into high density housing?

Content is captured as it was provided by stakeholders. No edits have been made.

### Outcome

It is clear that residents who participated in the community engagement have a strong connection to their community and would like to be able to access programs and services near their homes. Feedback collected will be used by administration to consider what type of facility might be possible for Albert Park and Radisson Heights.



## Engage Resource Unit

### Albert Park and Radisson Heights Community Facility Final Summary Report – February 2016

### Strategic Alignment

The conversation with the Albert Park and Radisson Heights community align directly with The City of Calgary Engage Policy which states engagement as: *“purposeful two-way dialogue between The City and citizens and stakeholders to gather information to influence decision making.”*

### Evaluation

The information below was gathered at the February 17, 2016 Albert Park and Radisson Heights regular community association meeting and represents feedback and comments from 9 participants.

The information provided during the engagement process set the stage for dialogue	Strongly agree 4	Agree 5	Disagree 6	Strongly disagree 0	n/a
The engagement was a good opportunity for me to share my views	Strongly agree 5	Agree 4	Disagree 0	Strongly disagree 0	n/a
This engagement was a good opportunity for me to hear other people’s views	Strongly agree 5	Agree 4	Disagree 0	Strongly disagree 0	n/a
I felt I had enough opportunities to provide input into this topic	Strongly agree 5	Agree 4	Disagree 0	Strongly disagree 0	n/a
I was able to see that feedback I provided was reported back	Strongly agree 5	Agree 4	Disagree 3	Strongly disagree	n/a 1

#### Comments:

- The City representatives were most informative & helpful.
- It was nice to see all the interaction. All your hard work was appreciated.
- There was a lot of beneficial information provided.
- There were many pro’s & con’s in reference to the outcome of our community hall.
- Build it and they will come. We need a new hall to have recreation programs.

### Next Steps

The City of Calgary will review all information collected and provide a “What We Did” report to the community which outlines how the information collected was used to make a recommendation on this project.