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Executive Summary
In January 2010 the City of Saint John appointed ADI Limited of Saint John, as an independent consultant to lead the public consultation process for the Sandy Point Road Planning Study and provide a Statement of Professional Opinion. The purpose of the study is to identify the optimum future use of City-owned property located south of Sandy Point Road and adjacent to Rockwood Park.

The public participation for this study followed standard planning practice techniques to engage those with a stake in the future use of the land leading to a City Planning Staff recommendation on potential amendments to the Municipal Plan and the Zoning Bylaw. On March 10th, 2010 ADI facilitated consultation sessions with the public for the purpose of understanding the issues and concerns related to residential development of City owned park land along the Sandy Point Road.

The results of the consultation and subsequent stakeholder meetings indicate two main themes of public concern; that of “conservation” of park land, and that of increased “access” to Rockwood Park. Utilizing the information from the consultation, professional practice and theory, and direct field observations ADI prepared a public policy guide that includes the following recommendations:

- No Net Loss of Parkland
- Increase Access to Rockwood Park
- Promote Residential Development in Areas with Existing Infrastructure
- A Commitment to Partnerships
- Protect Natural Resources – Expand Rockwood Park
- Protect Scenic Resources
- A Commitment to Design Excellence

Following these public policy recommendations ADI prepared a detailed concept plan that attempts to address the public policy guidance by separating the study area into two areas based upon themes of “conservation” and the other based upon increased “access” to Rockwood Park.

ADI’s statement of professional opinion represents a balanced approach that values both the natural features and landscape ecology of Rockwood Park and the cultural environment of sustainable communities.

“For real benefits from nature to be realised in urban areas, the dichotomy of town and countryside must be broken down. Nature needs to become recognised as an integral part of the fabric of urban life and just as importantly, human life needs to become reconciled as a part of nature.”

*Ground Work: Investigating the Need for Nature in the City, Mark Hudson, Evergreen, Toronto, Ontario*
Background
On August 18, 2009, Common Council for the City of Saint John adopted a resolution that the Department of Planning and Development should carry out a planning study to identify the optimum future use of City-owned property located south of Sandy Point Road and adjacent to Rockwood Park. The primary reason for the study is to ensure that proposed future land use of the subject area is the most appropriate from a planning, financial/economic, environmental/sustainable and community perspective. The study was commissioned in response to unsolicited offers from the development community to develop City-owned parcels of land located within the subject area for uses that are not currently permitted in the adopted Municipal Development Plan and Zoning By-law.

Common Council further directed that the Planning Study should engage those with a stake in the future use of land in this area in a public process leading to a Planning Staff recommendation on potential amendments to the Municipal Plan and the Zoning By-law.

The Department of Planning and Development being the responsible agency to provide Common Council with land use policy recommendations undertook a Technical Background Study gathering information on: defining legal boundaries, current planning policy, environmental matters, transportation, servicing, and economic / fiscal considerations to provide a context upon which any recommendations will be based.

In addition, to the technical background study Common Council appointed ADI Limited as an independent planning consultant to carry out two tasks:

a) To undertake public consultations as part of the planning process to solicit as many views as possible from interested parties, including developers, stakeholder groups and the general public of the future use of such lands; and

b) To prepare a Statement of Professional Opinion that will provide recommendations on the most appropriate future land use(s) of the subject lands. The Statement will also include: a summary of the public consultation event, any relevant design principles for any uses(s) proposed, examples of best practice elsewhere in Canada or abroad and reasoned planning justification for said recommendations taking account of the above.

Rockwood Park
Rockwood Park is a municipal park owned and managed by the City of Saint John. At 2,200 acres (891 hectares) Rockwood Park is one of the largest municipal parks in Canada. The origins of Rockwood Park are similar to many of North America’s parks. During the 1800’s the popularity of parks in most North American cities was a response to increasing industrialization and urbanization. Rockwood Park began in similar fashion as a growing Saint John populace took advantage of an informal recreation area close to the urban core. Rockwood’s popularity with local citizens inspired the formal adoption of “dedicated” parklands through Provincial legislation.

The term “dedicated” is often used in referring to parkland. Common phrases include “lands dedicated for park purposes” and “dedicated parklands.” However, dedication can also be implied. In the case of
Rockwood Park the informal dedication of parkland occurred over time through municipal actions which demonstrated that the City of Saint John considers the lands to be parkland. Examples of such actions have included publicly announcing the intention to purchase lands specifically for use as a park, developing a “master plan” for the park, capital budgeting for park purposes, “mapping” lands as parkland, and constructing park trails and other amenities.

Rockwood Park is not a highly programmed park in which every square foot has “design and purpose” such as New York’s Central Park. Rockwood Park’s story is still evolving. Major infrastructure improvements, such as the gateway development currently underway at the Lily Lake entrance, suggest a new “golden age” for Rockwood Park. However, as we move forward into this new period of park evolution there are also new costs and new challenges. One such challenge manifested in the summer of 2009 when Common Council placed a moratorium on the development of City owned land along the Sandy Point Road and called for a detailed planning study.

The area under consideration of this study generally encompasses lands bounded to the west by the Sandy Point Road from a point beginning at Kelly Lane continuing north along the Sandy Point Road for 5 Kilometers to an intersection with Foster Thurston Drive. The study area represents approximately one quarter of Rockwood Park along the north western boundary. Because of its size, 2200 acres, Rockwood Park is classified as a regional park.

Some of the main facts that are known:

- The Sandy Point Road corridor along Rockwood Park, curves along the northern and eastern boundary of Rockwood Park, and connects with arterial roads at either end
- Many of the residential dwellings along the corridor front directly on the Sandy Point Road and back onto the park. Only a few public streets intersect with the corridor along its length.
- The corridor includes lands that have been used as a municipal park for some decades

ADI’s primary task in this assignment is to prepare a “Statement of Professional Opinion” that includes recommendations on the most appropriate future land use(s) of the subject lands, including a summary of the public consultation event(s), any relevant design principles for any uses(s), proposed, examples of...
best practice and planning justification for recommendations. The challenge in rendering a “statement of professional opinion” that recommends potential land uses begins with thorough public consultation and by understanding the land’s value in its current state.
Public Consultation
On Wednesday, March 10th, 2010 ADI hosted two separate public consultations in the Lily Lake Pavilion’s Mac Murray Room. The sessions were held from 3-5 pm and from 7-9pm with ADI making formal presentations at 3:15pm and 7:15pm, a copy of ADI’s presentation is included in Appendix C.

Project Principle
A key message delivered to the public during the ADI presentation was the project principle. The project principle is a declaration of the core values that guided ADI’s service as professional planners working on behalf of Common Council and in the public’s interest. The Project Principle as stated during the March 10th Consultation Sessions was

“To develop public policy that will result in a safe, healthy and sustainable community by promoting and designing a vibrant urban form well integrated with the natural values of Rockwood Park”.

The consultation sessions were held in a workshop format with the public sitting in small groups of 8-10 people. Both sessions were well attended with approximately 70 persons attending the afternoon session and more 110 persons attending the evening session.

Figure 1 - March 10, 2010 Consultation Sessions
After each of ADI’s presentations the public was offered a short opportunity to ask questions. The consultation format was designed to allow participants to work together in small “breakout” groups. Once the breakout sessions began each table was instructed to elect a spokesperson for each table. These small groups would then engage each other directly and foster greater dialogue of issues and concerns among park users, neighbours, and residents. ADI’s planners; Brian White, Giovanni Paquin, Andrew Matheson, and Elizabeth De Luisa, and Nayan Gandhi from the City of Saint John facilitated among the groups. Additionally each table was supplied with questionnaires to aid the group discussion. Alternatively the questionnaire could be used as a survey form for individual comments. The questions provided to the public were as follows:

1. What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?
2. Identify on the map any special landscape, look offs, historic, or cultural elements.
3. Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?
4. Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road.
5. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Are there entrances to the Park? Are the entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park?
6. Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?
7. Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of architectural design features reflect the character of Rockwood Park?

Each table was also provided with a large scale map of study area and participants were encouraged to identify on the map any special landscape features, look offs, historic, or cultural elements that represent good park opportunities. Following a period of 45-60 minutes each table was provided an opportunity for their spokesperson to report back to the entire room their responses to the questions or provide general comments. During the reporting process notes were taken regarding the general concerns, issues and opportunities being brought forward, a summary table of those items is shown below on Table 1.0.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Issue or Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boundaries:</td>
<td>Need to clearly define the park. Boundaries of Rockwood Park need to be articulated. Does the park come to Sandy Point Road? Need to define the boundary. Need several visions of the park. South of Peacock along old abandoned Sandy Point Road is good buffer/boundary. Boundary is already known, Sandy Point Road (and Foster Thurston) is the boundary of the park and Cherry Brook Zoo is the entrance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment:</td>
<td>Extreme environmental sensitivity (trees on rocks, water tables, run off over road). Shallow soils/wetlands make it difficult to develop.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concern regarding runoff into lakes. Threat to fishing if developed. Harrigan Lake “infected” by development. Geopark points of interest (caves) Dumping along Dark Lake Road. Great view above Hazen White School/ site of former city dump.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development:</th>
<th>Focus on development complementary to the park. Potential development areas need to conform to strict design guidelines. How to develop? How to enhance the park? City of Saint John needs a clear vision and clear design guidelines for development. The area between the clear cut at 1671 Sandy Point Road and golf course are potential locations for development but only IF financial benefits or amenities go into Rockwood Park. Any new development should be Single Family dwellings only. The Golf course blends into the park very well. Golf course built in 1970s and needs upgrades. The driving range is well hidden and buffered. Leave the golf course alone. Zoo is well integrated. A lot of rock on Sandy Point Road – no blasting. 1671 lot – does not enhance the park – bad infill. No development at 1671 Sandy Point Road. This study is about Rockwood Park, not “surplus land”. There are development opportunities on waterfront so why develop here? Saint John has large land mass so why are we touching one of our biggest natural assets? Does housing fit? Not really. Retain all city-owned land in Rockwood Park. Don’t take park away from Saint Johners. No development east of Sandy Point Road, leave the park as it is. No development within park boundaries. Park land inside the roads should not be developed. No housing development (SFD, Townhouses, etc.). Development will reduce access. Cannot rely on zoning – rezoned Residential in 2005. Rockwood Park on 2009 calendar in Japan – international respect for park – endangered by development?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access:</td>
<td>More access to park! Focus improvements to new access points. More trails, improve walkability. 1 or 2 street side parking lots near existing trailheads and new trails and amenities! Increase parking lot size near zoo. Parking needs design guidelines. New park entrance at Ski Hill &amp; upgrade at zoo. Bike lanes on Sandy Point Road. Improve existing wilderness trails. Old road on Peacock Road is covered over cutting off public access, not improving it. Rockwood is a “Diamond in the rough that needs to be protected.” Only appropriate improvements would be to build 1 or 2 new trail heads. Upgrade Sandy Point Road (traffic concerns) – Traffic light need at Sandy Point Road intersection. Animal Rescue League needs 2200 ft. buffer (formerly Peacocks). Zoo security is a problem. Reopen the bunny ski hill for kids.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The maps with the public’s notations from the sessions have been summarized on Map 1.0 Public Consultation Highlights.
Stakeholder Meetings
In the period following the March 10th consultation sessions, ADI was contacted by several individuals and organizations for the purpose of expressing individual and group positions. Among the groups ADI met with were, Active Transportation Saint John, the Sandy Point Road Neighbourhood Group, the Friends of Rockwood Park, and various individuals and property owners along the Sandy Point Road. Letters and submissions from these groups have been included in Appendix A.

Consultation Summary Themes
The challenge in summarizing the public consultation session is that many of the public in attendance did not extend their input far beyond a “no development” position. Rather than discussing the opportunities of the planning study the general attitude of the consultation session represented no compromise position against yet another perceived threat to Rockwood Park. The public’s response was, according to long term park users, similar to the reaction and efforts to stop the natural gas pipeline routing through the park. However, several submissions and some members of the public did recognize that well designed clusters of development could potentially benefit the park. Notwithstanding the disparity in public opinion two main themes did emerge from the consultation session; the first being a theme of “conservation” and the other related to increasing “access” to Rockwood Park.

Together these themes of “conservation” and increased “access” have guided ADI in the formulation of the “statement of professional opinion.”

Conservation Theme
The first theme arising from the consultation is one of conservation and protection of Rockwood Park. Indeed the majority position held by those in attendance was that the park should remain exactly as it is today. Some in attendance held a stronger view of Rockwood Park as a de facto ecological reserve or conservation area whose ecological integrity is under direct threat from development.

Defining the Conservation Concern
From the public’s perspective, development pressures along the Sandy Point Road have the potential to result in an inevitable loss of open space and forests. The concern heightens such that the perception is that development pressures would degrade the existing parkland and that the ecological carrying capacity of existing parkland will be exceeded if the finite parkland resources are further eroded.

Professional practice in park management suggests that striking a balance between philosophies of “parks for people” and “maintaining ecological integrity” can be a difficult challenge. In Rockwood Park the job of striking that balance is made easier as the vast acreage provides sufficient buffering such that the core ecology is able sustain itself against intensive recreational uses and development pressures.

Municipal parks are normally areas focused on recreational activity and landscape enjoyment for residents and visitors. However, recreational activities inherently pose direct threat to ecological integrity of land and yet are completely consistent with the role of a municipal park. On the opposite
end of the spectrum many Provincial and Federal parkland areas have been set aside primarily to protect designated areas of ecological importance. While people and their activities are typically paramount in planning municipal parks, human activities that potentially threaten ecological integrity are restricted in Provincial and Federal parks. As people become more environmentally aware, their ideas about the ideal landscape for recreation as well as their preferred outdoor activities change.

Rockwood Park, at 2,200 acres, is classified as a regional park. Regional parks typically have two categories of landscape that of a “Core” and of an “Edge” area. The role of the “core” in a regional park is to maintain the “wilderness experience” for park users. Whereas the regional park “Edge” has a noticeably more human use component where more active and intensive uses are encouraged. The “Sandy Point Road Planning Study” area is entirely contained within the edge area of Rockwood Park, and therefore appropriate park activities with the edge should not interfere with the role of the park’s core in maintaining the “wilderness experience”. This approach is reinforced in the 1988 master plan which identified 3 areas of the park for development with the majority of the parkland along the Sandy Point Road falling into the “Recreation and Cultural Zone”. The focus of this zone is to use the park primarily on new initiatives for active and passive recreation developments.

The Rockwood Park Master Plan also recommended many activities such the clearing of trees and creating a more manicured landscape along the Sandy Point Road which would not relate well to a park management plan focused on maintaining ecological integrity. However, the role of a municipal park to enhance the human experience by providing a manicured landscape does relate well to the public’s understanding of what a city park should be.

One final and notable observation that the consulting team did make was that even though the public was concerned with maintaining the park’s integrity there was little or no reference to the fact that ecological systems, wildlife corridors, natural areas do not follow man made boundaries such as the
Sandy Point Road. ADI concluded, after reviewing the project background reports and through field observations, that there are areas such as the land around Howe’s Lake that have good potential for expanding Rockwood Park’s boundaries (see MAP 3.0). Such expansions of the park’s boundaries relate best to existing natural features and ecological networks and less upon man-made boundaries such as the Sandy Point Road. This concept of park expansion is explored in greater detail in the “Concept Plan”.

**Park Access Theme**

While public opinion was clear about the need to protect Rockwood Park there was also an equally strong sentiment expressed regarding the need to improve access to the park. The public’s view of Rockwood Park is that it provides a fulfilling natural experience that can occur daily within a relatively safe and secure situation; however this experience is not evenly distributed through the park. The public identified that safe and secure experiences in Rockwood Park along the Sandy Point Road are difficult to locate. The consensus of opinion was that opportunities do exist within the study area to develop greater park amenity that would provide natural experiences for those who often are unable to access them, including the young, the elderly, the infirm, and the poor. These ideas are also reflected in the 1988 Rockwood Park Master Plan that recommended trails, trail heads and better year round access.

Traditional park designs, such as Rockwood Park, followed a philosophy to create an oasis within the city, a reprieve from the noise and congestion. Thus, many traditional park designs turned their backs on the city with a strong landscape barrier at the street. Under many circumstances, this can increase risk of crime, and nuisance activity such as the illegal dumping of garbage.

Municipal parks that follow modern park planning practice encourage daily exercise on park trails and other park amenities by making them highly accessible from new and existing communities. The professional practice in creating successful city parks points to a need for
many park access locations with a variety of methods to arrive using differing modes of transportation, including walking, hiking, bicycling, public transportation, and personal vehicles. The area around Lily Lake is a good example of parkland with excellent variety in both the number of access points and methods of access.

Increasing access to Rockwood Park along the Sandy Point Road also requires the consideration for maintaining public safety. Areas where the most intense recreational uses occur should be located near public roads and adjacent to areas that have existing or planned community development. This will allow the future park design and access to incorporate CPTED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) principles in the areas that will be most heavily used by people. CPTED principles involve the design of buildings and open spaces to enhance public safety.

Within Rockwood Park’s “edges” it is appropriate to encourage park activities such as walking, hiking, bird watching, and other activities that reflect the interests of our aging demographic. Appropriate residential land uses immediately adjacent to, and somewhat integrated with the park landscape helps to ensure that the elderly have safe and secure access to the park. Park users, in general, will also benefit from the informal surveillance offered by nearby residents. Residential neighbourhoods that connect to the park edge and do not threaten the park core are referred to as “stewardship communities” and when properly designed become vital to the long term success of a municipal park.
Statement of Professional Opinion
ADI’s primary task to prepare a “Statement of Professional Opinion” includes recommendations on the most appropriate future land use(s) of the subject lands. In preparation of the opinion ADI has also recommended policy guidelines that will require a focus on themes of conservation and access which are further guided by good planning and urban design.

Guide to Public Policy
The intent of the public policy should be to achieve a high standard of care and sensitivity for the environmental conditions along the Sandy Point Road and for Rockwood Park. The concept plan for the study area relates to the consultation themes in the following manner:

- The degree of naturalness of the land along Sandy Point Road relates to existing conditions. Those areas that exhibit an existing high degree of naturalness, such as Area A (see MAP 2.0), should continue along that path and be enhanced by public policy decisions. Efforts to present this area as a more manicured landscape should be scrutinized against the priority to conserve and protect the ecological integrity of the area.

In contrast the area along the Sandy Point Road that exhibits a greater degree of cultural influence through existing residential and golf course development, such as Area B (see MAP 2.0) should be enhanced for opportunities to provide access to Rockwood Park. Additionally, as per the Rockwood Park Master Plan, “efforts to visually upgrade and clear view sheds into the park should be considered if Rockwood is ever to appear “park like” in nature”.

- The type of recreation outdoor experiences possible along the edge boundaries of Rockwood Park relate to the public commentary and recommendations stemming from the Rockwood Park Master Plan that encourage new trail development and new trail heads. In the conservation area (Area A see MAP 3.0) the recommendation is to examine private and public partnership opportunities to locate park trail head and facilities on privately owned land and thereby reinforcing the higher degree of naturalness in the area.

- Concerns regarding environmental sensitivity, as described by the public relates primarily to concern over storm water management and the potential for contaminated urban runoff to further degrade the existing condition of Rockwood Park’s lakes. Proposed development scenarios would be required to adhere to urban design guidelines that require detailed Site Disturbance Plans, detailed Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan, and a Storm Water Management Plan. (Appendix B)

- The intensity and scale of proposed uses is governed by the need to protect public views and relates to the scale determined by natural features in the park such as tree height. Proposed buildings can be more in scale with Rockwood Park’s trail edge by stepping back the building, hiding the bulk of the building behind lower-scale elements, or under a sloping roof. A greater level of discussion regarding design guidelines is provided in Appendix B.
Public Lands and Parks Policies
The Public Lands along the Sandy Point Road, whether designated park or not, are owned by the City of Saint John. The right to dispose of public lands resides in the trust of Common Council and guidance for decision making related to disposal of City owned lands comes through good public policy. The following are recommendations for Common Council’s consideration toward the adoption of new public policies.

Establish a “No Net Loss” of Parkland Policy
Critical to maintaining the Rockwood Park is the adoption of a “no net loss” of parkland policy and for greater clarity “no net loss of usable recreation and open space acreage” as a result of zoning changes, the sale of parkland, or through non-park uses.

There are two important reasons that the City of Saint John should consider in the adoption of a “no net loss” of parkland policy regarding Rockwood Park. First and foremost is the effect on natural systems which in keeping with the City’s Integrated Community Sustainability Plan (ICSP) states that the City shall:

- Respect Saint John’s natural ecosystems. Act as a custodian for the biodiversity and natural ecosystems of Saint John, and protect and restore them;
- model the development of Saint John on the characteristics of natural systems; and
- strive to minimize Saint John’s ecological footprint;

This first principle suggests that before parkland is divested its ecological or natural value should be evaluated and equal or greater compensation be reinstated for any lost parkland.

On the opposite end of the policy spectrum and the second principle supporting a “no net loss” of parkland is that loss and degradation of parkland can have a negative impact on real estate values. In Saint John, the potential loss and degradation of parkland may have a significant negative effect on the ability of Saint John to capitalize on the regional appeal of Rockwood Park.

At the local neighbourhood scale most people are willing to pay more for a home close to a nice park. Economists call this phenomenon “hedonic value” which is affected primarily by two factors: distance from the park and the quality of the park itself. The affect on property value in proximity to a park can be measured up to 2,000 feet from a large regional park; however most of the property value is within the first 500 feet. Research states that a “conservative value of 5 percent as the amount that parkland adds to the assessed value of all dwellings within 500 feet of parks. The preponderance of studies has revealed that excellent parks tend to add 15 percent to the value of a proximate dwelling; on the other hand, problematic parks can subtract 5 percent of home value.”

---

**Increase Access to Rockwood Park**

Rockwood Park has evolved as a traditional park design that attempts to create an oasis within the city, as a reprieve from industrial land uses and urban congestion. This type of traditional park design turns its “back” on the city with a strong landscape barrier at the street.

Quality of life is often cited as a relevant factor in attracting and retaining newcomers to an area. One key aspect of quality of life is the availability and quality of recreation and parks. Increased access to Rockwood Park, the “opening of doors”, coupled with improvements to the park’s recreational opportunities would lead to increased quality of life for residents. Convenient and well located access to park recreational opportunities also increases physical fitness, reduces resident anxiety and stress, and can lessen the incidence of substance abuse and depression.

**Promote Residential Development in Areas with Existing Infrastructure.**

As discussed previously regarding the Degree of Naturalness, the area along the Sandy Point Road from the golf range at Crescent Lake to Cherry Brook is a cultural landscape largely impacted by human settlement. A best practice approach to site development comes from LEED\(^2\) provides direction in favour of utilizing previously disturbed and developed sites. Additionally it is the accepted professional practice that “higher density forms of housing development as well as the redevelopment of existing areas (“intensification”) is, on balance, more environmentally sustainable than lower density development in greenfield areas (the pattern of development which has been typical in Saint John until very recently). Redevelopment makes more efficient use of land and can, in certain circumstances, reduce the need for additional infrastructure by making use of capacity in existing infrastructure.”\(^3\)

Growing Cooler: The Evidence on Urban Development and Climate Change a research study from the Urban Land Institute (ULI) makes a case for high-density, compact development models that, by design, reduce carbon emissions from vehicle traffic.

Urban sprawl occurs when development “leap frogs” outwards from the city core to its outskirts in the form of a low-density, auto-dependent development on rural land. Sprawl traditionally begins as unserviced single family dwelling subdivisions that consume much more land per-capita than traditional urban developments which then begin to demand services as found in the urban areas. Sandy Point Road exhibits some of these sprawl characteristics however where central services are already in the public ROW reasonable effort to develop appropriate residential infill should be explored.

The additional unique circumstance of the Sandy Point Road is that although “rural” in character the majority of the residents are less than 5kms from the city’s uptown core and less than 1km from the University of New Brunswick and Saint John Regional Hospital. Locating residential development in close proximity to these regional employment and service centers represents an excellent opportunity to promote a more sustainable “complete” community model.

---

\(^2\) Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) is an internationally recognized green building certification system that provides building owners and managers a framework for identifying and implementing practical and measurable green building design, construction, operations and maintenance solutions.

\(^3\) Review of Development Financial Incentives, City of Saint John, Hemson Consulting Ltd., June 2010
A Commitment to Partnerships

Through enhanced partnerships with schools, public agencies, private developers, and nonprofit institutions, Saint John can support opportunities to add park and recreation resources and other public spaces without acquiring land. By developing strong partnerships with volunteer groups, foundations, nonprofit organizations, resident and business organizations Saint John can support the park with advocacy, programming, and funding outside of the public’s purse.

The Animal Rescue League (ARL) recently purchased the former Peacock Nursery property with the intention of re-locating their animal shelter. The ARL is a non-profit organization that provides rescue, temporary housing, care and assistance to stray and unwanted animals in the greater Saint John area, as such they service the public interest. The former Peacock site is also ideally suited to service the public interest in the form of a major park hub that can accommodate a large parking area, washrooms, etc. without disturbing parkland. The City of Saint John should explore with the ARL, and other partners (e.g. Saint John YMCA – YWCA Glen Carpenter Centre) how both parties can mutually benefit from joint projects.

Protect Natural Resources – Expand Rockwood Park.

The unique aspect of this particular park is its location. The study area offers a wilderness experience immediately adjacent to a densely developed city. At 2200 acres Rockwood Park provides quietness, aesthetic beauty, species diversity and richness, as well as interesting elements and forest stands in an urban context where such attributes are rare. The close proximity of Rockwood Park to urban environments enables residents to experience the wild landscape on a daily basis. While expansion of the system is important, new parks must be selected carefully to ensure that they contribute to fulfilling the purposes of the system and that they justify the considerable public investment in acquisition and long term management.

Example criteria are used for initial evaluation of proposed sites to expand Rockwood Park are:

- significance of the proposed site’s resource themes;
- size (sufficient acreage to protect the principal resources);
- absence of incompatible features (water and noise pollution threats, etc.); and
- no limitations on public access that would inhibiting management or public use

Protect Scenic Resources

Saint John is has an abundance of high hills, bluffs, and steep topographic areas that offer spectacular views and vistas of the city, park land, river valley, the harbour and the ocean. While scenery is important to the overall quality of our communities, scenic vistas and view sheds are often destroyed during rapid change, both in the natural and built environments. Identification and protection of these assets is an important component of smart growth and scenic stewardship.
Establishment of design guidelines will not only limit the impact of development on scenic vistas and view sheds but also enhance the public opportunity to enjoy these assets. Clear design guidelines give communities a chance to decide how development will affect their neighborhoods and countryside. Responsible control of elements such as height, bulk, design, materials, color, landscaping, and siting helps a project blend with its surroundings.

Scenic areas endow communities with substantial benefits, such as higher property values and increased tourism revenue. Protecting scenic vistas and view sheds from the effects of haphazard development allows a community to preserve its unique charm, build civic pride, and attract positive growth to the area.

**A Commitment to Design Excellence**

Saint John will foster excellence in design for Rockwood Park for its park amenities and new communities. Excellent design creates environments that are safe, comfortable, interesting, pleasant and long-lasting, providing a place for people to enjoy and express themselves. Innovative design that promotes interaction with the park is encouraged. Quality public spaces, along the Sandy Point Road that invite people into Rockwood Park, are possible by adhering to design strategies such as:

- Design urban form along the Sandy Point Road respecting the public interest’s increased access to Rockwood Park;
- Design direct public connections and sightlines from the Sandy Point Road into Rockwood Park;
- Utilize materials of the highest quality in new and redeveloped public spaces so as to ensure that they will be built to last;
- Increase the budget and staff to support and maintain public spaces. As more people use public spaces in the future, more attention is required to maintain the safety, function and aesthetic of place;
- Ensure that that public gathering places such as trail heads can be easily watched by nearby residents;
- Trail heads and vistas should have convenient and functional seating, waste/recycling containers and other street furniture;
- Parking should be discreet and one of the least dominating features on the landscape.

A greater level of detail regarding the built environment is included in Appendix B.
Concept Plan
Rockwood Park represents one of the largest urban municipal parks in Canada. The study area, although only a portion of the park, is complex in both its geography and land use issues. Consequently, no single statement could attempt to address the variety of public policy issues that need Common Council’s attention. The following plan is therefore a guide to implementing public policy within the study area. Much of the proposed planning is very site specific and relates to small clusters of development, the vast majority of the study area should remain as park land developed only for recreational purposes. Land within the study area not specifically mentioned in the plan should remain largely in its current state, subject only to detailed scale site planning and additional public consultation.

A key consideration in this study is the degree of land alteration along the Sandy Point Road that has impacted the existing degree of naturalness. The area south of the driving range (Area A See MAP 2.0) tends toward larger sections of intact “greenfields” or undistributed sites. Whereas, the area of land (Area B see MAP 2.0) from the driving range along the golf course represents the largest contiguous section of the study area that has been and continues to the focus of construction activity.

Existing conditions along the Sandy Point Road both in the northern developed section and southern green fields represent the appropriate context in development of policy objectives. Along the northern section of the Sandy Point Road a reasonable amount of development can be integrated with existing residential and golf course development. The physical intrusion of development into the parkland will be limited to maximum of distance of approximately 150 meters reflecting the existing privately owned residential lots along the Sandy Road. Whereas the focus of southern section is to maintain a high degree of undisturbed natural vegetation on the conservation and park lands as well as at the rear of most of the residential lots. A detailed discussion of both areas follows.

Area A – Conservation Theme
Park Expansion and Connections to Open Space Networks
Growth and development throughout Saint John has been shaped by a natural network of open space. The natural corridors interconnect natural areas and provide opportunity for wildlife to migrate between habitat patches and maintain natural ecological functions. Within Saint John, this network of open space serves many functions. It shapes settlement form and provides natural resources that support the economy and preservation of our cultural heritage. It provides opportunity for outdoor recreation and aesthetic enjoyment. It also provides habitat for wildlife and performs important environmental services such as the retention of flood waters, uptake of nutrients, abatement of pollution and moderation of climate. Area A represents an opportunity to strengthen the connection between natural areas, parks and communities that will conserve biodiversity, provide opportunities for outdoor recreation, and retain Saint John’s natural heritage.

There is a high degree of naturalness found in the Area A lands was generally shown on Map 2.0. This land is primarily publically owned with only few private landowners being completely surrounded by parkland. The majority of the Area A lands are also undisturbed, due in part largely to the lack of private
ownership and that the lands are unserviced by either municipal water or sewer. Additionally majority of the publically owned park lands in this area are governed by the public trust that attached legal burdens to the development of Rockwood Park. This combination of undisturbed land and legal restrictions provides enough policy direction that these lands, notwithstanding site specific recommendations, should remain parkland for the “exclusive recreation and the enjoyment of the public.”

The focus of land acquisition relative to the proposed “no net loss of parkland” should be lands within AREA A. As discussed earlier in this report, the creation of a “no net loss of parkland” would include stipulations requiring that vacant land/open space within urbanized areas of Rockwood Park’s boundaries can only be developed if parcel of equal or greater size, ecology, geographic relationship, and accessibility can be acquired as public park space.

Site A – (Low Priority, 5-10 years)
Site A includes 2 parcels of land both of which are privately owned. Immediately west of Site A is a long narrow strip of land owned by the City of Saint John that was formerly a proposed alignment for the Sandy Point Road. The public has expressed, during the consultation, a desire to have the Rockwood Park boundary follow this alignment. Development potential requires the extension of public services and access to the Sandy Point Road and although these properties are not inholdings acquisition of these lands would reinforce the geographical integrity of the park. This is a low priority item that can be achieved over time through land trades or as designated lands for public purposes.

Site B - (High Priority, 2-5 years)
Site B is outside of the Sandy Point Road Planning Study Area and consequently outside the scope of this project. However, the opportunity for valued park land expansion was raised by the public and therefore discussed in this context. The site is approximately 10-12.25 hectares (25-30 acres) and includes Howe’s Lake and represents a portion of larger parcel owned by the City of Saint John that includes the location of the former city landfill. The land is part of the same geological formation home to “Howe’s Cave” within Rockwood Park. Site B represents a unique feature on the landscape in relation to Rockwood Park. As a predominate hill it offers great vistas to both the park and the City. The site is also one half of a small valley passage leading into Crescent Valley that combined with tall mature forests offers automobile drivers along the Sandy Point Road a well balanced comprehension of the landscape that contrasts well with the
open vistas provided along the Sandy Point Road nearest the golf course.

The land is unserviced and the steep slopes pose potentially difficult development constraints. In contrast the parkland potential of the site, as described above, would represent considerable value to Rockwood Park in support of the “geopark” proposal, landscape variety, and a “no net loss of parkland” policy should Common Council decide to proceed with limited development of some parkland.

As stated in the “no net loss of parkland” policy discussion lands considered for expansion of Rockwood should be targeted as strategic acquisitions to consolidate parkland boundaries or remove private inholdings. The evaluation of those lands should include the uniqueness of the physical or cultural heritage features that would add regionally significant recreation opportunities or natural and wilderness preservation features to Rockwood Park.

Site C – (High Priority, 2-5 years)
Site C is outside of the Sandy Point Road Planning Study Area and consequently outside the scope of this project. However, the public raised to ADI’s attention on several occasions that the Saint John Animal Rescue League owns this 16 hectare (40 acres) parcel of land privately owned by the Animal Rescue League (ARL) is a non-profit organization that operates an animal shelter that provides rescue, temporary housing, care and assistance to stray and unwanted animals in Saint John. The ARL property is low lying and flat in comparison to the surrounding lands. The ARL’s long term goal is to develop a new shelter facility at this location. Immediately south and abutting the ARL property, is an existing City owned gravel parking lot located on a sloping site that fronts onto the Sandy Point Road. This parking area provides access to the former ski-hill and the park trail system. The public has stated throughout the consultation process a strong desire to improve public access and parking at this location.

The City of Saint John should examine methods and opportunities to work in private public partnership with the ARL to develop enhanced public parking, amenities and trail access from ARL’s private lands. The partnership should also result in an additional benefit to Rockwood Park through acquisition of private inholdings as identified Sites E.

Site(s) D – (High Priority, 2-5 years)
The area of land between the two sites (D) combined with the potential expansion of Rockwood Park onto Site B represents an opportunity to create a signature parkway⁴. The sites

---

⁴ A roadway in a park: a landscaped thoroughfare connecting parks
represent the locations of entrances that reinforce the brand and character of Rockwood Park and provide a way finding function for regional visitors to Rockwood Park. Additional opportunities exist at these gateways to address the proposed “geopark” through the use of stone originating from and characteristic of the Saint John region.

**Site(s) E – (Low Priority, 15-20 years)**
Throughout AREA A (see Map 3.0) there are several privately owned inholdings\(^5\) that do not reinforce either the character or the boundaries of Rockwood Park nor do they provide public access opportunities to the park. Inholdings generally have the potential to threaten the ecological/geographical integrity of parks and as such the standard approach is to target these lands for strategic acquisition. It is recommended that the majority of the private properties within the park will over time be acquired for public use, the buildings removed and the properties restored to a natural landscape as much as possible.

Methods of acquisition range from commercial acquisition as the City’s financial resources permit, land trades and conservation easements.

**Site F – (Low Priority, 5-10 years)**
Site F is unserviced, zoned RS-2 (One and Two Family Suburban Residential) and is previously disturbed cleared land located on the eastern corner of Samuel Davis Drive and the Sandy Point Road. The site is approximately 0.8 – 1.2 hectares (2-3 acres) in area and should extend back from the Sandy Point Road on average a distance no greater than 75 meters. The site is less than 75 meters southeast of the Cedarcrest garden centre. Immediately west of and behind the garden centre a mixed density residential community “Rockwood Hills” is currently under development. In closest proximity to the site is a single family dwelling on the opposite southern corner of Samuel Davis Drive and Sandy Point Road and to the west across the Sandy Point Road another single family dwelling adjacent Cedarcrest.

The site contains a commercial billboard sign and does not provide scenic vistas of Rockwood Park nor does it contain park infrastructure or amenity. The site is well located less than 500 meters to both the Saint John Regional Hospital and the University of New Brunswick (Saint John) Campus. Consideration should be given for a mixed use high density residential ground floor commercial building.

---

\(^5\) An inholding is privately owned land inside the boundary of a park, protected area or similar publicly owned land. Inholdings result from private ownership of lands prior to the designation of the protected park or area, which then end up grandfathered and within the legally designated boundary.
The corner location of the property is ideally suited in the overall neighbourhood context to create a neighbourhood commercial high density residential node. The overall building design and orientation should relate well to the corner lot configuration. The design emphasis shall be placed upon the building’s corner such the overall impression is of a gateway to Rockwood Park and trail system. The visual prominence of the corner building should also be reinforced through increased massing at the street corner up to a height not exceeding five storeys. The articulation of narrow shop fronts with protection from the elements, large areas of glass and frequent shop entrances at grade level will form the basis of pedestrian oriented neighbourhood commercial environment. The predominant exterior building material for the commercial base is high quality exterior masonry materials.

Timing of development should occur as services are extended into the area relative to ongoing private investments.

**Site G – (Low Priority, 5-10 years)**

Site G represents lands that were previously disturbed having been formerly a residential lot of 1-1.2 hectares (2.5 to 3.0 acres). The site is approximately 150 meters south of the golf driving range, 150 meters northeast of the Cedarcrest garden centre and more than 300 meters from the nearest residential property.
Figure 9 - Medium density housing in Halifax protects public waterfront access.

The site is valley area relative to its surroundings and does not provide scenic vistas of Rockwood Park nor does it contain park infrastructure or amenity. The site is well located less than 500 meters to both the Saint John Regional Hospital and the University of New Brunswick (Saint John) Campus. The natural assets of the site such as frontage on the Crescent Lake combined with walking distance proximity to two of Saint John’s major employment and institutional destinations suggest that consideration should be given for a higher density form of residential development site. The physical orientation of the development suggest a linear form of development 3 storeys in height that relates to the Sandy Point Road while extending back no greater than 150 meters to provide views of Crescent Lake and to integrate CPTED principles with both the proposed main Rockwood Park multi-use trail and the short loop park trail along Crescent Lake.

Consideration of development opportunities for this site at the detailed site planning stage should consider protecting potential expansion opportunities for the Rockwood Park Golf course as per the original course design.

Timing of development should occur as services are extended into the area relative to ongoing private investments.
Area B – Access Theme
Rockwood Park Neighbourhood Development Area

The area along the Sandy Point Road from the golf range at Crescent Lake to Cherry Brook is cultural landscape largely impacted by human settlement (see Map 5.0). The Sandy Point Road, the sporadic residential development, golf course, and the zoo represent a contiguous area of development. This area also has some of the best scenic value (See Map 4.0) along the Sandy Point Road, although there is no dedicated park amenity or infrastructure that allows for public access to these views. During the consultation, the public expressed a desire for places where the public feels welcome and encouraged to congregate along the Sandy Point Road. The conceptual plan for AREA B (see Map 6.0) examines the need for public space designed with pedestrians in mind by creating “neighbourhood” that integrates public space and park amenity into quality community form. Each of the proposed opportunity sites is within walking distance of the primary destinations areas, and provides some gradient in density that is discernible from center (nearest the hospital/UNB) to outer edge. It is important for a neighborhood to have boundaries as well as a defined center, and this characteristic is often achieved through identifiable edges, either man-made or natural, in this concept the boundary is created through a multi-use trail that links the existing main trail to the proposed visitors areas at Site C (Animal Rescue League).

The concept plan strives toward a more sustainable urban form that has a robust network of clustered communities connected to the Sandy Point Road and pedestrian trails so that pedestrians, bicyclists, and drivers can move more efficiently and more safely. Multiple public intersections versus private driveways and short blocks also give pedestrians a more interesting environment to walk through. The concept plans for Area B exploit the need for more access by examining the Leadership in Environmental and Energy Design (LEED) Neighborhood Development rating system. LEED ND recommends locating intersecting streets at intervals of 150 meters to 180 meters, and no greater than 240 meters apart along any single stretch of public road. This spacing relates well to the need for maintaining public views into the park. (see Map 4.0)

The proposed development potential in Area B is 25 - 35 acres; under a “no net loss of parkland” Site B could provide compensation for the majority of the developed land.

On the topic of Smart Growth the American Planning Association notes that, “Parks enhance mixed development and redevelopment strategies, offsetting higher density concerns with accessibility to green space.” Larry Beasley, co-director of Vancouver Planning, comments, “It’s about the open space and the public realm being used to contribute to neighborhood form and identity. It’s not about having useless private plazas, but instead shaping buildings to emphasize the respite of open public park spaces and squares that are an integral part of every neighbourhood building cluster."
Site H – (Medium Priority, 5-10 years)
Site H represents a potential development opportunity of 1-1.2 hectares (2.5 to 3.0 acres). The site is located at the north side of driveway entrance to the golf driving range, approximately 200 meters northeast of the Cedarcrest garden centre and less than 100 meters from the nearest residential property located on the corner of Sandy Point Road and the entrance to UNB. The site is similar to Site G in most aspects and the approach to development is similar.

The site is also located less than 500 meters to both the Regional Hospital and UNB. The natural assets of the site such as lake frontage combined with walking distance proximity to two of Saint John’s major employment and institutional destinations suggest that consideration should be given for a higher density form of residential development site. The physical orientation of the development suggests a linear form of development 3 storeys in height laid out perpendicular to the Sandy Point Road extending down to the golf range. The development includes enhanced public parking for the range and a two-tiered golf platform as recommended in the 1988 Rockwood Park Master Plan. The development ensures public access to waterfront along Crescent Lake and integrates CPTED principles along the proposed Rockwood Park multi-use trail.

Development opportunities for this site should consider potential expansion of the Rockwood Park Golf Course as per the original course design. Special consideration should be given for the provision of a pedestrian/golf cart bridge over the narrow channel of Crescent Lake.

Timing of development should occur as services are extended into the area relative to ongoing private investments.

Site I– (Medium Priority, 5-10 years)
Site I is entirely contingent upon the planned and potential reconfiguration of the golf course and relocation of the 18th hole. The planned expansion would also potential relocate the clubhouse to a more central location on the site of the existing maintenance building and the maintenance building to the center of the golf course. No specific course changes have been approved or authorized.

Nevertheless, in various golf course reconfiguration scenarios including no change potential residential development could be considered at the existing Rockwood Park clubhouse and land along the golf courses warm-up tees and the 18th hole. The total area of land is approximately 1-1.2 hectares (2.5 to 3.0 acres). The depth of the site, from Sandy Point Road to the back of the site is constrained to 75 meters on average allowing for steep grades and existing golf course.
The site has some of the best scenic vistas across the golf course to Rockwood Park with longer range views extending out to Saint John harbour. Unfortunately, there are no trails or sidewalks and there is no dedicated public area from which the public can enjoy this view.

The site is well located less than 800 meters to both the Saint John Regional Hospital and the University of New Brunswick (Saint John) Campus. Distance to the hospital and the university destinations suggest that consideration should be given for a medium density form of residential development site. The physical orientation of the development restricts the depth of the development and suggests a short (2 to 3 storey) linear form of townhome development that integrates several public viewing platforms between buildings to preserve the view. These platforms and connections to the proposed trail should be located on public land and have direct access to the Sandy Point Road.

Timing of development should respond to the proposed future reconfiguration of the golf course and relocation of the 18th hole.

**Site J- (High Priority, 2-5 years)**

Site J is currently home to the golf course maintenance building and abuts single family dwellings on the two sides. The building is a prefabricated corrugated galvanized steel structure built on a concrete slab and located on the eastern side and 75 meters down grade of the Sandy Point Road. The building’s appearance was noted by the public as not enhancing the character of either Rockwood Park or the golf course. The most efficient location for this building is a location more central to the entire golf course. As discussed in Site I various scenarios for reconfiguration of the golf course have not been decided upon. Nevertheless, relocation of the maintenance building could occur independently of any other course reconfiguration. In this scenario Site I would be clustered medium density residential development 1.5 – 2.5 hectares (3.5 to 6 acres) in size and 75 meters in depth on average. The preferred building configuration is a clustered multi-unit.
apartment/condo/townhome 2-3 storeys with high quality urban designed around a central public courtyard. The courtyard will provide a public look off with public connections between the proposed Rockwood trail directly to the Sandy Point Road.

**Site K– (Low Priority, 10-15 years)**
Site K represents lands that, prior to the moratorium, were under active consideration by private interests for development of small residential sub-division. The site is generally well treed and has steep slopes down grade of the Sandy Point Road. The difficulty with developing suburban style residential, as was previously proposed, lots on land with steep grade is that this form of traditional development requires altering the landscape the consumption of a great deal of land. In contrast, Saint John has a long legacy of adapting housing styles to the difficult grades and steep terrain common in the area. In this scenario Site K would minimize the amount of vegetation and land to be altered by allowing 2 or more, as site conditions dictate, small parcels 1-1.2 hectares (2.5 to 3.0 acres) for development. Each parcel provides for a clustered medium density residential developments extending between 50 and 75 meters down from the Sandy Point Road. The preferred building configuration is a clustered multi-unit apartment/condo/townhome 2-3 storeys with fronts doors and balconies that provide safety and security around a central public court yard similar in scale and form to Site J. The courtyards will provide a public look off with public connections between the proposed Rockwood trail directly to the Sandy Point Road.

**Site L – (High Priority, 2-5 years)**
Site L, also known as 1671 Sandy Point Road, represents the largest potential residential development site of approximately 2.5 - 4 hectares (6 to 10 acres) in size and 150 meters in depth on average.

A key consideration in the evaluation of Site K (similar to all of the proposed sites) is the degree of land alteration that would be proposed under various development scenarios. The unusual circumstance in evaluating this site is that the property is largely impacted by previous and recent construction activity. Given the unattractive nature of the disturbed site the city agreed to sell a portion of the site to the
abutting property owners at 1687 Sandy Point Road. This lot represents a more than reasonable amount of natural vegetation and land to buffer the single family dwelling from any proposed multi-unit residential development.

In this scenario Site L would be clustered mixed density residential development. The preferred building configuration is two multi-unit apartment/condo/townhome buildings aligned perpendicular to the Sandy Point Road. The scale of the buildings begin at the road with a 4-5 storey tower apartment style building that gradually steps down to 2-3 storey high nearest the Harrigan Lake look-off. The buildings are oriented toward a new public street that extends from the Sandy Point Road to the rear of the property terminating in a cul-de-sac. The new public street includes sidewalks and street trees and a landscaped strip of land between traffic lanes to accommodate additional street trees.

Architectural designs of buildings will create a distinctive and attractive community with a strong sense of place that reinforces the character of Rockwood Park. Landscaping features will be designed to enhance the visual amenity of the buildings, public spaces or to mitigate visual impacts.

**Site M – (Low Priority, 15-20 years)**

Site M is somewhat unique in Area B in that it hosts the only major public trail head in the northern portion of Rockwood Park and notwithstanding the parking lot the site is relatively undisturbed. The area abuts a single family dwelling at 1711 Sandy Point Road. The potential development in this area is restricted to 2-3 hectares (5-7.4 acres).

The ideal development scenario includes a medium density residential townhouse project that provides for enhanced safety and security of the existing or redesigned trail head. However, the ideal configuration of proposed development could result in a greater disturbance of the site. The configuration and orientation of any development proposal requires detailed site planning with the onus placed upon the development community to demonstrate how construction activities can be confined to the least critical areas of the site. Development proposals should consider clustered development to minimize land disturbance and minimizes change to the existing landscape by matching any new streets, services and lot grading to the existing topography as closely as possible. Special attention should be paid to the retention of mature trees and appropriate buffering of the proposed development from the abutting single family dwelling.
**Important Geology**
- Howe’s Lake
- Limestone caves

**Potential "GEO Park"**
- Old landfill
- "Clean up/fix" Howe’s Lake

**Sandy Point Road**
- Is the Park boundary
- Need to clearly define the Park boundary
- Sandy Point Road
- Old landfill
- Need Bike Lane
- Leave golf course alone

**Traffic Safety Concerns**
- on Sandy Point Road
- Pedestrians not safe on Sandy Point Road

**Development**
- Permit needed
- Design guidelines
- No blasting

**Illegal Garbage Dumping**
- in trail parking lot
- Illegal Garbage Dumping along Dark Lake Road

**Water quality**
- Affected by infill and golf course

**Need Bike Lane**

**PROTECT ROCKWOOD!**
- No development within the park
- Keep all City owned parkland
- More access to the park
- More trails – improve walkability
- Maintain ecological integrity

**Animal Rescue League**
- Generates noise
- Needs to be separated from residential homes

**Add 1 or 2 Trailheads**

**Methuen Golf Course**

**Update the golf course**

**Permit development only along golf course up to 1671 Sandy Point Road**

**Lease Zoo as is**
- Security is a problem
- Improve entrance and parking

**No Homes! / Only permit Single Family Dwellings**

**Development if permitted needs design guidelines**

**Need to clearly define the Park boundary**

**Use Old Sandy Point Road as Rockwood Boundary**

**Old landfill**

**Map 1.0 – Public Consultation Highlights**
Map 2.0 – Division of Study Area
Area A
Opportunity Site
New Multi-purpose Trail Corridor
Major Public Roads
Existing Private Residential Lots
New Public Access
New Multi-purpose Trail Corridor
Major Public Roads
Existing Rockwood Trail
Park Node – View Platform/Shelter/Parking
Existing Parking Lot / Trail Head
Scenic View

Map 4.0 - Area B Park Amenities

Trail Development around Harrigan Lake
Map 5.0 – Area B Site Analysis Disturbed Areas

Previously Disturbed Lands
(Private Homes, Golf Course, Zoo, Cleared Land)

Existing Private Residential Lots

Area B
Map 6.0 – Area B Conceptual Plan

- Potential Residential Site
- New Multi-purpose Trail Corridor
- Major Public Roads
- Existing Rockwood Trail
- Existing Private Residential Lots

Legend:
- K: Potential Residential Site
- L: New Multi-purpose Trail Corridor
- M: Major Public Roads
- N: Existing Rockwood Trail
- J: Existing Private Residential Lots

Map Details:
- Average Width 75 meters
- Average Width 150 meters

Areas:
- Area B
- Relocate Maintenance Bldg.
- Relocate Hole (Tee, Fairway and Green)
APPENDIX A: - Public Responses to Questionnaire

Attached are unedited transcripts from questionnaires provided in both hardcopy form and electronic form. In some submissions the respondents have prepared their responses directly to the questions, others have prepared general notes, all responses are included. Non substantive grammatical errors, spelling mistakes and typographic errors have been corrected in order to provide clarity in the submissions. No substantive edits to the intent, tone or content have been made. To protect the privacy of respondents their identity is not provided.

Public Questionnaire/Survey:
The focus of the Sandy Point Road Planning Study is on improving the quality of our urban environment and enhancing the role of Rockwood Park along the Sandy Point Road. On the attached map please identify any special landscape features, look offs, historic, or cultural elements that represent good park opportunities.

What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?

Identify on the map any special landscape, look offs, historic, or cultural elements.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road.

Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Are there entrances to the Park? Are the entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park?

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of architectural design features reflect the character of Rockwood Park?
Respondent # 1
What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?
I truly believe the area is beautiful and will benefit from well-thought out, planned and executed development strategy. I've attached a couple links and photos of ideas that would benefit outlying park communities (the technical term slips my mind) and really would fit in with the surroundings, whether single family or multiple residence.
In response to the questions:

*Identify on the map any special landscape, look offs, historic, or cultural elements.*

The wetland, where the driving range is, a special habitat to birds and animals some of which may contribute to conserving flora and fauna within the park boundaries. For instance there is a small group of endangered lady's slippers in the park and if a wetland on the boundary is destroyed many of the insects that pollinate and help the species may also disappear, threatening their existence.

The access road from Cherry Brook Zoo area is pristine and it would be a shame to see the lake with houses skirting it. The area needs to be sustainable and managed by someone with expertise on woodlot management.

*Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined.*

*Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?*

Parking and better access to park trails, improving the trails to make public participation more attractive. The park would be a wonderful commuting pathway for residents from Millidgeville and surrounding area down to Sand Cove Road to use as a bike/walking path to get access to Lily Lake and Uptown.

If housing were approved it would benefit municipal funding for utilities and services BUT the housing needs to be regulated and built to fit in with the natural surroundings, there is a current shortage of food for the burgeoning deer population in Saint John, we don't need to be further depleting it by cutting down all the trees.

*Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road.*

The park boundary is somewhat well-defined, basically considered to be the Sandy Point Road boundary. I consider all the hash marks to be park boundary save the current residential properties. A lot of this boundary is not currently used to its full potential.
Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road?
Are there entrances to the Park? Are the entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park?

No there aren't many facilities, one sign facing the wrong direction at the Cherry Brook Zoo entrance. It's mostly wild forest, and that's a part of its charm. There are old trails that seem to be self-sustained by intermittent use but some of them are maintained (and created with damage to the environment) by mountain bikers.

There needs to be more enforcement of dumping litter. There are quite a few people that use the Dark Lake road entrance and leave their rubbish behind all around the lake.

The trail that exist are off the parking area near Cherry Brook Zoo, one on the Dark Lake Road entrance and access from the ski hill/pipeline, It would be nice to see improved access on the intersections at McLaren's Blvd and Sandy Point Road, a park entrance with a nice community and paths leading into the beautiful streams and rock formations just inside near Mayflower Lake.

The public entrances to the park are:

Lily Lake/Fisher Lakes - these are nice, safe and highly used.

Cherry Brook Zoo - parking is not visible from road but the area has a high traffic volume. The sign in this parking area faces the wrong direction and the map is old and somewhat out of date. It would be nice to see an improved lot since there is a lot of inefficiently used land. My only concern when parking there is potential theft since the cars aren't visible from the main road.

Dark Lake Road. - poorly serviced road in winter causing bad potholes, it's a residential area so the road does get ploughed. It's used by the public but not very many people use it. Since the traffic volume is low this is an access point for illegal dumping and illegal operation of motorized vehicles like SKI-DOOs and ATVs. (We actually almost got hit by a ski-doer a couple winters ago while snowshoeing at night)

Pipeline/Old Ski Hill - Steep access to the park. The parking area is very small, but due to the steep hill to gain access to the rest of the park it's not used by many people.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?

There aren't many existing developments aside from near Lily Lake. The developments that go up near the area are trashy low-quality, they clear cut and blast and make a mess of the natural environment. (University Ave, apartments for example.)

If there were to be development, especially condos or town houses, they should be tastefully & architecturally designed. They need to be built into the landscape with minimal impact on the geology and surrounding trees. The developers need to present sustainable plans and the money acquired from these developments should be put into sustainable woodlot managed paths. It's unreasonable to not allow ANY development but the development must be ecologically friendly, visually pleasing (or even better not visible, hidden among the trees) and with minimal impact.
Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of architectural design features reflect the character of Rockwood Park?

Ha-ha!! I have to say the new improvements to Lily Lake and surrounding area were very nice, but the development that the city currently allows is destructive and unsightly. Places like Cedar Point, so much ancient natural river habitat was destroyed to put up MASSIVE single family dwellings and the apartments on University Ave destroyed the drainage capacity of the geology and this will have long term consequences that nobody considers. There has been little to absolutely NO consideration in this city to incorporate natural characteristics into design. It would be welcome to see some interesting and sustainable housing developments established. NO VINYL SIDING!!!!!!

Respondent # 2

I attended one of the public input studies regarding development of City owned Rockwood Park lands bordering on Sandy Point road and want to make an input.

For your info, I and two of my baby boomer generation friends who have large houses (and tax bills) in the Mt Pleasant area are very interested in continuing to live in the area, in smaller lower maintenance situations but find little suitable property available. An orderly well designed low rise development anywhere along Sandy Point road with good access to the park would provide us with an alternative to moving away, provide a significant tax base increment to the city, and not interfere with the enjoyment of the park by the citizens.

Responses to your questions from study above

What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?

Responsible development of any city owned property should be encouraged to improve the tax base and enhance utilization of the Park. I am definitely in favor of additional residential development along the portion of Sandy Point Road from Golf Course entrance up to the Zoo entrance to the Park, including the portion of the golf course where the Quonset Hut is located and any other portion of Sandy Point Road which is water and sewage serviced.

Development should be restricted by appropriate zoning which would to me include garden home style development, but not apartment buildings.

Development should include public access corridors to the park for multi season use, for example, if the lands adjacent to the Golf Course are developed there should be a public access into the park between developed lots at the Quonset Hut area.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?

Generally the boundaries are well defined; however, there should be no development or encroachment on the Sandy point road from the pipeline right of way north and east to the road into Mayflower Lake or on the south side of that access road.
Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road.

Because there are limited funds park improvements and maintenance of anything more than basic access should be limited to the main entrance, and Lily Lake/Campground/Barn/Fisher Lake area. Spreading limited funds around gets substandard result everywhere. The park is so large a focus is required, and it is logically at the Lily Lake end.

Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road?

Are there entrances to the Park? Are the entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park?

Public entrances to the park........

Many trail entrances are not listed, however, these are currently entrances which allow me to park a vehicle and go into the park.

Lily Lake- Mayflower Lake- Fisher Lakes- Peacocks Garden centre gate- Golf Course seasonally in two places (clubhouse and Quonset hut); Zoo parking lot to trans Canada trail; along Sandy Point Road going south east just before the entrance to Carpenter centre parking; and the gate just at end of Ashburn road extension.

It is important that all of these are maintained in any development plan, and enhanced by parking and signage.

The rest of the questions I will leave to other authorities.

Respondent # 3

I agree with Respondent #2, that some appropriate housing between the golf course and Dick Powell's house (1687 Sandy Point Road) will not harm the park or the environmental aspects of the area that people enjoy. It could serve to enhance / protect the park if there were more people keeping an eye on it, and maybe have another wilderness trail entrance near Harrigan Lake that people could use to enter the park.

The area around the old Peacock’s Garden center should be enhanced and preserved as park. That's my opinion.

Respondent # 4

What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?

1. Define the borders of City owned land vs. Private land in the study area and call that city owned land “Rockwood Park” and maintain zoning as “Park”
2. Improve the entrance to the Ski Hill
3. Maintain the moratorium on development in the study area, unless current zoning allows it. Variances are not acceptable.
4. Howe’s lake cave area is a Point of Interest for the UNESCO Geopark proposal by the Stonehammer group. It has geological and paleological significance and is under scientific study.
Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined.
Rockwood Park is bounded by roadways and a highway and is bordered by private land that is adjacent to the park. The private land is mostly cleared and that which is not, is part of the Rockwood Park forest area. This map produced by the city illustrates what I mean quite well -

Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?
Public citizens don't get see the boundary unless they are invited to one of those homes. The forest and terrain serves well as a buffer.

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road.
Rockwood Park is in a natural state along Sandy Point Rd. except where it's been cleared for development purposes (recreation, housing, gas pipeline, power transmission lines etc). The remaining terrain has been intact for several hundred million years. It's not “landscaped”.

Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road?
Are there entrances to the Park? Are the entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park?
In the study area the trailheads are (north to south):

1. NB Trail exits by entrances close to cherry brook zoo
2. Mayflower Lake Trailhead on Dark Lake Rd.
3. Trail to Howe’s Lake cave area (in ditch just north of old Peacocks driveway)
4. Old Ski Hill trailhead at gated entrance just south of old Peacocks driveway in power line and pipeline corridor.

The trails in the wooded part of the study area are too numerous to list and there are no benches or facilities that I know of other that the Golf Course and driving range.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe.
NB Trail entrance exits close to cherry brook zoo, safe inviting and ample parking. Well known and well used. Gated and Map signage.

Mayflower Lake Trailhead on Dark Lake Rd is safe and inviting and close and has parking space for a few vehicles. No gateway.

Old Ski Hill trailhead at gated entrance just south of old Peacocks driveway in power line and pipeline corridor. Safe, gated and well used. The sign is in disrepair and the parking space could be cleaned up and renovated.
Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?
The existing housing developments could have been planned a bit better. I don't know of any other proposed developments other than Mr. Cavanaugh’s which came about when the city approached him with a land deal which triggered the moratorium and this study.

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural designs reflect the character of Rockwood Park?
Mr. McKee’s place at 1711 Sandy Point fits in although I’ve never really seen it. Get what I mean? The Golf Course provides a nice vista and driving range is nice and secluded on a lake but the public is not freely admitted to either until off season (skiing, snowshoeing etc) as in the rest of Rockwood Park.

Respondent # 5
Having just learned of this plan today (Mar 10), and as a long-time user of the Park, I offer a few considerations. The work plan on your web site is not really clear regarding what is being planned. The immediate concern is that this is a thinly veiled attempt to disguise a substantial planned development (which really means destruction of habitat and recreational area) as a mere planning exercise.

I suggest that the project can be extremely simple -do not allow any further residential development whatsoever in the designated zone. The fact that the city is embarking on a substantial "consultation" exercise for something that logically should be quite simple, suggests that something much bigger is actually in the works, which is a major worry. The city appears to suggest in its work plan that people are having a hard time getting into the park and that the solution is "well-planned growth". This does not make sense.

There are major problems with your work plan. The "project principle" is gobbledygook. What is required is a simple statement of the overall goal for the region, and principal objectives to guide land use in and around the park to achieve the goal. Unfortunately, I suspect that the term "vibrant urban form", incomprehensible to anyone valuing plain language, involves buildings, paving, and concrete. Sadly this is completely at odds with the "natural values of Rockwood Park". As such, the core principle you have tried to state is fundamentally flawed.

The key objective for Rockwood Park should be preservation. It is important to be clear on this. The 1988 Master Plan you cite in your work plan includes "Protection and Perseveration". The fact that this vital word has been mangled does not send a reassuring message to the many citizens like me who value Rockwood Park and who wish to see it protected in perpetuity.

Another important point: in your consultations, if you genuinely want to reach important park stakeholders, you need to look well beyond city boundaries. Many people travel to recreational events in the park from all over NB. Outdoor clubs and associations of all kinds from across the province need to be included, and actually consulted.

Much more could be said but I believe what should guide you are the basics. Preserve Rockwood Park. It's very simple.
Respondent # 6
Interesting experience – good intentions. ADI insisting on commercial housing development angered all at my table.

What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?
- Traffic lights at intersection by zoo
- Access into park – ski hill from Sandy Pt. Road
- Animal shelter (20 acres) – remain park land – (1/4 mil away)
- (Nov 2009) – reopen road to ski hill and parking

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?
- Boundary well defined at Sandy Pt. Road.
- Park side (south?) should have no housing, only access and activity areas useable by parents with young children, others with teen interest.

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.
- Only two trails – too far apart for older people
- Need more entrances and then activities that are suitable to a wild / park place.
- Benches and toilet facilities are essential at regular intervals.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe
- Lily Lake – 2 sides – far more entrances (and parking) needed.
- Others along Sandy Pt. Road have been shut off (ski hill, water tower, etc.)

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?
- Have the horses (other animals could be added) somewhere that the public can see and use. Most popular in all seasons with young children (1 – 12 years).

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural design features that reflect the character of Rockwood Park?
- New Lily Lake Pavilion and buildings farther up the road into the park are wonderful learning places for public school children and for adults.
- Have summer camps (day) for kids on huge scale that moves daily around the park.
Respondent # 7

What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?

Leave it alone! We have one of the biggest urban parks. Let’s keep it that way. Encroaching on this land even 100 meters is a really bad move. If we keep chipping away at the park, there will be nothing left for future generations.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?

By the roads that surround it: Sandy Point Rd., Foster Thurston, and the 4-lane highway. This is one of the great features. You can’t get lost, as you’ll always come out to a road.

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.

Great! No, there are not benches, facilities, or other park amenities along this area. There are trails and woods, that’s all we need! If someone wants to use park amenities, they can use the area around Lily Lake, horse barns, playground, and beaches.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe

Lily Lake and the one just up from the Lily Lake entrance for cars. There are too many other entrances to list that can be accessed by foot, bike, snowshoe, cross country ski, and so on.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?

The recent development around Lily Lake is great! But that’s all there needs to be for now. If we install too many paved/gravel walking trails, then you lose the whole “being out in nature” idea.

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural design features that reflect the character of Rockwood Park?

The Lily Lake Pavilion, the interpretation center, the trailer park, horse barns, playground, canteen are all we need for now. Please leave our park alone!

Respondent # 8

What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?

The best opportunity along Sandy Point Rd. would be to LEAVE IT ALONE. Instead of taking advantage and destroying its natural beauty for Profit!

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?

The roads that are around Rockwood Park are Sandy Point Rd., Foster Thurston, and 4-lane highway.
Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.
The quality along Sandy Point Road is the natural woods, which provides a private setting for its park and is home to the wildlife.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe
Lily Lake, trails by foot, biking, too many to list.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?
No. It’s slowly going to move into this park until there is no park to speak of. Sure, the recent developments have improved the park. But if we are talking about Condos, Apartments, developing the land, then you’re destroying the Park.

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural design features that reflect the character of Rockwood Park?
The Lily Lake Pavilion, the interpretation center, horse barn, and playground. This is enough for the park. PLEASE LEAVE THIS PARK ALONE.

To the pamphlet it looks like the decision has been made, so this is probably a waste of time and will never be read.

Respondent # 9
We are already having problems with water coming onto our land now because of trees being cut down behind us, so if the land is developed and more trees are removed, there will be even more of a problem than we are having now.

Respondent # 10
What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?
Develop PARK infrastructures – i.e. trailhead parking, bathrooms, picnic areas, trails, etc.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?
Park boundary best defined along an existing road, not by privately owned land. Park boundary interfaces poorly with private homes. Private homes inhibit public access to park lands.

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.
None existing. Should be PARK infrastructure.
Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe
The only trailhead to the northern part of the park is beside Cherry Brook Zoo. If this is developed privately, there will be no access to the northern end of the park.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?
Development within the park. Parking, pavilion, trails, etc.

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural design features that reflect the character of Rockwood Park?
Lily Lake Pavilion, Rockwood Park info centre.

**Respondent # 11**
What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?
The boundary of Rockwood Park has always been Sandy Point Road.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?
We are already driving wildlife into urban streets. We need every inch of this to let the wildlife thrive.

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.
Several times green space was mentioned as essential to community living. Everyone along Sandy Point will lose their green space.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe
We enjoy Natural Safety in the park because there is not MASS population living around the park.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?
Where my land is, because of a small development going on behind my place I’m already getting water running down beside my house that’s never been there before.

**Respondent # 12**
What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?
Incorporate all City Land into Rockwood Park. Increase Public access and maintain existing trails and upkeep.
Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?

Boundary to Rockwood Park not defined.

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.

It has been ignored and not properly developed as a Park.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe

Lily Lake, Fisher Lakes and out by the Zoo.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?

Golf Course and Driving Range.

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural design features that reflect the character of Rockwood Park?

See above.

**Respondent # 13**

What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?

Make a few more entrances and parking lots.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?

All along the Sandy Point Road from Zoo to Lily Lake.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe

Lily Lake, Fisher Lake, near Zoo.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?

Lily Lake Pavilion, new horse stables, paved and/or graveled walk paths.
Respondent # 14
What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?
Put all city land along Sandy Point Road into the park.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?
Not well defined.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe
Improve public access points.

Respondent # 15
What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?
1. Retain all city lands along Sandy Point Road.
2. Create more access in this area with proper parking.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?
Along the thru way.

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.
It has been ignored. The existing trails have washed out, signage has deteriorated.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe
1. Lily Lake
2. Fisher Lake
3. Cherry Brook Zoo area
Yes. But we should have more.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?
Yes – golf course if properly managed, driving range, zoo.
Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural design features that reflect the character of Rockwood Park? There has been no private development which has added anything except for the above.

**Respondent # 16**

*What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?*

- Have another access trail head (Dark Lake Road)
- Include a bike lane along Sandy Point Road to provide peripheral access.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?

The boundaries are perfect now:

1. Foster Thurston
2. Sandy Point Road
3. Highway

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.

There are currently no park amenities on Sandy Point Road, which is a shame.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe

As a female that frequents the park, I am concerned about my safety and very rarely go alone. If there were better access points it would be more reassuring.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?

No industrial/commercial/residential development is acceptable! The Lily Lake area is wonderfully developed for the masses, but keep the interior of the park for the outdoor enthusiasts!

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural design features that reflect the character of Rockwood Park?

Improve the Cherry Brook Zoo trail head. A proper parking lot plus lighting will encourage more use as well as reduce the “inappropriate” activity that occurs there after dark.

**Respondent # 17**

*What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?*

- Trail heads near the Regional
- A circum-park trail
- Trail access from Foster Thurston
Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.

Mountain biking along the proposed land (especially between the golf course and Lily Lake) is considered the best in the country (for urban). I have personally seen this recruit several high caliber professionals to the city, which are assets.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?

Build outside the park. There is plenty of land bordering. Then use the bordering park land to make the park accessible.

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural design features that reflect the character of Rockwood Park?

This is an essential asset as free public recreation/fitness, especially for poor citizens. Protect it.

Respondent # 18

What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?

Identify what is unique about this spot – geological/natural/environmental. Improve trail heads, more viewing areas and interpretive signage – linked into interpretive centre.

Line – Sandy Point – Old Sandy Point Road – provide land already – allow one facility/wooded development

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?

Majority of Sandy Point Road and line behind houses (perhaps Old Sandy Point Road), working around trust land.

1 or 2 more trailheads, trailheads with discreet parking lots, discreet signage and discreet toilet services, including # 1671

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.

No blasting, rock landscapes, work with landscapes, no filling in of areas, rear toilets.

Best opportunities – research/understand natural environment: geology, natural lunar heritage; create awareness.

- Cherry Brook Zoo
- One near old Peacock nursery
- Ignored trailheads
- More viewing areas
- Key interpretive signage linked to stronger interpretive centre.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe
1. Cherry Brook Zoo
2. Near Peacock / ski hill

Other possible entrances:
3. 1671
4. Possibly another one leading into lake

Any development of trailheads and parking, etc. to enhance park would work with current landscapes. No blasting, etc.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?
1. Atsko Nose and Richard Powell’s house; integrated woodland setting, simple facility
2. Golf course
3. Cherry Brook Zoo

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural design features that reflect the character of Rockwood Park?
Have development that enhances park – discreet hidden parking, lots etc. for trailheads, discreet toilets, and discreet signage.

Respondent # 19
Not an open process – people not allowed to ask all their questions.

What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?
Better trail leads and lookouts.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?
Existing roadways.

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.
From golf course out to zoo. Existing homeowners built into the trees to keep natural feel and protect trees and environment. Recent developments have bulldozed all trees and destroyed the landscape.
Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe
Lily Lake – good access and signage. Access at Cherry Brook Zoo not well marked and inadequate parking.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?
Atsko Nose house is integrated into the surroundings.
Cherry Brook Zoo
Golf course

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural design features that reflect the character of Rockwood Park?
No. No.

Respondent # 20
Sandy Point Road (Session 1) 3-5 PM

- Need better sense of what the session is.
- Need better speaking equipment.
- No development on entire hatched area.
- Concerned about the need for traffic lights along Sandy Point Road (corner in front of Sandy Point Road) and Cherry Brook Zoo.
- Stewardship connotes responsibility:
  - People who will live within the park limits will consider it their private property.
- City should have first dibs on existing properties along Sandy Point Road.
- Cherry Brook Zoo and golf course should not be considered an entrance as they are specific to their uses.

Sandy Point Road (Session 2) 7-9 PM

- Redevelop the Old Sandy Point Road.
- No development/or Single Family housing development.
Respondent # 21
- I am a frequent, 4-season park user.
- The purple grid area (study area) on maps should not have residential development approved. A small parking area adjacent Peacock’s would be okay.
- Also, don’t make everything one size fits all. Don’t repeat the province’s mistake when they paved Fundy foot paths.

Respondent # 22
What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?
Create and distribute a map showing significant wilderness areas within the study area.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?
The BEST boundary of Rockwood is Sandy Point Road. The homes along the road should be the exception NOT the example. NO NEW DEVELOPMENT!

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.
Beautiful wilderness! Trails, caves, amazing limestone features, too many to name.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe
Dark Lake Road, Cherry Brook Zoo – Both could use some help. Two additional small road-side parking lots would be useful.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?
NO, there are none. Keep the wilderness as wilderness.

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural design features that reflect the character of Rockwood Park?
NO! Wilderness and a green escape from the city is Rockwood’s character.

- No development east of Sandy Point Road – residential/industrial.
- 1 or 2 trail-heads for access/safety of park users.
- 1 or 2 small street-side parking lots – lighted.
- Bike lane on Sandy Point Road.
- Funding for improvement of existing wilderness trails: hiking, biking, walking, etc.
Respondent # 23
Quite, remote wilderness areas are what make Rockwood such a gem. Keep it that way. There are NO underutilized areas!

What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?
Bike lanes and slower speed limit on Foster Thurston and North Sandy Point.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?
Sandy Point Road & Foster Thurston

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.
Beautiful rock faces

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe
Lily Lake, Fisher Lake, golf course, zoo. Yes. They are safe. Could use more bike lanes and upgraded signs (the old 80s signs are dated). Any additional entrances bring the remoteness closer and defeat the purpose of wilderness.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?
Animal Rescue League. That’s it!

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural design features that reflect the character of Rockwood Park?
The new Lily Lake Pavilion is excellent – it is enough development.

If the city is looking for revenue, consider implementing a city wage tax to recover $ lost from population working in the city but moving out to the valley. Rockwood Park is still fuzzy(?) and that is a big reason people move away. The city should really investigate demand for more housing. There are already too many vacant houses in town.

Respondent # 24
I do not want any development of Rockwood Park. I do not want Rockwood Park to have paved trails. I do not want Rockwood Park to become like the Irving Nature Park. It is the city’s responsibility to fix the main road without the sale of land from Rockwood Park.
Respondent # 25

The focus of the Sandy Point Road Planning Study is on improving the quality of our urban environment and enhancing the role of Rockwood Park along the Sandy Point Road. On the attached map please identify any special landscape features, look offs, historic, or cultural elements that represent good park opportunities.

The City’s website does not have a map attached.

What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?

Actual parking at the trail entrances along Sandy Point road. Having the trails move visibly marked so more people know about them and were not afraid to use them.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined.

Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?

The park boundary is only really defined by Sandy Point Road. Other than Sandy Point Road there are not many signs stating that you are no longer in the park.

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other park amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.

Along Sandy Point Road there are trail entrances, aquatic driving range, Rockwood golf course, and Rockwood’s Cherry Brooke Zoo. I do not recall there being any benches, garbage cans, etc. on this end of the trails. It would be nice if there was more lighting and benches along these areas as there are great biking and hiking trails accessible from here.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe.

Main Public entrances to Rockwood Park are at the top of crown street (Lake Drive south) and off of Hawthorne Avenue.

There are also two entrances to Rockwood Park trails off of Sandy Point Road, One beside the old Peacocks flower shop and the other by Cherry Brook Zoo. There are also trail entrances on Hawthorne Ave. and from the top parking lot at the end of Mount Pleasant Ave.

With the construction that has been done in 2009 and what is to come in the rest of the phases for the re-development of Rockwood Park, the Lake drive south entrance is the only entrance that I would consider safe and inviting. The Hawthorne entrance needs more lighting but since it is closed during the winter and around dark during the summer it does not really get used as much as the Lake drive entrance.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?

The re-development that has been done so far has been good for Rockwood Park In 2008 the boardwalk was built so that the Lily Lake trail could be wheelchair/stroller accessible. In 2009 Phase 1 was started and completed which made the Lily Lake Pavilion wheelchair accessible, a new section of paved trail put
in and parking made better. Although now that the road is narrower and people are still parking on the side of the road it tricky to get through a times (I know the city has to deal with it now and about the parking lot being done in phase II).

This year Phase II is going to be completed and the much needed parking will be finished. I cannot wait until all the Phases are completed to see the transformation of the park and hope it is used by more locals.

*Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural designs reflect the character of Rockwood Park?*

I would not be pleased to see the development of more homes or buildings along Sandy Point Road. I live 2 minutes away from Rockwood Park, I am out there every day walking my dog, hiking with friends and work at the campground in the summer time. I drive Sandy Point Road everyday from Parks Street ext. to the University and like that we have so much wildlife and free park land right in the middle of our city. Since the boundaries of Rockwood Park have never been marked well why change it know and take part of the “park” for buildings. I believe it would be best to leave it as is or update what is, not create homes or buildings that will be separate from the park.

**Respondent # 26**

Dear “Whoever’s in Charge”,

We think you were being quite silly when you took away our giant tobogganing hill. Why do it? If you want to make money with Lily’s Café, get RID OF the WALKWAY and PATIO! Kids will want to have some hot chocolate after they go sledding.

For people in wheelchairs or who have strollers, they could go through the Pavilion or go on the ramp next to the water.

Oh, and about the border line, you should just put a fence and some signs instead of big, ugly condos. If people live near the park, they will just walk in, litter and even cut down trees!

Sincerely,

P.S. We are going to keep writing until something Good happens.

**Respondent # 27**

I have spent many hours in Rockwood Park, mostly accessing it from Saint Point Road, since I am a Millidgeville resident. I have included comments below in response to your Rockwood Park questionnaire.
**Best opportunities along Sandy Point Road to make park better.**

I have heard a number of public discussions that seem to want to ‘develop’ the park to allow better access for all. However, the ‘wilderness’ part of the park toward the north end is well used precisely for its backcountry trails. It is one of the great features that make Rockwood Park suitable for a wide range of the population.

The Lily Lake-Fisher Lakes end of the park provides a very different developed feel and the trails there are nice, but not suitable for skiing, snowshoeing, mountain biking, hiking. Along Sandy Point Road is one of the best places to maintain access to the ‘wilderness’ part of the park. The city has marked several entrances as part of ‘Rockwood Park’ for decades and they are well used by citizens. Some suggestions include,

Improve access next to Cherry Brook Zoo. Better defined parking lot, perhaps install a gate to close the upper part of lot at night, but still allow access for parking closer to road. This would allow evening use by skiers, snowshoe, hikers, especially during winter season.

Improve access through Wilderness Trail entrance next to former Peacock property. It is marked by signage and allows great access for cycling, hiking, skiing and snowshoeing. Improve parking at entrance.

Maintain the trailhead at the end of Dark Lake Road, this allows great access for cycling, hiking, skiing and snowshoeing.

**Boundary**

The Cherry Brook Zoo, the parking lot/trailhead next to it, the golf course and driving range, the trailhead at Dark Lake Road, the Wilderness Trail entrance, the forest along the road to Hazen White School, has all been promoted on city maps as part of Rockwood Park for the 25 years I have lived here.

**Landscape and Amenities**

There are few amenities along Sandy Point Road, but there are trailheads and signs, and one map. Trailhead access directly into the backcountry of the park is one of the best features of the park along Sandy Point Road. Better gates and signage to keep out ATVs and snowmobiles are needed. Also concerning landscape note that Howe’s Cave and an interesting area of karst topography exists between Dark Lake Road and the former Peacock property.

**Access**

The parking lot/trailhead next to Cherry Brook Zoo – has always seemed reasonably safe, plowed and maintained.

The trailhead at Dark Lake Road – parking a bit of an issue, but it is a trailhead used by a small group, and a cycling trailhead that requires no parking, seems reasonably safe next to two homes.

The Wilderness Trail entrance – seems safe, but parking is on and off, rarely plowed and the ‘parking lot’ is non-existent.
**Development**
Sport and recreational facilities along the margin of the park are okay, golf course, driving range. Development of a ‘ski-lodge’ or hike-in cabin, boardwalk on one of the upper lakes might be okay. I have no desire to see homes on the lakes. I would rather have the parkland, undeveloped. I pay city taxes and expect some quality of life in Saint John. Rockwood Park is one of the city’s best assets. I expect there are thousands of people that use the more undeveloped end of the park. I would rather have it than another hockey arena. I am quite content with the development at the Lily Lake-Fisher Lakes end of the park and a backcountry feel to the rest.

**Respondent # 28**
*What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?*
Keeping entrances to trail and golf course clear of snow so the public can enjoy all year around, not just in the summer. Saint Johners of all ages enjoy these trails but they could be better utilized.

*Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?*
The boundaries, as best identified by the city, have always been Sandy Point Road itself other than the private lots. Behind the homes, the wild life continues to move about in their natural habitat.

*Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.*
As parks should be, most of the area is bordered by trees, providing natural habitat for animals, protection for the soil. There is an excellent trail leading from Sandy Point Road to Lily Lake with smaller trails leading off, minor impact to the environment.

*Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe*
Lily Lake, Fisher Lake and the trail entrance off Sandy Point Road. The latter could be improved upon to make it more inviting.

*Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?*
The zoo and golf course complement the park but increased multi-unit housing will have a negative impact on Saint John’s one renowned natural resource. For the future of the city’s citizens, it must be preserved.
Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural design features that reflect the character of Rockwood Park?
The enhancement of the Lily Lake Pavilion has definitely increased both the character and value of Rockwood Park. The improvements made to the golf club building are also in keeping with the area it is in and reflective of the surroundings.

**Respondent # 29**
The focus of the Sandy Point Road Planning Study is on improving the quality of our urban environment and enhancing the role of Rockwood Park along the Sandy Point Road. On the attached map please identify any special landscape features, look offs, historic, or cultural elements that represent good park opportunities.

*What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?*

The best opportunities along Sandy Point Road is to see areas for people to have a picnic area, benches, more paths and other amenities that families can benefit from. I rather see that animals still have their habitats.

*Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?*

The Park itself is rather large. There are homes nearby such as my small unit home but it is a way from the park. In the surrounding area it does have the Cherry Brook Zoo, Hospital, School and many other dwellings along the road. The park itself, does stretch out for many miles and by adding more houses along the boundary is getting rid of trees and destroying the animals land to survive. Soon the animals will migrate in our street’s and backyards. So therefore, I might not be able to describe the boundary but therefore stating my opinion to what can happen.

*Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other park amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.*

The landscape is breathe taking and large. The only trails that there is that I can see is coming out from Fishers lake exit area. I know that trails do extend all around the park itself. There are some little areas for picnics, horseback riding trails, dog park, playground, fishing lakes but it should be a touch more expanded more heading put towards the hospital area and the Old Sandy Point road.

*Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe.*

The park entrances are on Hawthorn Ave and Mount Pleasant. The entrances seem safe but can be busy at times with events whereas; car pile up’s and people walking along the side getting to the park can get ran over by a car. The pedestrian crossing is nearly visible to drivers and hardly anyone does not respect it. I think that there should be more entrances and exits for the park.
Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?
No opinion on this one.

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural designs reflect the character of Rockwood Park?
I think personally, that the green space should be left untouched. We have enough dwelling in the city to compensate the loss of trees and the poor innocent animals that dwell on the land. I would hate to see Mother Nature destroyed for a building project of any kind to please the City and Politicians.

Respondent # 30
The focus of the Sandy Point Road Planning Study is on improving the quality of our urban environment and enhancing the role of Rockwood Park along the Sandy Point Road. On the attached map please identify any special landscape features, look offs, historic, or cultural elements that represent good park opportunities.

What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?
To make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners, no more development. If, and when, possible, buy up land around park to expand park boundaries. If possible, try to extend it to the rivers.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined.
Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?
The roads surrounding the Park are the defined boundaries. I’m unable to cite any example that I’m aware of where private homes interface well with park boundaries.

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road.
Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other park amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.
For the most part, the landscape along Sandy Point Road is in its natural pristine state.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe.
Lily Lake, Fisher Lakes, by the old Peacock Florist and just before Cherry Brook Zoo. The entrances by the former Peacock property and the zoo need to be improved to be more inviting and accessible. Any improvement at this end of the park that is done will mess with the natural surrounding environment.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?
None that I’m aware of.

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural designs reflect the character of Rockwood Park?
No.
Respondent # 31
This is my opinion on the development of Sandy Point Road from Tucker Park Rd. to Cherry Brook Zoo. I live at # # # Sandy Point Rd. and I have enjoyed using Rockwood Park for over 40 years.

As it stands, the first priority of the city should be to alleviate the traffic on that stretch of the road. At rush hours, it is often necessary to wait for a few minutes to merge in the traffic and if you develop along the road on Rockwood Park Side, it only gets worse. The area should remain designated single house dwelling only. As warm weather arrives, there are many employees from the hospital and young people from the vicinity run along the road. They are literally risking their lives to improve their health. It does not make sense to bring more traffic to that road. The first priority for the city is to improve the lives of the people, not the coffer of the city. Young people are our future and there is no better place than Rockwood Park to improve their health. We should think about the next generation first and foremost.

As a frequent user of Rockwood Park and a nature lover, I am completely opposed to any development (single houses included) of Harrigan Lake and the adjacent bog area next to Cherry Brook Zoo. I have seen many plants not seen anywhere else in the park along that trail. There are Clintonia, Pitcher Plants, Large cranberries, numerous bog plants whose names I do not know. These areas should be preserved for our next generation at all cost and the trail head should be improved for the enjoyment of the ever expanding nearby residents. As a resident close to the driving range, I think the areas opposite the flower shop are more appropriate for the development of town houses and condos as those areas are not at all used by Rockwood Park users.

Respondent # 32
I was at the evening meeting at Lily Lake Pavilion. The questionnaire that you had did not ask the real questions as to what the citizens really want.

First of all the boundaries of the park are from all of Sandy Point road from the pavilion all the way out to Foster Thurston and Ashburn lake road to the highway back in the highway and on to the pavilion again.

Now for development in Rockwood Park you do not need any other entry way into it other than what you have because you cannot maintain control of what you have and with new development along Sandy Point Road with your new high-rises that developers want it will be impossible to manage the people coming and going through the back of each of these new developments. If you want to develop along Sandy Point Road opposite the park for your new revenue that you are looking for go ahead. At the meeting at the pavilion you did not have the proper people there to explain the whole aspect of what you really wanted to do as far as I am concerned Ken Forrest himself should have been there to show what real development that these developers wanted to do on Sandy Point road on the Park side. As you know from the information that you gathered there that evening at least 95% of the people did not want ANY development in that park at all along Sandy Point Road or the park at all.

If the City is just looking for revenue from the developers all the City has to do is start charging big industry their FULL Tax Rate i.e. The LNG tax deal, also stop paying out exorbitant prices for parcels of land like the new bus garage at $50,000.00 an acre when buying land from the big family. When selling
the land to the big family instead of selling it for $350.00 an acre (Black River Road) it should be $10,000.-- $20,000.00 an acre.

I do not know what the prices were for the little parcels of land that you had to purchase from big family on the Red Head Road for the new sewer treatment plant but In my opinion you should have expropriated it like it was done to the people on the new Bayside Drive extension for a pittance nowhere near what it was worth.

I am done ranting about past mistakes so PLEASE LEAVE ROCKWOOD PARK AS IT IS A TRUE NATURE PRESERVE WITHIN THE CITY. Before you mess it up completely.

Respondent # 33

Dear Mr. White,

Further to the open public consultation process at Lily Lake (March 10, 2010) and our personal meetings; I have drafted this response. First, I want to thank you for your time and willingness to discuss the study and invite public input. As you are aware, almost all public citizens, including groups "SPRNG" and "Friends of Rockwood Park" are against any inappropriate development within Rockwood Park.

As you are aware, I live in the area. I agree that inappropriate development of any area of Rockwood Park or Sandy Point Road would not be in our neighborhood, community, or the City's best interest. Most people do realize, however, that appropriate, planned, responsible, and long-term growth/progress is a necessary reality for any thriving community.

Prior to our meeting (March 17, 2010), I was very concerned/anxious regarding the proposal and the planning process over the past 2-3 years. Specifically, I shared the same concerns as my neighbors felt; that the future of the Golf Course, Driving Range, the Zoo, and Harrigan Lake was uncertain. Indeed, even the fate of Rockwood Park, as everyone has known it, could be permanently harmed/changed/lost.

To lose these amenities would not only be emotionally disturbing to me, personally, but lead to severe and incalculable damage to my property value as it is enhanced and supported by the proximity of the park and its amenities. I was relieved when you advised me that, in fact, the future of the key features of the park are not at risk and that part of the planning process may be able to even enhance and improve the Park's sustainability and utility.

We further talked about other possibilities that would not only help the park but improve the situation for the local community, as well. Specifically, one of the largest anxieties and concerns by citizens and neighbors was about inappropriate subsidized, low-end housing potentially being developed at Harrigan Lake. Also disconcerting is the proposal to build 48 townhouses adjacent to lands of Harrigan Lake and in front of the Golf Course.

Most people find the current physical state of 1671 Sandy Point (Harrigan Lake road fill site) to be the only unacceptable part of the Park and the Sandy Point neighborhood since it is not aesthetically pleasing and serious improvements must be made to correct the situation.

I do think that local residents, and the remainder of the community, would accept a proper housing development conjoined directly with Park enhancement, at this location, if the development was well-
planned in a cosmetically and environmentally pleasing fashion; deserving to be a key feature of the Park and our community (with substantial landscaping, walkways/sidewalks, antique lamp posts + feature ground lighting, color-matched stamped concrete patio areas, and other architectural features to serve as an adequate park theme/environment).

Obviously, this would be an expensive adventure and, hence, would require not only a significant initial investment of capital but also long-term, sustainable commitment. Any housing should be custom-designed, upscale, high-end complexes co-located as part of the development/park rejuvenation.

"Upscale" meaning that only highest quality buildings would be utilized on the site with the best cosmetic upgrades (i.e. architectural metal/copper/Chateau high-pitched roof details, stone/cultured stone facings, wrought iron railings, etc.) so as to look "at home" as a natural part of the Park.

Also, I suggest this development to be "green" by design and energy efficient with solar roof panels (for solar hot water +/- "net metering" when available), high efficiency heat pumps, rain water collector cisterns (for lawn/shrub maintenance, etc.) Obviously, professional architectural and development planner/engineers (perhaps, from your very firm) would have an integral role in the ultimate design and functionality of this proposal.

In following the City’s technical background report (page 5), it is noted "that any applicant must demonstrate his/her development is not premature and prejudice the possibility for future subdivision (development) in the area". Previous proposals, from what I understand, have been premature and would have negatively affected the neighborhood and my property, across the street, causing a disamenity and, therefore, devaluation of investment. Premature and inappropriately planned developments, not including rejuvenation of the entire Harrigan Lake site (and adjacent lands)/Park, may prejudice future improvements/repair of that very site which, seems to be the largest community, neighborhood, and Park problem.

To quote from the City’s Millidgeville Plan, “Millidgeville is an area of the city which offers high quality residential and family environment.” A city like Saint John must be able to cater to an exclusive residential market. The quality of development affects the City’s ability to compete for new commercial and industrial growth as increasingly the location decisions for these developments hinge upon quality of life rather than access to markets and raw materials. A high quality single family must be encouraged. I might appropriately add that much of our current working population of Saint John live outside Saint John in Rothesay, Quispamsis, and Gondola Point. They pay no taxes to the City of Saint John but use and depreciate our infrastructure; I think this has been an obvious and longstanding problem. I suggest that high-quality, sophisticated, and efficient housing in the unique and beautiful lands located here, on Sandy Point Road, overlooking the Kennebecasis River/Bay, the Golf Course, and naturally rugged Rockwood Park may be able to bring a number of those people back to the Saint John market.

This will be reality and make sense as the cost of gasoline increases (cost of commuting will increase), the baby boom generation ages (need to be close to hospital/government/transport services, etc.), and property taxes increase in the Rothesay/Quispamsis area. Obviously, this would be a golden opportunity for improvement of the tax base of the City of Saint John and a positive outcome for all involved.

Recently, provincial property tax rates went up and, I suggest, if the City dropped its municipal rate; this would also immediately help bring more people to our community (many from competing bedroom communities) making Saint John stronger, more vibrant, and prosperous. Certainly, for pending
developers with new ideas and fresh investment capital, any positive moves made by the city in favour of the above-mentioned proposals would be warmly received.

I look forward to your upcoming report and suggestions to council.

**Respondent # 34**

*What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?*

Leave it as a park instead of thinking $$$$ signs.

*Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined.*
*Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?*

The roads that surround it: Foster Thurston, Sandy Point Road, 4-lane highway.

*Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road.*
*Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other park amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.*

No, it’s woods, which provides a private setting for its park, which homes our wildlife.

**Respondent # 35**

*What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?*

Incorporate all city-owned property into Rockwood Park, which lays inside of the roadways that loop the park.

*Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road.*
*Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other park amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.*

Very sensitive, shallow soil, wooded wet areas. Any development would jeopardize the park.

**Respondent # 36**

*What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?*

Former ski hill access (entrance near Cherry Brook Zoo), animal shelter (proposed to move). Should open up this area to new development. Residential development will not happen (must be left undeveloped. Opposed to development.

*Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined.*
*Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?*

Sandy Point Road should be the boundary. Only development should be access to trails.
Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other park amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.

Respondent # 37
What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?
No further development. More access to the park off Sandy Point Road

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?
Maybe off-road parking – similar to the Irving Nature Park.

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other park amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.
Redevelop road where the ski hill used to be.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe.
Cherry Brook Zoo. Nothing developed either side of Peacock’s!!

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?
Security is important!!

Respondent # 38
What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?
No buildings on 1671 Sandy Point Road. All city-owned land to be zoned park. Sandy Point Road to be boundary of park.

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road. Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other park amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.
Improve access from Cherry Brook Zoo. Improve access from ski hill. Maintain signs.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?
Building on park land will destroy lakes and endanger the special species in park.
Respondent # 39
What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?
Complete the trail to create security by new development.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined.
Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?
The City of Saint John should identify the boundaries of the park; eliminate the confusion from the residents of Saint John, especially neighbours of the park along Sandy Point Road. In turn, the city should promote development and control the petitions ongoing.

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road.
Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other park amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road?
Provide details.
No continuous trail from Cherry Brook Zoo to Rockwood Park clubhouse.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?
Proposed development from Mike Cavanaugh Homes along Sandy Point Road (re: 2nd hole fairway) will enhance the surrounding area around the park, create security, and absorb some of the infrastructure from the Sandy Point Road fairway.

Respondent # 40
What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?
Keep intrusions by residential and commercial activities minimal. The road is already congested and the new buildings at UNBSJ and the medical training will make it far worse than today!

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined.
Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?
Exactly – we need to have the current boundaries noted far better. As far as most are concerned, the boundaries should include areas that are beyond the original title.

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road.
Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other park amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road?
Provide details.
Benches? Are you nuts?? On Sandy Point Road? Rockwood Park is essential as a multi-purpose green space. Not every inch needs to be “maximized” or “monetized” – a field has great value as a field!!!
Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe.

The main buildings at Lily Lake need a different approach to parking and how we are able to get to the park features. With scant parking anywhere close to Lily Lake, we need to find out how to encourage bus use, carpooling and alternate modes of transportation especially during summer.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?

I have not found any of the encroachments into what I believed to be the boundaries of the park to be complimentary. If they want to build on the opposite side of the street – fill your boots. But Hands Off Rockwood Park!!

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural designs reflect the character of Rockwood Park?

This is a useless question and I find the waste of my time to be indicative of the “development at any cost” attitude I see here today. I would see “Improvement to the Park” as being no further encroachment into our Common Green Space!!

Respondent # 41

What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?

Improve the parking lot at the zoo end of the park making it attractive, well-treed and unobtrusive.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined.
Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?

The boundary is not well-defined – but Sandy Point Road should remain as the border of the park.

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road.
Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other park amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road?
Provide details.

The landscape is rocky and treed – provides a buffer to the more interior area of the park.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe.

A public entrance to the park could be developed where the old ski hill was – where the Animal Rescue League property now is.
Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?

The consensus of our group is that there should be no inappropriate development – i.e. apartment buildings, town houses, condos, etc. If single family houses are built next to Sandy Point Road they must fit in with the natural environment of the park.

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural designs reflect the character of Rockwood Park?

The houses that have been built in the 1950s that have been on Sandy Point Road border of the park are unobtrusive, well treed and have not changed the esthetics.

**Respondent # 42**

Dear Sir,

Only in Saint John do I find people working to infringe on our Green Space. Many other cities are working to expand theirs.

How sad!

**Respondent # 43**

What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?

Keep the park natural woods, not artificial trees not native to NB. There is a trend to build houses expensive for the property tax assessment . . . crazy concept!

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road.

Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other park amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Provide details.

Mostly woods. Foot paths need adjoining bicycle paths. A tall tower is needed on the top of the hill near or at the former artillery defense site. This could give a view of Halifax airport lights in proper weather. Also, there need to be wheelchair routes.

Where are the public entrances to the Park? Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park? Describe.

By Lily Lake through to the artificial lake and out on Sandy Point.

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?

Rockwood Park had an excellent zoo. This was demolished – a section of land was sold, given, or otherwise to have the Cherry Brook Zoo. Seniors should be able to walk around Lily Lake at lake level; they can’t.
Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural designs reflect the character of Rockwood Park?
The original Pavilion was demolished, and then the present building, which in part is a labour senior section, was built. The roadway is being lowered. The south hill needs proper development.

Many seniors and handicapped persons would like to travel in stages. A growing number use wheelchairs or pushes to help them travel. These require flat areas or paths where they will not interfere with others coming behind by blocking their passage, and yet they wish to be mobile to those coming the opposite way with some form of divider. If there is a divider it should not have high bushes or trees or any form of growth to obstruct vision. Many seniors are afraid of others. Thugs can attack them from behind, grab their purses or carry-all, push them down and flee without the person attacked being able to see what or who. If there is a cross divider visibility, there is a greater possibility of someone being able to see what’s happening, which could be a deterrent to an attacker.

As to Lily Lake, it is still impossible to travel around the lake at a level close to the water. At the west end, one must climb or navigate up a steep hill. This should be changed.

Respondent # 43
I was one of those who attended the consultation at the Lily Lake pavilion a couple of weeks ago. My understanding was that you will receive submissions until 3 April. Here is mine.

Before I start I should like to say that at the consultation there seemed to be two different foci:
- whether or not there should be "development" on the publicly-owned land along the eastern and southern side of Sandy Point Road;
- and how that area of Rockwood Park should be "developed".

In my opinion these two issues are separate and no attempt should be made to treat them together.

The question of the "development" of that area of Rockwood Park should be considered as an integral part of an overall plan for the park, not as something separate. For example, now that new access off Sandy Point Road has been created on Harrigan Lake, it might be nice to develop a swimming place there with a refreshment stall run by a non-profit group, as at Fisher Lake. But this should not be done until the Fisher Lake beach is used more regularly and by more people than it has been recently when I have been there.

I also think you asked the wrong questions, but I will try to answer them anyway.

What are the best opportunities along Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood park a better park for all Saint Johners?
For a start, keep it for all Saint Johners; don't sell off bits for private "development". Beyond that, see my comments above.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined?
Like most people, I take this as an invitation to say what the boundaries of Rockwood Park should be in this area, so that they are well defined. Rockwood Park should include all land on the right side of Sandy Point Road as you come from Hazen White school that is publicly owned. Many of us thought this was
already the boundary of Rockwood Park. At the consultation you said you didn’t know where the park boundaries were. If it were bounded by Sandy Point Road, the boundary would be well defined.

*Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park.*
I am not aware of any such examples.

*Describe the quality of Rockwood Park's landscape along the Sandy Point Road.*
I do not have the expertise to do this. To me, it is typical New Brunswick woodland, in good condition, with beautiful lakes in it.

*Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other park amenities along Rockwood Park/Sandy Point Road? Provide details.*
There are many trails besides the official ones and some of them are probably unknown to the City and ADI. I know of three benches; one beside Harrigan Lake (though it may have been thrown in the lake); one by Long Lake; one by Frying Pan Lake. The golf course and the driving range count as amenities, I guess. Otherwise I know of none.

*Where are the public entrances to the park?*
(a) By the zoo; (b) across the golf course; (c) along the unmade road on the right at the top of the hill coming up Sandy Point Road (mind the dog); (d) at the bottom of the former ski hill; (e) a lesser-known one part way up the Sandy Point Road hill. Perhaps the new access to Harrigan Lake could count as well.

*Are these entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park?*
(a) is safe and reasonably attractive; (b) is not a single entrance so the question does not fit; (c) is neither safe nor attractive; (d) would be safe if the gate was opened and access left to the former car park; it would be reasonably attractive if the car park was put into decent shape; (e) is safe and attractive for those who use it; it would be neither for someone who just happened to find it. The new Harrigan Lake access needs work if it is to be made usable, let alone safe and inviting.

*Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) complements [presumably you mean "complements"] the values of Rockwood Park? If so, how exactly?*
The golf course fits reasonably well with the park's purposes because it is a recreational facility; though now it is no longer municipally operated it has become more expensive. The same could be said of the former ski hill and the driving range. The houses along Sandy Point Road intrude on the park; they do not fit with the park's purposes or, using your language, complement the park's values. No future private "developments" of any kind can "complement the park's values" because, by definition, the park's values are public while the values of private "developments" are private. In such circumstances, "public" and "private" values are antagonistic and can never be complementary.

*Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of homes, buildings or architectural designs reflect [sic] the character of Rockwood Park.***
No existing "development" reinforces the character or values of Rockwood Park; as noted above, some public "developments" manage not to be inconsistent with the character and values of the park because they are public and recreational. There is a city-owned hut off Sandy Point Road past the golf course that is inconsistent with the character and values of the park. There are no examples of private homes
or buildings which reflect the character or values of the park because, as noted above, they are by
definition antagonistic to those values and character.

As a final comment; the final questions start to get at the point. What is public is, or should be, available
to all. What is private is available only to the private interests who own it; unless they think they can
make a buck by ripping the public off. The difference is fundamental and is a zero sum game. When
public park land is privatized, private interests gain and the public interest loses. And rarely, if ever, is
the true cost to the public interest of the loss of amenity and other value reflected in the price paid for
the public land. The City apparently wants to recoup the cost of its "investment" in putting water and
sewerage along most of Sandy Point Road; let it do so by allowing "development" to take place along
the western and northern side of Sandy Point Road (the opposite side to the golf course and driving
range), where there is plenty of room. But let it leave the publicly-owned land on the southern and
eastern side (the golf course side) of that road "development"-free, and designate it clearly as what
most of us thought it was already -- part of Rockwood Park.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback. However, you will forgive me if I have some doubt
as to the value of this process, including whatever report you may submit to Common Council unless
you promote "development" in the area I suggest there be no "development".
**Three Priorities of SPRNG:**

**1. Rockwood Park**
Protection of this very important public asset and eco-system

- In our neighbourhood, the boundaries of Rockwood Park are clearly defined as the city-owned land that edges Sandy Point Road and Foster Thurston Drive. We would like the City to acknowledge this.
- Please find attached, Map A with PAN/PID numbers for the city-owned properties in the study area and PAN information from the Province of NB. According to this 2010 tax assessment, majority of these parcels are described as “Rockwood Park”, “Golf Course”, or “Cherry Brook Zoo”.
- We believe the entire study area is Rockwood Park and should remain as park for public use.
- Rockwood Park’s principles and public uses must be clarified in an updated Rockwood Park plan.
- We support better public access to and better amenities for the park.
- This section of Rockwood Park, between Cherry Brook Zoo and the Golf Course, is a forested wilderness area that is removed from any view of the community that surrounds it. It offers a rich and diverse, yet very fragile eco-system of waterways, flora and fauna. The human footprint is minimal. This rugged section of the park offers trails that vary in difficulty and length, and connect to waterways and trail heads.

**2. The SPRNG Neighbourhood**
Maintaining the integrity of the neighbourhood

- SPRNG supports Saint John’s need for more housing and an increased population. However, planned development that respects the input of neighbourhoods and the general public will ensure the right developments are built in the right places. Saint John has a lot of vacant land. It is absolutely not necessary to cut into Rockwood Park for residential use.
- In and around this neighbourhood, subdivisions and plans for further residential development are already substantial. Please find attached Map B showing two subdivisions the City has recently committed to – Fieldstone Estates and Rockwood Hills. These two subdivisions have a potential to provide 264 homes. The map also shows the Crescent Valley Revitalization Initiative that has been planned in the area immediately below the study area. This project has a potential of providing 1,000 additional homes.
- This study process is very rushed. It would make more sense for this study to be completed once the key principles of Plan SJ and Rockwood Park have been articulated. For this reason, the moratorium should be kept in place until Plan SJ is out. These plans must complement one another, otherwise, once development begins and the damage is done, the land cannot be reversed.

**3. Sandy Point Road and Foster Thurston Drive**
Public and neighbourhood safety

- Improved road and traffic safety is a priority for the neighbourhood. The current conditions of Sandy Point Road and Foster Thurston Drive from the hospital/university to the throughway are already posing dangerous conditions for motorists, as well as walkers and cyclists. There are too many hills, curves, blind spots and deep ditches. These less than ideal conditions and their use as a major route to and from the East, do not support residential growth.
Map A
Property Boundaries & PAN / PID Numbers
for the City-owned Land Inside Rockwood Park
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PAN</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Assessment Year</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Current Assessment</th>
<th>Current Levy</th>
<th>Property Description</th>
<th>Tax Class</th>
<th>Taxing Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1674195</td>
<td>SANDY PT RD</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>$90,100</td>
<td>$1,330.51</td>
<td>ROCKWOOD PARK/PARKLAND</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>City of/Cité de Saint John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5552688</td>
<td>901 FOSTER THURSTON DR</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>$574,900</td>
<td>$8,489.55</td>
<td>CHERRY BROOK ZOO</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>City of/Cité de Saint John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5980514</td>
<td>MOUNT PLEASANT AVE</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>$881,100</td>
<td>$17,744.11</td>
<td>ROCKWOOD PARK</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>City of/Cité de Saint John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5632276</td>
<td>SANDY PT RD</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>$23,900</td>
<td>$352.93</td>
<td>ROCKWOOD PARK/PARKLAND</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>City of/Cité de Saint John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1678987</td>
<td>SANDY PT RD</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>$26,000</td>
<td>$383.94</td>
<td>ROCKWOOD PARK/PARKLAND</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>City of/Cité de Saint John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5980548</td>
<td>1771 SANDY PT RD</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>$301,900</td>
<td>$4,458.16</td>
<td>GOLF COURSE</td>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>City of/Cité de Saint John</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5981308</td>
<td>1771 SANDY POINT RD</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>St. John</td>
<td>$614,100</td>
<td>$27,045.03</td>
<td>GOLF COURSE</td>
<td>Fully Taxable</td>
<td>City of/Cité de Saint John</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map B – Potential Number of Housing Units
Two Subdivisions & One Proposed Housing Project

Fieldstone Estates
64 Single Family Dwellings

Rockwood Hills
92 Townhouses and
108 Condo Units

Crescent Valley Revitalization
Mixture of:
- Single Family Dwellings
- Semi-Detached Dwellings
- Row Houses
- Apartment Buildings
Approx. 1,000 Units
March 20, 2010

Mr. Brian White
ADI Limited
520 Somerset Street
Saint John NB E2K 2Y7

RE:  Sandy Point Road Planning Study
     The Rockwood Park Advisory Board

Dear Brian,

We have been following this study very closely since the day the Common Council agreed to fund it in August 2009. Curiously missing from the whole process is the presence of the Rockwood Park Advisory Board. They are supposed to offer input on matters affecting the park. In fact, Councillor Killen was seeking the Common Council of its “…acknowledgement of its important advisory role in the stewardship of this precious gem, Rockwood park.”

Councillor Killen’s motion on this matter dated March 23, 2009 and the Common Council’s resolution are attached for your reference.

I would like to see in your Statement of Professional Opinion, what role the Rockwood Park Advisory Board is playing in this study, and their position on a possible exploitation of a part of Rockwood Park as a potential location for residential development.

Yours truly,

Dick Powell

Cc/ Mr. Nayan Gandhi
The City of Saint John Planning & Development
March 23, 2009

Your worship Ivan Court
Members of Common Council
City of Saint John

Dear Mayor Court and Fellow Councillors:

**Subject: Rockwood Park Advisory Board**

After an extended time of inactivity, the Rockwood Park Advisory Board is meeting regularly. After examining the terms of reference, the Board is confident it can offer significant input on matters affecting the park. It hopes that Council will provide acknowledgement of its important advisory role in the stewardship of this precious gem, Rockwood Park.

**Motion: That Council seek input from the Rockwood Park Advisory Board whenever Council is considering decisions affecting the park.**

Respectfully submitted,
(received via email)

Councillor Killen
responsable de la supervision et du contrôle de la plupart des services et que, si des membres du conseil pouvaient individuellement mobiliser les ressources humaines, cela pourrait empêter sur les tâches du directeur général.

L'avocat municipal précise qu'il ne souhaite pas donner l'impression que chaque demande d'un conseiller doit être soumise au Conseil pour approbation. Il indique qu'un conseiller peut faire la même chose qu'un citoyen qui interroge un chef de service ou tout autre personnel de gestion concernant un aspect des politiques ou opérations de la Ville.

À l'issue du vote, la proposition est rejetée. Le maire ainsi que les conseillers Court, Higgins, Killen, McGuire, Mott, Snook et Titus votent contre la proposition.

Proposition du conseiller Farren
Appuyée par le conseiller Court
RÉSOLU que cette séance du conseil soit prolongée au-delà de 22 h.

À l'issue du vote, la proposition est adoptée. Les conseillers Killen, McGuire, Mott et Sullivan votent contre la proposition.

11.4 Rockwood Park Advisory Board (Councillor Killen)

On motion of Councillor Killen
Seconded by Councillor McGuire
RESOLVED that Council seek input from the Rockwood Park Advisory Board whenever Council is considering decisions affecting the park.

Question being taken, the motion was carried.

11.4 Conseil consultatif du parc Rockwood (conseiller Killen)

Proposition du conseiller Killen
Appuyée par le conseiller McGuire
RÉSOLU que le Conseil collabore avec le Conseil consultatif du parc Rockwood chaque fois qu'il prend des décisions concernant le parc.

À l'issue du vote, la proposition est adoptée.

11.5 Summary of Motions (Councillor Sullivan)

On motion of Councillor Sullivan
Seconded by Councillor Court
RESOLVED that the submitted chart of motions dated March 26, 2009 be received for information.

Question being taken, the motion was carried with Councillors Snook and Titus voting nay.
March 22, 2010

Mr. Brian White

Rockwood Park is a 2,200-acre people park and wilderness sanctuary in the heart of Saint John. In fact for all of those who frequent her, Rockwood Park is the very heart of the city. From its inception in 1894, the park has gradually grown into one of North America’s largest urban parks. Parcels of land have been bequeathed to the people of Saint John by people who understood the great value of Rockwood Park, and other parcels have been purchased by the city for the purpose of extending the park boundaries.

Rockwood Park is described in Saint John’s tourism literature as “The Heart of Nature in the Heart of the City.” Some residents have described it as a “gem”; others have said it is “Paradise in our backyard.” Friends of Rockwood Park believe that the Mayor and Council have no idea how true these words are. Statistics will show how many people use the campground, which is operated by the Saint John Horticultural Association. Statistics will show how many people swim, canoe, and barbecue. Statistics will show how many people use the horse barns, take sleigh rides, golf, visit Cherry Brook Zoo and the Interpretation Centre, but there are no statistics on the number of everyday park users who run and walk the trails, who fish the many lakes, who birdwatch, who bike, ski and walk the more isolated areas of the park. Rockwood Park has 26 kms of trails. There are accessible and multi-use trails for everyone, from the handicapped and the novice to the advanced hiker. In addition to the park’s pristine forest, there are endangered wildflowers and other unique plant life. One of the best features of the park is its welcoming and beautiful entrance. Well maintained roads, paved trails, unpaved trails around Lily Lake and Fisher Lakes are readily accessible from this entrance – and then there is the “pièce de résistance”, the wonderful wilderness area of the park that Friends of Rockwood Park feel is extremely important and desirable. Without this wilderness area, the greatness of Rockwood Park would disappear. It would be just another city park.

Rockwood Park is ideally located close to the city centre making it readily accessible to all the citizens of Saint John and surrounding areas. It is within walking distance for single parents and families with little money. It offers space, swimming, playgrounds, a place to picnic, outdoor adventure and fun. It is a gathering spot to meet friends. This place is very special to the residents of Saint John. From generation to generation, Saint John residents have been proud to state they have one of the largest natural, urban parks in Canada. This is our proud history and heritage for 116 years now. We cannot let the greed of the present generation diminish and degrade this symbol of pride - this people’s place. We MUST NOT let them deprive future generations of their turn in Rockwood Park.

Over 160 people representing park users attended the consultation meetings on March 10, 2010. In attendance were: Regular park users ● Park neighbours ● Representatives from Outdoor Enthusiasts ● Active Transportation Saint John ● Sandy Point Road Neighbourhood Group ● Saint John Naturalists’ Club ● Friends of Rockwood Park ● Concerned Citizens Small Business group ● Mountain bikers, joggers and hikers, among others.
To these people, the park is an everyday part of their lives. They like its wilderness feel. They like the peace and naturalness. The consensus from the attendees was that the boundaries of Rockwood Park must be defined AND there must not be any housing or commercial development within the Rockwood Park Boundaries.

What is Rockwood Park? It is a sanctuary that is bounded by Sandy Point Road, Foster Thurston Drive, the throughway and city streets in the Mount Pleasant area. There is no question about boundaries. Maps obtained from Leisure Services indicate very clearly that this is Rockwood Park. Service New Brunswick recognizes the area as parkland. Land was donated and purchased for parkland. Signage and trails mark it as parkland. Tourism literature indicates that the area is park. Most park users would say that this is the boundary. Friends of Rockwood Park say that this area IS Rockwood Park and as such, there can be no development on this land that is not park related.--NO development within these existing park boundaries. Allowing even the smallest amount of development within the park opens the park to commercial interests which breaks a public trust for parkland since its inception in 1894. This park is for the enjoyment of the public. It has been degraded enough by private interests whose only aim is to make money for themselves.

Friends of Rockwood Park Inc. feel that the City of Saint John has not been a good and faithful steward for the park. Land has been donated, expropriated and purchased in trust to ensure the survival of the park for the enjoyment and benefit of the people of today and in the future. The primary guiding principle for park management is that the maintenance of ecological integrity must be the first consideration. A management plan would establish an approach for achieving the objectives of ecological integrity and public opportunities for understanding, appreciation and enjoyment in Rockwood Park. FORP Inc. encourages Common Council to review the Master Plan for Rockwood Park and incorporate the goals of Vision 2015 and the Sustainability Principles that Council recently approved, so that there would be no suggestion of selling off Rockwood Park piece by piece for short term economic gain.

Rockwood Park is more important than ever now that science has confirmed the health benefits of having such a facility in an increasingly polluted world.

In addition, who knows what wrenching effects climate change will bring to Saint John. Let's keep Rockwood Park as a refuge and haven to help us through those times.

Rockwood Park should remain a symbol and tribute to 'sound, public decision making' made in the best interests of everyone.

FRIENDS OF ROCKWOOD PARK INC.
114 Sandy Point Road
Saint John, NB E2K 3R8
March 24, 2010

Mr. Brian White
ADI Limited

Dear Mr. White:

As a member of the Friends of Rockwood Park, it was distressing to hear that Rockwood Park was again under siege relative to inappropriate development.

One solution to this problem is to rezone all city-owned land to “parkland” along the stretch of the Sandy Point Road in question and all other areas where the city owns property bordering the park. This would provide the crucial buffering needed to prevent future loss of any parkland.

The property located at 1671 Sandy Point Road is a glaring example of the City’s lack of concern for adherence to the principles of its park stewardship. They have clearcut this once natural area right to the shoreline of Harrigan Lake IN ROCKWOOD PARK and exposed this wonderful little lake to the impurities carried by runoff from the dirt and dust of the now barren property. This lot MUST be allowed to re-grow its native flora where possible and be assisted where not possible. The trees MUST be replanted along Harrigan Lake to once again seclude her. This is not the place for a park entrance! This is NOT a place for development, residential or otherwise!

As for expanding the number of entrances to Rockwood Park, people are well able to access the wilderness area and all other areas from existing access points. There is particularly no need to open the wilderness area up thereby degrading natural habitat.

I respect that you are a professional and schooled in the ways of best developing a city park. However, Rockwood is more than just a city park. She is partly that but also part wilderness. This unique feature is what we need to protect from inappropriate development. The “city park area”, I would say, has been nicely developed. If your recommendations were to be aimed at this area of the park, I would say feel free to massage, clip and wheedle away, although I think it’s pretty nice as is. However, my real concern is development and loss of the wilderness area.

I beg you to give primary consideration to recommending protection of the wilderness area if you feel as we do, that it is most important and the true heart of our park.

Betty Lizotte
Member - Friends of Rockwood Park
114 Sandy Point Road
Saint John, N.B. E2K 3R8
506-652-3597
Response to Sandy Point Road Planning Study
Jean Pearce, March 25, 2010

The purpose of the Sandy Point Road Planning Study is to prepare a recommendation report to Common Council towards the creation of public policy regarding the optimum future use of city-owned property located south of Sandy Point Road and adjacent to Rockwood Park. The city planning department have emphasized that this is NOT a Rockwood Park Study. Therefore it seems strange that the questions at the March 10 public consultations were directly related to Rockwood Park.

No public policy regarding the use of city-owned property south of Sandy Point Road can be drafted because these lands are IN Rockwood Park. Until the city can prove that the subject area lands are not Rockwood Park lands then there can be no discussion on future use.

All city owned property within the area bounded by Sandy Point Road Foster Thurston, Highway 1 and streets around Lily Lake is park property and as such may not be sold off or developed for any other than park use.

The consultant has said that public policy will address:

1. the degree of naturalness of the land along Sandy Point Road (from urban to park wilderness)
2. The type of recreation outdoor experiences possible along the edge boundaries of Rockwood Park
3. Concerns regarding environmental sensitivity
4. The intensity of existing and proposed uses and the scale of use.

The degree of naturalness of the land along Sandy Point Road (from urban to park wilderness). I feel that the most recent housing along Sandy Point Road in the park does not exhibit any understanding of naturalness. The lot landscaping does not blend in with the park. Contours in the land have been filled. Backyards adjacent to the park are untidy. On the other hand, Cherrybrook Zoo, the homes of Monica Chaperlin and Bob McKee and Atsako Nose and Richard Powell are set back and hidden in the trees. One would hardly know they are there. Older homes on both sides of Sandy Point between the golf course and the zoo have trees around them and are set back from the road.

The construction of those proposed 6 story buildings would always look "wrong". There is no transition from nature to development. That may be why there is a suggestion to build so-called "garden homes", in an attempt to soften the change, to "trick ones eyes" No matter what development occurs there will be pesticide run-off, oil from parked cars and other vehicles, salt from winter plowing. All are harmful to the environment and are to be avoided.
The type of recreation outdoor experiences possible along the edge boundaries of Rockwood Park.

Over 160 people representing park users attended the consultation meetings on March 10. In attendance were:
- regular park users,
- park neighbours
- representatives from Outdoor Enthusiasts,
- Active Transportation Saint John,
- Sandy Point Road Neighbourhood Group,
- Saint John Naturalists' Club,
- Friends of Rockwood Park,
- Concerned Citizens Small Business group,
- mountain bikers,
- joggers, hikers, among others.

These people use the park. They like its wilderness feel. They like the peace and naturalness. It is a sanctuary. The consensus from the attendees was that the wilderness end of the park should be left as is.

Concerns regarding environmental sensitivity

The technical study mentioned only spleenwort, found around Harrigan Lake as a species at risk. There are more unique and threatened species of flora in the park. The lime rich soils for which Rockwood Park is known for provides ideal habitat for two rare forms of wild orchid. These include Pink Lady's Slipper and Yellow Lady's Slipper. These delicate flowers are very susceptible to disturbance and decreased orchid populations in parks and other public areas can be attributed to over-picking (Hinds, 2000) Mature coniferous and deciduous stands with thick canopies allow small amounts of light through to the forest floor and provide the shady habitat required to grow Indian Pipe. This is a unique plant belonging to a very small family of only three species.

Rockwood Park is considered a part of the broader Stonehammer Geopark. Howe's Cave, which is found within the 250 m study area has been placed on the geosites list. It and Harbell's Cave are probably the largest caves in the park. Caves are not common in New Brunswick and these are likely the best caves in the Ashburn Formation marble which is only in the Saint John area. There are some other nice weathering features and karst topography near Howe's Cave. There are places in the study area which are easily accessible and very important sites for the Stonehammer geopark. One is at the west end of the trail that goes to Dark Lake Road, another is looking across Sandy Point Road at the street outcrop at the trailhead near the zoo. Extending to Sandy Point Road is also the only way to include outcrops of the Kennebecasis Formation (the red sandstone-conglomerate seen by UNB) in the park. It only occurs near the driving range.
There are many wetland areas and different forest stands throughout the park. These provide habitat and food for the many animals, birds, reptiles, insects and fish in the park. Encroachment into the park will destroy habitat.

It seems that the city does not understand or value Rockwood Park. There appears to be the view that any decisions regarding park lands must be on an economic basis. Economic value can be easily measured. The intangible values of park land cannot be measured but are nevertheless extremely important. Please read the attached Appendix.

I support the opinion and research that is expressed there regarding intangible values of Rockwood Park.

The intensity of existing and proposed uses and the scale of use:

Rockwood Park is a place worth protecting. In this era of growth obsession where anything can be sacrificed on the altar of supposed progress, we are rapidly seeing the demise of such places. In recent years we have seen industrial players irrevocably scar this sanctuary, with the same blind logic. To allow further development inside the park boundaries is insult to injury. It is astonishing that despite a clear message from the people of our city, we seem to be unable to find elected officials with enough integrity and fortitude to put this issue to rest once and for all. This is a slippery slope: every bit of development that sears or erodes our park, no matter how seemingly well intentioned, makes it easier for subsequent destruction.

The pipeline was an affront to the people of Saint John, reminding them that despite the illusion of power that democracy frequently provides, we are merely tenants in someone else's industrial park. We lacked the combined power to rebuke the devastation visited on our park, but we cannot allow that to justify the greed of other individuals to erode this public commons that is arguably one of this city's most noteworthy assets.

The City of Saint John has not been a steward for the park. There may have been a blessing in disguise in that there has been little development in the far end of the park, leaving it as wilderness. That is a major attraction for large numbers of people. Land has been donated, expropriated and purchased in trust for the enjoyment and benefit of its residents. The primary guiding principle for park management is that the maintenance of ecological integrity must be the first consideration. A management plan would establish an approach for achieving the objectives of ecological integrity and public opportunities for understanding, appreciation and enjoyment in Rockwood Park.

Public Consultation, Trust, and Transparency

The city hired an independent consultant to lead the public consultation so that there would appear to be no bias in this issue. Much time has been spent listening to me as an individual and also as my position on the board of Friends of Rockwood Park. I do appreciate that. However, I have concerns with the speed with which this consultation has taken place. Only a month was given for the public to think about what should be said and to put thought to paper. Out of that month, one week the consultant was away from
the province leaving just 3 weeks to ask questions and formulate opinion. Then the consultant has about 2 weeks to write his Professional Opinion and make recommendations. This study process is very rushed. It would make more sense for the study to be completed as part of Plan SJ, the proposed new municipal plan. It would also make more sense to wait until Leisure services completes its recreational needs study.

The two 2 hour sessions on March 10 did not allow time for true meaningful discussion on the use of city owned land along Sandy Point Road. It would have been better for true public input to have had the questions before the sessions and to have known the format that the consultation would take. There definitely should have been a microphone. Several people had great difficulty hearing presenters. Despite the overwhelming belief that this city owned land is within the Rockwood Park boundary and should NOT be used for housing, the questions from the public on what the park boundaries are still have not been addressed by the city. City employees at the public session would not answer the question. This question has to be answered before there can be any discussion on land use along Sandy Point road and before the city even considers this land as surplus to its needs.

There is also a lack of trust of planning staff, of some city employees and of some members of Common Council because the public has been left in the dark regarding decisions made in the past regarding the park. For instance regarding lot #1671 Sandy Point Road, in 2003, 3.3 hectares of parkland located near Harrigan Lake was clear-cut by the City. Then a hillside was blasted, tons of fill was used to fill in a stream and a wetland during road construction in 2005. This was done without first consulting the area residents and there was nothing we could do to stop them.

Who made the decision? Why was the street built? Were appropriate permits received from the Department of the Environment under the Clean Air Act and the Clean Environment Act? Has the city of Saint John sold this property to a developer? Allowing a street to be constructed and a housing development on this parkland property would indicate a distinct lack of stewardship of the park. My definition of stewardship is related to the environment, the concept of responsible care-taking; based on the promise that we do not own resources, but are managers and are responsible to future generations for their condition. Supporting any land use of this property without consideration of the detriments to the park is abdicating responsibility and breaching public trust.

The City, along with the consulting firm ADL, posted an ad for the public consultation process for March 10, 2010 in the Telegraph Journal on Feb 24th as “Sandy Point Road Planning Study”.

Unfortunately, the ad didn’t mention that this city-owned land is mostly what most Saint Johners think of as a part of Rockwood Park. One of the primary objectives of this study is to define the boundaries of the park within the study area. If people knew Rockwood Park was a component of the study, it would likely heighten community interest.
The Rockwood Park Advisory Board has the responsibility for overseeing activities and development in the park. This body is supposed to be stewards of the park. There has been no public statement from them on either where park boundaries are or their position on this issue. They in fact represent the public, Where have they been? There are at least two members of Common Council on the Board. The public needs to know their views before any decision by council is made.

Leisure Services is responsible for the day to day operation of the park. Another study on Trails and Bikeways is being conducted at this time. Also being studied are the recreation needs of the public. These studies have not been completed. It would seem to me that the results of these should be incorporated into your study.

**SOME QUESTIONS ABOUT TRUST TO CONSIDER:**

- Why did the City choose this particular boundary line for the study? Particularly, the boundary line that extends into Rockwood Park? Does this boundary line represent anything in particular within Rockwood Park, or was it just a line that was arbitrarily drawn?

- Why was Rockwood Park (and determining its boundaries) not identified in last week’s Ad for the March 10th public consultation? This is clearly stated as one of the purposes of the study yet the public is not aware that this study affects the future of Rockwood Park.

- Why doesn’t the City undertake a ROCKWOOD PARK study that clarifies its boundaries and describes design guidelines, FIRST and BEFORE considering land use that borders the Park?

- Why is the public consultation period so short and so poorly advertised? Is the City avoiding meaningful consultation?

The city of Saint John as recently as December 15, 2008 and again in February 9, 2009 have agreed to The Integrated Community Sustainability Plan and The Corporate Strategic Plan which emphasizes sustainability in everything the city does.

From Page 24 of The Integrated Community Sustainability Plan, here are some of the listed principles:

- **Principle 4.** Respect Saint John’s natural ecosystems by acting as a custodian for the biodiversity and natural ecosystems of Saint John and protecting and restoring them. There are small streams leading into the lakes of the park. A housing development on the edge of Lake Harrigan is not, in my opinion, respecting the ecosystem.

- **Principle 5.** Model the development of Saint John on the characteristics of natural systems.

- **Principle 6.** Strive to minimize Saint John’s ecological footprint. Already industry and commercial interests that destroy wetlands are obligated by legislation to
restore a wetland in another part of the city. Why destroy the wetland in the first place?

- Principle 7: Establish a systematic process of continual improvement, based on action-planning, accountability, transparency and good governance. The sale and proposed change in use of this property defies planning principles, indicates little accountability and very little transparency. Apparently the city has a Master Plan for Rockwood Park. How does the development of this property adhere to the Master Plan?

Sustainable development means development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. It means integrating the environment with the economy, it means protecting ecosystems, it takes into account the environmental and natural resource costs of different economic options and the economic costs of different environmental and natural resource options, it means preventing any kind of pollution and it shows respect for nature and the needs of future generations.

Respectfully submitted
Joan Pearce, March 24, 2010
Appendix

The quoted sections which follow have been taken from The Rockwood Park Integrated Management Plan, a forest study done in 2005 by Charlene Urquhart, a summer student and graduate of UNB Forestry. Ms. Urquhart has articulated the need for environmental sensitivity and the real value of Rockwood Park.

“Rockwood Park has a diverse combination of wetlands and forestlands. Many bogs, swamps, and marshes may be found in low lying areas at times giving way to streams or lakes. Higher elevations are home to both tolerant and intolerant hardwood stands, as well as softwood and mixed wood stand types...

Nine lakes, several of which are connected by a system of streams with well defined channels, help form the vast watercourse network in Rockwood Park. Many ephemeral streams are found through the park. These streams run during the spring melt, and commonly dry up during the summer months. They may also serve as important watering holes for wildlife during the wet season, but do not serve as fish passages. During an unusually wet summer season, these streams may continue to run. Some of these streams may have defined channels in areas where spring runoff is substantial, however many of these streams do not have well defined channels.

Many cliffs and caves, formed from impressive rock outcrops and exposed bedrock, can be found through all forest types in the park. Many stream beds cut through rocky terrain, and several lakes are almost entirely contained within a variety of rock types including limestone and granite (Clayden, 1987).

“Park Value

The full value of parklands is described simply as “the sum of the interactions of the intrinsic values of the resource itself plus the myriad instrumental values assigned by humans (Putney, 2003). There are many intangible values associated with parklands. Intangible values include instrumental values: a means to an end, and intrinsic values: an end in itself. Intangible values are those which can not have a dollar value directly assigned to them, and are often difficult to fully understand and appreciate. In the article Perspectives on the Values of Protected Areas (Putney 2003), a list of the most common intangible values associated with parks defined by the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) was included. The WCPA defined 11 general categories of intangible values. These included: recreational values, spiritual values, cultural values, identity values, existence values, artistic values, aesthetic values, educational values, research and monitoring values, peace values, and therapeutic values. Several benefits come as a result of these values. The article Recreational Values of Protected Areas (Shultzis, 2003), cites several studies pertaining to benefits of parks and natural areas. Specifically, a study completed in 2000 by Roggenbuck and Driver identifies the taxonomy of wilderness benefits, and a study by Driver and Burns done in 1999 identifies the benefits of leisure activities. An analysis of these studies resulted in a list of benefits resulting from intangible values of parks, listed here: • Developmental, • Therapeutic; • Mental Health; • Physical Health; • Social Identity; • Spiritual; • Cultural; • Aesthetic; • Educational; • Environmental; • Economic.

Rockwood Park is no exception, and the benefits of these values can be seen. For example, Rockwood Park is used by many students to collect data for school projects. The summer of 2005 saw students collecting data on park usage. Traffic monitoring
devices were located at several locations in the park. The aesthetic benefits of Rockwood Park are proven by the numerous people photographing different areas of the park. The social benefits of the park are also evident by the number of individuals who meet with their friends and family at the park as well as the special events that take place in the park.

The many intangible values of Rockwood Park contribute to the overall quality of life in the Saint John area. Quality of life has been used to describe many different aspects of life, however, often times it is directly associated with recreation, parks and open spaces (The Trust for Public Lands Publications: Business Relocation). Quality of life in a community is very important to not only the individuals currently receiving the benefits on a daily basis, but to other aspects of the community environment as well. Rockwood Park contributes significantly to the quality of life in the Saint John community. This can be seen by observing the interactions of the public in the park on a daily basis. It is also clear that proper preservation and management of Rockwood Park can play a key role in other areas such as tourism and growth and development.

There are also some very significant tangible environmental values associated with trees, parks, and forests. Trees and plants are very good indicators for air and water pollution. Trees are also highly important when it comes to carbon sequestration; the removal of carbon from the surrounding atmosphere. Because of their ability to cleanse the environment of polluting carbon, they have become an important factor in minimizing climate change. Provincial and municipal commitment to climate change action makes conservation and management of parks and forests more important than in the past. "Rockwood Park is a very large parcel of forested property, and proper management and conservation will ensure Rockwood Park remains healthy and productive acting as a vital carbon sink, which will significantly contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gases.

In addition to the numerous intangible values and tangible environmental values associated with Rockwood Park, economic value of resources also exist. These include property value, as well as timber and non-timber forest products. These are values that can be assessed in terms of dollars and are universally understood. This is not meant to suggest that any of these resources be harvested or used for economic revenue, because they should not. Instead, these economic values are included as an alternate means to help individuals understand the enormous value of the park as an asset to the community.

**Ground Vegetation**

Data from the ground vegetation survey resulted in a list of over 80 ground vegetation species. from approximately 38 different families. These include shrubs, flowering plants, woody plants, ferns, mosses, lichens and liverworts. It should be noted that this is not a complete survey of the ground vegetation of Rockwood Park. This survey only includes vegetation that fell within the sample plot parameters. Many additional species can be found in the park, which do not appear in these survey results. Some of the dominant families found in Rockwood Park include the Lily, Aster, Honeysuckle, Rose, and Heath families. The species diversity in Rockwood Park can be attributed to the wide range of habitat types in the park.

The lime rich soils for which Rockwood Park is known for provides ideal habitat for two rare forms of wild orchid. These include Pink Lady’s Slipper and Yellow Lady’s
Slipper. A photo of Pink Lady’s Slipper taken in Rockwood Park is found in figure 11. These delicate flowers are very susceptible to disturbance and decreased orchid populations in parks and other public areas can be attributed to over-picking (Hinds, 2000). Healthy populations continue to thrive in Rockwood Park despite the fact that several clustered populations occur along the heavily used NB Trail.

The stream beds and stream banks found in Rockwood Park also create habitat suitable for a variety of species with specific nutrient and moisture requirements. An isolated population of what is thought to be Jack-in-the-Pulpit was identified on a stream bank located not far from the south-east boundary of the Cherry Brook Zoo, near an indistinct extension off the Owen Lake trail. Wild Canna was also found in the slow moving stream connecting Long Lake with Owen Lake. Both of these are known to cause skin dermatitis. Several other species that may cause contact dermatitis, photosensitization, or photo dermatitis were identified in the park. These include Pink Lady’s Slipper, Yellow Lady’s Slipper, Red Baneberry, White Baneberry, and Beaked Hazelnut (Hinds, 2000).

Mature coniferous and deciduous stands with thick canopies allow small amounts of light through to the forest floor and provide the shady habitat required to grow Indian Pipe. This is a unique plant belonging to a very small family of only three species. The uniqueness of this plant can be attributed to the fact that the stem and flower are whitish and appear translucent. The colouring of this plant is explained by the lack of chlorophyll, the chemical responsible for photosynthesis making plants green (Hinds, 2000)

A variety of species can be found in the well developed and undisturbed bogs of Rockwood Park. These include specific bog species such as Lambkill, Rhodora, Labrador Tea and Leather Leaf. Carnivorous plants such as the Pitcher Plant and Round Leaf Sundew may also be found scattered through bogs in Rockwood Park.

Visual and auditory observations of wildlife and their indicators were also recorded. Eight species of mammals are known to currently inhabit the park. These include deer, porcupine, skunk, hare, chipmunk, squirrel, woodchuck and raccoon. These were identified based on either direct animal observation, or observation of scat, tracks, or other distinctive activity. Evidence of past beaver activity was present, and indicators of possible recent, but not current, moose and bear activity were recorded. Twenty-five bird species were identified. These species included various songbirds, water fowl, and birds of prey including eagle and hawk. Small numbers of both amphibians and reptiles were also recorded. These include 3 species of frog, the Eastern American toad, garter snake, red back salamander, and common snapping turtle.

Continued management will help discover the true value of Rockwood Park, and develop the potential of Canada’s largest municipal park.“
Hand delivered March 26, 2010

To ADI Limited  
Att. Mr. Brian White, Planner

Re: Sandy Point Road Planning Study / Your Questionnaire

Dear Mr. White,

I want to thank you again for e-mailing me on Monday your questionnaire. I am not so computer-savvy as to be able to print my answers and comments to the questionnaire in its windows and open spaces, and because I can often not read my own handwriting I will reply with this letter instead.

The attached map is not detailed enough to enable me to identify features of “good park opportunities”, but I will comment below on opportunities along Sandy Point Road (SPR). I read your power points (PP) of the public consultation, and your Study seems to strive to get not only some more residences built along the SPR, but to find a rationale for housing developments within the 250 m strip along SPR, which right now is part of Rockwood Park (RP). I list my concerns in the following.

This 250 m strip, to the best of my knowledge, was not mentioned in the August 2009 motion by Common Council, which started the SPR Planning Study. In any case, how was it established? MAP 2 of your Technical Background Report (TBR) shows a division of RP into City Land and Trust Land which, I submit, is a classification which has been newly introduced and which requires a legal opinion explaining how this division can be reconciled with the Legislative Act of 1893. This Act established RP by acknowledging the Horticultural Association’s ownership, and when the city acquired in 1967 all of RP from the Horticultural Association, the conditions of the 1893 Act flowed through to the City and govern, in my opinion, also additional lands which the City acquired for RP.

The only exception, as I see it, would be lands within RP which are either still privately held or which the City acquired for the specific purpose of land development. I have asked for the information how the City acquired the so-called city-owned lands and, I suggest, this info has to be part of an unbiased Study, as is a legal opinion concerning the 1893 Act being applicable to the whole RP. As to the boundaries of RP along SPR, I talked to people who live along the SPR. Generally they think that the RP starts where their lots end. Most of those families have lived there for generations, and many have sold property or have had property expropriated for the assembly of RP. They assumed that in places where there are no residences that the RP goes right up to the SPR.
The question if and how to access RP from SPR, as posed in your PP, is a bit unrealistic. Nobody will now or in the future walk (there are no sidewalks) to an access point into RP along the SPR, especially not “the Young, the Elderly and the Informed,” who would presumably drive or be driven, which would need parking lots with lighting, toilets, trash cans, benches etc., for which the City does not have the money. So let’s be a bit realistic and admit that for the above reasons such accesses seem to be unsustainable.

But conversely, the need to restrict access to the RP in order to have control over vandalism in the park is real, and protection from vandalism can not be provided by the “Eyes on the Park” of your PP. To the contrary, the people living close to such access points would be greatly inconvenienced by the goings-on at night and could also be intimidated and/or terrorized by its perpetrators. A row of residences along the SPR with no organized access to the RP in between the lots would probably prevent such a scene. The moment housing developments extent into the 250 m strip of the Study it will become difficult to protect the RP from vandalism because access control is lost.

There exist presently three entrance points to the RP, at the Lily Lake Pavilion, close to the Zoo and from the Hawthorne Ave. Extension. There is ample parking a short distance from Hawthorne Ave., Ext., but the parking lot at the Zoo could probably be improved, and also at the Pavilion and beyond more parking spaces are needed on occasion. I am in the RP quite often, and I have heard no visitor clamouring for more access points. The existing public amenities can be easily walked to from the large Hawthorne, the smaller parking lots along Lake Drive and the ring road around South Fisher Lake, and the rest of the RP is and should remain a wilderness park. In an address to the Standing Committee on Private Bills on May 10, 2007 the City Solicitor, Mr. John L. Nugent, confirmed this “wilderness” by stating that “the large portion of this park, which is wild lands, remains under the management and direction of the Horticultural Association”.

With the Golf Course, the Driving Range and the Zoo no further ‘amenities’ are needed along the SPR to “make RP a better Park for ALL SAINT JOHNERS” (your questionnaire). What improvements to other parts of the RP should be contemplated and done is outside the scope of this Study, but certainly the Pavilion, the Interpretation Centre, the Children Playground, the Barn and to a certain degree even the Trailer Park enhanced the use of Lily Lake and Fisher Lake (i.e. the most accessible part of the Park), but maybe a developed tenting area in the wilderness part and a few more wilderness trails would compliment the values of RP.

To start Housing Developments in the 250 m strip of the Study will bring some money to the City and benefit some developers, and the owners of in-park housing will also be conveniently close to the Golf Course, but this will definitely not “make a better Park for ALL SAINT JOHNERS,” and such “optimum use” will spread to those additional lands within the RP beyond the 250 m strip which promise profit to developers, and this will be the beginning of the end of RP as it was established by the 1893 legislative Act.

I have complained about the lack of discussion after your PP presentation at the public consultation. Much of your presentation should have been discussed and some misunderstandings could have been avoided. An important opportunity was lost. I do not want to
dissect your whole presentation, but your Slide #23 actually is the questionnaire, and this. I felt, entitles me to take the liberty and comment on a few of your slides:

Slide #4 talks about discussing opportunities along SPR. No discussion happened. Slide #9 talks about mixing urban development and wilderness areas, but we were not told if and how this was achieved in the other 5 parks you name. Slide #13 shows the Blue Mountain Park with a “Stewardship Community” outside its edges but no invasion of the park by developers with row-housing and high-rises. No definition for a “Stewardship Community” was offered, but I would suggest that local groups like SPRNG and FORP are certainly acting as stewards for RP, and you probably have or will receive their comments.

Slide #14 shows the Acres 1988 RP Master Plan, and I am surprised that it was included in your presentation. It infringes upon lands governed by the 1893 Act and did not get any further consideration after it had been presented.

Slide #17 talks about “limited public access.” Please see my comment above; but than it states “fully serviced,” and I think this touches on the main issue of the Study. A lot of money was spent for water and sewer lines along SPR either without a proper cost-and-revenue study, or it was all along planned to sell part of RP to developers, and this was facilitated by creating City- and Trust Lands, and so to eventually recover the “fully serviced cost” by sacrificing parts of RP.

Slide #20 talks about green spaces adjacent to residential homes. This is a requirement of the City By-Law for housing developments, and it is routinely circumvented by the developers who pay the City some money instead. The same will happen with developments in RP, because those residents can walk out of their back yard right into RP. Unfortunately, this does not apply to the public at large and does not “make RP a better Park for ALL SAINT JOHNERS”.

The questionnaire asks for examples where development compliments the values of RP, and refers to examples of homes, buildings or architectural designs which reflect the character of RP. I would like to point out that RP has several functions:

It provides easy access to Fisher- and Lily Lakes and to the Children Playground, the Barn and the other amenities I mention above. There is no shortage of families, many with young children, who have no time nor money to otherwise enjoy the open air in a park-like environment. And RP also provides, in the middle of Saint John, a place where one can find solitude and the enjoyment of nearly undisturbed wilderness with its wildlife and fauna, a good place to re-charge one’s energies and to contemplate in peace and quiet.

It is also a place for rigorous walking, jogging or mountain-biking in the wilderness. It is a place for many things to many people, and none of them needs the development of homes, buildings etc. in RP to compliment the park’s values. They know and value the park as it exists. It should be left alone to be enjoyed by ALL SAINT JOHNERS.

Respectfully,

[Signature]
APPENDIX B - Rockwood Park Design Guidelines

The City of Saint John is interested in innovative proposals that lead to the thoughtful development of sites along the Sandy Point that maximize the public access to Rockwood Park. Saint John in turn now looks to the design community to deliver excellence and creative solutions that meet or exceed the public’s expectations. Mediocre design, poor quality building materials, and poor craftsmanship are not worthy assets to accompany one of Saint John’s most precious public resources.

Design guidelines determine the minimum expectation and provide the City of Saint John with new criteria from which they can evaluate proposals based upon the development’s ability to do the following:

- Maximize pedestrian and park user activity;
- Provide a range of park amenities, landscaping and streetscape infrastructure that improves the immediate area through an increase in pedestrian traffic through to Rockwood Park;
- Exemplify quality in architecture and building materials;

Examples of well designed communities that exemplify a greater respect for natural amenities while incorporating park like residential design guidelines include such communities as; Banff, Alberta; Regatta Point, Halifax; Issaquah Highlands, Washington; High Point, Seattle; Centreville, Tallahassee, Florida and Conover Commons, Redmond, Washington. Additionally, the federal government of New Zealand has taken the approach that urban design of buildings, places, and open spaces will make their communities more successful and enhance quality of life of their residents.

The New Zealand Urban Design Protocol publishes identifies seven essential design qualities that together create quality urban design:

- **Context**: seeing buildings, places and spaces as part of whole towns and cities
- **Character**: reflecting and enhancing the distinctive character, heritage and identity of our urban environment
- **Choice**: ensuring diversity and choice for people
- **Connections**: enhancing how different networks link together for people
- **Creativity**: encouraging innovative and imaginative solutions
- **Custodianship**: ensuring design is environmentally sustainable, safe and healthy
- **Collaboration**: communicating and sharing knowledge across sectors, professions and with communities.

Figure 16 - Example from "Good Solutions Guide For Medium Density Housing, New Zealand, April 2007"
“Rockwood Park Style”
The design approach to development along the Rockwood Park should reinforce the park’s identity in the same fashion as communities in many of Canada’s National Parks are held to high standards. Communities such as Banff control through their Municipal By-laws specific architectural styles and emphasize the development of strong design principles that reinforce the unique character of the national park.

Rockwood Park’s profile within the region requires that great diligence be taken when evaluating proposals such that the quality of new buildings will equal the quality of the park’s natural beauty. The creation of a “Rockwood Park Style” through Design Guidelines implemented within the City’s Land use By-law will help create a uniquely New Brunswick community that demonstrates Saint John’s respect for the abundance of nature in the city center.

Design Guidelines are not rigid rules to bring about a single architectural vision. Rather, Saint John’s insistence on design quality will demonstrate our expectations that will assist developers, designers, City staff, Common Council. The removal of uncertainty provides a clear indication of the standard expected, and the framework for preparing solutions.

Design Guidelines should be implemented as mandatory performance requirements within the realm of municipal plan policy requiring discretionary approval from Common Council with respect to individual development proposals. The importance of the specific guidelines will vary for proposals since there are many ways of addressing each guideline, therefore individual applications should be evaluated on their own merits.

The City of Saint John should consider preparing new zoning requirements that would require each development proposal to be evaluated by Common Council. Utilizing the intent behind the design guidelines, the public can comment on and Common Council the discretionary approval over whether the objectives of the design guidelines have been met.

The establishment of a “Rockwood Park Style” should relate to common design themes such as:

- **Sensitivity to Nature**
  Buildings should have a direct connection to their natural environment, either through the shape and scale of the building, use of natural and native materials.
Scale
Scale is the relative size of one thing to another, e.g.: the relative proportion of a building to humans, to the site and neighbourhood, to its community, and to its larger natural setting the Saint John River.

Framed Views
The area along the Sandy Point Road contains existing and potential view corridors into Rockwood Park that must be carefully considered in the detailed site planning of buildings. Special attention should be paid to framing the building to maximize views or minimize visual impact.

Human Scale
Even the largest buildings in and near Rockwood Park incorporate elements at street level which relate to “human scale” – for example, well-defined and sheltered entrances, canopies, porches, seating areas, and low-scale decorative lighting. In some cases the building base is also used to achieve this effect.

Emphasis on Structural Expression
An important characteristic that will create uniqueness around Rockwood Park is the expression of structure on the exterior of the building in the form of oversize columns, exposed trusses or brackets, stone pilasters, buttresses and arches, masonry lintels and sills, and exposed cross-bracing.

Strong Roof Forms and Deep Overhangs
A great variety of roof forms, usually sloping, in many configurations perform an important technical function in our harsh climate protecting residents from foul weather and preventing snow accumulation.
Distinct Building “base”, “middle”, and “top”
Buildings have both a strong roof form and a strongly expressed building “base.” Larger buildings often step back as they become higher, with the thickest walls (often stone or masonry) at the base.

Some smaller buildings have a projecting second level, which also emphasizes the ground floor as a base.

On larger buildings, the base may be one or more storeys high. On smaller buildings, the base is often just up to the window sill level.

Attention to Detail
The best buildings will display an obvious attention to detail by the designer and the builder. The buildings exemplify craftsmanship in the “fit and finish” and by using the quality materials in the right place, these buildings are meant to last.

Relief and Texture
Buildings make use of surface recesses and projections and strongly textured finishes and rarely incorporate “flat” facades. The majority of the building facades can be seen from a distance, the strong shadow lines gives the buildings facades depth and changes the character of the buildings throughout the day. This characteristic will provide park users with visual interest from distant views.

Scale and Massing
Larger buildings shall be divided into smaller masses by breaking up the building footprint, offsetting walls, shifting rooflines to vary height, and articulating building elevations. This guideline is intended to break up larger buildings, make them more compatible with smaller adjacent buildings, and create visual variety.

Distinct changes in style, scale, and massing should be used primarily to highlight important features, land uses, or sites.
Height
In order to balance the height of new buildings in character with the scale of the park the maximum height should generally not be greater than the maximum height of the mature tree canopy found in Rockwood Park. Typical species found throughout the park include species such as Eastern white-cedar which grows to heights of up to 16 metres or about 4-5 storeys.

Site Planning
New residential buildings should not project too far into Rockwood Park but relate well to the Sandy Point Road and or new public streets. Rockwood Park shall provide the open space and recreational needs for new residents therefore the emphasis shall be on the provision of reduced front, side and rear yards. Large “rural estate” yards are not encouraged.

Buildings should try and work with their site by stepping in plan and section, not ignoring slopes by incorporating large retaining walls, high exposed basements or extensive re-grading. New buildings shall endeavour to minimize cut and fill on sloping sites, retaining walls shall be “stepped” and landscaped.

Building and Site Lighting
Lighting shall be directed to the driveway, building entrances and walkways and shall be arranged so as to divert the light away from the park, adjacent lots and buildings.

Landscaping
The public’s perception of a boundary around Rockwood Park should be reinforced with landscaping that evokes a cultivated natural image of the surrounding landscape. Decorative plantings should be provided around buildings that consist of native trees, shrubs and ground cover.
**Streetscape Elements**

All proposed development shall adhere to the following streetscape design requirements:

- Direct pedestrian access from the Sandy Point Road to Rockwood Park and related park amenities such as a viewing area with benches;
- Provide street trees, bike racks, benches and other amenities;
- Provide public art relevant to Rockwood Park to enhance the public’s interest in the park.

**Environmental Protection Measures**

All new proposed development will meet certain basic design objectives as follows:

- Reproduce the pre-development hydrological conditions and utilize natural drainage systems to the greatest possible extent;
- Confine development and construction activities to the least critical areas of the site to minimize land disturbance;
- Minimize changes to the landscape by matching lot grading to the existing topography.
Sandy Point Road Planning Study

Community Consultation

Wednesday, March 10, 2010
Agenda

• Introductions
• Meeting Purpose
• Study Purpose
• Project Principle
• Background – 10 minutes
• Work Session - 45 minutes
• Reporting – 45 minutes
• Wrapup – Next Steps & Followup
Introductions

- Planners practice in the public’s interest and value both the natural and cultural environment.
Purpose of this Meeting...

Inform the public about this study.

Learn about the values of Rockwood Park along the Sandy Point Road.

Discuss the opportunities.

No decisions will be made tonight
Common Council desires development along the park edge be well-planned growth balancing the Park values with economic, environmental, and infrastructure considerations.

The **purpose** of the Sandy Point Road Planning Study is prepare a recommendation report to Common Council towards the creation of **public policy** regarding the optimum future use of City-owned property located south of Sandy Point Road and adjacent to Rockwood Park.
Project Principle

guiding the consultation process;

• “To develop public policy that will result in a safe, healthy and sustainable community by promoting and designing a vibrant urban form well integrated with the natural values of Rockwood Park”.
Public Policy will address:

- The degree of naturalness of the land along Sandy Point Road (from urban to park wilderness);
- The type of recreation outdoor experiences possible along the edge boundaries of Rockwood Park;
- Concerns regarding environmental sensitivity;
- The intensity of existing and proposed uses; and, the scale of uses.
Greener?

“...compact cities are the most carbon friendly. Concentrating more development along the greenway would: help the region decrease its reliance on the automobile, increase safety and user ship of the trail and increase property tax revenue to the city. The key is balancing the concerns of residents...”

David Owen, Author - Green Metropolis: Why Living Smaller, Living Closer, and Driving Less Are the Keys to Sustainability
Canadian Park Land Planning
“The defining characteristic of a Canadian city of the future, one that has truly **Canadian values** associated with it, is a city that embraces this mix of **urban development** and **wilderness areas**…”

Professor Martin Willison, PhD.  
School for Resource and Environmental Studies, Dalhousie University

Nose Hill Park, Calgary
Rockwood is among the largest urban parks in Canada

North Saskatchewan River Valley Park System, Edmonton 18,278 acres
Rouge Park, Toronto 12,356 acres
Nose Hill Park, Calgary 2,780 acres
Wascana Park, Regina 2,300 acres
Rockwood Park, Saint John 2,200 acres
Stanley Park, Vancouver 990 acres
Planning Approach to large “regional scale” parks

Core Wilderness Area

Edge Wilderness

Stewardship Communities
Planning Approach
for large “regional scale” parks

Core wilderness area
silent and isolated.

Edge wilderness
surrounds the core, and is
the focus of recreational
activities.

Stewardship Communities
around and interspersed
with the Edge enhance the
park through design and
creating more “stewards of
the park”.
Example : Blue Mountain / Birch Cove Lakes Regional Park - Halifax
1988 Rockwood Park Master Plan

Rockwood Park Planning
“By concentrating a higher level of developments and associated activity in this area, the park will become more of a people place.”

Rockwood Park Master Plan

Where are there opportunities to make the park more of a people place?

Rockwood Park has a Core and a Edge but lacks Stewardship Communities.
Sandy Point Road / Rockwood Park

**EDGE** can be described as:

- **heavily wooded and very difficult to discern the actual park boundary;**
- **limited public amenity with only single public trail head to access the park’s inner core;**
- **contains sporadic residential development that typically fronts directly on the Sandy Point Road.**

The Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road “EDGE” can be described as:
Sandy Point Road / Rockwood Park

well defined and well used
highly programmed
plenty of amenities
historical heart of the park.

rural character with
private homes
few park amenities
limited public access
fully serviced

Understanding the interface between Sandy Point Road and Rockwood Park
The Rockwood Park Master Plan calls for trails heads along the park’s outer edge.

Q. Where are the best opportunities for public access to the park?

Example from Halifax about of the lack of park access.
Do you live in an age-friendly community?

“...In Denmark, access to the outdoors is considered to be a human right. Access to green spaces, generally, must be user-friendly. Well-maintained parks and safe green spaces are to be built and maintained. Outdoor seating is to be available, as are public toilet facilitates. Sidewalks are required to be safe, smooth, level, non-slip and wide enough to accommodate wheelchairs and scooters…”

Jo-Ann Fellows, Telegraph Journal
Tuesday September 8th, 2009
• Time spent in nature immediately adjacent to home helps people to relieve mental fatigue, reducing aggression.

• Green space adjacent to residential homes become gathering places where neighbors form social ties that produce stronger, safer neighborhoods.

“density and parks complement each other”
Good park planning can provide residents with a regular fulfilling natural experience that is.

**Regularly Accessible**
- Accessible on foot on a daily basis from public streets, on sidewalks and through gateways.

**Safe and Secure**
- Buildings face the park with windows toward the street and that frame the park and provide “eyes on the park”.

**Open to All**
- Experiences for those who often can’t access the core: the young, the elderly, the infirmed, etc.
• What are the best opportunities along the Sandy Point Road to make Rockwood Park a better park for all Saint Johners?

Can we improve the quality of our urban environment and enhance the role of Rockwood Park along the Sandy Point Road?
Identify on the map any special landscape, lookoffs, historic, or cultural elements.

Describe where the boundary along Rockwood Park is well defined. Give good examples of how the park boundary interfaces with private homes along Rockwood Park?

Describe the quality of Rockwood Park’s landscape along the Sandy Point Road.

Are there trails, benches, facilities, and other amenities along Rockwood Park / Sandy Point Road? Are there entrances to the Park? Are the entrances safe and inviting gateways into the park?

Are there examples where development (existing and proposed) compliments the values of Rockwood Park? If so how exactly?

Does existing development reinforce the character or values of Rockwood Park? Give examples of architectural design features reflect the character of Rockwood Park?
Next Steps

1. ADI will prepare a Statement of Professional Opinion.
2. City Planning Staff will review ADI’s report.
3. Staff will prepare a recommendation report to Common Council to implement any proposed changes to the Municipal Plan and or Land Use By-law.
4. Common Council may direct Planning Staff to initiate (or not) the process for implementing any proposed changes.
Follow-up with Brian White

Email: blwhite@adi.ca
Office: 520 Somerset Street
Phone: 646-8020
Thank you