

CHAPTER 4 NEEDS ANALYSIS

INTRODUCTION

The previous chapter revealed one side of the planning equation; that is, what resources are available today to meet the park and recreation needs of the Township's customers. This chapter examines the other side of the equation – what resources must be available tomorrow to satisfy existing deficiencies and projected demands.

Determining future park and recreation needs is a difficult task. It is more of an art than a science in that it takes a combination of techniques used together to effectively gauge what park and recreation services would best serve the customer base. The five techniques used to assess needs in this chapter include:

1. recreation survey results;
2. key person interviews;
3. a standards comparison;
4. a service area assessment; and
5. public meeting input.

This chapter is organized according to the above major topics. The sections devoted to each topic draw conclusions regarding unmet recreation needs and deficiencies in the supply of parks and recreation services, forming the basis for the goals and recommendations that will be formulated in subsequent chapters.

RECREATION SURVEY RESULTS

Survey Overview

A survey was conducted as a primary means to gather public input and to enable the Township to plan the future of its park and recreation system to reflect customers' interests and preferences. In accordance with the customer base priorities established in Chapter 2, the survey was targeted to reach two customer groups:

- primary customers – residents of Horsham Township; and
- secondary customers – nonresidents employed in Horsham Township.

To reach both customer groups, the survey questionnaire (refer to Appendix B) was distributed via U.S. Postal Service bulk mail to all residential and nonresidential addresses along mail routes serving Horsham Township. The Township mailed 12,436 surveys in January 2003. A total of 1,128 questionnaires were filled out and returned, resulting in a 9 percent return rate. By comparison the only other time the Township conducted a recreation needs survey was in 1990, which produced a 26 percent rate of return.

Traditional mail surveys typically result in a 10 percent return. Therefore, the survey effort for this plan is generally consistent with surveys of this type, albeit a lower return than had been anticipated. The Township had hoped for a response equal to or greater than that achieved in 1990. Why was the survey return rate not as high as expected? The answer to this question can only be speculated.

- No response can be interpreted as a response in and of itself. In other words, if people feel strongly that they need to express their opinions to foster change regarding the subject matter of a survey or to better address their interests and needs, then they theoretically answer and return the questionnaire. Conversely, people may often choose not to respond to a survey if they regard the subject matter as being something unimportant or of low priority to them. Therefore, a lack of response can be interpreted as being a general acceptance from the non-respondents that the existing supply of parks and recreation services is sufficient to meet their needs and that they have no critical recreation needs or concerns.

Commentary: The Township has made significant improvements to its parks and recreation services since 1990 when the first recreation survey was administered. Because there were significant unmet needs that have since been met, it is thought that the public's perception is more positive and customers are happier with the recreation resources available to them today than with what were provided 13 years ago. Therefore, it can be asserted that the return rate is indicative that the local park and recreation system is better and adequate for many customers.

In spite of the above interpretation of how non-respondents might feel, only data obtained from returned surveys can logically be factored into the findings. Those who chose not to respond (despite their viewpoints, whether satisfied or unsatisfied, happy or unhappy, or concerned or not concerned) lost the opportunity to influence the decision-making process based on the survey findings alone.

The basic purpose of any survey is to gather data from a sample of the total population. Furthermore, the premise behind a survey is to estimate the prevailing opinions and sentiments of all people. Although the survey was not structured to produce a statistically accurate representative sample of resident opinion, the conclusions drawn from the responses reflect a wide spectrum of customers that provided both positive and negative viewpoints regarding the future of the park and recreation system.

Customer Groups

The survey questionnaire (refer to Appendix B) was designed to enable the unique needs of different customer groups to be identified through data analysis. The first three questions of the survey asked respondents to provide information so that the data could be sorted by:

- type of customer (residential/primary and nonresidential/secondary);
- age and gender; and
- customer service area.

Figure 13 presents return data according to customer type. Despite efforts to elicit response from nonresidential properties, recognizing that they also benefit from the local park and recreation system, all but five returned surveys originated from residential addresses. This represents less than one percent of all returns. Therefore, the survey results are predominantly based on the needs of primary customers.

Figure 13
 Residential and Nonresidential Surveys Returned

| QUESTION 1: | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Is the nature of your mailing address residential or nonresidential? | | | | | | | |
| <i>RETURNED SURVEYS</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Residential:</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Number</i> | 134 | 272 | 150 | 230 | 304 | 33 | 1,123 |
| <i>Representation</i> | 11.88% | 24.11% | 13.30% | 20.39% | 26.95% | 2.93% | 99.56% |
| <i>Nonresidential:</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>Number</i> | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 |
| <i>Representation</i> | 0.18% | 0.18% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 0.09% | 0.00% | 0.44% |

Survey respondents were instructed to answer the questions to reflect the needs of everyone in their household for residential addresses and to account for the recreation interests of all employees at nonresidential addresses. Assuming that all respondents followed this instruction, 3,386 customers were surveyed, as identified by age and gender in Figure 14:

Return data for the customer service areas are presented in Figure 15. This figure shows that geographically, the highest number of returned surveys (305) came from area E, accounting for 27 percent of all returns. Area A returned the least number of surveys (136), resulting in the lowest representation at 12 percent of the total returns. Based on 2000 census data and the number of surveys returned from residential addresses (1,123), 12 percent of the households in the township participated.

It is interesting to compare the above percentages with percentages derived for each customer service area based on the residential population surveyed. Because a total of 74 persons surveyed were nonresidential customers, the balance of 3,312 persons were residents. This is a little more than 13 percent of the township's 2000 population. Figure 16 shows that even though customer service area A had the lowest representation of returned surveys, it had the highest percentage of

Page Reserved for:

Figure 14
Customers Surveyed

Figure 15
Geographic Distribution of Surveys

| QUESTION 3: | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Identify the Area of the Township in which you live (or work, if a nonresidential address). | | | | | | | |
| <i>RETURNED SURVEYS</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Number</i> | 136 | 274 | 150 | 230 | 305 | 33 | 1,128 |
| <i>Representation</i> | 12.06% | 24.29% | 13.30% | 20.39% | 27.04% | 2.93% | 100.00% |

representation of the population for its respective geographical area – almost 33 percent. Ironically, the roles were also switched for customer service area E in that it had faired the best regarding the number of surveys returned, but did poorly (i.e., for all intents and purposes, it tied in last place) according to the population of the service area represented.

Figure 16
Representation of Primary Customers

| <i>POPULATION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
|--|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>Residential Population Surveyed</i> <i>(Percentage of Total)</i> | 427 (13%) | 781 (24%) | 481 (15%) | 804 (24%) | 790 (24%) | 29 (1%) | 3,312 (100%) |
| <i>2000 Census Population</i> <i>(Percentage of Total)</i> | 1,303 (5%) | 7,457 (31%) | 3,872 (16%) | 4,347 (18%) | 7,253 (30%) | na (na) | 24,232 (100%) |
| <i>Representation</i> | 32.77% | 10.47% | 12.42% | 18.50% | 10.89% | na | 13.67% |

Another interesting comparison can be made between the percentages of the “residential population surveyed” and the “2000 census population” for each customer service area. These percentages are shown in parentheses in Figure 16.

- A greater proportion of the population of areas A and D are represented in the total survey results than are distributed between the two geographies (i.e., 13% versus 5% and 24% versus 18%, respectively).
- A smaller share of residents in areas B and E were surveyed than lived there at the time of the census.
- The percentages for area C are nearly identical.

A reasonable explanation for the disparity between the percentages could be that the township population has actually shifted in the past three years since the 2000 census was taken. For example, a significant amount of new housing units have been constructed in customer service area A, which would explain the higher percentage of response. Likewise, other changes in the population base in other customer service areas may have affected the survey response in those locales.

Organization of Survey Findings

As noted earlier in this plan, it is the collective mix of public, quasi-public, and private recreation areas and facilities in a community that serves to satisfy customer’s needs. It becomes difficult to separate out a single park or a grouping of parks or facilities to assess how effectively each meets the needs of the population. However, the recreation survey asked various questions in an attempt to measure how customers feel about different aspects of the park and recreation system and to judge whether parts of the system and services should be expanded.

Because many questions addressed related matters, the findings from the survey are organized and presented in the following format:

- community-wide park needs;
- neighborhood-type park needs;
- facility needs;
- program needs;
- publicity needs;
- maintenance needs; and
- preservation needs.

Community-wide Park Needs

One question from the recreation survey asked for comment regarding the availability of parks and recreation facilities on a community-wide basis (refer to Figure 17). When asked to rate whether the supply of parks and recreation facilities in the township is adequate, three-quarters of the respondents indicated that it is, with slightly more than one-third of all respondents strongly agreeing with the statement. Nearly 16 percent of the respondents were neutral on the subject. Seven (7) percent were dissatisfied to some degree with the supply. Only 3 percent surveyed rated that supplying parks and facilities is unimportant to them.

Figure 17
 Adequacy of Parks/Facilities Community-wide

| QUESTION 6: In general, the supply of parks and recreation facilities in Horsham Township is adequate. | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 44.85% | 39.05% | 42.00% | 34.35% | 40.98% | 24.24% | 39.27% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 35.29% | 32.85% | 31.33% | 46.52% | 32.79% | 3.03% | 34.84% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 11.76% | 18.61% | 18.00% | 12.61% | 17.38% | 6.06% | 15.78% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 5.15% | 5.47% | 6.00% | 4.35% | 5.90% | 3.03% | 5.32% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 2.94% | 1.46% | 1.33% | 1.74% | 1.64% | 0.00% | 1.68% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 0.00% | 2.55% | 1.33% | 0.43% | 1.31% | 63.64% | 3.10% |

Neighborhood-Type Park Needs

There were four questions in the survey questionnaire that elicited comment regarding parks and recreation facilities in the respondents’ “neighborhoods.” The first question (refer to Figure 18) asked about the availability of nearby recreation opportunities for adults in the five customer service areas. Fifty-eight (58) percent of the respondents felt that existing neighborhood parks adequately serve the recreation needs of the adult population. Slightly more than one-fifth (21%) felt neutral, neither agreeing nor disagreeing that the supply is adequate. Almost 19 percent believed the supply of adult recreation is inadequate, with only one-third of those respondents feeling strongly in that regard. Nearly 21 percent were neutral on the subject. Three (3) percent responded that adult recreation parks and facilities are unimportant to them.

Figure 18
 Adequacy of Neighborhood Parks/Facilities for Adults

| QUESTION 7: | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| The Area in which you live/work is adequately served by parks and recreation facilities for ADULT recreation. | | | | | | | |
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 37.50% | 22.99% | 30.67% | 33.91% | 28.85% | 21.21% | 29.52% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 27.21% | 15.69% | 30.00% | 42.17% | 30.49% | 9.09% | 28.19% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 22.06% | 25.18% | 29.33% | 13.48% | 20.00% | 3.03% | 20.92% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 8.09% | 23.72% | 5.33% | 8.26% | 13.44% | 3.03% | 12.85% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 5.15% | 11.31% | 4.00% | 1.74% | 4.92% | 3.03% | 5.67% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 0.00% | 1.09% | 0.67% | 0.43% | 2.30% | 60.61% | 2.84% |

When respondents were asked to judge the availability of parks for youth in their neighborhood, 29 percent felt strongly that the supply is okay (refer to Figure 19). Twenty-seven (27) percent believed that the supply is moderately adequate. While 18 percent had a neutral viewpoint, 23 percent indicated that there is some degree of need to expand the supply of neighborhood parks so that youth can play closer to home. Respondents who regarded the provision of parks for youth as being unimportant represented about 4 percent.

Almost half of the respondents (45%) indicated that members of their family or business employees would use a park more often if one was closer to their home or place of work (refer to Figure 20). Surprisingly, 31 percent were undecided as to whether a closer park closer would result in more frequent visits. Almost one-fifth (18%) noted that their family/employees would not visit a park any more frequently if one were closer. About 6 percent rated that having a park closer to them is not important.

Figure 19
Adequacy of Neighborhood Parks/Facilities for Youth

| QUESTION 8: | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| There are enough public recreation areas close to where you live for the YOUTH in your neighborhood to use for play. | | | | | | | |
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 37.50% | 21.90% | 36.67% | 31.74% | 25.90% | 15.15% | 28.63% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 30.15% | 28.47% | 22.67% | 32.17% | 23.93% | 9.09% | 26.86% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 16.18% | 17.88% | 22.00% | 13.48% | 20.98% | 3.03% | 17.73% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 10.29% | 20.07% | 12.67% | 16.09% | 16.07% | 6.06% | 15.60% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 4.41% | 9.49% | 5.33% | 5.22% | 8.52% | 3.03% | 7.00% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 1.47% | 2.19% | 0.67% | 1.30% | 4.59% | 63.64% | 4.17% |

Figure 20
Usage of Neighborhood Park

| QUESTION 11: | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Your family (or your employees if a nonresidential address) would use a Township park more often if one was closer to your home/place of work. | | | | | | | |
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 23.53% | 26.64% | 20.67% | 23.48% | 31.48% | 6.06% | 25.53% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 16.91% | 25.18% | 16.00% | 23.04% | 15.08% | 6.06% | 19.24% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 26.47% | 28.47% | 38.67% | 33.91% | 31.15% | 21.21% | 31.21% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 16.18% | 8.03% | 10.00% | 10.00% | 7.87% | 0.00% | 9.40% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 11.76% | 8.03% | 10.00% | 8.26% | 9.51% | 3.03% | 9.04% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 5.15% | 3.65% | 4.67% | 1.30% | 4.92% | 63.64% | 5.59% |

In a question that evoked response similar to that for which results are presented in Figure 20, not quite one-third (30%) of the respondents expressed that they consider it to be of moderate to high importance for the Township to purchase more land for a park closer to their homes/business (refer to Figure 21). One-third considered a new park close to where they live/work to be of moderate to low importance. While nearly one-quarter (24%) were undecided whether the Township should or should not acquire and new park closer to their address, 13 percent expressed that such an acquisition is unimportant to them.

Figure 21
Acquire a Closer Neighborhood Park

| QUESTION 14: | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| It is important for the Township to purchase more land for a new park closer to your address. | | | | | | | |
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 11.76% | 18.25% | 20.67% | 13.91% | 14.10% | 9.09% | 15.51% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 11.03% | 15.69% | 15.33% | 16.52% | 11.15% | 0.00% | 13.56% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 22.79% | 22.99% | 20.67% | 24.35% | 27.87% | 3.03% | 23.67% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 13.97% | 13.50% | 8.67% | 15.22% | 15.08% | 0.00% | 13.30% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 26.47% | 17.52% | 24.00% | 19.13% | 19.34% | 24.24% | 20.48% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 13.97% | 12.04% | 10.67% | 10.87% | 12.46% | 63.64% | 13.48% |

Facility Needs

Parks offer greater benefit to the public if they are developed to suit the recreation preferences of the population being served. Given the broad interests among the people, a wide range of facilities must be provided. Four questions were included in the survey to collect information about the facility needs that are unique to Horsham Township customers. The first question asked if it is important to have the Township develop more active recreation facilities (refer to Figure 22). The survey revealed that one-third of the respondents felt it is important. Twenty-six (26) percent had a neutral viewpoint, while the same share of respondents (26%) disagreed. A little over one-tenth (13%) revealed that new active facilities are unimportant to them.

Figure 22
More Active Recreation Facilities

| QUESTION 15: | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| It is important for the Township to develop more active recreation facilities (i.e., athletic fields, ball courts, playgrounds). | | | | | | | |
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 18.38% | 14.23% | 17.33% | 13.48% | 10.16% | 6.06% | 13.65% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 18.38% | 26.64% | 18.67% | 20.43% | 17.70% | 3.03% | 20.21% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 25.00% | 22.63% | 21.33% | 30.00% | 30.49% | 12.12% | 26.06% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 12.50% | 9.49% | 13.33% | 13.04% | 17.38% | 3.03% | 13.03% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 13.24% | 14.96% | 19.33% | 10.00% | 13.44% | 6.06% | 13.65% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 12.50% | 12.04% | 10.00% | 13.04% | 10.82% | 69.70% | 13.39% |

On the other side of the spectrum of active recreation is the preservation of natural areas for passive recreation. Nearly three-quarters (73%) of all respondents

regarded preservation to be an important action to undertake (refer to Figure 23). Almost half (47%) felt that preservation should be regarded with a very high importance. Thirteen (13) percent expressed a neutral point of view. Seven (7) percent disagreed. Six (6) percent expressed a feeling of unimportance to setting aside protected areas for passive recreation.

Figure 23
More Natural Areas for Passive Recreation

| QUESTION 16: | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| It is important for the Township to preserve more natural areas (i.e., stream valleys, woodlands) as parkland for passive recreation. | | | | | | | |
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 47.06% | 46.35% | 52.67% | 46.52% | 49.84% | 12.12% | 47.25% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 26.47% | 27.37% | 25.33% | 30.43% | 24.59% | 9.09% | 26.33% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 13.24% | 13.14% | 12.67% | 15.22% | 12.13% | 6.06% | 13.03% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 5.15% | 3.28% | 4.00% | 2.17% | 2.95% | 0.00% | 3.19% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 2.21% | 5.11% | 2.67% | 1.74% | 5.25% | 6.06% | 3.81% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 5.88% | 4.74% | 2.67% | 3.91% | 5.25% | 66.67% | 6.38% |

One question on the survey elicited comment regarding the provision of a communitywide trail system (refer to Figure 24). Response to the question revealed that 82 percent supported the creation of a trail system. More than half (58%) of the respondents strongly agreed that more trails are needed and are necessary to meet their recreation needs. Seven (7) percent were neutral on the subject. Five (5) percent of the respondents each expressed disagreement with the need for and a disinterest in more trails.

Figure 24
Continue Creating Community-wide Trail System

| QUESTION 17: | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| It is important for the Township to continue creating a community-wide trail system for pedestrians and bicyclists that would link together parks with residential areas. | | | | | | | |
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 58.09% | 55.47% | 66.67% | 61.74% | 57.70% | 12.12% | 57.89% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 25.00% | 25.55% | 20.00% | 25.22% | 25.25% | 9.09% | 24.11% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 6.62% | 8.39% | 6.00% | 5.65% | 8.85% | 6.06% | 7.36% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 0.00% | 2.55% | 2.67% | 1.30% | 1.97% | 3.03% | 1.86% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 4.41% | 4.01% | 4.00% | 3.04% | 2.62% | 0.00% | 3.37% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 5.88% | 4.01% | 0.67% | 3.04% | 3.61% | 69.70% | 5.41% |

Facility Preferences

A large part of the survey questionnaire was devoted to asking respondents to specify the facilities that are needed to serve their recreation needs. The questionnaire presented a list of 29 facilities from which the respondents were asked provide answers in two parts:

- Part 1 – They were asked to identify the facilities that they currently use.
- Part 2 – They were asked to rate how important it is for the Township to expand the availability of the facilities to serve their future needs.

Figure 25 lists the findings relative to both parts of the facility needs exercise. The fourth column of the table presents the results of Part 1. The percentage of respondents who use each facility is presented in conjunction with the ranking of the facility based on percentage (ranking in parentheses). For example, 46 percent of the respondents indicated that they currently use bicycling trails, and this was the third most popular response. Seventy-one (71) percent of the respondents stated that they use hiking/walking trails, which ranked at the top of the list as the facility that the population uses the most. The ten favorite facilities, in order according to use, include:

- hiking/walking trails;
- fitness/exercise trails;
- bicycling trails;
- picnic areas and pavilions;
- nature areas and interpretive trails;
- playground apparatus;
- historical sites;
- fishing areas;
- tennis courts; and
- basketball courts.

The fifth through the tenth columns in Figure 25 present data obtained from Part 2 of the survey's facility needs exercise. The columns show the percentage of respondents indicating the degree of importance to develop more of each facility in the future. However, to assess the relative importance of each facility to serve respondents' needs, the data was plugged into a weighted ranking system (refer to Appendix C) to reveal the facility priorities of respondents. The facilities in the table are listed in order of priority from 1st through 29th, with the facilities in greatest demand at the top of the list and those in least demand at the bottom. The top ten facilities that respondents most need are listed below in order of preference:

- bicycling trails;
- hiking/walking trails;
- fitness/exercise trails;
- outdoor swimming pool;
- nature areas and interpretive trails;

Page Reserved for:

Figure 25
Township-wide Facility Demand

- indoor recreation center;
- dog park;
- ice skating areas;
- environmental education center; and
- outdoor amphitheater.

The second column of Figure 25 presents the priority ranking that each facility had received in 1990 when the Township last conducted a recreation needs survey. It is interesting to compare the rankings to see what changes have occurred in customers' preferences. For example, facilities in the top five grouping have remained the same with the exception of "playground apparatus" and "nature areas and interpretive trails" which essentially switched places. Playgrounds were ranked 4th in 1990, but are now 11th, whereas nature areas and interpretive trails were 11th and are now 5th. The drop in the priority of playground apparatus can be attributed to the fact that the Township has installed new play equipment at many of its parks throughout the community, which now better satisfy the needs of the population. A reasonable explanation for the increase in priority for nature areas/trails could be that the continued development in the township and the resultant loss of open space has heightened the public's awareness and interest in preserving areas into which they can escape and experience nature.

By comparing the priority ranking to current use, additional observations can be made. Compare the numbers for an outdoor swimming pool, for instance. Despite ranking 4th in priority for a preferred recreation facility, a pool came in 14th place based on current use. This is not surprising because people cannot participate in outdoor swimming activity when the supply of public pools is limited. Similarly, a small percentage of the population currently uses an indoor recreation center, but the demand for this facility is relatively high (ranked 6th) due to the fact that there are not many places available for general indoor recreation.

Facility demands and preferences by customer service area are presented in Figure 26. As expected, there are variations in what people of different geographic areas need. These differences can be attributed not only to unique recreational interests of the customers but also to the varied supply of recreation resources to which the population can use. A particularly good example to point out is the need for an outdoor swimming pool. The priority for a pool ranks at least in the top four facilities in all customer service areas except area B where it ranks in 9th place. The logical reason for a pool not to be in greater demand in area B is because a private swim facility, the Hideaway Swim Club, is located in this area.

Questionnaire Omission

It is important to point out an error in the survey questionnaire: "baseball fields" were inadvertently omitted from the list of facilities from which respondents were asked to respond. Because respondents were not specifically questioned regarding their need for this type of facility, it could be argued that the public need for them might not be adequately represented in the survey results. However, the consequence of this

Page Reserved for:

Figure 26
Facility Demand and Preference by Area

error is not believed to be of critical concern since everyone had an equal opportunity to identify baseball fields as a write-in response:

- The questionnaire provided two blank spaces (questions 51 and 52) that respondents could fill in to specify “other” facilities that they need even though the facility was not listed. Results indicate that only 9 write-in responses for some sort of baseball facility were provided, which is less than 1 percent of all respondents.

It is also speculated that the overall effect of omitting baseball fields from the facility list was lessened by the fact that the “softball fields” category likely served as a catch-all for customers’ softball **and** baseball needs because of the similarity between the facilities. In fact, baseball fields and softball fields were listed as one type of facility when the Township conducted a recreation needs survey in 1990.

For further analysis, the responses to the baseball field write-ins were added to those provided for softball fields to generate one combined score, but the priority did not change – it remained as 23rd. Therefore, it is assumed that the need for baseball fields is being sufficiently met in relationship to other facilities that are in greater demand. If respondents felt strongly about baseball fields, then a written response was an available alternative elsewhere in the survey questionnaire.

The need for baseball facilities also appeared in two other sections of the survey that offered write-in responses:

- Questions 19 and 20 gave respondents the opportunity to specify unlisted actions that they felt the Township should take to better satisfy their recreation needs. Only 4 respondents noted that the provision of baseball fields is an important action.
- The last page of the questionnaire was an open-ended question providing space for respondents to give additional written comments or recommendations regarding recreation and parks in the township. This opportunity resulted in only 2 respondents mentioning that baseball field improvements are needed.

Reaffirmed Facility Needs

Appendix D includes 7 detailed tables that present written responses provided by respondents, five of which relate, in whole or in part, to facility needs:

- Table D-1 – As noted above, questions 19 and 20 evoked responses that reinforced the importance of providing facilities – as an action that should be undertaken by the Township to better meet customers’ recreation needs. Although the intent was to identify unique needs of customers, respondents wrote down answers that repeated responses given elsewhere on the questionnaire, which essentially served to reaffirm the importance of the named facility to them. The majority of the 198 responses duplicated need previously identified, but one unique facility need was expressed – a dog park, which is a dedicated park or area for dog owners to bring their pets for exercise, play, and socialization. Forty-

Figure 27
Write-in Facility Needs

| # Responses from Questions 19 & 20 | # Responses from Questions 51 & 52 | # Responses from the Last Question | Categorical Response: Facility Type |
|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| 4 | 9 | 2 | Baseball Fields |
| 11 | 1 | 11 | Basketball Courts |
| 34 | 8 | 86 | Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities / Trails |
| na | 1 | 1 | Bocce Courts |
| na | 1 | na | Dirt Bike Track |
| na | 1 | na | Disc (Frisbee) Golf Course |
| 44 | 6 | 45 | Dog Park |
| 4 | 3 | 1 | Equestrian Facilities |
| na | 1 | 1 | Field Hockey Fields |
| 1 | 1 | 8 | Fishing Areas |
| na | na | 1 | Garden Plots |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | Golf Facilities |
| na | na | 4 | Handicapped Facilities |
| na | na | 1 | Hunting Areas |
| 3 | 3 | 7 | Ice Skating Facilities |
| 29 | 23 | 42 | Indoor Facilities |
| na | na | 1 | Lacrosse Fields |
| 3 | 1 | 4 | Library |
| na | na | 1 | Model Airplane Facility |
| na | na | 1 | Model Railroad Facility |
| na | na | 1 | Multi-Purpose, Turf Playfields |
| 3 | na | na | Outdoor Amphitheater |
| na | 1 | na | Outdoor Racquetball Facility |
| 27 | 1 | 50 | Outdoor Swimming Pool |
| na | na | 3 | Park Benches |
| 8 | 2 | 3 | Passive/Natural/Environmental Area |
| na | na | 4 | Picnic Areas and Pavilions |
| 5 | 1 | 26 | Playgrounds |
| 1 | 2 | 1 | Restrooms |
| na | na | 1 | Senior Citizen Facilities |
| na | na | 2 | Shared Use of School Facilities |
| na | na | 1 | Shared Use of Private Facilities |
| 2 | na | 4 | Soccer Fields |
| 13 | 3 | 14 | Skating Facility |
| 3 | 5 | 1 | Target Range |
| 2 | na | 3 | Tennis Courts |
| na | 1 | 1 | Volleyball Courts |
| 198 | 77 | 311 | Total |

four (44) respondents provided a comment in support of this type of facility. Figure 27 identifies the total number of responses relative to each facility type that was written in by the respondents.

- **Table D-2** – If respondents indicated in question 30 that they would like to have handicapped facilities available, they were given the option of specifying the type of such facility needed. Sixteen (16) written responses were provided, ranging from a general comment that anything accessible would be welcomed to more specific needs like accessible garden plots, restrooms, trails, and playgrounds.
- **Table D-3** – Question 44 allowed the need for specific kinds of senior citizen facilities to be identified. There were 40 written responses to this question. The most popular response (29 total) was for an indoor senior center for meetings and recreational activities. Another common expressed need was for more trails (7).
- **Table D-4** – Questions 51 and 52 gave survey respondents the opportunity to specify facilities that they need even though they were not listed, thereby enabling the Township to identify special needs of customers. Although most of the 77 responses were repeats, a dog park stood out again as a unique need.
- **Table D-7** – The last question of the survey (unnumbered) also resulted in many facility needs being repeated by respondents (refer again to Figure 27). There were 45 respondents voicing their support for a dog park.

Program Needs

To assess the existing and projected void in the program supply base, the survey included many questions relative to the supply of recreation programs. When asked about the existing supply of recreation programs for adults in the township, only 15 percent of all respondents strongly agreed that the supply is adequate (refer to Figure 28). Nearly one-quarter (23%) moderately agreed that enough programs for adult recreation are provided. Forty (40) percent felt neutral about the adequacy of the supply base. Of the remaining one-fifth of respondents, 17 percent indicated some degree of dissatisfaction with the supply and 4 percent indicated that adult recreation programs are unimportant to them.

Figure 28
Adequacy of Programs for Adults

| QUESTION 9: | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| In general, the supply of recreation programs (organized activities) for ADULTS in Horsham Township is adequate. | | | | | | | |
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 13.97% | 13.87% | 17.33% | 18.26% | 14.10% | 9.09% | 15.16% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 25.00% | 18.61% | 28.00% | 26.96% | 23.61% | 9.09% | 23.40% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 41.91% | 44.89% | 34.67% | 36.09% | 42.95% | 15.15% | 39.98% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 13.24% | 16.79% | 15.33% | 14.78% | 11.80% | 3.03% | 14.01% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 3.68% | 3.65% | 2.00% | 2.61% | 4.92% | 0.00% | 3.46% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 2.21% | 2.19% | 2.67% | 1.30% | 2.62% | 63.64% | 3.99% |

The existing supply of recreation programs for youth in the township was rated to be adequate by 57 percent of all respondents, with 26 percent strongly agreeing that there were enough youth programs (refer to Figure 29). Almost one-third (29%) had a neutral viewpoint, while 8 percent felt either strongly or moderately dissatisfied with the supply. Roughly 5 percent indicated that programs provided for the youth population are unimportant.

Figure 29
 Adequacy of Programs for Youth

| QUESTION 10: | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| In general, the supply of recreation programs for the YOUTH in Horsham Township is adequate. | | | | | | | |
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 28.68% | 21.53% | 32.67% | 30.43% | 25.25% | 15.15% | 26.51% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 36.03% | 33.94% | 28.00% | 38.70% | 22.95% | 9.09% | 30.67% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 23.53% | 32.48% | 28.67% | 20.00% | 38.36% | 12.12% | 29.34% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 8.09% | 6.20% | 6.67% | 9.13% | 7.21% | 0.00% | 7.18% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 1.47% | 1.46% | 1.33% | 0.87% | 1.64% | 0.00% | 1.33% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 2.21% | 4.38% | 2.67% | 0.87% | 4.59% | 63.64% | 4.96% |

In addition to gathering information about existing programs, the survey asked respondents to offer insight as to the need for programs in the future. Respondents expressed their opinions about whether the Township should provide more recreation opportunities for the following identified customer groups:

- preschoolers (0-5 years old);
- children (6-12 years old);
- teens (13-18 years old);
- young adults (19-34 years old);
- older adults (35-59 years old);
- seniors (60 years old and older); and
- handicapped persons (any age).

The results from these questions are presented in seven tables (refer to Figures 31 through 37). They are provided as percentages of response township-wide and are also broken down according to customer service area. This information can guide the Township in planning programs that target specific sectors of the population for each area. They indicate preferences for customer group programming and reveal unique variations in needs based on geography and demographics.

Respondent answers to the program demand questions can be summarized for the entire township (refer to Figure 30). The response indicates that there is a perceived need for more programs for every customer group. On a township-wide level, the percentage of respondents that agreed that programs should be provided ranged

from a low of 26 percent to a high of 43 percent. The percentage of respondents that disagreed with the need for more programs ranged from 5 to 13 percent. The percentages for agreement or disagreement correlated to one another in that groups with a higher percent of agreement tended to have a lower percent of disagreement. The share of respondents who were neutral on the subject was relatively the same across the board, at an average of 28 percent. And an average of 25 percent of the respondents rated that the provision of programs was unimportant.

Figure 30
Township-wide Summary: Program Demand by Customer Group

| QUESTIONS 12a through 12g: It is important for the Township to strive to provide more recreation opportunities for | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | CUSTOMER GROUP | | | | | | |
| | <i>Preschoolers (0-5)</i> | <i>Children (6-12)</i> | <i>Teens (13-18)</i> | <i>Young Adults (19-34)</i> | <i>Older Adults (35-59)</i> | <i>Seniors (60+)</i> | <i>Handicapped (any age)</i> |
| <i>Agree</i> | 26.33% | 34.75% | 43.18% | 36.70% | 42.64% | 39.27% | 36.53% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 31.12% | 28.19% | 25.18% | 29.34% | 27.48% | 28.90% | 30.59% |
| <i>Disagree</i> | 13.65% | 11.53% | 8.34% | 7.80% | 7.89% | 7.10% | 5.76% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 28.90% | 25.53% | 23.32% | 26.15% | 21.99% | 24.73% | 27.13% |

Figure 31
Program Demand for Preschoolers

| QUESTION 12a: It is important for the Township to strive to provide more recreation opportunities for preschoolers (0-5 years old). | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 13.24% | 12.04% | 14.67% | 11.74% | 13.11% | 9.09% | 12.68% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 8.82% | 13.50% | 12.00% | 20.43% | 12.79% | 3.03% | 13.65% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 35.29% | 32.12% | 27.33% | 28.26% | 34.75% | 9.09% | 31.12% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 7.35% | 6.93% | 6.67% | 7.83% | 6.23% | 0.00% | 6.74% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 8.82% | 5.47% | 10.67% | 5.65% | 6.89% | 3.03% | 6.91% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 26.47% | 29.93% | 28.67% | 26.09% | 26.23% | 75.76% | 28.90% |

Figure 32
Program Demand for Children

| QUESTION 12b: It is important for the Township to strive to provide more recreation opportunities for children (6-12 years old). | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 16.18% | 13.87% | 18.00% | 17.39% | 13.44% | 6.06% | 15.07% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 13.97% | 19.34% | 18.00% | 28.26% | 17.70% | 12.12% | 19.68% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 32.35% | 28.83% | 26.67% | 22.17% | 33.44% | 6.06% | 28.19% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 5.88% | 6.57% | 6.67% | 5.65% | 5.90% | 0.00% | 5.94% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 7.35% | 4.74% | 7.33% | 5.22% | 5.25% | 3.03% | 5.59% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 24.26% | 26.64% | 23.33% | 21.30% | 24.26% | 72.73% | 25.53% |

Figure 33
Program Demand for Teens

| QUESTION 12c: It is important for the Township to strive to provide more recreation opportunities for teens (13-18 years old). | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 21.32% | 22.99% | 22.00% | 24.78% | 20.00% | 9.09% | 21.81% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 18.38% | 19.71% | 18.67% | 27.83% | 21.64% | 12.12% | 21.37% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 29.41% | 25.55% | 24.00% | 21.30% | 28.52% | 6.06% | 25.18% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 2.21% | 5.11% | 7.33% | 2.61% | 4.26% | 0.00% | 4.17% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 5.15% | 3.65% | 6.00% | 3.48% | 3.93% | 3.03% | 4.17% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 23.53% | 22.99% | 22.00% | 20.00% | 21.64% | 69.70% | 23.32% |

Figure 34
Program Demand for Young Adults

| QUESTION 12d: It is important for the Township to strive to provide more recreation opportunities for young adults (19-34 years old). | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 18.38% | 14.60% | 13.33% | 15.65% | 15.41% | 6.06% | 15.07% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 18.38% | 25.18% | 20.00% | 24.78% | 19.34% | 12.12% | 21.63% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 32.35% | 24.09% | 31.33% | 28.70% | 34.43% | 9.09% | 29.34% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 5.15% | 4.74% | 3.33% | 3.04% | 2.95% | 0.00% | 3.63% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 3.68% | 5.47% | 4.00% | 3.04% | 4.26% | 3.03% | 4.17% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 22.06% | 25.91% | 28.00% | 24.78% | 23.61% | 69.70% | 26.15% |

Figure 35
Program Demand for Older Adults

| QUESTION 12e: It is important for the Township to strive to provide more recreation opportunities for older adults (35-59 years old). | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 17.65% | 16.06% | 15.33% | 15.65% | 19.02% | 0.00% | 16.40% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 22.79% | 26.28% | 21.33% | 33.91% | 25.90% | 12.12% | 26.24% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 32.35% | 23.36% | 30.67% | 26.52% | 30.16% | 9.09% | 27.48% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 4.41% | 5.47% | 2.00% | 3.48% | 3.28% | 0.00% | 3.72% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 4.41% | 4.74% | 5.33% | 3.04% | 3.93% | 3.03% | 4.17% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 18.38% | 24.09% | 25.33% | 17.39% | 17.70% | 75.76% | 21.99% |

Figure 36
Program Demand for Seniors

| QUESTION 12f: It is important for the Township to strive to provide more recreation opportunities for seniors (60 years old and older). | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 13.24% | 26.28% | 20.00% | 11.74% | 21.31% | 6.06% | 18.97% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 17.65% | 18.98% | 17.33% | 23.91% | 23.28% | 3.03% | 20.30% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 35.29% | 24.82% | 29.33% | 30.43% | 30.49% | 9.09% | 28.90% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 1.47% | 4.38% | 2.67% | 3.48% | 1.97% | 0.00% | 2.84% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 4.41% | 4.74% | 4.00% | 3.91% | 4.26% | 3.03% | 4.26% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 27.94% | 20.80% | 26.67% | 26.52% | 18.69% | 78.79% | 24.73% |

Figure 37
Program Demand for Handicapped Persons

| QUESTION 12g: It is important for the Township to strive to provide more recreation opportunities for handicapped persons (any age). | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 11.76% | 21.53% | 12.67% | 20.87% | 20.98% | 12.12% | 18.62% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 10.29% | 17.88% | 18.67% | 20.87% | 20.33% | 3.03% | 17.91% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 41.18% | 28.83% | 32.67% | 27.83% | 30.82% | 9.09% | 30.59% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 1.47% | 3.28% | 1.33% | 1.30% | 1.64% | 0.00% | 1.86% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 2.21% | 4.38% | 4.67% | 3.48% | 4.26% | 3.03% | 3.90% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 33.09% | 24.09% | 30.00% | 25.65% | 21.97% | 72.73% | 27.13% |

Programs for non-active recreation, such as bus trips/tours, adult education, arts and crafts/hobbies, and drama, were considered to be of importance to more than half (51%) of all respondents (refer to Figure 38). Slightly over one-fourth (27%) of all respondents expressed a neutral opinion regarding the provision of more non-active recreation programs. A total of 12 percent disagreed, while one-tenth (10%) felt that it is unimportant to offer these types of programs.

Figure 38
Demand for Non-active Recreation Programs

| QUESTION 18: | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| It is important for the Township to offer more recreation programs for non-active recreation (i.e., bus trips/tours, adult education, arts/crafts/hobbies, drama). | | | | | | | |
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 22.06% | 24.09% | 25.33% | 23.48% | 25.90% | 12.12% | 24.02% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 27.94% | 30.66% | 19.33% | 26.52% | 31.80% | 6.06% | 27.57% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 27.21% | 26.28% | 32.67% | 30.43% | 24.26% | 15.15% | 27.22% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 8.09% | 5.11% | 7.33% | 5.65% | 5.90% | 0.00% | 5.94% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 4.41% | 4.01% | 4.67% | 6.09% | 4.59% | 0.00% | 4.61% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 10.29% | 9.85% | 10.67% | 7.83% | 7.54% | 66.67% | 10.64% |

Program Preferences

As was done for facilities, the survey questionnaire included a needs assessment exercise for a list of recreation programs. Respondents were asked to identify which of 42 programs are needed to serve their recreation needs:

- Part 1 – Respondents identified the types of programs that they currently participate in.
- Part 2 – Respondents rated how important it is for the Township to expand the availability of the programs to serve their future needs.

Figure 39 lists the findings relative to both parts of the program needs exercise. The fourth column of the table presents the results of Part 1. The percentage of respondents who participate in each type of program is presented in conjunction with its ranking based on percentage (ranking in parentheses). For example, 35 percent of the respondents indicated that they currently attend concerts, and this was the most popular response. And 27 percent of the respondents stated that they participate in swimming programs, which ranked third based on population participation. The ten favorite programs, in order according to participation, include:

- concerts;
- holiday events/community parties;
- swimming;
- aerobics/adult exercise;

Page Reserved for:

Figure 39
Township-wide Program Demand

- group trips/tours;
- arts and crafts and hobbies;
- golf;
- fishing;
- basketball; and
- family fun nights.

The fifth through the tenth columns in Figure 39 present data obtained from Part 2 of the program needs exercise. The columns show the percentage of respondents indicating the degree of importance to provide more of each program in the future. The priority identification methodology in Appendix C was again used, however, this time to reveal the relative importance of each program to serve respondents' needs. The programs in the table are listed in order of priority from 1st through 42nd, with the programs in greatest demand at the top of the list and those in least demand at the bottom. The top ten programs that respondents most need are listed below in order of preference:

- concerts;
- swimming;
- arts and crafts and hobbies;
- aerobics/adult exercise;
- group trips/tours;
- holiday events/community parties;
- family fun nights;
- senior citizen programs;
- ice skating; and
- environmental education.

The second column of Figure 39 presents the priority ranking that each program had received as a result of the 1990 survey. By comparing the present rankings to those from 1990, it can be seen that the top five program preferences have remained the same with the exception of “playground programs” and “group trips/tours” which practically reversed positions. Playground programs were ranked 3rd in 1990, but are now 12th, whereas group trips/tours were 11th and are now 5th. The drop in the priority of playground programs can be attributed to the fact that the Township has increased the number of organized activities for children and youth at its local parks, which now better satisfy the needs of the population. Shifting demographics and a greater public interest in travel probably is the reason for the increase in priority for group trips/tours. Interestingly, a comparison of the priority ranking to current use shows that the top five rankings almost match.

Program demands and preferences by customer service area are presented in Figure 40. There are variations in what people of different geographic areas need, differences that can be attributed to the unique recreational interests of the customers and to the varied supply of programs available to each population subset. Once again, a good example that illustrates this relationship is the need for swimming

Page Reserved for:

Figure 40
Program Demand and Preference by Area

programs. The priority for swimming ranks at least 2nd in all but customer service areas B and C, where it ranks 6th and 7th, respectively. The logical reason for swimming not to be in greater demand in area B is due to the fact the Hideaway Swim Club offers swimming opportunities. Why swimming is not higher in area C is more of a mystery, except that residents in this area may have their own private pools or access to a common facility, such as the Talamore at Oak Terrace Swim Club.

Reaffirmed Program Needs

Four (4) tables in Appendix D present respondents' written answers related to program needs:

- Table D-1 – Questions 19 and 20 resulted in written responses that reinforced the importance of providing certain programs as a way for the Township to better meet customers' recreation needs. Many of the respondents' answers were merely reiterations of needs addressed in other parts of the survey. Forty (40) programs covering a diversity of recreation interests were specified. Programs that had been mentioned more than once are listed below:
 - group trips/tours (7 responses);
 - concerts (4 responses);
 - children's programs (3 responses);
 - community-based events/celebrations (3 responses);
 - senior citizen programs (3 responses);
 - teen programs (3 responses); and
 - cost-effective/affordable programs (2 responses).
- Table D-5 – If respondents indicated that sports camps are needed, Question 87 permitted them to specify the type of such program they need. A total of 108 written responses were provided. Six (6) respondents expressed that there is a need for a broad spectrum of customers to have access to a wide variety of sports. Other write-ins having at least two responses were distributed among 13 more defined categories of sports:
 - soccer (28 responses);
 - basketball (18 responses)
 - baseball (10 responses)
 - lacrosse (7 responses);
 - preschool-oriented sports (6 responses);
 - field hockey (4 responses);
 - softball (3 responses);
 - tennis (3 responses);
 - track/running (3 responses);
 - volleyball (3 responses);
 - football (2 responses);
 - golf (2 responses); and
 - hockey (2 responses).
- Table D-6 – Questions 95 and 96 gave survey respondents the opportunity to specify programs that they need even though they were not listed. Fifty-five (55) responses were received covering a wide range of programs. A few received two or more responses, making them worthy of mentioning:

- in-line skating / skateboarding programs (5 responses);
 - walking club programs (4 responses)
 - dog programs (3 responses); and
 - racquetball programs (2 responses).
- Table D-7 – The last question of the survey (unnumbered) was yet another opportunity for respondents to offer comments and recommendations regarding recreation programs in addition to other park or recreation issues that they had on their minds. A total of 105 respondents wrote something related to programs. Many write-ins (24) addressed a diversity of recreation interests, whereas 81 comments had other commonalities to be organized into the following 17 groups:
 - adult programs (12 responses);
 - teen programs (11 responses);
 - senior citizen programs (9 responses);
 - sports camps (7 responses);
 - group trips/tours (7 responses);
 - concerts (6 responses);
 - children’s programs (5 responses)
 - family-oriented programs (4 responses);
 - handicapped programs (3 responses);
 - volleyball (3 responses).
 - community-based events/celebrations (2 responses);
 - arts and crafts and hobbies (2 responses);
 - girls programs (2 responses);
 - lacrosse (2 responses);
 - preschool-oriented programs (2 responses);
 - in-line skating (2 responses); and
 - walking club programs (2 responses).

Publicity Needs

The recreation survey questionnaire was designed to serve two purposes. First and foremost, it posed questions for the Township to gather data about customers’ recreation needs. Second, the questionnaire served as a publicity tool – a means of informing the customers of the parks and facilities available to them.

A map and an inventory of Horsham’s parks and facilities were printed on the pages of the survey preceding the questions. This was done so that all respondents would have a common understanding of the park system and to help them in answering the questions. Before the survey was released, the Township’s quarterly newsletter, the *Horsham Township Report*, described the local parks and recreation facilities and informed customers of the importance of the upcoming survey.

The survey asked respondents to indicate whether they were aware of all the Township’s parks and recreation facilities prior to receiving the inventory supplied in the Township newsletter and the survey. Only slightly more than one-third (36%) said that they were familiar with all of the recreation resources offered by the Township (refer to Figure 41). Sixty (60) percent said that they were not aware of everything. Less than 3 percent did not respond.

Figure 41
Awareness of Township Parks and Facilities

| QUESTION 4: | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Before you received the brochure included in the recent Horsham Township Report or the Parks Map insert to this survey, were you aware of all Township parks and facilities that are available? | | | | | | | |
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| Yes | 39.71% | 35.77% | 36.00% | 40.00% | 35.74% | 15.15% | 36.52% |
| No | 60.29% | 62.77% | 62.67% | 59.57% | 63.61% | 15.15% | 60.64% |
| Unknown/unanswered | 0.00% | 1.46% | 1.33% | 0.43% | 0.66% | 69.70% | 2.84% |

Respondents were asked to express their opinions regarding publicity of the Township’s recreation opportunities (refer to Figure 42). Fifty-eight (58) percent expressed that they are in favor of improved publicity and advertising in order to learn more about what is offered. About one-fifth (21%) was undecided whether they agreed or disagreed with being better informed. Less than one-tenth (9%) were not in favor of increased publicity efforts.

Figure 42
Importance of Improving Publicity

| QUESTION 13: | | | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| It is important for the Township to improve publicity to better inform your address about the recreation opportunities offered by the Township and others. | | | | | | | |
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Strongly Agree</i> | 29.41% | 29.56% | 25.33% | 23.04% | 29.18% | 12.12% | 27.04% |
| <i>Moderately Agree</i> | 32.35% | 32.12% | 33.33% | 34.78% | 29.51% | 15.15% | 31.65% |
| <i>Neutral</i> | 22.06% | 17.88% | 19.33% | 25.22% | 23.93% | 3.03% | 21.28% |
| <i>Moderately Disagree</i> | 4.41% | 7.30% | 6.00% | 5.22% | 4.59% | 3.03% | 5.50% |
| <i>Strongly Disagree</i> | 4.41% | 3.28% | 5.33% | 3.04% | 3.28% | 3.03% | 3.63% |
| <i>Unimportant</i> | 7.35% | 9.85% | 10.67% | 8.70% | 9.51% | 63.64% | 10.90% |

To understand which methods of publicity and advertising would be best for getting the word out to customers, respondents were asked to identify those that work well for them. Figure 43 presents the priority order of 6 methods that were listed and identifies 9 other ways of notifying people that were specified as write-in responses:

- Posters/signs and seasonal newsletters received the highest response, with more than four-fifths of all respondents voting for each of them.
- Over half (54%) think advertising on the Township’s cable television channel would work well.

- Local newspapers came in fifth place with nearly half (47%) responding in favor of this method of publicity.
- Basically one third (33%) voted for using the Township web page as a vehicle to inform customers.
- A little less than one-quarter (22%) felt that school handouts are effective.
- The write-in responses received interest from less than 2 percent of all respondents.

Where the survey provided spaces available for written responses, the perceived need for improved publicity again was revealed as follows:

- Questions 19 and 20 (Table D-1) – 2 related responses; and
- Last Question; unnumbered (Table D-7) – 26 related responses.

Figure 43
Publicity Preferences

| QUESTION 5: | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------|
| Are the following good ways for the Township to provide your address with information about parks and recreation opportunities in the Township? | | | | | | | |
| <i>RESPONDENT OPINION</i> | <i>AREA A</i> | <i>AREA B</i> | <i>AREA C</i> | <i>AREA D</i> | <i>AREA E</i> | <i>AREA UNKNOWN</i> | <i>TOWNSHIP TOTAL</i> |
| <i>Posters/Signs</i> | 83.82% | 84.31% | 86.67% | 87.39% | 83.61% | 90.91% | 85.55% |
| <i>Seasonal Newsletters</i> | 83.09% | 79.56% | 90.67% | 87.39% | 81.97% | 12.12% | 82.45% |
| <i>Cable TV Channel</i> | 56.62% | 54.74% | 62.67% | 43.91% | 52.46% | 87.88% | 54.26% |
| <i>Local Newspapers</i> | 43.38% | 53.28% | 37.33% | 47.39% | 53.11% | 15.15% | 47.70% |
| <i>Township Web Page</i> | 33.09% | 32.48% | 34.00% | 35.22% | 31.80% | 6.06% | 32.45% |
| <i>School Handouts</i> | 27.94% | 16.06% | 23.33% | 37.39% | 18.03% | 3.03% | 22.96% |
| <i>Other (Write-in Responses):</i> | | | | | | | |
| <i>E-mail</i> | na | na | na | na | na | na | 1.86% |
| <i>Direct Mail</i> | na | na | na | na | na | na | 1.51% |
| <i>General Flyers</i> | na | na | na | na | na | na | 0.27% |
| <i>Seniors Meetings</i> | na | na | na | na | na | na | 0.18% |
| <i>Park Events Announcement</i> | na | na | na | na | na | na | 0.18% |
| <i>Church Bulletins</i> | na | na | na | na | na | na | 0.18% |
| <i>Township Meetings</i> | na | na | na | na | na | na | 0.09% |
| <i>Chamber of Commerce</i> | na | na | na | na | na | na | 0.09% |
| <i>Radio</i> | na | na | na | na | na | na | 0.09% |

Maintenance Needs

Some respondents recommended through write-in responses that parks and facilities should be better maintained for reasons of improving aesthetics, safety, or security:

- Questions 19 and 20 (Table D-1) – 9 related responses; and

- Last Question; unnumbered (Table D-7) – 41 related responses.

Preservation Needs

Some respondents recommended through write-in responses that more land should be protected and preserved. Preservation comments covered all types of features such as natural resources, woodlands, native plants, wildlife habitat, farmland, areas for passive recreation pursuits, and other lands set aside simply to curb the loss of open space from development:

- Questions 19 and 20 (Table D-1) – 23 related responses; and
- Last Question; unnumbered (Table D-7) – 39 related responses.

Proponents and Opponents

In the last question of the survey (unnumbered; Table D-7), some respondents wrote comments that did not specifically address facility, program, publicity, maintenance, or preservation issues. However, many of these miscellaneous responses clearly conveyed either a positive or a negative viewpoint toward the provision of parks and recreation services in the township:

- Proponents (66 responses) are those who offered supportive comments by praising what has been accomplished thus far as well as commending the efforts of the Township to better satisfy the needs and interests of its customers. Below are examples of the content of these comments:
 - We have a wonderful park system already.
 - Horsham has done a great job.
 - I applaud the Township.
 - Things have improved a lot.
 - Wonderful parks and recreation.
- Opponents (35 responses) are those whose comments expressed some degree of dissatisfaction with the idea of expanding the Township's parks and recreation services. Below are examples of the content of these comments:
 - Keep taxes down.
 - Enough is enough.
 - No more parks.
 - There is too much money spent on parks and recreation.

KEY PERSON INTERVIEWS

Overview

As part of the information gathering process for the plan, input directly from selected civic leaders, organizations and businesses that are influential in the community was sought. Sixteen invitations to participate in a key person interview were extended. Because schedules did not permit GMAC and the Hatboro-Horsham High School Student Council to participate, fourteen interviews were conducted, as follows:

1. Boy Scout Troop 3;

2. College Settlement Camp;
3. Hatboro-Horsham Education Foundation;
4. Hatboro-Horsham Youth Basketball Association;
5. Horsham Hawks Football and Cheerleading;
6. Horsham Lions Club;
7. Horsham Little League Association;
8. Horsham Rotary Club;
9. Horsham Soccer Association;
10. Horsham Township Chamber of Commerce;
11. Horsham Township Seniors Club;
12. Liberty Property Trust;
13. Naval Air Joint Reserve Station – Willow Grove; and
14. Suburban Cyclists Unlimited.

The purpose of the interviews was to gather opinions, ideas, and comments to help the study committee make informed decisions. A standard set of questions to which the Study Committee sought a response was sent to the key persons in advance of the interview date so that they could address the topics ahead of time with others from their organization to form responses that truly represented their constituency. Key persons were given the opportunity to interview face-to-face, over the telephone, or by filling out and returning the questionnaire.

It is important to note that the interviews were intended to supplement the survey findings, which served as the primary tool for estimating customers' recreation needs. It is not possible to treat the responses from the interviews as a data set that can be merged with the survey data to create a collective prioritized list of needs. Although the responses must be considered individually, they confirm many of the recreation preferences revealed previously. The following facilities were identified as needed by the entities that were interviewed:

- a multi-purpose building serving many groups, with meeting space and kitchen facilities;
- an outdoor amphitheater for performing arts;
- indoor basketball courts (multi-purpose gym);
- baseball fields;
- active recreation (more emphasis);
- a swimming pool;
- soccer fields;
- a dog park;
- a golf course;
- bikeable roads;
- lacrosse fields;
- neighborhood park development (Chestnut Creek Park, playground & walking trail); and
- a camping area.

A question-by-question breakdown of the answers gathered during the interviews is

presented in Appendix E.

STANDARDS COMPARISON

Overview

The survey findings revealed a wealth of information about customers' recreational interests and preferences. Although a survey is perhaps the best way of analyzing public recreational needs, other methods of analysis can be used in conjunction with a survey to refine the findings and conclusions.

The second method used, in part, to assess public recreational needs in this chapter involves population ratio standards. Population ratio standards are numerical expressions that relate population size to recreational demand.

Standards had been widely used in the past by governmental jurisdictions across the country to quantify the amount of needed public parkland. And they continue to be used as generic guidelines to this day. For decades, the National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA), a national organization of persons in the parks and recreation and allied professions, advocated the use of standards as a tool for helping to frame what a community's park and recreation land requirements should be.

Standards were not intended to serve as a definitive yardstick against which to measure the adequacy and size of a park system. Instead, the NRPA suggested that standards be adapted to suit community-specific conditions and unique and changing needs from one community to the next. However, in practice, standards were misused as they often were applied indiscriminately regardless of local factors and modifications that should have been made.

Current practice recommended by the NRPA for municipal recreation planning, and more specifically for quantifying the amount of parkland needed, no longer relies on standards but rather involves a complex process of determining levels of service for facilities. The level of service approach basically identifies the types and numbers of facilities that are in demand and then translates the demand into the amount of land (acreage) needed to accommodate the facilities. The requirements for undertaking this approach precluded it from being applied for this plan, as not enough baseline data were available to support the methodology. Therefore, standards remain as one of the tools used to assess the overall supply of parkland acreage in Horsham Township.

NRPA's former standards called on communities to provide a minimum total of 7.5 to 12.6 acres of parkland for every 1,000 residents. These numbers reflected a 20 percent contingency built into the acreages to account for unexpected increases in recreation activity that could subsequently require more parkland than would commonly be needed for 1,000 people. Because it is presumed that most communities would be unable to satisfy their customers' parkland needs simply by

providing a single large park, the standards further recommended that the total parkland acreage be distributed with 76 percent of the acreage devoted to neighborhood parks and the remaining 24 percent allocated to community parks.

Since there is a 5.1-acre difference between the high and low acreages of the range, a decision had to be made locally as to what number should be used to conduct a standards comparison. Rather than apply the low acreage or take a middle-of-the-road approach by using the midpoint of the range, it was decided to use the top of the range – 12.6 acres. Because Township officials strive to meet public parkland needs to a high degree, using the upper end of the range reflects that philosophy. In terms of the decision to use a standard of 12.6 acres per 1,000 customers, the distribution among neighborhood parks and community parks becomes 9.6 and 3.0 acres, respectively.

A second decision also had to be made. Since standards are traditionally applied as per the population of the community (i.e., primary customers, as noted in Chapter 2), thought had to be given as to how to factor in the secondary customers that the Township acknowledges will also be served by the parks. It was decided that demand for parkland generated by nonresidents who work in the township is expected to be one-quarter as much as the demand from the primary customers. In other words, the parkland standard of 12.6 acres per 1,000 persons would apply to the primary customer population, but a lesser standard of 3.15 acres per 1,000 persons would apply to the secondary customer population.

By using standards in conjunction with population data, it is possible to estimate how much community and neighborhood parkland should be provided both now and in the future. Then, by comparing these estimates to the existing parkland supply, the extent to which needs are not being met now or will not be met in the future can be measured. The following hypothetical example illustrates how a "standards comparison" is conducted:

$$\begin{array}{r}
 10 \text{ (the number of acres needed to serve a given population)} \\
 -6 \text{ (the number of acres that exist)} \\
 = 4 \text{ (the unmet need or deficit in the supply of acreage)}
 \end{array}$$

When conducting a standards comparison, two factors must be considered. First, only parkland that is Township-owned or under a formal use agreement with the Township can be counted as meeting recreation needs. Parks and recreation areas must be unrestricted and open to the public before they can be considered as part of the "supply" base. Though school, quasi-public, and private recreation areas serve limited sectors of the population, the lack of consistency regarding public accessibility to these sites requires that they not be counted towards meeting needs as suggested by standards.

The second factor or criterion used to select qualifying "supply" resources relates to parkland acreage. Community parks serve as dual-purpose recreation areas in that they typically not only serve as larger areas offering facilities of interest to all

customers township-wide, but they also function as neighborhood parks for residents who live nearby. For this reason, a community park can be counted twice as meeting acreage requirements. The entire acreage is counted once toward meeting community park acreage needs, and up to 10 acres (the typical recommended size of a neighborhood park) is counted a second time toward meeting neighborhood park acreage needs.

A table of the current supply of parkland that qualifies for the standards is shown in Figure 44. The following observations are made about the parks relative to the criteria for the standards comparison:

- All but one of the seven community parks also function as neighborhood parks. Chestnut Creek Park, which does not offer a diversity of recreation facilities to attract local resident use from the “neighborhood,” is the exception.
- The Power Line Trail straddles two customer service areas, with approximately one-half of its distance in area D and the other half in area E. While the 7.5-acre corridor functions as a community park, the acreage can be equally divided between the two areas (i.e., 3.75 acres each) for meeting neighborhood parkland needs.

Figure 44
 Qualifying Supply Resources

| Site Name and Classification | | Community Parkland <small>(acreage)</small> | Neighborhood Parkland <small>(acreage)</small> |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|--|
| COMMUNITY PARKLAND: | | | |
| C1 | Chestnut Creek Park | 64.60 | na |
| C2 | Cedar Hill Road Park | 87.00 | 10.00 |
| C3 | Kohler Park | 71.42 | 10.00 |
| C4 | Deep Meadow Park | 51.88 | 10.00 |
| C5 | Samuel Carpenter Park | 30.98 | 10.00 |
| C6 | Power Line Trail | 7.50 | 7.50 (note 1) |
| C7 | Lukens Park at Dresher Road | 50.68 | 10.00 |
| NEIGHBORHOOD PARKLAND: | | | |
| N1 | Hideaway Hills Park | na | 2.86 |
| N2 | Jarrett Road Park | na | 2.31 |
| N3 | Sawyers Way Park | na | 11.66 |
| N4 | Whetstone Tot-Lot | na | 1.32 |
| N5 | Saw Mill Lane Tot-Lot | na | 1.97 |
| N6 | Maple Park | na | 7.46 |
| N7 | Meetinghouse Park | na | 6.50 |
| N8 | Wayne Avenue Park | na | 1.40 |
| N9 | Blair Mill Park | na | 3.35 |

Note:

1. Neighborhood acreage divided equally between customer service areas D and E.

Figure 45 estimates parkland needs using two dates in time – the years 2000 and 2025. A column for the population of each of the two customer groups, primary and secondary, is provided for both years. The breakdown of the year 2000 populations for the customer service areas was derived from:

- primary customers – Bureau of Census data, block level analysis; and
- secondary customers – Township estimates as to the geographic distribution of workers in the community.

The 2025 population forecasts were derived by assuming that the distribution of residents and workers among the customer service areas would remain the same into the future. Therefore, the township-wide projections for both customer groups were divided between the five areas in accordance with the same percentage breakdowns as existed in 2000.

Figure 45
 Standards Comparison

| Geographic Area and Year | Primary Customer Population | Secondary Customer Population | Total Customer Base (note 1) | Total Acreage Needed | Current Acreage Supplied | Surplus or Deficit |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| COMMUNITY PARKS: | | | | | | |
| Township-wide: | | | | | | |
| Year 2000 | 24,232 | 26,050 | 30,745 | 295.15 | 364.06 | 68.91 surplus |
| Year 2025 | 30,890 | 31,000 | 38,640 | 370.94 | 364.06 | -6.88 deficit |
| NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS: | | | | | | |
| Customer Service Area A: | | | | | | |
| Year 2000 | 1,303 | 2,605 | 1,954 | 5.86 | 20 | 14.14 surplus |
| Year 2025 | 1,661 | 3,100 | 2,436 | 7.31 | 20 | 12.69 surplus |
| Customer Service Area B: | | | | | | |
| Year 2000 | 7,457 | 1,824 | 7,913 | 23.74 | 18.71 | -5.03 deficit |
| Year 2025 | 9,506 | 2,170 | 10,048 | 30.15 | 18.71 | -11.44 deficit |
| Customer Service Area C: | | | | | | |
| Year 2000 | 3,872 | 1,303 | 4,198 | 12.59 | 12.86 | 0.27 surplus |
| Year 2025 | 4,936 | 1,550 | 5,323 | 15.97 | 12.86 | -3.11 deficit |
| Customer Service Area D: | | | | | | |
| Year 2000 | 4,347 | 7,294 | 6,171 | 18.51 | 16.06 | -2.45 deficit |
| Year 2025 | 5,541 | 8,680 | 7,711 | 23.13 | 16.06 | -7.07 deficit |
| Customer Service Area E: | | | | | | |
| Year 2000 | 7,253 | 13,025 | 10,509 | 31.53 | 28.7 | -2.83 deficit |
| Year 2025 | 9,246 | 15,500 | 13,121 | 39.36 | 28.7 | -10.66 deficit |

Note:

1. Sum total of 100% of the primary customers and 25% of the secondary customers.

The sixth column of Figure 45 shows the current parkland supply in the township as a whole and for each customer service area. The standards are then applied for the current population and the forecasted population to show the total demand and how it is affected by projected changes in the customer base.

Community Park Needs

Comparing how many acres the township should have (as per the locally-tailored standards) to the existing supply reveals that there is now a surplus of 68.91 acres of community parkland. The surplus is projected to turn into a deficit as the customer population grows, ultimately peaking at almost 7 acres in the year 2025. The acreage deficit is not large enough to warrant the provision of another community park based on size alone. Other factors, such as whether the community parks are equitably distributed throughout the community to serve the population, will need to be studied to confirm or deny this conclusion.

Neighborhood Park Needs

Neighborhood parks are meant to provide spaces and facilities for residents close to their homes. These parks should be tied into nearby residential areas by sidewalks, trails, and bicycle-friendly roads to assure safe pedestrian and bicycle access. The concept of safe accessibility suggests that each customer service area should have well-placed parks to satisfy its own populations. For this reason, an analysis of the supply and the need for neighborhood parks is organized by customer service area.

Customer Service Area A – Deep Meadow Park and Samuel Carpenter Park qualify as neighborhood parks offering 10 acres each to the supply base for this area. The population is estimated to increase from 1,954 to 2,436, a gain of only 484 persons. According to standards, there is enough acreage to meet the current need as well as the projected 2025 need for this area. The current surplus of 14.1 acres is estimated to drop to 12.7 acres for 2025.

Customer Service Area B – Maple Park, Meetinghouse Park, Wayne Avenue Park, and Blair Mill Park contribute a total of 18.71 acres to the neighborhood park supply. Standards suggest that there should be 23.7 acres of neighborhood parkland to satisfy the year 2000 customer base of 7,913 persons. Furthermore, an additional 6.4 acres will be needed to serve the projected increase of 2,135 customers between now and 2025. With 18.7 acres of existing neighborhood parkland, these needs translate into deficits of 5.0 for 2000 and 11.4 acres for 2025. Using guidelines as to the average size of a neighborhood park, these deficits translate into a need for one more park.

Customer Service Area C – The entirety of Hideaway Hills Park and 10 acres of Cedar Hill Road Park result in a combined 12.86 acres of neighborhood parkland supplied in area C. Deducting this acreage from the amount of parkland needed now (12.6 acres) and in 2025 (16.0 acres) results in a slight surplus for now but leaves a deficit of 3.1 acres into the future. The customer base is expected to increase by 1,125 persons. According to the acreage numbers, the customer base of this area

seems to be well served without the need to provide another park.

Customer Service Area D – Three recreation areas totaling 16.06 acres serve neighborhood parkland needs in this customer service area. These include two community parks (i.e., Kohler Park at 10 acres and the Power Line Trail at 3.75 acres) and the 2.31-acre Jarrett Road Park. With a projected growth of 1,540 additional customers, Seven (7) acres of neighborhood parkland should be acquired between now and 2025 to satisfy the deficiencies in the supply for this area. This acreage, based on site size guidelines, is not great enough to warrant another park.

Customer Service Area E – Lukens Park at Dresher Road and the Power Line Trail provide 10 acres and 3.75 acres, respectively, to the supply of neighborhood parkland in this area. The neighborhood parks of Sawyer's Way Park (11.66 acres), Whetstone Tot-Lot (1.32 acres), and Sawmill Lane Tot Lot (1.97 acres) add another 14.95 acres. Comparing the total supply of 28.7 acres to the acreage needs reveals that this area has a current deficit that will grow to 10.66 acres in 2025 when the customer base reaches 13,121 persons. There was a deficit of 2.8 acres for 2000. The size of the deficit suggests the need for one more neighborhood park.

SERVICE AREA ASSESSMENT

Overview

The distance that a park is located from the population determines, to a large extent, its ability to satisfy public needs. A park should be located within a reasonable distance from the population it is intended to serve. In addition, communities need to have numerous parks distributed throughout the community to ensure that all residential areas are served.

To judge whether existing parks are well-distributed and if residential areas of the township are underserved by community and neighborhood parkland, "service area guidelines" can be used. These guidelines prescribe how far away residents can live from a park and yet be considered to be served by it. They are expressed in terms of straight-line distances (radii) from park boundaries. For example, it is suggested that a community park should ideally serve no more than a population living within a 2-mile radius of the park's boundaries. For a neighborhood park, a .5-mile service radius from the park applies.

It should be noted that service radii distances are based on professional judgment reflecting typical patterns and probabilities of park use. For example, the ability of a park to service the average person would be diminished if the ideal distance were exceeded. This does not preclude, however, the possibility that people may travel farther to reach a park. Because of this limitation, the radii should serve as general yardsticks against which to measure the ability of a park to service the people, but should be adjusted as necessary to suit unique local conditions.

The same list of recreation areas that qualify as community and neighborhood parks for the standards comparison can be used to conduct a service area assessment (refer to Figure 46). Once again, community parks, except for Chestnut Creek Park,

function as dual-purpose recreation areas. Service areas for these 6 parks include geographic areas equivalent to .5-mile and 2-mile radii emanating from their park boundaries. Only a 2-mile service area radius applies to Chestnut Creek Park, as it functions solely as a community park. And only a .5-mile service area radius applies to the 9 neighborhood parks.

Figure 46
 Park Service Areas

| Site Name and Classification | Neighborhood Park | Community Park |
|--|-------------------|-----------------|
| | .5-mile distance | 2-mile distance |
| COMMUNITY PARKS: | | |
| C1 Chestnut Creek Park | | X |
| C2 Cedar Hill Road Park | X | X |
| C3 Kohler Park | X | X |
| C4 Deep Meadow Park | X | X |
| C5 Samuel Carpenter Park | X | X |
| C6 Power Line Trail | X | X |
| C7 Lukens Park at Dresher Road | X | X |
| NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS: | | |
| N1 Hideaway Hills Park | X | |
| N2 Jarrett Road Park | X | |
| N3 Sawyers Way Park | X | |
| N4 Whetstone Tot-Lot | X | |
| N5 Saw Mill Lane Tot-Lot | X | |
| N6 Maple Park | X | |
| N7 Meetinghouse Park | X | |
| N8 Wayne Avenue Park | X | |
| N9 Blair Mill Park | X | |
| SCHOOL PARKS: | | |
| S1 Limekiln Simmons Elementary School | X | |
| S2 Dorothea H. Simmons Elementary School | X | X |
| S3 Hatboro-Horsham High School | X | X |
| S4 Hallowell Elementary School | X | |
| S5 Keith Valley Middle School | X | X |
| S6 Blair Mill Elementary School | X | |

Recreation areas that qualify for inclusion in the service area assessment differ somewhat from the standards comparison in that schools that are accessible for public recreation can also be factored into this analysis. Chapter 3 noted the importance of the Hatboro-Horsham School District in offering recreation facilities to meet the basic recreational needs of customers. Of the 6 school parks in the township, 3 are large enough and offer a diversity of recreation facilities to qualify as sites for both neighborhood- and community-oriented recreation and, therefore, can

have both .5-mile and 2-mile radii emanating from them:

- Dorothea H. Simmons Elementary School;
- Hatboro-Horsham High School; and
- Keith Valley Middle School.

The Limekiln Simmons Elementary, Hallowell Elementary, and Blair Mill Elementary schools are classified as neighborhood park resources serving customers within one-half mile from them.

Figure 47 is a map showing how the service area guidelines apply to the township. The map graphically represents two geographic areas: 1) a “blob” for the area that is collectively served by neighborhood parks as well as community parks, and 2) other areas served only by community parks. A basic interpretation of the map is that the distribution of community parks appears to be adequate. There is no part of the township that does not lie within the service area of a qualifying “community park.” In terms of the provision of closer-to-home recreation opportunities, the distribution of qualifying “neighborhood parks” is focused in the core of the township where the greatest number of primary customers live. The areas not served by a neighborhood park are generally along the fringes of the community, within the confines of the naval air station, and in the northern portion of the township.

From a location and spatial perspective, customers could be better served by parks. Additional analysis of customers’ recreation facility (i.e., ball fields, ball courts, etc.) needs will indicate whether there are shortfalls of available facilities within the parks. Another analysis that is important to consider is the accessibility of the parks for pedestrians and bicyclists.

The service area guidelines imply the need for good pedestrian and bicycle access to parks. For driving, there is little difference between a .5-mile and a 2-mile distance. However, for residents who wish to walk or bike rather than drive to parks, quick, safe and easy access and ideal travel times are recommended. Generally speaking, reasonable goals are for the travel time to a community park to be 30 minutes for walking and 15 minutes for bicycling. The travel time to a neighborhood park for walking and bicycling should be 15 minutes and 5 minutes, respectively. Rather than try to provide parks within these timing parameters, it is much more beneficial to ensure that customers have safe routes through their neighborhoods and connecting to the parks that are intended to serve them.

The concept of safe accessibility suggests that each customer service area should have well-placed parks to satisfy its own customer base. This is not to say, however, that some people will not decide to travel to a park outside of the park zone in which they live. As such, the Township should plan its park system so that persons that choose to walk, jog, or bicycle to parks will not be expected to travel along unsafe roads with dangerous crossings. Sidewalks, bicycle-friendly roads, and trails throughout the community will make this possible.

Figure 48 maps the existing pedestrian and bicycle network in the township. The location of sidewalks and trails are shown, but roads that accommodate bicyclists are not. Bicyclists have the legal right under State law to ride on any public road in the township, which theoretically makes all portions of the community and all parks accessible by bike. However, making roads more conducive to bicycling requires the removal of basic bike hazards and, in some cases, special accommodations such as striping, signage, and dedicated bike lanes. Horsham Township does not have any special on-road bike facilities at this time.

An alternative method of mapping roads suited to bicycling is to identify the roads that are not suitable: where the average bicyclist would not feel comfortable sharing the road with motorists. There is an extensive system of low-volume traffic roads in Horsham that are generally safe and compatible for bicycling – for example, the typical residential street with a low posted speed limit and primarily local motorists. Roads in the township that are classified as arterials and collectors are mapped in Figure 48. These carry heavier traffic at higher speeds and are less likely to be used by bicyclists other than those that are experienced riders who can confidently operate under most traffic conditions.

Recommendations in subsequent chapters of this plan will address specific roads that should be retrofitted to better accommodate bicyclists. Certain roads will be designated as fundamental routes for bicycling transportation and access. Those that provide a direct link between key parks where connectivity is either limited or can be greatly enhanced by on-road bicycle facilities will be identified. Recommendations to improve the sidewalk and trails systems will be recommended, too, with an attempt to achieve an interconnected network among the three components.

PUBLIC MEETING INPUT

Overview

The Study Committee conducted the following meetings as part of the planning process, all of which were open to attendance by the general public:

- September 18, 2002;
- October 16, 2002;
- November 20, 2002;
- January 15, 2003;
- February 19, 2003;
- April 30, 2003;
- June 18, 2003;
- July 16, 2003;
- August 20, 2003;
- September 3, 2003
- September 17, 2003
- October 1, 2003;

- October 15, 2003; and
- November 19, 2003.

Page reserved for:
Figure 47
Park Service Area Map
(11x17 front side)

Page reserved for:
Figure 47
Park Service Area Map
(11x17 reverse side)

Page reserved for:
Figure 48
Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Map
(11x17 front side)

Page reserved for:
Figure 48
Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Map
(11x17 reverse side)

These meetings, which were forums designed to review parts of the plan as it was being prepared and to discuss, debate, and resolve related issues, provided citizens in attendance the chance to address their questions and concerns. The minutes of the meetings, including the comments made by the public during them, are a matter of public record. The minutes are available for viewing at the Township administrative offices.

CONCLUSION

This chapter presented the recreation needs of the community. It studied existing conditions and made general conclusions regarding deficiencies in the existing supply of recreation opportunities. The challenge of Horsham Township is to formulate strategies to remedy the deficiencies and better satisfy customers' recreation needs.

