



2010

*FINAL REPORT OF THE GREEN SPACE
ADVISORY PANEL*



Executive Summary

Green Space Advisory Panel Mandate

In many ways, green spaces define a community. Bring to mind a neighbourhood playground, a baseball diamond, a nature trail, a wetland, a community garden, the natural landscape that tells you you are home: all of these are green spaces. From childhood to old age, they form an integral part of our sense of place and our quality of life. They contribute to a healthy, active lifestyle, and a healthy environment. They provide natural services, improve community resilience and livability, lower green house gas emissions, and generate economic benefits. In Northern Ontario, access to open spaces and outdoor recreation is part of who we are. In Greater Sudbury, the decades of reclamation and revegetation efforts brings a special appreciation and responsibility of stewardship for the green space we so enjoy. This is reflected in the importance given to our natural environment in the Official Plan, the Healthy Community Strategy, and the Local Action Plan. In addition, the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan and the Parks, Open Space and Leisure Background Report and Master Plan outlined specific objectives relating to green spaces.



Specifically, Council established in the 2006 Official Plan that two programs be undertaken with respect to green space:

7.2.1 Programs

“2. A park classification system to address the range of Parks and Open Space types and characteristics will be established to guide park acquisition, development, and management. The park classification system will have regard to natural beauty, environmental functions, and recreation value.”

“4. Further delineate natural environment areas in need of municipal protection along with appropriate strategies for conservation and acquisition.”

On October 24th, 2007, Council appointed the Green Space Advisory Panel to implement these Official Plan programs. In addition to the recognition of the value of a comprehensive strategy regarding green spaces in Greater Sudbury, there was a need to address recurring green space issues such as citizen concerns over new developments, and decisions around the disposal or purchase of leisure service properties.

The panel was given the mandate to:

- Recommend to Council a Parks and Open Space Classification System which is suitable for the City of Greater Sudbury as per Official Plan program # 2.
- Recommend to Council natural assets which should be considered for inclusion in the City's Park and Open Space System as per Official Plan program # 4.
- Recommend to Council a rating or evaluation system which might assist Council in establishing acquisition priorities and making park and open space acquisitions.
- Review the City property inventory and recommend to Council properties to be included in the Leisure Services portfolio and identify those Leisure Services properties which should be declared surplus to parks and open space needs and disposed of as per Official Plan policy 7.2.1 (8).

There are 27 members of the Green Space Advisory Panel, including citizen representatives, citizen experts, and City staff. Public input was sought during public open houses and on-line, during April 2010.

Over the past two and a half years, the Panel has drafted the following items for Council's consideration:

- A Parks Classification System
- A list of existing parks classified according to the Parks Classification System
- A Surplus Parkland Disposal Policy
- A rating structure for potential acquisitions; and
- A list of green space opportunities.

This report also includes a discussion of acquisition strategies, and recommendations for moving the work forward.

A Parks Classification System

Our vision:

The Greater Sudbury parkland system meets local, community and city-wide needs for accessible and safe outdoor recreation and education, contributes to a high quality of life for present and future residents, and preserves significant natural features and functions in perpetuity.

A classification system is an important tool for evaluating and managing the parks and open space system. The parkland system meets citizens' needs for natural beauty, outdoor recreation and outdoor education, and fulfills our responsibility as stewards of our natural environment. The classification system reflects these many diverse park types, uses, and values.

The Parks Classification System allows green space to be classified as one of seven types of parks:

- Neighbourhood park - to meet the recreational needs of its immediate neighbourhood.
- Community park - to provide the space and supportive facilities needed for active recreation.
- Regional park - to be a focal point for the City as a whole.
- Linear park - to be a connector for people and/or wildlife.
- Natural park – to protect a natural area while meeting residents’ needs for passive recreation.
- Cultural/historical special purpose park - to protect sites with historic, scientific, cultural, social, or spiritual importance; or to serve a special, specific purpose.
- Ecological reserve - to protect significant natural areas with ecological and/or geological importance, or that capture a characteristic natural feature of the City.

The Parks Classification System provides generic information on each park type: the purpose, general description and use, facilities and features, size, and service area/standard. For example, the standards indicate that every child and adult resident should be within an easy walk of a neighbourhood park and a natural park, and within a 20-minute walk or a short bike ride to a community park. The system of parks is meant to be a connected network, accessible to residents and wildlife of the Greater Sudbury region.

An inventory of green spaces

In order to develop a comprehensive park system for green spaces, make informed decisions, properly manage existing parks and open space, and identify gaps and opportunities, an inventory of green spaces is required.

The Green Space Advisory Panel completed an inventory in three parts:

- lands in the existing Parks and Open Space system;
- other public lands and other recreational lands; and
- green space opportunities - natural assets which should be considered for inclusion in the City’s Park and Open Space System.

These inventories were compiled using GIS mapping, staff knowledge, and knowledge from the panel and the wider community. Sites were classified using the draft Parks Classification System as appropriate, and other pertinent information was also noted, such as location, size, features and facilities, ownership, zoning and land designation.



Establishing acquisition priorities

Having identified green space opportunities, the next step in moving forward is to prioritize these sites in regards to acquisition. The panel developed an approach for establishing acquisition priorities. Using defined criteria, the panel rated green space opportunities using three variables; conservation value, recreation value, and level of risk. The resulting acquisition value could then be rationalized in a consistent manner. In broad terms, acquisition priority is thus rated higher for sites with higher recreation or conservation value, and for vulnerable sites. Need is another factor influencing acquisition priorities. Therefore, a gap analysis will be an important tool in assessing acquisition priorities.

Acquisition strategies

In order to meet the vision of a balanced park system that is: accessible to all residents, meets parkland needs throughout Greater Sudbury, and protects areas of ecological, geological and cultural significance, an effective acquisition strategy is required. The challenge that will be faced in the future is how to address the desire to add to the Green Space inventory with limited financial resources and how to strategically focus acquisition efforts.

Four overarching goals guide the acquisition strategy:

1. Protect ecologically valuable, environmentally sensitive, or unique natural assets.
2. Create and complete networks of physical linkages for people and wildlife.
3. Create and complete a balanced, interconnected parks system meeting local, community and regional passive and active recreational needs.
4. Protect the unique aesthetic and geographic character of the community.

In practical terms, these goals can be met by bringing sites with high/moderate recreation and conservation values into the parks inventory, and filling gaps in the existing parks system.

City owned green space opportunities which have high/moderate conservation and/or recreation value should be zoned as parkland (or a similar zoning category) and brought into the parks inventory over time.

For non-city owned green space opportunities, the highest priority should be given to sites that are ecologically important or sensitive, are important natural assets, or would have high recreational value. The acquisition priority ranking should generally guide future acquisitions and the order in which acquisitions should be addressed. From time to time, significant opportunities to acquire more moderately scored lands may arise and the flexibility to take advantage of these situations should be maintained. The City's Official Plan and Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan contain targets for the amount and location of park properties in the community which will also inform acquisition decisions. The Parks, Open Space and Leisure background report also contains information on which areas of the City are deficient in parkland.

It is important to address the parkland needs of these areas, and to complete an updated gap analysis.

By following this acquisition strategy, the City of Greater Sudbury can achieve a parks system that protects important natural features and functions, meets citizens' park needs throughout the community, provides linkages for people and for wildlife, and maintains our city's unique landscape and natural beauty.



Park Land Disposal Policy

Residents accord special value to parkland. Therefore, additional measures should be taken when considering parkland as surplus, as compared with other City-owned land. In recognition of this, a Park Land Disposal Policy was developed.

The policy consists of three sections:

- The criteria that must be met in order to consider whether to declare a site surplus.
- The requirements for public notification and public input.
- The use of funds from the sale of surplus parkland.

Recommendations and next steps

The Panel recommends that Council approve in principle the final report of the Green Space Advisory Panel dated June 16, 2010. In addition, a number of specific recommendations are made, as stated in the "Recommendation for Council Adoption", attached to the report. The panel recommends that the work specifically mandated by Council be adopted, to fulfill Programs 7.2.1.2 and 7.2.1.4 of the 2006 Official Plan including; adoption of the parkland classification system, parkland disposal policy, and identification, evaluation and prioritization of green space opportunities.

Furthermore, the Panel has a number of recommendations that are necessary for the successful implementation of the acquisition strategy. Financial resources will be necessary to proceed with acquisitions of non-city owned green space opportunities. Therefore, the recommendation is made that Council direct staff to prepare a budget option for next year's budgeting process for park and open space acquisition. The Panel also recommends that this work be utilized as input in the next review of the Official Plan. Finally, to move forward with a comprehensive green space strategy and the implementation of the acquisition strategy, the recommendation is made to continue the Panel, with a mandate defined to meet identified needs and gaps and to respond to questions that Council may have on the parks system from time to time. A number of important tasks were identified for the Panel. Priorities include assessing connectivity, completing a gap analysis, advising and assisting with implementation, examining further opportunities, and advising on the Official Plan review.

Table of Contents

Introduction and Background	2
What is green space?.....	3
What are the benefits of green space?.....	3
Environmental Benefits	4
Benefits to Human Health and Quality of Life	4
Economic Benefits	4
Green Space in the City of Greater Sudbury	5
The Greater Sudbury Green Space Advisory Panel.....	5
Public Consultation	7
Chapter 1: Parks and Open Space Classification System	9
A vision for the parks and open space system	9
Objectives of the Parkland System	10
Park Types	11
Service Area and Provision Standard	16
Connectivity.....	17
Other green space.....	18
Summary	18
Chapter 2: An inventory of Green Spaces	20
An inventory of existing parks.....	20
An inventory of other public lands and other recreational lands	21
An inventory of green space opportunities	21
Summary	23
Chapter 3: Establishing Acquisition Priorities	24
Conservation Value.....	25
Recreation Value.....	26
Level of Risk.....	26
Rating acquisition priorities	26
Acquisition Priority – non-city-owned properties	27
Non-city owned property	28
City owned property	29
Acquisition priorities for identified green space opportunities.....	30
Gap analysis	30
Summary	33
Chapter 4: Acquisition Strategies.....	34
Goals	34
Objectives	34
City Owned Lands with Green Space Potential.....	35
Private Lands with Green Space Potential.....	35
Land Acquisition Options	37
Funding and Resources	41
Summary	41

Chapter 5: Draft Park Land Disposal Policy	43
Park Land Disposal Policy	44
Chapter 6: Recommendations and next steps	47
Adopting the work mandated to the Green Space Advisory Panel by Council	47
Supporting the acquisition strategy and other work of the panel.....	48
Next steps: continuing the work	49
Summary	52
Bibliography	53

List of Appendices

Appendix A	Green Space Advisory Panel Members
Appendix B	Green Space Advisory Panel – Summary of Public Input
Appendix C	Green Space Classification System
Appendix D	Park Management
Appendix E	Existing Parks & Other Public Lands & Recreational Lands List
Appendix F	Green Space Opportunities List – Private Owned Lands
Appendix G	Green Space Opportunities List – City Owned Lands
Appendix H	Acquisition Priority Assessment for Non-City Owned Properties
Appendix I	Acquisition Priority Assessment for City-Owned Properties
Appendix J	Park Land Disposal Policy

List of Maps - CD Attached

Green Space Maps:

Ward 1	Ward 7 Maps 1-5
Ward 2 Maps 1-4	Ward 8
Ward 3 Maps 1-2	Ward 9 Maps 1-2
Ward 4 Maps 1-2	Ward 10
Ward 5	Ward 11
Ward 6 Maps 1-2	Ward 12

Introduction and Background

What is green space?

Green space is a term commonly used to denote parkland, greenways, open space, natural heritage or environment lands, vacant lands, conservation lands or green infrastructure such as drainage ditches. It encompasses a wide variety of sites and uses. Green space is the park where neighbourhood children play, the garden-side bench, the playing fields where recreational and competitive sports leagues hold their games, the community garden donating produce to the food bank, the trail providing a pleasant walk or a convenient route to work, sewage lagoons that provide rest stops for migrating waterfowl or are homes to wetland birds, the woodlot and the farmer's field. Green space is the small patch of bush where people walk their dogs and children play freely, the natural area that brings peace to the end of someone's day, the habitat for native flora and fauna, and the wetlands, floodplains, and woodlands that provide natural services. Green spaces are the lakes and hilltops that make up the characteristic landscape of Greater Sudbury. Green spaces play an important role in the lives of all residents, whatever their age, lifestyle, or walk of life.



What are the benefits of green space?

“Among other benefits, parks and open space also contribute to the preservation and conservation of natural features, provides opportunities for passive recreational activities, provides physical linkages for the movement of humans and animals, and contributes to the aesthetic value of the community” Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan June 2004, p.108

Green space offers many benefits to society including: ecosystem benefits such as wildlife habitat, biological diversity, water storage and air quality/climate moderation; economic benefits such as enhanced property values, tourism opportunities, beautification and improved quality of life; social benefits such as outdoor recreation opportunities, health and wellness, active transportation links; and green infrastructure

benefits such as storm water management. Green space, to a significant degree, helps to define the character of a community or city.

Environmental Benefits

“..the City has adopted the following strategic goal: .. to protect and improve the environmental and ecological health of the community.” Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan June 2004, p.10

Green spaces provide valuable habitat for many species of native flora and fauna. They are a necessary land base for maintaining and increasing biodiversity. Healthy native plant and animal populations are a seed source that can contribute to, and accelerate, natural restoration of other areas. Maintaining green spaces is also one of the key strategies municipalities can use in mitigating and adapting to the effects of climate change. Woodlands, wetlands, and other types of natural areas provide many services, all of which have economic value to the municipality. These include improving air and water quality, moderating extreme temperatures, and reducing peak water flow to the storm sewer system and adjacent water ways.

Benefits to Human Health and Quality of Life

“Environmental protection and preservation is paramount to creating and maintaining a healthy community.” Greater Sudbury Healthy Community Strategy June 2005, p.10

The direct benefits of urban green spaces to physical and mental health are well documented. Urban green spaces and trails also improve health by encouraging healthy living, physical activity, and active transportation. Access to natural areas is an important contributor to residents’ quality of life in the City of Greater Sudbury.

Economic Benefits

Even including the initial cost of acquisition, green space is less costly to taxpayers over both the short and long term than developed land (Association of New Jersey Environmental Commissions, 1996). In fact, open space has been found to be a financial asset to communities, generating net revenue (University of New Hampshire, 1996). In addition, urban green spaces provide valuable services to the municipality such as storm water abatement; soil erosion and sediment control, air pollution control, reduced energy costs, etc. These services have substantial economic value, estimated at over \$100,000 a year for one moderate sized urban green space (The Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 1996; Douglas College, 2001).

Further economic benefits are accrued due to the desirability of green space. Urban green spaces increase the value of surrounding properties, resulting in increased property

tax revenue for the municipality. They also contribute economically by attracting tourists, attracting and retaining professionals and businesses, and by contributing to the overall positive image of the community.

Green Space in the City of Greater Sudbury

“Greater Sudbury’s natural environment is a defining feature of the City’s image and appeal.” Official Plan 2006, p.73

*“A healthy natural environment is critical to Greater Sudbury’s quality of life.”
Official Plan 2006, p. 90*

Natural areas have a special place in Greater Sudbury. Unlike most cities, the City of Greater Sudbury, in addition to having green spaces generally it encompasses agricultural land, forest reserves, provincial parks and conservation reserves. The abundance of lakes, the rocky hills, and the access to outdoor activities are defining characteristics of our community. A high quality of life based on natural beauty, and access to trails and other outdoor recreation opportunities is an important factor in the attractiveness of our City, and is prominent in material used to attract people to move to the City. The City of Greater Sudbury also has a special appreciation of green spaces, due to over three decades of reclamation and greening efforts. The continued need for reclamation of barren lands damaged by historic mining and smelting, and the awareness of the effort behind the natural beauty so enjoyed today brings a special appreciation and responsibility of stewardship, as acknowledged in the Official Plan (p.65).

The Greater Sudbury Green Space Advisory Panel

For the past several years green space issues have emerged throughout the City of Greater Sudbury. Citizen’s concerns have arisen over new development in neighbourhoods that would eliminate private open space which has been appreciated for its green space qualities over the years, and to which neighbouring landowners attribute natural value (e.g. Roxborough, Centennial Drive, Bennett Lake). Green space issues have also emerged when the City has considered the appropriateness of disposal of surplus leisure services property to be placed on the open market, and when the City considered acquisition of key natural assets (e.g. CPR Bay lands) in the context of the need and priority of the purchase. Additionally, local environmentalists indicated a need for the former City’s Natural Asset Report to be reviewed and updated to include the entire City of Greater Sudbury. Finally, the City’s Healthy Community Strategy 2005 advocates that the City should have more linked green space with connecting trails for active green space transportation networks. Taken together, there is a clear need for a comprehensive strategy regarding green spaces in Greater Sudbury.

In the past, green space issues were addressed on an area by area basis in the development of secondary plans, local area plans, community improvement plans or in the former town recreation master plan documents where these existed. At various times, these plans had made recommendations with respect to trail linkages, protection of sensitive areas, or acquisition of key properties. However, there was no clear overall direction. To a certain extent, the Parks, Open Space and Leisure Background Report and Master Plan, and the new City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan examined a number of these issues and made recommendations going forward. However, given the cost and time required to address all issues and develop additional background information, it was not possible to further develop a number of green space issues. Nor was it possible to identify new green space(s) which should be added to the City's current park and open space public land inventory. As well, criteria for prioritizing future green space acquisitions, dispositions and land exchanges were not fully developed.

At the same time the new Master Plan and Official Plan were being developed, the City amalgamation had brought all former town and city public lands into one common ownership.



To address the issues outlined above, Council established in the new Official Plan that two programs would be undertaken with respect to green space:

7.2.1 Programs

“2. A park classification system to address the range of Parks and Open Space types and characteristics will

be established to guide park acquisition, development, and management. The park classification system will have regard to natural beauty, environmental functions, and recreation value.”

“4. Further delineate natural environment areas in need of municipal protection along with appropriate strategies for conservation and acquisition.”

To implement these Official Plan programs and address the green space issues that had arisen, Council appointed the Green Space Advisory Panel on October 24th, 2007. Specifically, the panel was given the mandate to:

- Recommend to Council a Parks and Open Space Classification System which is suitable for the City of Greater Sudbury as per Official Plan program # 2
- Recommend to Council natural assets which should be considered for inclusion in the City's Park and Open Space System as per Official Plan program # 4

- Recommend to Council a rating or evaluation system which might be utilized to assist Council in establishing acquisition priorities and making park and open space acquisitions; and
- Review the City property inventory and recommend to Council properties to be included in the Leisure Services portfolio and identify those Leisure Services properties which should be declared surplus to parks and open space needs and disposed of as per Official Plan policy 7.2.1 (8).

The Panel's work did not include special consideration of rural and agricultural land, or the protection of natural assets that remain in private ownership.

There are 27 members of the Green Space Advisory Panel. This includes five citizen experts, including individuals from VETAC, Rainbow Routes, Nickel District Conservation Authority, and the Ministry of Natural Resources; 14 citizen representatives from 10 wards; nine city staff including representatives from Leisure Services, Planning, Real Estate, and Environmental Initiatives (see Appendix A). All panel members had equal weight, and decisions were made by consensus or general agreement wherever possible. The then Director of Planning Services Bill Lautenbach chaired the meetings of the Panel.

The Panel met approximately 18 times from their inception in 2007 to the release of this report. During this time frame, the Panel drafted the following items for Council's consideration:

- A Parks Classification System
- A list of existing parks classified
- A Surplus Parkland Disposal Policy
- A rating structure for potential acquisitions; and
- A list of potential acquisition sites.

This report also includes a discussion of an acquisition strategy, and recommendations for moving the work forward.

Public Consultation

In forming the panel, an effort was made to include representation from all Wards. This was accomplished, with the exception of Ward 8. Throughout the work of the Panel, all members, including Ward representatives, looked at the 'big picture', in terms of what was best for the City of Greater Sudbury. Ward representatives also took on the responsibility to represent their Ward, seek further input from Community Action Networks and other relevant groups, and make site visits to areas with which they were not personally familiar.

Prior to completing their final report, the Panel conducted a number of open houses and created a website to solicit comments from the public on the work completed to date. Wider public input was especially important in identifying those green spaces that are valued at a neighbourhood level, and are not more widely known.

The public open houses took place on the following dates

- April 13 at the Tom Davies Arena in Lively
- April 14 at the Garson Community Centre in Garson
- April 15 at the Lionel Lalonde Centre in Azilda
- April 20 at the Howard Armstrong Centre in Hanmer
- April 21 at the Dowling Leisure Centre in Dowling
- April 22 at the Tom Davies Square in Sudbury. This open house featured a presentation and a facilitated discussion.

At the centre of the public input initiative was a Green Space Webpage (www.greatersudbury.ca/greenspace) on the City of Greater Sudbury website that featured all of the work of the Panel to date, mapping and an opportunity for the public to submit comments online.

In all, approximately 25 people attended the open houses, and 16 comments were received on the website. Unfortunately, this was a lower response than would have been desired. Respondents reiterated the importance of many of the green space opportunities identified by the panel. They also pointed out some new sites, with five new green space opportunities being added as a result of public comment. Public input and any corresponding action taken by the panel are summarized in Appendix B.



Chapter 1: Parks and Open Space Classification System

In the Official Plan, Council established that the following program would be undertaken:

7.2.1 Programs

2. A park classification system to address the range of Parks and Open Space types and characteristics will be established to guide park acquisition, development, and management. The park classification system will have regard to natural beauty, environmental functions, and recreational value.

A classification system is an important tool for organizing, evaluating and managing the parks and open space system. By defining the diverse types and uses of green space, it allows the most effective management of existing parks, as well as a more precise identification of gaps in service. An effective classification system should:

- Guide the development, acquisition, and management of existing and future parks.
- Provide an easily understandable identity for each park type, so that those referring to a map or list can immediately visualize the basic nature of the parks in question.
- Guide the appropriate management and use of all park types, from developed parks (maintenance of grounds, equipment, and facilities) to ecological reserves (protection and/or restoration of natural ecosystems).
- Support the stated objectives of the parks and open space system (Official Plan, section 7.1).

Some consideration should also be given to matching the classification system with pre-existing categories, to facilitate the process.

A classification that is best suited to the City of Greater Sudbury Parks and Open Space System will be guided by a vision statement, have clear practical objectives, define park types that encompass the diversity of green spaces in the community, and set service area and provision standards consistent with the Official Plan.

A vision for the parks and open space system

The term ‘public parkland’ includes the “land base required for recreational activities and outdoor facilities. Among other benefits, parks and open space also contributes to the preservation and conservation of natural features, provides opportunities for passive recreational activities, provides physical linkages for the movement of humans and animals, and contributes to the aesthetic value of the community” (Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan, Section 7.1 pg 108; June 2004).



In so many ways, parkland is an essential part of our community. What is the vision we strive for, for our parkland? That every child can run to a neighbourhood park to play with their friends, or to a natural area to explore and discover nature and their own imagination. That every citizen can find beauty, peace of mind, and the company of their neighbours in parkland that is an easy walk from their home. That outdoor recreational sports can be played throughout the community. That our city's unique geography and natural beauty is maintained as part of the identity of our community. That natural features, sensitive ecosystems and wildlife habitat are conserved. That parkland is connected by trails and linkages for humans and wildlife.

A **vision statement** brings all of this together:

The Greater Sudbury parkland system meets local, community and city-wide needs for accessible and safe outdoor recreation and education, contributes to a high quality of life for present and future residents, and preserves significant natural features and functions in perpetuity.

Objectives of the Parkland System

The Greater Sudbury parkland system meets citizens' needs for natural beauty, outdoor recreation and outdoor education, and fulfills our responsibility as stewards of our natural environment. It recognizes the value of parkland to human health and quality of life, and the obligation to preserve and enhance our natural environment through the maintenance, restoration and enrichment of native flora and fauna.

Specifically, the following objectives should be met:

1. To provide areas of land and water for passive and active recreational activities, outdoor facilities, and aesthetic value that complements the unique natural and cultural character of the Sudbury region.
2. To protect ecologically valuable, environmentally sensitive, or unique natural assets. Ecological value should be protected in core natural areas that is home to

- native flora and fauna in as large and contiguous areas as possible. Regard should be made to potential natural assets, with changing future conditions due to revegetation, reclamation, and natural recovery.
3. To provide physical corridors or linkages for humans and wildlife. Linkages should provide people with connections between parks, neighbourhoods, and other key destinations, and provide wildlife with linkages between core natural areas.
 4. To sustain the 'global recognition' that Greater Sudbury has within science, reclamation and research communities.

Park Types

The classification system defines a number of park types that encompass the diverse range of needs, use and functions of parkland. In deciding on the categories of park types, recommendations were taken from the Parks, Open Space and Leisure Background Report (2004), examples from other communities were examined, and Panel members contributed their experience and expertise. Once a classification system was drafted, it was tested by categorizing existing parks, to ensure that it was a good match for the diversity of parks in Greater Sudbury.

The classification system has the following park types:

Neighbourhood Park: A Neighbourhood Park's primary purpose is to meet the recreational needs of its immediate neighbourhood.

Depending on the needs of the residents, it could include a playground, community gardens, passive space with benches, paths, informal natural areas, or other options. In response to residents' needs, a neighbourhood park may change over time. St. Charles Lake Park is an example of a Neighbourhood Park.



Community Park: A Community Park's primary purpose is to provide the space and supportive facilities needed for active recreation in the community.

A community park is characterized by sports fields and/or other sports facilities, but often includes opportunities for other uses such as play equipment, paths, picnic areas, or natural areas. A Community Park will often meet nearby residents' needs for a park in their neighbourhood (and so is understood to play a dual role as a neighbourhood park for that area). However, distinct from a Neighbourhood Park, a Community Park is designed to serve the active recreational needs of the wider community. Meatbird Lake Park is an example of a Community Park.



Regional Park: A Regional Park's primary purpose is to be a focal point for the City as a whole, due to its unique attributes, function, and size. It may also be a tourist attraction.

A Regional Park will often meet nearby residents' needs for a park in their neighbourhood (and so is understood to play a dual role as a neighbourhood park for that area). However, distinct from a Neighbourhood Park, a Regional Park is designed to play a unique role, and to serve the entire City. Bell Park is the classic example of a Regional Park.



Linear Park: The primary purpose of a Linear Park is to be a connector linking different areas of the City. Linear Parks may be trails/paths, waterways, or habitat corridors.

Linear Parks will often run through, or connect to, other parkland or neighbourhoods. These connections should be noted in the park description as they enhance all parks involved by contributing to connectivity of greenspaces in the system. The Junction Creek Waterway Park and the Rotary Trail are two examples of Linear Parks.



Natural Park: The primary purpose of a Natural Park is the protection of a natural area while meeting residents' needs for passive recreation.

A Natural Park may be small or large, and may serve a neighbourhood, community, or entire region. Lake Laurentian Conservation Area is an example of a natural park of regional significance. The primary focus of a Natural Park is the protection of the natural area. Therefore, even Natural Parks known only to local residents are distinct from Neighbourhood Parks, which can be developed in diverse ways (e.g., Oak Hill).



Cultural/Historical Special Purpose Park: The primary purpose of a Cultural/Historical Special Purpose Park is to protect sites with historic, scientific, cultural, social, or spiritual importance. *Anderson Farm and the Copper Cliff Roast Beds are examples of this.* Alternatively, it can serve a special, specific purpose. *Skateboard parks would be examples.*



Ecological Reserve: The primary purpose of an Ecological Reserve is to protect significant natural areas with ecological and/or geological importance, or that capture a characteristic natural feature of the City. Use will be restricted appropriately to meet this purpose. *An example is the Vermillion River Wetlands.*



Photo provided by Rainbow Routes

Note that arenas, pools, or other recreational facilities that do not have an accompanying park land base are classified simply as ‘Facility’.

A Classification Table provides more detail for each park type, under the headings of **purpose, general description, facilities/features, size, and service area/standard** (see Appendix C). These headings are taken from the suggested parkland classification system in the Parks, Open Space and Leisure Background Report (Table 6-1, 2004), with the addition of a **purpose** heading.

Given the diverse purposes of these park types, appropriate use will differ. For example, natural parks will have very limited development, if any, and will support low-impact, passive recreation. This contrasts with the development of playing fields, play structures, and sports facilities in community parks. These different appropriate uses and management are summarized in Appendix D.

In the case of natural parks and ecological reserves, a management plan should be developed, such as the one being developed for the Roxborough Greenbelt. Management plans can also be useful for other large parks, parks of regional significance, and parks where a community group has an interest in making improvements or changes. Especially in the latter case, the community should be fully involved in developing and implementing an appropriate plan. There have been many successful examples of such community partnerships. One such example is the Rick MacDonald park site in Azilda which saw over 250 volunteers of all ages put in trails and gardens, paint fences, and install play equipment and skateboard ramps.

In some cases, a site appears to fit well into more than one park type. However, there is almost always one dominant park type that best described the primary purpose of a particular green space. Each park is classified as the one park type that best fits its purpose and character. Important information will not be lost, however. Other park types that apply are included as the first information in the description of each site. Other important information is also captured. Specific information required is specified in the ‘description’ row of the classification table.

Some specific examples are:

- Neighbourhood Parks: The special cases of ‘tot lots’ or ‘school parks’ must be noted.
- Regional Park: The description should include a list of those attributes, attractions, and/or venues that make the park unique.
- Linear Park: The description must specify whether it is a ‘trail/pathway’, ‘waterway’, or ‘habitat corridor’.
- Natural Parks: The dominant landscapes and natural assets included in the park must be listed in the description – this will not only give a clear picture of the park, but is important for park management decisions. If the park is considered to be important to the region (rather than to a smaller community),

this should also be clearly noted. Most Provincial Parks, with the exception of nature reserve class parks and conservation reserves within the limits of Greater Sudbury would be included in this type.

- Cultural/Historical Special Purpose Park: The description must explain the specific importance of the site, and the facilities included (if any).
- Ecological Reserve: As with natural parks, the dominant landscapes and natural assets included in the park must be listed in the description – this will not only give a clear picture of the park, but is important for park management decisions. Potential and known ANSI and/or provincial significance must be noted. Nature reserve class provincial parks would fit into this park type. Regional or local significance should also be noted.
- For all park types: it should be noted if the park adds to an existing or proposed Linear Park (i.e. the linear park will run through the park, or connect directly to it).

Occasionally, a green space may be divided into two distinct types – in essence, defining two adjacent green spaces. An example would be the James Jerome playing fields (community park) and the Lily Creek marsh and board walk area (natural park). In this case, each section should receive its own distinct classification.

Service Area and Provision Standard

Park type addresses the diverse roles of green space. Service areas and provision standards address the amount and accessibility of green space for residents.

In the Official Plan, Council established the following policy:

7.2.1 Policies

7. To guide the development of a parks system, the City will use as a target for acquisition the objective of four (4) hectares of Parks and Open Space per 1,000 residents within 800 metres of residential areas, without having to cross a major barrier such as a railway line or Arterial Roads.

In addition to this overall policy, the Parks, Open Space and Leisure Background Report (2004) suggested more detailed Service Areas and Provision Standards (Table 6-1: Suggested Parkland Classification System for the City of Greater Sudbury). Adapting these standards to the classification system:

- Neighbourhood Parks should be within a 10 minute walk without crossing major barriers, with a minimum of 0.25 ha per 1000 residents.
- Community Parks should serve communities and settlement areas, be within a 20 minute walk without crossing major barriers, with a minimum of 1.5 ha per 1000 residents.

- Regional Parks serve the entire City, with a minimum of 2.25 ha per 1000 residents.
- Linear and Natural Parks should be within a 10 minute walk without crossing major barriers. For the latter, larger sizes (>2 ha) are preferable where possible. In addition, natural parks will be identified based on natural value, independent of service standards or accessibility.
- Cultural/Historical Special Purpose Parks and Ecological Reserves are site determined. The focus is on preserving worthy sites, not on specific service standards. In general, larger, contiguous areas are best for ecological function. Connectivity to other green space is also important.

Returning to the initial vision, these provision standards translate into every child and adult resident being within an easy walk of a neighbourhood park and a natural park, every community being within a 20-minute walk or a short bike ride to a community park, the protection of cultural and historical sites, and the protection of significant natural areas with ecological and/or geological importance and characteristic natural features of the City.

Connectivity

Connectivity is another important measure of the function of green space, both in terms of trail linkages for people, and for corridors for movement among core habitats. As such, it is a strategic quality of an effective and efficient park system. Connectivity of natural habitat that links parks, whether through corridors or ‘stepping stones’ is an important measure of functional green space. This is true for trail linkages for people, and for movement of wildlife between core habitats that sustain natural biodiversity. Known linkages have been included as important information in the classification of a park. Neither the Official Plan, nor the Parks, Open Space and Leisure Background Report (2004) provide a quantitative measure or standard for connectivity. This would be a valuable addition.



Connectivity at one level can be a measure of whether a green space is physically linked to other near-by green space. It is preferred that areas be connected where possible, especially the community, regional, natural, ecological reserve, and linear type parks (which may themselves act as connectors).

Some services and other land use functions may interrupt otherwise continuous green space. Many of these are essential infrastructure and land uses (e.g., roads, railways, pipelines, agricultural land). However, it is possible to mitigate their impacts to reduce



the number and width of separations between green space. It is the combined mosaic of diverse land uses that reflect the quality of life for residents. Green space in the urban and rural context should be arrayed in such a way that residents should be able to walk, run or cycle to green space parks without prohibitive barriers (e.g., roadways that do not allow pedestrian crossings to access park space). In the same way, properly planned green space should

minimize barriers to natural movement of wildlife between core park types. When a core park space is not connected to any other parks, it is fragmented from other park areas and will lose natural diversity over time. In moving forward, the classification system will be a useful tool when connecting park types with an emphasis on linking larger areas, and the long term goal of connecting all green space parks.

Other green space

The classification system identifies the diverse needs and roles of parkland within Greater Sudbury. It is important to note that the municipal parks system is not the only land base meeting park needs, and green space is more broadly defined than parkland. As described in the next chapter, these lands are included in the inventory of green spaces (see Appendix E). Where appropriate, these properties are classified by park type, according to their attributes and use. Other pertinent information is also listed.

This land base can include properties such as public open space and cemeteries that may be used for passive recreation, as well as more functional city owned green spaces such as buffers around landfills, sewage lagoons and green infrastructure. It can also include properties such as Provincial Crown Lands in Provincial Parks and conservation reserves, conservation areas under the management of the NDCA, recreational lands surrounding universities, colleges and other educational institutions, and privately owned recreational land such as a ski hill or trails.

Summary

A classification system is an important tool for evaluating and managing the parks and open space system. By defining the diverse types and uses of parkland, it allows the most effective management of existing parks, as well as a more precise identification of gaps in service. The classification system is guided by the vision statement: *the Greater Sudbury parkland system meets local, community and city-wide needs for accessible and safe outdoor recreation and education, contributes to a high quality of life for present*

and future residents, and preserves significant natural features and functions in perpetuity. The parkland system meets citizens' needs for natural beauty, outdoor recreation and outdoor education, and fulfills our responsibility as stewards of our natural environment. It recognizes the value of parkland to human health and quality of life, and the obligation to preserve and enhance our natural environment through the maintenance, restoration and enrichment of native flora and fauna. The classification system reflects these many diverse park types, uses and values. Parks were classified as: neighbourhood park, community park, regional park, linear park, natural park, cultural/historical special purpose park, or ecological reserve. For each park type, the purpose, general description and use, facilities and features, size, and service area/standard were determined. The system of parks is meant to be a connected (not fragmented) network, accessible to residents and wildlife of Greater Sudbury.

Chapter 2: An inventory of Green Spaces

In order to develop a comprehensive strategy for green spaces, make decisions that have regard to the big picture (as opposed to on a case by case basis), properly manage existing parks and open space, and identify gaps and opportunities, an inventory of green spaces is required. The Green Space Advisory Panel has completed an inventory in three parts:

- An inventory of lands in the existing Parks and Open Space system (see Appendix E)
- An inventory of other public lands and other recreational lands, including other city owned lands (see Appendix E); and
- An inventory of green space opportunities: publicly and privately owned sites identified as having green space potential (see Appendix F).

	Existing Park		Opportunities CGS		Opportunities Private		Other public lands		TOTAL	
	#	ha	#	ha	#	ha	#	ha		
Regional Park	18	432.3	0	0	2	173.6	1	9.8	21	615.7
Community Park	39	207.3	0	0	2	18.4	5	264.2	46	489.9
Neighbourhood Park	167	405.6	1	0.1	7	20.9	10	19.4	185	446
Natural Park	42	2611.4	6	9.4	63	10067	3	1026.6	114	13714
Linear Park	23	90.8	2	0.7	40	1679.5	2	8	67	1779
Ecological reserve	1	18.8	0	0	9	2924.7	5	1771.7	15	4715.2
Special Purpose Park	18	40.1	1	5.2	3	143.7	1	2	23	191
Facility	9	26.8	0	0	0	0	3	93.7	12	120.5
Brownfield	0	0	0	0	2	20.6	0	0	2	20.6
Forest Reserve	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4722.5	2	4722.5
School	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	98.2	11	98.2
Provincial Park	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2947.7	2	2947.7
Other	6	25	0	0	7	297.5	2	21.6	15	344.1
TOTAL	323	3858.1	10	15.4	135	15345.9	47	10985.4	515	30205

Notes:

Totals may not sum do to rounding.

Facilities are some but not all: arenas, pools, rowing club, navy league, yacht club, lasalle cemetery, beach, Golf Course

Other includes all lands not classified at the time the report was written

Prepared by the Community & Strategic Planning Section, City of Greater Sudbury

31-May-10

All of these sites can be viewed on the attached CD.

An inventory of existing parks

Using existing lists from Leisure Services, GIS mapping, and input from the Panel, an inventory of existing parks was completed. All existing parks were classified with the draft Classification System,. Other pertinent information was also noted, including:



location, size, features and facilities, ownership, zoning and land designation (see Appendix E). Each site was viewed and discussed individually by the panel. Note that staff ensured that all existing parks are either zoned 'P' or compatible zoning such as 'I', during the review of the new draft Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw.

An inventory of other public lands and other recreational lands

Within Greater Sudbury, many important recreational lands are outside of the municipal parks system. Many schoolyards, for example, serve as neighbourhood parks. The walking and cross-country ski trails on Laurentian University lands and on Lake Laurentian Conservation Area lands are among the most valued green spaces in our community. In addition, Crown land, Provincial Parks and conservation reserves occur within the City of Greater Sudbury. These are public lands. Some private lands also have an established role as green space. The Onaping Ski Hill is an example of privately owned green space that is formally recognized as important recreational land. An inventory of these public and other recreational lands was compiled using GIS mapping, staff knowledge, and knowledge from the Panel and the wider community (see Appendix E). This Appendix also includes City owned Open Space that is neither an existing park nor a green space opportunity (e.g. landfill buffers). All city owned land, compiled with GIS information and staff knowledge, is shown on the attached CD.

An inventory of green space opportunities

In the New Official Plan (adopted June 2006), Council established that one of the programs that should be undertaken, with respect to green space, is as follows:

7.2.1 Programs

4. Further delineate natural environmental areas in need of municipal protection along with appropriate strategies for conservation and acquisition

With this program from the Official Plan and with no official identification of new green space that should be added to the City's inventory, one of the Green Space Advisory Panel mandates is to:

- Recommend to Council natural assets which should be considered for inclusion in the City's Park and Open Space Systems as per Official Plan program #4

The Green Space Advisory Panel held their first meeting on Tuesday, November 27, 2007. At this initial meeting, the Panel was introduced to all members, presented with the importance of green space and its use in a city, provided with in-depth background material, and were introduced to the Panel's tasks over the next three years. At the conclusion of this meeting, the Panel was asked to choose five ward specific green spaces and five city-wide green spaces in other wards in the City of Greater Sudbury that should be included within the City's Park and Open Space System. These green space opportunities could be city-owned property, other public property, or private property.

To guide the Panel in this initial task, the following was provided:

- Supporting documents, which included:
 - Parks, Open Space & Leisure MASTER PLAN (June 2004);
 - Parks, Open Space and Leisure Background Report (July 2004);
 - Official Plan (June 2006)
 - Natural Assets Report;
 - Current Park inventory;
and
 - Maps.
- Expertise from:
 - Expert members;
 - City staff members; and
 - Ward members' own knowledge of their area and its green spaces and how they are accessed and used.



The Panel also learned that the Parks, Open Space & Leisure MASTER PLAN (June 2004) calls for the following green space standards:

- An emphasis on acquiring sites greater than 4 hectares in size;
- A city standard of 4 hectares of developed parkland per 1000 population;
- A city standard that playground sites be within 800 metres of residential areas; and
- An aim to attain a balanced system with wide accessibility and equitable distribution.

The initial “wish list” of five ward specific and five city wide green spaces provided a starting point for the panel to discuss and review needed green space in the City. This initial list was added to with the goal of a comprehensive inventory of green space opportunities for each ward. To this end, ward representatives examined maps, spoke to other residents in their wards, including Community Action Networks and community groups, where possible, and physically explored their ward. For several months, each meeting began with the ward representative describing his or her ward and the “wish list” green spaces chosen for that ward. Expert members, City staff, ward representatives and other panel members would provide additional information about a particular green

space. This discussion was also aided by the use of GIS to locate a particular green space in the city and its proximity to other green spaces, residential areas, city services and other pertinent information. The supporting material described above further directed the discussion. Also, Panel members were encouraged to physically visit wish list green spaces in their ward to glean additional information such as access to the green space, use by residents, and other important information. Each site was reviewed individually. All green space opportunities were classified with the draft Classification System, and other pertinent information was also noted, including location, size, features and facilities, ownership, zoning and land designation (see Appendix F and Appendix G).

The draft classification system (see Chapter 1), provided a means to see what green space elements were missing from a particular ward or a particular neighbourhood. The Panel felt it was important that all residents in the City of Greater Sudbury had easy access to different types of green spaces, where possible. A variety of green space maintains the City of Greater Sudbury's connection to the natural environment and beautify the city. A large proportion of the 'wish list' sites are natural parks, which reflects the relative lack of this park type in the existing parks system. This also coincides with the preference of residents for passive recreation, recorded in the Parks, Open Space and Leisure Background Report (2004).

The list of green space opportunities was further scrutinized by the community at large through Open Houses held in various areas of the city throughout the month of April 2010. At these Open Houses the Green Space Advisory Panel's mandates were presented and the work completed, included the wish list, was discussed.

Summary

In order to develop a comprehensive strategy for green spaces, make informed decisions, properly manage existing parks and open space, and identify gaps and opportunities, an inventory of green spaces is required. The Green Space Advisory Panel completed an inventory in three parts: an inventory of lands in the existing Parks and Open Space system, an inventory of other public lands and other recreational lands, and an inventory of green space opportunities.

Almost three years of information gathering and vetting has resulted in very thorough list of green space that should be included in the City of Greater Sudbury's park inventory. This list is not static. Maintaining the list of green space opportunities and updating any changes will be necessary. This list will help guide the City in acquiring green space land that will benefit all residents through: ecosystem benefits such as wildlife habitat, biological diversity, water storage and air quality/climate moderation; economic benefits such as enhanced property values and tourism opportunities; social benefits such as beautification and improved quality of life, health and wellness impacts and active transportation links; and green infrastructure benefits such as storm water management. Green space will continue to define the character of our city and make the City of Greater Sudbury a place where people want to live and visit.

Chapter 3: Establishing Acquisition Priorities

Having identified green space opportunities, the next step in moving forward is to prioritize these sites in regards to acquisition.

In the Official Plan, Council established that the following program would be undertaken:

7.2.1 Programs

4. Further delineate natural environmental areas in need of municipal protection along with appropriate strategies for conservation and acquisition

The Green Space Advisory Panel was given the mandate to:

- Recommend to Council a rating or evaluation system which might be utilized to assist Council in establishing acquisition priorities and making park and open space acquisitions.

The task of rating land acquisition priorities is faced by land trusts, municipal park systems, and regional, provincial and national park systems. The panel reviewed a number of examples. The general approach of using measures of value and measures of vulnerability / threat to assess acquisition priority is a common sense one and found in most examples. The B.C. Capital Region District 1983 Review of Regional Parkland was the most comparable model, capturing a range of values relevant to Greater Sudbury, and a having successful track record. The Parks, Open Space and Leisure Background Report (2004), was also used for guidance.

The Panel identified the following factors that should be considered:

- The long-term, ‘big picture’ view for parkland in Greater Sudbury
- A balanced parks system
- Connectivity
- A priority for waterfront properties
- Gap analysis, and supply of parkland
- Demographics
- Social justice and equity
- Natural value
- Human value: use, etc.
- Level of risk or threat from development, roads, or other stressors
- Accessibility



- Unique or representative landscapes, sense of place
- Aesthetic value

These factors were grouped into three main categories: two measures of the value of the site as parkland – **conservation value** and **recreation value**; and a measure of vulnerability – **level of risk**.

Conservation value refers to the intrinsic natural value of the site, and includes factors such as the inclusion of a Natural Heritage site, the importance of a natural or recovered feature or function on the site, the ecological value and sensitivity, the presence of a unique or representative feature such as a hilltop or shoreline, the habitat value, the size and integrity, and the connectivity to other green space sites. Conservation value was assessed with the aid of the Natural Heritage Background Study 2005, as well as the expertise of Stephen Monet (Manager of Environmental Planning Initiatives), and other Panel members with expertise in the field (VETAC members, biologists, MNR provincial park planners, and NDCA staff).

Recreation value refers to the value accorded by residents, and includes factors such as use, need, gaps in service areas or standards, aesthetic value, sense of place, linkages, and balance of park types. Regard was made to service level standards (as referred to in the OP), and use (based on experience of residents in the area - ward representatives did site visits and spoke with residents if they were not personally familiar with the site).

Level of risk refers to the likelihood that a site may be lost, altered in a way that reduces its conservation and/or recreation value, or removed from public use. The level of risk was based on land use status (OP land use designation, zoning), current planning applications, and knowledge of history and ownership of the site by planning and property staff.

Conservation value, recreation value, and level of risk were quantified from 1 to 5. In order for these ranking to be clearly understandable, reproducible, and directly comparable to any new sites assessed, the following guidelines were used.

Conservation Value

High Conservation Value	4 or 5	E.g. contains a unique natural feature, has significant ecological significance or sensitivity, contains a recognized natural heritage feature, includes shoreline or hilltop
Moderate Conservation Value	3	E.g. a healthy natural area with moderate ecological value and attractiveness
Low Conservation value	1 or 2	Natural area with little existing or potential special ecological value or attractiveness

Recreation Value

High Recreation Value	4 or 5	E.g. there is no other park of that type in the service area, it fills a need for a neighbourhood or natural park in a neighbourhood without, acts as a new linkage, traditional use indicates a high value, fills a unique recreational need
Moderate Recreation Value	3	E.g. has recreational value in an area whose parkland is already sufficient, has potential for a unique recreational use in the area, traditional use demonstrates moderate value by residents
Low Recreation value	1 or 2	Little current or potential recreational value in an area whose park needs are already met

Level of Risk

High Level of Risk	5	Slated for development, or under some other immediate threat
	4	Designated/zoned for development, or under some other imminent threat
Moderate Level of Risk	3	No current or imminent threat, but risk is anticipated
Low Level or Risk	1 or 2	No anticipated threat

Rating acquisition priorities

When considering properties to bring into the parks inventory, a high priority will be given to sites with a high recreation value, a high conservation value, and/or a high risk.

In practical terms, priority will be high for:

- Sites with a Natural Heritage feature, important natural features or functions, high ecological value or sensitivity, unique or representative features such as a hilltop or shoreline, high habitat value, larger size and integrity, or connectivity to other natural sites.
- Sites that are well used, fill a need, fill a gap in service areas or standards, have recognized aesthetic value or contribution to sense of place, provide linkages, or contribute to a balance of park types.

- Sites with value that is at risk of being lost, altered in a way that reduces its conservation and/or recreation value, or removed from public use and Appendix G.

Acquisition priority was ranked from 0 to 5, with 5 being the highest priority. In order for these ranking to be clearly understandable, reproducible, and directly comparable to any new sites assessed, the following guidelines were used. Note that separate charts were used for city owned sites, as these sites are all low risk, compared to privately owned properties, and can be brought into the parkland inventory without property acquisitions.

Acquisition Priority – non-city-owned properties

High (4 and 5): It is a high priority to protect this site, and it should be done soon.

Moderate (2 and 3): It is a high priority to protect the site, but waiting will not mean losing it, so other high priority sites should be addressed first. Or, it is a moderate priority site that must be addressed quickly not to be lost.

Low (0 or 1): These are sites that are a low priority overall, or that are a moderate priority that are at low risk.

High	5	This site has a high conservation value and/or high recreation value and a high level of risk. It is a high priority to include this site as part of the parks system, or protect it in some other way, and it is important to act very quickly to do so.
	4	This site has a high conservation value and/or high recreation value and a moderate level of risk. It is a high priority to include this site as part of the parks system, or protect it in some other way, and it is important to act quickly to do so.
	3	This site has a high conservation value and/or high recreation value, a low level of risk, and can only reach its potential through development of the site. It is a high priority to include this site as part of the parks system, or protect it in some other way. Although it is at low risk, it is of benefit to do so fairly quickly, so that it can reach its full value. OR This site has moderate conservation and/or recreation value and a high level of risk. It is a moderate priority to include this site as part of the parks system, or protect it in some other way, and it is important to act quickly to do so.
	2	This site has a high conservation value and/or high recreation value as is, and a low level or risk. It is a high priority to include this site as part of the parks system, or protect it in some other way, but the low level of risk means that a wait is acceptable. OR This site has moderate conservation and/or recreation value and a moderate level of risk. It is a moderate priority to include this site as part of the parks system, or protect it in some other way.
	1	This site has moderate conservation and/or recreation value and a low level of risk.

		It is a moderate priority to include this site as part of the parks system, or protect it in some other way, but the low level of risk means that a wait is acceptable.
Low	0	This site has a low conservation value and a low recreation value, and any level of risk. This site is a low priority for acquisition.

Working charts were used to determine acquisition priorities. These are summarized below and are found in Appendix H and Appendix I.

Charts for assessing acquisition priority based on conservation value, recreation value, and level of risk. *Find the row with the assigned values and risk levels, to find the corresponding acquisition priority.*

Non-city owned property

Value	Risk	Acquisition priority
high conservation value (4,5) and/or high recreation value (4,5)	high level of risk (4,5)	5
high conservation value (4,5) and/or high recreation value (4,5)	moderate level of risk (3)	4
high conservation value (4,5) and/or high recreation value (4,5)	low level of risk (1,2) and acquisition would allow significant enhancement of its value to the community (trail development or other park development)	3
high conservation value (4,5) and/or high recreation value (4,5)	low level of risk (1,2)	2
moderate conservation value (3) and/or moderate recreation value (3)	high level of risk (4,5)	3
moderate conservation value (3) and/or moderate recreation value (3)	moderate level of risk (3)	2
moderate conservation value (3) and/or moderate recreation value (3)	low level of risk (1,2)	1
low conservation value (1,2) and low recreation value (1,2)	any level of risk	0

Note: It is important to keep these numbers up to date, as levels of risk change. Ideally, sites with acquisition priorities 2-5 should be brought into the parkland inventory.

Charts for assessing acquisition priority based on conservation value, recreation value, and level of risk. In this case, acquisition refers to bringing this city owned land into the parks system. Find the row with the assigned values and risk levels, to find the corresponding acquisition priority.

City owned property

Value	Risk	Acquisition priority *
high conservation value (4,5) and/or high recreation value (4,5)	risk level 2 (Council may potentially see value in selling this property at some time, the land use designation would allow development, or there is some other risk)	5
high conservation value (4,5) and/or high recreation value (4,5)	risk level 1	4
moderate conservation value (3) and/or moderate recreation value (3)	risk level 2 (Council may potentially see value in selling this property at some time, the land use designation would allow development, or there is some other risk)	3
moderate conservation value (3) and/or moderate recreation value (3)	risk level 1	2
low conservation value (1,2) and low recreation value (1,2)	any level of risk	1

** If this site is a high priority to develop to meet a recreational need (e.g. trail development, park facilities, dog park...), add one to the acquisition priority, to a maximum of 5. In addition, mark the number with a '*' to flag it for the attention of leisure services when park development decisions are being made.*

The Panel recommends that City-owned properties with rankings 2-5 be included in the parkland inventory.

Acquisition priorities for identified green space opportunities

All sites identified as green space opportunities were ranked according to their conservation value, recreation value, level of risk, and acquisition priority. Each site was discussed individually by the panel, using GIS mapping, and information brought by the citizen representative from the ward, other panel members, and city staff. New information was sought where necessary. To view these rankings, see Appendix F and Appendix G.

Gap analysis

In determining where to focus acquisition efforts, gaps in the existing parks system is an important factor. This is reflected in the acquisition priority ranking system described above. Citizen Representatives made an effort to identify gaps in their ward. However, a gap analysis is needed to properly identify gaps in service.

The Parks, Open Space and Leisure Background Report (2004) undertook a simple gap analysis based on a provision level of 3 hectares per 1000 residents (note that the Official Plan sets a provision level of 4 hectares per 1000 residents, pg. 70). Taken from Table 4-1: Existing Parkland Inventory by Service Area (hectares):

Community/Service Area	City Park Hectares per 1000 population	Total Hectares per 1000 population (including City Parks, all city-owned land zoned 'P', parks or playgrounds owned by community organizations; not including schools or NDCA land)
Azilda, Chelmsford	3.05	3.05
Coniston, Wahnapiatae, New Townships	1.85	1.85
Dowling, Levack, Onaping	3.73	4.94
Garson, Falconbridge, Skead, Bowland's Bay	4.03	4.8
Lively, Naughton, Whitefish, Worthington	19.09	19.89
Sudbury - Downtown	8.24	8.24
Sudbury – Flour Mill / Donovan	0.97	0.97
Sudbury – Minnow Lake	12.18	13.57
Sudbury – New Sudbury	0.79	1.47
Sudbury – South End	1.1	2.18

Sudbury – West End, Copper Cliff	1.82	1.82
Val Therese, Hamner, Val Caron, Blezard Valley, McCrea Heights, Capreol	3.71	4.66
City of Greater Sudbury	4.18	4.81

Based on this analysis, the following areas, listed roughly in order of need, were deemed deficient in parkland:

- Sudbury – Flour Mill/Donovan area
- Sudbury – New Sudbury area
- Sudbury – South End
- Sudbury – West End and Copper Cliff
- Coniston, Wahnapiatae, and the New Townships
- Chelmsford and Azilda

This information was used when ranking sites for acquisition priority, and can continue to be used when proceeding with acquisitions.

In moving forward with an acquisition strategy, efforts would be best directed by a complete and updated gap analysis. New information and tools gathered by the Panel will allow for a more detailed and sensitive assessment of gaps in parks service.

- The analysis above does not take into account some important green space and recreation lands, such as NDCA lands, Laurentian University lands, school parks, and privately owned recreation lands. These lands have now been inventoried and can be incorporated in a more accurate analysis of available green space.
- Now that a classification system has been created, a gap analysis can take park type, and service area standards by park type, into account. This will give a much more refined view of the existing parkland in a community and the nature of the gaps there-in.
- Now that green space opportunities have been inventoried, the impact of bringing identified public and private green space opportunities into the parks inventory can be measured. This will allow: monitoring progress over time in terms of filling gaps in service; assessing whether or not a particular green space opportunity fills a gap in park service; identifying gaps that are not addressed by the green space opportunities listed to date.
- GIS mapping of the sites now allows an assessment of proximity measures for parkland. A gap analysis of proximity service standards can now be done overall, and by park type.
- This GIS mapping and other information will also ultimately allow connectivity to be assessed, and gaps in connectivity to be identified.
- Current census data should be incorporated in these analyses, providing up to date information on population and demographics. This information is necessary to

calculate population based service standards, and also allows parkland decisions to best suit the population of a given area.

The Panel recommends that an updated gap analysis be carried out, including:

1. An updated gap analysis by service area, considering both overall service and service by park type. *This analysis will identify which service areas are deficient in parkland, overall, and for particular park types. Using the same service areas as the Parks, Open Space and Leisure Background report (2004) will allow comparisons to be made between the two analyses. However, in order to accurately identify gaps in individual outlying communities, additional analysis for smaller service areas may be needed. The Solutions Committee identified the following communities: Azilda, Beaver Lake, Blezard, Capreol, Chelmsford, Coniston, Dowling, Falconbridge, Garson, Hanmer, Kukagami, Levack, Lively, Naughton, Onaping, Skead, Val Caron, Wahnapiatae, Wanup, and Whitefish.*
2. A gap analysis by proximity, following the standard that all citizens should be within 800m of parkland, without crossing a major barrier (such as an arterial road or a railway). This analysis should be done overall, and by park type (taking into account differences in proximity standards for different park types, and multiple roles of some parks). *The goal is for all citizens to be within a 10 minute walk of both a neighbourhood, linear and natural park, and within a 20 minute walk of a community park. It would also be useful to add a proximity standard for linear parks (e.g. within a 10 minute walk).*
3. An analysis of the contribution of identified green space opportunities to identified gaps, overall and by park type. This should be done separately for city-owned and non city-owned green space opportunities. In essence, the gap analyses in (1) and (2) should be redone: (a) adding city owned green space opportunities; (b) adding non-city owned green space opportunities; and (c) adding all green space opportunities. *This will give a measure of the impact of bringing these green space opportunities into the parks inventory. It will also reveal any remaining gaps that are not filled by the existing list of green space opportunities.*
4. A gap analysis of connectivity. It is preferred that park areas be connected where possible, especially the community, natural, ecological reserve and linear parks. *Measure(s) of connectivity will have to be determined. Some possible measures are found in Edmonton's Natural Connections Strategic Plan (2007). This should be a task of the next iteration of this Panel – to finalize criteria on connectivity.*

5. Regard to present and anticipated demographics and anticipated growth.
Demographics and anticipated growth will affect parkland needs in terms of amount and type of parkland needed.

During the remainder of its term, the Panel will continue working to complete as much as possible of items 1-3, and possibly 5. This work will be presented to Council as a manager's report in October 2010, and added to this report as an additional appendix.

It is important to note that the gap analyses for service area and proximity are complementary. That is, because they measure different aspects of park service, a deficiency in parkland can be flagged by **either** measure (not necessarily both in the same area).

It is also important to reiterate that the gap analysis is one tool in assessing acquisition priorities. Independent of gaps in service, it is important to secure sites identified as having green space / parkland value, reflected in the conservation and recreation values, and the acquisition priority values described in the previous section.

Summary

Having identified green space opportunities, the next step in moving forward is to prioritize sites for acquisition. Using defined criteria, the panel rated green space opportunities according to conservation value, recreation value, level of risk, and corresponding acquisition value. A gap analysis is another important tool in assessing acquisition priorities.



Chapter 4: Acquisition Strategies

In undertaking their mandate, the Green Space Advisory Panel looked not only at green space properties currently within the ownership of the City but also identified other private and public properties with Green Space potential (see Chapter 3). Acquisition priorities were also rated, to guide acquisition decisions and strategies (see Chapter 4). The challenge that will be faced in the future is how to address the desire to add to the Green Space inventory with limited financial resources and how to strategically focus acquisition efforts.

In order to meet the goals of a balanced park system that is accessible to all residents, meets parkland needs throughout Greater Sudbury, and protects areas of ecological, geological and cultural significance, it is necessary to have an acquisition strategy that has a wide vision, that is balanced, and that is long-term. As recommended in Chapter 6, the success of this acquisition strategy will rely on having quantitative goals, objectives, timelines, and commitments of supportive resources and funding.

Moving forward, it is the view of the Green Space Advisory Panel that the following strategy should guide the pursuit of future green spaces.

Goals

Four overarching goals guide the acquisition strategy:

1. Protect ecologically valuable, environmentally sensitive, or unique natural assets. Ecological value should be protected in core natural areas that are as large and contiguous as possible.
2. Create a complete and balanced network of physical linkages between green spaces for people and wildlife.
3. Create and complete a balanced, interconnected parks system meeting local, community and regional passive and active recreational needs.
4. Protect the unique aesthetic and geographic character of the community.

Objectives

In practical terms, these goals can be met by fulfilling the following objectives:

- a. Set a high priority on protecting sites identified with high conservation and/or recreation values, including sites classified as ecological reserve, and act in a timely manner to bring as many of these sites as possible into the parks system.

- b. Set a high priority on acquiring lands which fill a gap in the existing parks system, including linkages.
- c. Protect as many sites as possible identified with moderate conservation and/or recreation values.
- d. Achieve a balanced, connected parkland system throughout the city, meeting park land needs for all neighbourhoods.

City Owned Lands with Green Space Potential

Among those lands identified as having future green space potential are some lands already owned by the City but vacant or used for other purposes (see Appendix G). With respect to these lands, it is the recommendation of the Green Space Advisory Panel that these lands or the portions of these lands which have a high or moderate conservation



and/or recreation value be zoned as parkland (or a similar zoning category) and brought into the parks inventory. The former is already well underway. During the preparation of the new draft Comprehensive Zoning by-law, staff have zoned city-owned green space opportunities as 'P', or in a few cases, as some other compatible zoning designation (i.e. 'I'). Moving forward, those city-owned green space opportunities with

an acquisition priority of 2-5 should be brought into the parks inventory over time. In the meantime, these properties can be viewed as 'non-operating parks'. Those that are valued for passive recreation can be enjoyed by residents, with the understanding that no leisure resources are available for properties until they are brought into the parks inventory. In developing a schedule for doing so, consideration should be given to acquisition priority, need, interest and possible partnerships with community groups, and capacity of Leisure Services for any required maintenance or park development. Sites with lower conservation and recreation value (acquisition priority 1) may be considered surplus subject to the parkland disposal policy and applicable by-laws and policies.

Private Lands with Green Space Potential

As directed by their mandate, the Green Space Advisory Panel also identified sites with green space potential that are privately owned (as described in Chapter 2). These sites

were ranked according to their conservation value, recreation value, and level of risk, resulting in an acquisition priority of 0 - 5, with 5 being the highest priority (see Chapter 3, and Appendix F).

The highest priority for acquiring private lands with green space potential should be given to sites that are ecologically important or sensitive, are important natural assets, or would have high recreational value. The acquisition priority ranking should generally guide future acquisitions and the order in which acquisitions should be addressed. Also, the City's Official Plan and Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan contain targets for the amount and location of park properties in the community which will also inform acquisition decisions. An updated gap analysis will provide further direction, once completed. From time to time, significant opportunities to acquire more moderately scored lands may arise and the flexibility to take advantage of these situations should be maintained.

Following the goals and objectives outlined above, privately owned sites with green space potential can be divided into three categories:

Priority I: Sites that are ecologically important or sensitive or are important natural assets, sites recognized to have a high recreation value, and sites necessary to meet recreational needs. This would include all sites with a high conservation and/or recreation value, including ecological reserves and those filling a gap in the parks system. These sites would have an acquisition priority ranking of 4-5, and some of 2-3. The acquisition priority number gives a good idea of the level of urgency for the site, and hence the order in which they should be addressed.

Priority II: Sites at risk that would make a positive contribution to the parks system for their natural or recreational value. These are sites with a moderate conservation and/or recreation value, with a high or moderate risk. They correspond to the remaining sites with acquisition priorities of 2-3.

Priority III: Low-risk sites that will make a positive contribution to the parks system for their natural or recreational value. These are sites with moderate conservation and/or recreation value, and low risk. These correspond to acquisition priority 1.

All privately owned sites identified as having green space potential are listed in Appendix F, grouped by ward, and in order of acquisition priority.

It is a high priority to bring Priority I and Priority II sites into the parks inventory. Bringing Priority III sites into the parks inventory would also make a positive contribution to the parks system. All else being equal, priority should be given to larger sites, sites that fill gaps, and balance among areas. It is also important to maintain flexibility to act where opportunities arise. This list will be kept up to date in regards to any new sites, or changes in status.

Land Acquisition Options

There are a number of tools available for the acquisition of green space lands. These include tools such as purchase, land swaps, and donations that bring land into public ownership. It is important to point out, however, that, in the right circumstances, other tools are also available that can maintain the ecological and/or recreation value of a site without purchase of the land. These include partial interest in the land, such as easements, leases, and co-ownerships, as well as land use tools. This section provides a brief overview of the approaches available:

1. Purchase by the City

The City keeps a Parks Reserve account. Funds from this account are used to purchase green space for park lands and the account is replenished when park lands are sold or when the City receives cash-in-lieu of park land pursuant to subdivision and certain other development applications. In addition to being used for park land acquisition, the funds in this reserve account are also used for the purchase of parks maintenance equipment and for parks improvements. The amount of money added to the reserve each year fluctuates with the amount of development in the community. Over the past three years, the reserve was replenished by between \$148,000 and \$194,000 each year. The City also has a Sale of Land Reserve account which is replenished when non-park lands owned by the City are sold. These funds can be used for a variety of purposes.

Given the limited size of the City's Parks Reserve vis-à-vis the significant costs associated with acquiring land and equipping parks sites, opportunities for the outright purchase of new Green Spaces will be somewhat limited. While new development and park land sales will occur in the future to add to these funds, and the Reserve will continue to be an important tool, it would nevertheless be wise to consider other mechanisms for acquiring new park lands as well.

2. 5% Park Land Dedication

When subdivision applications are approved by the City, the Planning Act entitles the municipality to take 5% of the land for park purposes. On this basis, new park properties may be added to the City's inventory each time a subdivision is approved. The City also has the option of taking cash-in-lieu as noted in the previous section.

3. Land Exchanges

The Green Space Advisory Panel has proposed a Park Land Disposal Policy which sets out criteria for identifying and disposing of surplus green space lands.

Where an existing green space property is identified for disposal, consideration could be given to exchanging these lands for another property identified as having Green Space value. Other city owned lands that are declared surplus should also be considered for land exchanges. Where land values differ, such exchanges could also include cash and/or a tax receipt for income tax purposes. This is similar to the process that occurred to acquire the Roxborough Greenbelt property.

4. Donations

There is the opportunity for an individual or organization to donate land to the City. In cases like this, the City is able to issue an income tax receipt for a gift of land. In the special case of ecologically significant land, the Eco Gift program may apply, which compensates owners well for their donation.

5. Crown Land

In cases where priority green space lands are in the ownership of the Province, a request could be made by the municipality for transfer of these lands. While it is usually the policy of the Province to obtain market value for property, it may be possible to demonstrate how such a transfer would meet other provincial objectives and reduce or waive the purchase price.

Opportunities to exchange lands may also exist. For example the City has lands within the Daisy Lake Provincial Park, which could be transferred to the Province to be regulated as part of Daisy Lake Provincial Park and receive that higher level of protection.

6. Expropriation

The municipality has the ability, through a legal process, to secure lands from a property owner for public use. The property owner is compensated for their land and any injurious affection associated with the taking. This tool, while available to the municipality, is seldom used for park purposes except in the case of linear parks where a specific property acquisition is required to complete a corridor.

7. Lease

A lease provides the municipality with a limited interest in land. Leases are another tool infrequently used due to the reluctance to spend public monies on lands which are not in the ownership of the City. As in the previous tool, this approach has occasionally been used for linear trails where the investment in the land is not significant and where the property owner is willing to lease the

property but is not interested in permanently relinquishing their property rights. However, lease agreements can sometimes be used successfully. An example is Copper Cliff Park, which is privately owned by Vale Inco, but maintained by the City as a public park.

8. Conservation Easements and Trail Easements

Conservation Easements can be used when there is a desire to protect some ecological aspect of a property but where ownership of the land itself is not transferred. In these cases, an easement protecting the natural feature is registered on the title of the property and the property owner receives a benefit in return. For example, an easement donated on a voluntary basis may qualify as an ecological gift under the *Income Tax Act* of Canada, allowing corporate or individual donors to obtain an official donation receipt and claim an enhanced tax benefit.

Trail easements may be a useful tool to create or complete linear parks.

9. Joint-Use Agreements

The City has standing joint-use agreements with school boards within the community. In these cases, the City may provide facilities on school board lands where there is a benefit from both a parks perspective and a school board perspective. While this tool doesn't add lands to the City's inventory, it does provide enhanced recreational facilities on lands open to the public. Joint use agreements could also be explored with other public or private owners as appropriate.

10. Grants

There are a limited number of organizations and foundations which provide grants for the acquisition of lands. Usually these organizations have a specific mission or focus and grant applicants must demonstrate how a proposed acquisition would meet the organization's criteria. Two potential sources of significant funding for urban green spaces that have been identified are the EJLB Foundation, and MEC. The Nature Conservancy of Canada is another potential source of funding for important natural heritage sites where they are provincially significant. To secure such outside funding will require an acquisition strategy with a wide vision, and commitments of municipal funding.

11. Surplus School Properties

Many local school boards are going through Accommodation Review exercises as a result of declining enrolments and an aging infrastructure. Where former school properties are declared surplus, the municipality is given a first opportunity to acquire the property. Given the large play areas usually associated with school properties, this provides an important opportunity for the acquisition of green space for park lands in areas where there are identified needs and established use. It should be noted that the option would exist in each case to obtain the surplus land, the surplus building or both.

12. Land Trusts

In some jurisdictions Land Trusts have been set up to hold and manage donated property. Guidance is available from organizations such as the Ontario Land Trust Alliance and handbooks outlining standards and practices are available from the Canadian Land Trust Alliance. As well as holding lands, Land Trusts can also play a valuable role in promoting the benefits of donations, in identifying priority areas, in seeking donations of land and in partnering with others in the community to achieve Green Space goals. There are a variety of incentives available to Trusts including Income Tax Credits for donors.

13. Land Use Tools

A number of land use tools are available. Protective land use designations and protective zoning provide protective status to recognized natural heritage assets, and ecologically sensitive areas. Community Improvement Plans can provide the City with financial tools to accomplish park goals included in the plan. Conditions of approval of plans of subdivision and the site-plan approval process provide opportunities to work with the private owner to protect natural areas, provide trails and linkages, and develop parkland that meets the needs of that area. Density bonusing, density transfers, and CPUD's may allow the possibility of directing development in a way that leaves larger natural areas free for parkland, along with other possibilities for meeting park needs.

14. Temporary Tools

In some circumstances, time may be needed to reach an agreement with a private land owner that is agreeable to all parties. A number of tools are available. Options and right-of-first refusal would give early notice if the owner decides to sell the land. These tools do have a cost, and may only be appropriate if the outcome is certain. Leases and management agreements are examples of tools that can be a temporary solution, while a permanent arrangement is being explored.

All of these options should be actively pursued by the City in attempts to secure higher priority Green Space lands as described in this report. Different circumstances in each case will dictate which tool is most appropriate but a long term acquisition strategy will utilize most or all of these tools to achieve the City's Green Space goals. It stands to reason that sites with a high acquisition priority will warrant more investment if needed, while possibilities such as donations, management agreements, affordable leases, and easements will be more workable for sites with a lower priority and low risk. It is also evident that opportunities for high risk sites are time sensitive, and should be explored in a timely manner, before being lost. Opportunities should be monitored on an ongoing basis as new or enhanced mechanisms may become available in the future.

Certain circumstances warrant special mention:

- **Publicly owned land (non CGS):** for sites owned by universities, colleges and the NDCA, protection of the site should be possible through an agreement with the owner to place a protective status or easement on the site when priority sites contribute to Greater Sudbury green space needs. For sites owned by school boards, partnerships can be made for recreational purposes, and CGS will have the first opportunity of purchase if the land is sold
- **Mining lands:** management agreements, affordable leases, or easements may enable use of some of these sites for trails or open space, where acquisition is not a possibility.
- **Ecogift donations:** for privately owned lands that have ecological significance and were not purchased for profit, this program provides a very good return to the donor
- **Sympathetic landowner:** conservation easements, donations or delayed donations, affordable leases, management agreements will all be easier to accomplish with a landowner who shares the city's view of the value of the site
- **Enforceable protection:** this exists for natural assets recognized by provincial legislation and in the Official Plan – this could be expanded by defining sites of regional and local significance in the OP.

Funding and Resources

Acquiring land will require funding and other resources. To accomplish the goals outlined here, on-going funding will be needed. A commitment by the municipality will also be necessary to obtain any significant outside funding. Recommendations to address this need will be outlined in the next chapter.

Summary

By following this acquisition strategy, the City of Greater Sudbury can achieve a parks system that protects important natural features and functions, meets citizens' park needs

throughout the community, provides linkages for people and for wildlife, and maintains our city's unique landscape and natural beauty. Priority I sites are key to meeting this goal. Priority II and III sites would also make an important contribution to the parks system. As many of these sites as possible should be brought into the parks inventory, using all of the approaches available. Sites that fill a recognized gap should also be a high priority. Level of priority, immediacy of risk, arising opportunities, and available resources will all influence the order in which sites can be brought into the parks system.

Chapter 5: Draft Park Land Disposal Policy

For many years now the City of Greater Sudbury has had a by-law which governs procedures for the acquisition and sale of land by the City. Currently it is By-Law 2008-174 which fulfills this function. It should be noted that this by-law deals with all City property acquisitions and sales and not just park lands. It is primarily a procedural document which sets out processes to be followed in the sale and acquisition of lands.

Given that there are various factors which should be taken into consideration before declaring a parks property surplus, the Green Space Advisory Panel has proposed the creation of a “Park Land Disposal Policy”. If endorsed by Council, this policy would be adopted as a Schedule to By-Law 2008-174.

In preparing this policy, the panel had regard to the Official Plan and the Parks Master Plan. In addition, several guiding principles were followed:

- That every child and every adult citizen be an easy walk from a park and natural area.
- That important natural features and functions be protected
- That a balanced, connected parks system be maintained to meet parkland needs throughout the community.
- That residents should be informed about any parkland considered for sale in their neighbourhood, and that they have input in the decision.
- That the sale of surplus parkland should benefit both the area in which the sale was made, and contribute to overall acquisition of parkland, in a way that is fair to all areas of the city.

The policy consists of three sections. The first outlines the criteria that must be met in order to consider whether to declare a site surplus. These include criteria set in the Official Plan and criteria recommended by the Parks Master Plan. It also includes criteria to ensure that parkland that is well used, is meeting a current or future need for parkland supply, or that includes an important feature are not disposed of.

The second section sets requirements for public notification and public input. Notice includes a sign on site, mail out notices, notification of CANs and other relevant community groups, and additional notice for larger or more significant sites. All those submitting written comments will receive notice of the Planning Committee meeting at which the



decision will be made. The staff report will include all public comments received, and an appropriate response.

The third section deals with the use of funds from the sale of surplus parkland. Funds would be deposited in the Parkland Reserve. Fifty percent of the funds from any particular sale will be directed towards acquisition of parkland based on the adopted priority list. The remaining fifty percent will be directed toward acquisition of parkland or park development in the ward in which the sale was made. This division is a balance of a number of factors:

1. Acquisition of high priority green space opportunities is necessary to meet parkland needs and goals. Land acquisition is a relatively high cost, and designated funding is required. Once an investment is made to bring a site into the parkland inventory, it becomes an asset for current and future generations with very little future cost. On the other hand, if an investment is not made to bring high priority sites into the parkland inventory, these sites will be lost, along with the opportunity to satisfy parkland needs and goals.
2. Residents have an expectation that a sale of surplus parkland will bring a benefit to their area, through acquisition of new parkland, or improvements in existing parks. This is also consistent with past practice by Leisure Services.
3. It is important to benefit wards equitably. For example, in some wards, there may be little or no opportunity to acquire new parkland. These wards would benefit most from improvements of existing parkland. Other wards are deficient in parkland. Having no surplus parkland to sell, these wards would benefit most from parkland acquisitions following the adopted priority list.

The proposed policy consists of the following (also see Appendix J).

Park Land Disposal Policy

In determining whether or not a Park Land property shall be declared surplus and sold by the City, the following criteria and requirements shall apply:

Criteria

1. Consider parkland for disposal if a site is deemed non-essential for current or future use, within the context of service area standards, and a balanced, connected parks system;
2. Consider parkland for disposal if there is ample supply and type of the same park and open space or facility in the neighborhood, ward, and community based on the adopted classification system, and service area standards;

3. Parkland disposal should conform to the policies of the Official Plan;
4. Waterfront properties owned by the municipality will not be offered for sale or disposal except in the case of municipal shore allowances in front of private land;
5. Other surplus Parks and Open Space lands may be considered for sale subject to:
 - a. There are overlapping service areas,
 - b. There are no facilities or site facilities are significantly underutilized,
 - c. There are no important ecological or environmental functions present, or no recognized natural heritage features,
 - d. The lands are located within an area that has an oversupply of existing and planned parkland, following the target of 4 ha per 1000 residents, within 800m of residential areas without crossing a major barrier. Generally, a neighbourhood should be served by both a neighbourhood park and natural park, based on the adopted classification system.
 - e. The lands are not needed for future parks as identified by the parks classification system or municipal infrastructure requirements;
6. Parkland should not be disposed of if the site has an identified risk management function or liability or it protects significant municipal assets (i.e. well head protection);
7. Parkland should not be disposed where there are significant opportunities to add or link to existing green space or further create a more balanced parkland system, and
8. Proposed site for disposal should have low or limited recreation potential, conservation potential, or attractiveness/sense of place.

Other Requirements

9. Disposal is based on an appraisal of fair market value both for full or limited marketability sites.
10. Following internal circulation/review, proposed disposals should be circulated to the ward councilor, area CANs, playground and neighbourhood association, or other community groups known to represent area interests, for input, and to all property owners within a 200 metre radius, requesting written comments if any within 30 days of mail-out. Area mail out radii may be increased based on the

- significance of the disposal on the advice of the ward councilor, or for properties valued at greater than \$100,000. For these more significant disposals, a small, clearly worded notice may also be placed in the appropriate media.
11. A generic sign will also be posted on the site for 30 days once the above circulation and approval to proceed is complete. This sign will have contact information (phone and website) regarding this potential disposal. A copy of the area mail-out and a clear notice of the cut-off date for comments will also be affixed to the sign. The notice will also be posted to the city website, linked by a clearly visible and clearly labeled 'button' on the 'residents' page.
 12. All residents who have submitted written comments will be informed of the date of the Planning Committee meeting at which the matter will be considered for decision.
 13. The staff report regarding the proposed disposal should include: the rationale for the sale of parkland, a map localizing the site, and the expected benefits to the City and ward parks system from the sale. The staff report should also include attached copies of all public comments received, and a section relating the staff recommendation to these comments.
 14. Funds from the sale of surplus parkland would be deposited in the Parkland Reserve. Fifty percent of the funds from any particular sale will be directed towards acquisition of parkland based on the adopted priority list. The other fifty percent of the funds from any particular sale will be directed towards acquisition of parkland or park development in the ward in which the sale was made.

Chapter 6: Recommendations and next steps

Over the past two and half years, the Green Space Advisory Panel has worked to fulfill its mandate:

- Recommend to Council a Parks and Open Space Classification System.
- Recommend to Council natural assets which should be considered for inclusion in the City's Park and Open Space System.
- Recommend to Council a rating or evaluation system to assist in establishing acquisition priorities.
- Review the city property inventory and recommend to council properties to be included in the Leisure Service portfolio, and identify those Leisure Services properties which should be declared surplus.

This work addresses two programs established by Council in the new Official Plan with respect to green space:

7.2.1 Programs

"2. A park classification system to address the range of Parks and Open Space types and characteristics will be established to guide park acquisition, development, and management. The park classification system will have regard to natural beauty, environmental functions, and recreation value."

"4. Further delineate natural environment areas in need of municipal protection along with appropriate strategies for conservation and acquisition."

The Panel recommends that Council approve in principle the final report of the Green Space Advisory Panel dated June 16, 2010. In addition, a number of specific recommendations are made, as stated in the "Recommendation for Council Adoption", attached to the report.

The Panel also has some general recommendations for moving forward with an acquisition strategy and overall green space strategy.

Adopting the work mandated to the Green Space Advisory Panel by Council

The panel recommends that the work specifically mandated by Council be adopted, to fulfill programs 7.2.1.2 and 7.2.1.4 of the Official Plan.

A. That Council adopt the Parks and Open Space Classification System proposed by the Panel for its parkland assets;

The parkland classification system defines a range of different types of parks and open space, and will guide the use, development, management, and acquisition of existing and future parks.

B. That Council adopt the surplus parkland disposal policy for dealing with City land assets which may fall into a surplus position;

The parkland disposal policy recognizes the importance of parkland to residents and will guide the identification and disposal of surplus parkland, including public notification and input, and the use of any revenue generated.

C. That Council approve in principle the listing of natural assets for possible inclusion in the City's park and open space system, as well as, the priority rating methodology for evaluating potential parkland acquisitions, and the priority ratings for identified green space opportunities, and that staff be instructed to utilize these tools in future deliberations or when parkland opportunities arise;

The identification, evaluation and prioritization of green space opportunities will guide acquisition of parkland, and will allow staff to move forward with the acquisition strategy. This includes bringing city-owned green space opportunities into the parks inventory, according to their value as parkland, need, and opportunity.

Supporting the acquisition strategy and other work of the Panel

The Panel has a number of recommendations that are necessary for the successful implementation of the acquisition strategy.

D. That Council direct staff to prepare a budget option for next year's budgeting process for park and open space acquisition which could be utilized for green space purchase opportunities or matching funds;

In order to implement the acquisition strategy and successfully meet the goals of bringing sites with high conservation or recreation value and sites meeting parkland needs into the parkland inventory to create a balanced parkland system that meets neighbourhood, community and regional park needs, financial resources are needed to acquire high priority properties. Money currently available in the Leisure Services budget and the Parks Reserve are not sufficient to meet this need. It should be noted that once green space properties are purchased, there will be little additional cost to the municipality, and that the economic, social, and environmental benefits will be on-going. It should also be

noted that many opportunities are time sensitive, and that once high priority sites are lost, so too will be the opportunity to meet park needs and objectives. For these reasons, it is the recommendation of the panel that Council direct staff to prepare a budget option. At that time, staff will consider the appropriate amount, based on need and the wider circumstances of the municipality. The amount considered may be expected to be in the range of \$100,000 - \$200,000. Allocated funding should continue to be designated annually, at least until all Priority I and II sites have been acquired, are no longer available, or are subject to some other satisfactory arrangement.

Further funding will also be required. In addition to a budget allocation, the following approaches could be used:

- Appropriate use of existing park reserve fund
- Establish a land trust
(http://www.olta.ca/what_we_do.aspx?page_name=What_We_Do/publications&restricted=no)
- Apply for grants and matching funds
- Establish a municipal land acquisition reserve fund
- Community Improvement Plans
- Voluntary donations by tax payers
- Work pro-actively with land-owners for donations and creative solutions

F. That the work of the Green Space Advisory Panel be utilized as input in the next review of the Official Plan

This will update relevant mapping and programs, and make land use designations and other policy consistent with the new classification system, and other new information. This will include ensuring all parkland is marked on the OP maps; refining land use designation to reflect the classification system adopted; updating Natural Heritage sites as required; providing guidance on which properties should receive EP zoning.

Next steps: continuing the work

Finally, the Panel has several recommendations for the implementation of the acquisition strategy and to continue the work of a comprehensive green space strategy for Greater Sudbury. These are captured in the recommendation to continue the panel, with a mandate defined to meet identified needs and gaps.

E. That Council recommends the continuation of this Panel with renewed membership in the New Year with a clear mandate to assist Council in the implementation of green space acquisition and development strategy;

The Green Space Advisory Panel has identified a number of tasks that are important in moving forward:

- Advising Council in monitoring, implementation, and setting timelines for acquisition goals;
- Establishing a land trust, and following up on other resources for acquisitions;
- Providing guidance on the OP review, and on questions arising about new sites;
- Filling in any gaps on site identification, and site evaluation (e.g. gaining provincial status where warranted; establishing criteria for local significance; filling in gaps in knowledge; linkages);
- Developing a strategy for appropriate protection of natural assets on private land (e.g. criteria for buffers; tree cutting by-law; watershed approach);
- Developing a strategy for increasing urban green space (e.g. neighbourhood tree planting programs, green roofs, swales, living walls);
- Completing a thorough gap analysis;
- Developing criteria for measuring connectivity, and identifying goals, gaps and opportunities; including existing trail systems in mapping;
- Assessing identified green spaces from an ecosystems approach (large core natural areas of a variety of habitat types; linkages and stepping stone areas; wide buffers along waterways), and develop a strategy specific to this approach;
- Updating the Natural Assets inventory and mapping; and
- Engaging the public; place making (naming, mapping sense of place).

In creating a mandate for the next Green Space Advisory Panel that is both the most constructive in advancing the work, and manageable in the time frame available, the Panel has identified the following priorities:

1. Connectivity

Connectivity is an essential attribute of a functional parks system. Recreation value is enhanced by trail linkages and connectivity between different recreation areas and park types. Active living is also encouraged and facilitated. Conservation value and ecological function is improved by connectivity between large, contiguous habitat areas, whether through corridor linkages, or ‘stepping stones’ of natural areas that allow movement of wildlife.

The next Panel should use the GIS mapping completed to assess connectivity, and identify needed linkages. Existing recreational trails, waterway corridors, and potential habitat corridors should also be marked. In addition quantitative measures of connectivity should be developed. Examples of potential quantitative measures can be found in Edmonton’s Natural Connections Strategic Plan (2007).

2. Gap Analysis

As discussed in Chapter 3, a thorough gap analysis is an important tool in achieving a parks system that meets parks needs in all neighbourhoods and communities. An accurate assessment of gaps in parks service assists in directing acquisition and park development to meet the needs of underserved areas.

The next panel should undertake a comprehensive gap analysis, building on the work of this panel. Work that should be completed includes: an updated gap analysis by service area, considering both overall service and service by park type; a gap analysis by proximity, overall and by park type; an analysis of the contribution of identified green space opportunities to identified gaps, overall and by park type; a gap analysis of connectivity; and regard to present and anticipated demographics and growth. For more detail, see Chapter 3.

3. Implementation

The next panel should advise Council in implementing the acquisition strategy. This work would include: recording progress and providing annual updates to Council and other stakeholders; developing an acquisition schedule for city-owned and non-city owned green space opportunities (maintaining flexibility to act as opportunistically); and locating resources. Setting up a land trust would be a very positive step. A land trust would be able to receive donations of land and money, seek funding, and work with property owners in a way that a municipality may not always have available. The Ontario Land Trust Association has comprehensive supportive resources for setting up and running a land trust.

4. A fresh look

The next panel will be able to look over the work with fresh eyes. They may identify new gaps, or new sites of interest. They may pursue other opportunities to enhance urban green space, or consider approaches for privately owned green space. They may build on the data generated to view the inventory of green spaces through the lens of ecosystem function, and develop a strategy specific to that perspective.

5. The Official Plan Review

During the term of the next panel, the City of Greater Sudbury will carry out its five year Official Plan review. At that time, the panel will advise Council on how this review can have regard to the work presented in this report, and any further work completed. This will be an important opportunity to incorporate the additional data and mapping, ensure consistency, and examine other opportunities.

Summary

The Panel recommends that Council approve in principle the final report of the Green Space Advisory Panel dated June 16, 2010. In addition, a number of specific recommendations are made, as stated in the “Recommendation for Council Adoption”, attached to the report. The Panel recommends that the work specifically mandated by Council be adopted, to fulfill programs 7.2.1.2 and 7.2.1.4 of the Official Plan.

This includes the adoption of the parkland classification system, the parkland disposal policy, and the identification, evaluation and prioritization of green space opportunities.

Further, the Panel has a number of recommendations that are necessary for the successful implementation of the acquisition strategy. Financial resources will be necessary to proceed with acquisitions of non-city owned green space opportunities. The Panel recommends that Council direct staff to prepare a budget option for next year’s budgeting process for park and open space acquisition which could be utilized for green space purchase opportunities or matching funds. The Panel also recommends that the work of the Green Space Advisory Panel be utilized as input in the next review of the Official Plan. Finally, to continue the work of a comprehensive green space strategy and the implementation of the acquisition strategy, the recommendation is made to continue the Panel, with a mandate defined to meet identified needs and gaps. Important work was identified for the next Panel: determining measures of connectivity, a gap analysis, advising and assisting with implementation, a ‘fresh look’, and advising on the Official Plan review were identified as priorities.

The Panel also has some general recommendations for moving forward with an acquisition strategy and overall green space strategy.



Bibliography

- Association of New Jersey Environmental Commissions. *Economic Benefits of Open Space/Costs of Development: An Annotated Bibliography*, 1996.
- Association of New Jersey Environmental Commissions. “Open Space is a Good Investment: the Financial Argument for Open Space Preservation”. 2004.
- Auger, Philip A. “Does Open Space Pay?” *Natural Resource Network*. University of New Hampshire Cooperative Extension. 1996.
- Capital Regional District Parks Department. *Review of Potential Parkland*. 1983.
- The City of Edmonton. *Urban Parks Management Plan*. 2006.
- The City of Edmonton Office of Natural Areas. *Natural Connections Strategic Plan*. 2007.
- EarthCare Sudbury. *2010 EarthCare Sudbury Action Plan*. 2010.
- East Bay Regional Park District. *Master Plan*. 1973.
- Environment Canada. Ecological Gifts Program. May 25, 2010.
<<http://www.ec.gc.ca/pde-egp/default.asp?lang=En&n=FCD2A728-1>>
- Evergreen. *An Urban Land Trust Primer*. 2003.
- Evergreen. *Green Space Acquisition and Stewardship in Canada's Urban Municipalities: Results of a Nation-wide Survey*. 2001.
- Evergreen. *Land Securement Mechanisms for Conserving Natural Landscapes in Urban Canada – DRAFT*. 2009.
- Fausold, C.J., Liljeholm, R.J. “The Economic Value of Open Space” *Land Lines*. 1996: 8(5).
- Fraser, D.M. “Greenlands in the Central Ontario Zone. Issue Paper No.4.” *Neptis Foundation*. 2003.
- Gwinnett County. *Comprehensive Parks and Recreation Master Plan*. 2004.
- Healthy Community Expert Panel. *Greater Sudbury Healthy Community Strategy*. 2005.
- Land Trust Alliance. *Strategic Conservation Planning by Land Trusts*:

Protecting Freshwater Resources in the Southeast US 2005-2010. 2010.

Land Trust Alliance. Strategic Conservation. May 25, 2010.
<<http://www.landtrustalliance.org/about-us/who-we-are/programs/strategic-conservation/strategic-conservation>>

Lutzenhiser, M., Netusil, N.R. "The Effect of Open Space Type on a Home's Sale Price: Portland, Oregon" *Contemporary Economic Policy*. 2001: 19 (1): 291-298.

Maller, C. Townsend, M. St. Leger, L. Henderson-Wilson, C. Pryor, A. Prossen, L. Moore, M. "Healthy Parks, Healthy People: the Health Benefits of Contact with Nature in a Park Context." 2008.

Monet, S. Boucher, N. *Natural Heritage Background Study*. 2005.

Monteith Brown planning consultants. *City of Greater Sudbury Parks, Open Space & Leisure Background Report and Executive Summary*. 2004.

Monteith Brown planning consultants. *City of Greater Sudbury Parks, Open Space & Leisure Master Plan*. 2004.

Ontario Land Trust Alliance. Publications. May 25, 2010.
<http://www.olta.ca/what_we_do.aspx?page_name=What_We_Do/publications&restricted=no>

Planning Services Division, Growth and Development Department, City of Greater Sudbury. *The City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan*. September 2008 Consolidation. 2008.

Project Evergreen. "Economic Fact Sheet: The Economic Benefits of Green Spaces"

Project Evergreen. "Environmental Fact Sheet: The Environmental Benefits of Green Spaces"

Tree Canada. Benefits of Urban Forests. May 25, 2010.
http://www.treecanada.ca/site/?page=programs_urbanforestry_benefits&lang=en

Appendix A

Green Space Advisory Panel Members:

Ward 1 – Gerard Courtin	Ward 7 – Keir Kitchen
Ward 2 – (Franco Mariotti)	Ward 8 – No appointment
Ward 3 – Lorne Taylor, Warren Maskell	Ward 9 – Roel Teunissen, Robert Hanson
Ward 4 – Don Brisbois	Ward 10 – Samantha Baulch, Naomi Grant, Dr. Beaumont Nelson
Ward 5 – Michel Lauzon	Ward 11 – John Rauh
Ward 6 – Elaine Comacchio-Blais	Ward 12 – Will Morin

Experts:

Franco Mariotti - Biologist, Environmental Activist, Science North link (Ward 2)

Dr. Stephen Monet - Ecologist, Wetlands Specialist, Natural Heritage Background Study (Ward 10)

Dr. Peter Beckett - Botanist, Ecologist, Community Environmentalist (Ward 11)

Paul Sajatovic - Nickel District Conservation Authority

Will Kershaw - Ministry of Natural Resources Parks Planner (Ward 1)

Deb McIntosh - Executive Director of Rainbow Routes (Ward 9)

Staff Implementation Team:

Bill Lautenbach – General Manager of Growth and Development

Paul Baskcomb – Acting Director of Planning Services

Chris Gore – Manager of Community Partnerships

Keith Forrester – Real Estate Coordinator

Ian Wood – Chief of Staff to the Mayor

Kris Longston – Senior Planner, Community & Strategic Planning

Krista Carré – Senior Planning Technician

Stephen Monet – Manager of Environmental Planning Initiatives

Appendix B - Green Space Advisory Panel - Summary of Public Input

Name	Nature of Comment	Action Taken
Gord Lundgren	Concerned about development and preservation of endangered species around Lily Creek and specifically Green Space 10-25.	Green Space 10-25 has been identified as a neighbourhood/natural park in the study.
Ginette Forget-Rose	Indicated that Ward 12 Uptown CAN would like a neighbourhood park in the area and questioned the possibility of establishing one on the United Steel Workers Property.	Outside the scope of the study.
Michael Giroux	Requested that the lands along Falconbridge Road behind the Falcon Hotel in Garson be protected.	These are the Vale Inco flux pit lands. Greenspace #7-77 has been created and can be included for future considerations.
Chris Blomme	Identified islands in Kelly Lake that have not been included in the study and are important bird habitats. Also stressed the importance of protecting identified areas around Robinson Lake, Kelly Lake and Laurentian University. Additionally noted that the Coniston and O'Donnell Roastyard have some historical significance.	Islands in Kelly Lake have been mapped and assigned the number 1-57 a, b and c and have been added to the Opportunities List.
Paula Worton	Discussed the importance of the green spaces around Kelly and Robinson Lakes.	Areas surrounding Kelly Lake and Robinson Lake have been identified as 1-48, 1-49a & b, 1-50, 1-13, 1-45, 1-53, 2-64, 9-50, 9-51, 9-15, 2-40, 2-10
Pierre Perreault	Requesting the establishment of an off leash dog park at the north end of Second Avenue.	Site 11-58 has been identified as a green space opportunity.
Marc Pleau	Stressed the importance of areas 5-56a & b for recreational uses and the need to link these opportunities to neighbouring existing parks.	5-59a & b are identified on the opportunities list.
Lucie Poulin	Would like to add the lands along Hwy. 144 beside the Community Centre.	Property has been labeled as 3-72 and added to the opportunities list.
Peter Zwarich	Would like to see greenspace area 10-78 zoned as Park.	Property has been zoned Park in the draft comprehensive zoning by-law.
Jenny Martindale	Encourages the preservation of greenspace area 10-78, also had additional concerns about St. Charles Lake and forest reserves in Dowling.	Majority of site 10-78 has been zoned Park in the draft comprehensive zoning by-law, the serviced lots on Hyland Drive are remaining R2.
Nancy Scott	Wants greenspace area 10-78 rezoned to Park.	Property has been zoned Park in the draft comprehensive zoning by-law.
Arik Theijsmeijer	Encourages the preservation of greenspace area 10-78.	Property has been zoned Park in the draft comprehensive zoning by-law.
Jan Buley	Would like greenspace on Maki Avenue preserved.	Property is already identified as an existing park and is already zoned as such.
Cheryl Wormsbecker	Wants greenspace area 10-78 rezoned to Park.	Property has been zoned Park in the draft comprehensive zoning by-law.
Lynn Buckham	Commented that the table lists greenspace 10-80A as having waterfront, when in reality it doesn't.	Greenspace 10-80 A & B have been merged and is on Lake Nepahwin.

Name	Nature of Comment	Action Taken
Carole Boileau	Wants to improve area around transit bus stop across from Tim Horton's in Azilda. Secondly, she also wants to protect an area between Junction and Charlebois Street adjacent to a creek that flows in Whitewater Lake. Thirdly, she feels improvements need to be made to the lake access on Laurier Street between Puska and Montcalm.	Added 4-53 to the opportunities list. The area between St. Alphonse and Junction Streets are slated for development, however the City currently owns the area identified as 4-54 and has now been added to the opportunities list. The Whitewater Lake access point off Laurier has been added as 4-55 on the opportunities list.
April 22nd facilitated discussion	Ward 2: North of Garrow Road and 2-35, well used tobogganing hill on Inco owned land.	Added 2-70 to the map and on the private opportunities list.
	Ward 2: South of 2-37, between Evans and Church Streets, CGS land. This area looks low on parks, would this CGS land be suitable?	Added site 2-71 on the map and the City owned opportunities list.
	Ward 2: CGS land around 2-16 – capture any of this? Especially around lakes?	Expanded 2-16 to include cross-country ski trails and revised the Existing Park list.
	Ward 3: join 3-60 and 3-64 along waterway	Added 3-73 to private opportunities list to connect 3-60 and 3-64.
	Ward 3: CGS land North of 3-23a and b	The areas adjacent to 3-23a & b (AY Jackson) have been added to the map and CGS owned opportunities list as sites: 3-23c, 3-23d and 3-23e.
	Ward 3: Connect 2-67 and 3-67	Extended site 3-67 westward to connect to 3-71 which is already linked to 2-67. Revised private opportunities list with updated area.
	Ward 12: 5-59B - connect to Lasalle through remaining green spaces – make small park there. High residential density along here.	Two nearby connections exist. École Felix-Ricard exists on the north-west side of site 5-59b and Arthur street can be used as a travel corridor on the eastern side of 5-59b.
Viki Mather	Recommended Chiniguchi Provincial Park should be included on the maps. This includes Wolf Lake and Kukagami Forest Reserves.	Added the portion of Chiniguchi that is within Municipal boundaries. It has been grouped with 7-54 (existing parks list) and 7-72 (private opportunities list).

Appendix C - Greater Sudbury Green Space Classification System

	Neighbourhood Park	Community Park	Regional Park
Purpose	To meet the recreational needs of the neighbourhood	To provide the space and supportive facilities needed for active recreation in the community	To be a focal point for the City as a whole, due to its unique attributes, function, and size
General Description	<p>Easily accessible neighbourhood park space. May contain play equipment, sand boxes, benches, informal playing fields, natural areas, benches, community gardens, etc, depending on the needs of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Could be further classified as: 'T' – 'Tot Lots' – a micro park, generally one lot 'S' – 'School Park' (school yard used by the neighbourhood outside of school hours)</p>	<p>Developed park that can provide a focus for active recreation.</p> <p>Multi-purpose and catering to all ages.</p> <p>Centrally located close to major residential areas, if possible – designed pedestrian access; on arterial or collector roads for ease of community access.</p>	<p>Large park providing a unique function to the entire City of Greater Sudbury. May also be a tourist attraction. Can accommodate City-wide use and larger venues.</p>
Facilities/ Features	<p>Safe pedestrian access.</p> <p>May contain play equipment, room for casual play, shaded rest areas. May also contain open space, natural areas, walking trails and other features.</p>	<p>Facilities for active recreation such as sports fields, hard courts, outside rinks, indoor facilities, beaches, picnic areas, paths, natural areas.</p> <p>Safe pedestrian and bicycle access, access by public transit, and sufficient parking</p>	<p>Vary with special nature of each park: may be waterfront areas, beaches, special attractions or entertainment facilities.</p> <p>Should be linked to trail system, public transport, and be easily accessible by car, with sufficient parking.</p>
Size	Typically 0.2 – 1 hectare. Up to 4 hectares if it includes a significant portion of open space.	Typically 2 – 10 hectares.	Varies. May be larger than 10 hectares.
Service Area and Standard	<p>Serves immediate neighbourhood (up to 10 minute walk)</p> <p>0.25 ha per 1000 residents, within 800m without crossing a major barrier (including community parks within this area).</p> <p>Service area / standard-varies depending on the needs of the neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Serves a community/settlement area (up to 20 minute walk - see service areas in master plan).</p> <p>1.5 ha per 1000 residents, within 1600m without crossing a major barrier (including neighbourhood parks within this area).</p>	<p>City of Greater Sudbury.</p> <p>2.25 ha per 1000 residents.</p>

	Linear Park	Natural Park
Purpose	To follow linear natural or cultural landscape features and to be a connector linking different parks in the City	To protect a natural area while meeting residents' needs for passive recreation
General Description	<p>Corridors connecting different areas – e.g. trails, waterways, wetlands, cliff systems, and or habitat connectors.</p> <p>May be a tourist attraction.</p> <p>Park description must specify it as: 'trail' – to connect parks and other points of interest. To provide the opportunity for alternative transportation; 'waterway' – to preserve and provide public access to waterways, lake and river shorelands; 'habitat corridor' – to connect core natural areas and provide the opportunity for wildlife movement between them.</p> <p>No new roads.</p>	<p>Landscapes in a predominately natural condition. Varies from a small patch of nature valued by the immediate neighbourhood to a large natural area drawing residents from throughout the City.</p> <p>Provides residents and visitors with access to natural areas with recreational, educational, and scenic value. May have a history of use by residents. Benefits include protection of watersheds, and critical wildlife habitat, educational uses, green infrastructure, aesthetic and economic value of the area, and economic activity such as berry-picking and tourism.</p> <p>Park description should specify the landscape and natural assets included: E.g., 'aquatic' - lakes, rivers, shoreline, wetlands; and, 'terrestrial' - valley lands, woodlots, cliffs, hill top, geological / geomorphological features</p>
Facilities/ Features	<p>Varies as appropriate to site. Possible facilities include trail heads, trail markers, rest areas.</p> <p>Adjacent natural areas may be included.</p>	<p>May have no facilities, but may include informal walking trails, educational signage, cross-country ski trails, and rest areas.</p> <p>No new roads.</p> <p>May be linked to trail system, public transport, and be easily accessible by car, with sufficient parking. Parking, washroom facilities, rest areas, or interpretive centres could be concentrated in a small area of the park (but will not use more than 1% of area).</p>
Size	<p>A width of 15 metres centred on a trail is a minimum to accommodate trail activity.</p> <p>Connectors of other park classes could have a width up to several kilometres where possible.</p>	<p>Varies</p> <p>Generally, a goal of > 15ha will be used where possible, but the importance of much smaller areas providing access to nature in existing neighbourhoods is also recognized.</p>
Service Area & Standard	<p>City of Greater Sudbury</p> <p>The object is connectivity of parkland and other key areas between and among wards.</p> <p>All residents should be within 800m of a linear park, without crossing a major barrier.</p>	<p>Varies. Smaller natural parks (<5ha) may serve a neighbourhood; larger natural parks (>5ha) may serve Greater Sudbury.</p> <p>The objective is to provide all neighbourhoods with access to a natural area, with larger natural parks serving the wider community.</p> <p>All residents should be within 800m of a natural park, without crossing a major barrier.</p>

	Cultural / Historical / Special Purpose Park	Ecological Reserve
Purpose	To protect a site with historic, scientific, cultural, social, or spiritual importance or other purpose.	To protect significant natural areas that have ecological and/or geological importance, or that capture a characteristic natural feature of the City
General Description	Lands and or waters that may have aesthetic, historic, scientific, cultural, social or spiritual importance for past, present or future generations.	<p>Lands and/or waters with ecological and/or geological importance. May have a natural or scientific importance as a particular natural asset. It may be deemed important to the community.</p> <p>The park description will further identify the type of natural assets, and landscapes included, as well as key features and sensitivities.</p>
Facilities/ Features	<p>May include archaeological sites, native heritage sites, built heritage, cultural landscapes identified by residents. May or may not have facilities such as signage, interpretive centres or walks, rest areas, etc, and/or may include conservation efforts to sustain a feature.</p> <p>Adjacent natural areas may be included.</p> <p>Some green space has a primary non-park focus. None – the – less they can also contribute as significant parkland (e.g., storm water buffers – Heath Unit on Paris Street; sewage lagoon – Chelmsford, Montpellier Road) as they add aesthetics or special functions to the park system (e.g., spring migrants and summer birding at sewage lagoon).</p>	<p>Contains a natural feature worthy of protection for its natural function, uniqueness, sensitivity, or environmental value.</p> <p>May also capture a characteristic natural feature of Greater Sudbury.</p> <p>May or may not be publicly accessible, depending on appropriate land use. If public access is appropriate it may contain minimal supportive infrastructure such as trails, boardwalks, interpretive signage. This infrastructure will never exceed 0.5% of the area, or impinge on the natural value of the site.</p> <p>The protection of the natural assets is always the guiding principle.</p> <p>No new roads.</p>
Size	As determined by the site.	<p>Varies</p> <p>Generally >15ha, but recognizing that in some cases very small Ecological Reserves may have value (e.g. for a specific habitat or nesting site)</p> <p>The goal should be to protect the asset in its entirety if possible, with a further buffer zone from developed areas.</p>
Service Area and Standard	Greater Sudbury, or as determined by site.	<p>Greater Sudbury.</p> <p>The objective is to protect all sites identified as having importance as an ecological reserve.</p>

Appendix D – Park Management

Regional Parks

Regional Parks *i.e. Bell Park, Moonlight Beach* are considered to be high maintenance due to the fact that they are large, often have a variety of uses including: trails, play equipment, beaches, etc. These parks are used both passively and for active recreation. They are often considered tourist destinations and are allocated a large budget for maintaining the different aspects.

Community Parks

Community Parks *i.e. James Jerome Sports Complex, Delki Dozzi Park* are considered to be high maintenance due to the fact that they typically include sports fields and play equipment. These parks are used primarily for active recreation and service larger areas.

Neighbourhood Parks

Neighbourhood Parks *i.e. St. Charles Lake Park, McCrea Heights Playground* are considered to be high maintenance as well due to the fact that they typically include landscaping, benches, trails and play structure which all require maintenance. These parks are used primarily for active and passive recreation by neighbouring residents.

Linear Parks

Linear Parks *i.e. Junction Creek Waterway Park, Hillfield Trail* are considered to be low to medium maintenance. If the City of Greater Sudbury has assumed a formal trail within a Linear Park it is responsible for maintaining the trail and 6 feet on either side of the trail. Normally the rest of the park remains in a natural state. The City does not maintain informal trails. These parks are typically used for passive recreation and pedestrian transportation.

Natural Parks

Natural Parks *i.e. Roxborough, Nickeldale Dam Area* are low maintenance as there are few artificial features requiring regular care. If the City of Greater Sudbury has assumed a formal trail within a Natural Park it is responsible for maintaining the trail and 6 feet on either side of the trail. These parks are typically used for passive recreation. The primary focus of this type of park is protection of natural features. It is anticipated that they will remain in a natural state.

Cultural/Historical Special Purpose Park

Cultural/Historical Special Purpose Park *i.e. Anderson Farm/Museum, Jane Goodall Park/Trail* can range from a high to low level of care due to the varying nature of these parks. These parks can also range from active to passive uses.

Ecological Reserves

Ecological Reserves *i.e. Vermilion River Provincially Significant Wetland, Daisy Lake Uplands and Robison Lake Wetland* are typically low maintenance as there are few artificial features requiring regular care. These parks are typically passive and remain in a natural state. The primary focus of this type of park is protection of natural features. It is anticipated that they will remain in a natural state.

Appendix E

Green Space Existing Parks and Other Public Lands and Other Recreational Lands List

WARD 1 - EXISTING PARKS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
1-1	St. Charles Lake Park	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	0.9	Natural Area/ Waterfront/Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1	Living Area 1
1-2	Byng	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	I	Institutional
1-3	Byng Public-CGS School	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	0.3	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	I	Institutional
1-4	Delki Dozzi Park	Community Park	McKim	1	17.2		Public-CGS	P, PS	Parks & Open Space
1-5	Fraser Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	0.3	Tot Lot/Corridor to Junction Creek/ Linear Park	Public-CGS	R2	Parks & Open Space
1-6	Gatchell Pool	Community Park	McKim	1	1.2	Swimming Pool	Public-SBE	I	Institutional
1-7	Hillcrest Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	0.5	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
1-8 a)	Junction Creek Waterway	Linear Park	McKim	1	1.8		Public-CGS/ SCDSB	CO, I, M1-2	Mixed Use Commercial/ Parks & Open Space
1-8 b)	Junction Creek Waterway	Linear Park	McKim	1	1.9		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
1-9	Marcel	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	0.2	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R4	Parks & Open Space
1-10	Moonglo Passive Park (Telstar)	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	1.2		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
1-11	Queen's Athletic Field	Regional Park	McKim	1	2.3		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
1-12	Quinn Logan	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	0.3	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R6	Living Area 1
1-13	Robinson Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	2.2	Boardwalk link to Nova Court	Public-CGS	P, CO	Parks & Open Space
1-15	Copper Park	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	4.2	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R2	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
1-16	Corsi Hill	Historical/Cultural/ Special Purpose Park	McKim	1	0.4	Hilltop with Scenic Views/ Neighbourhood Park	Public-CGS	R1	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space

WARD 1 - OTHER PUBLIC LANDS AND OTHER RECREATIONAL LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
1-26	Corpus Christi SS		McKim	1	2.2		Public-SCDSB	I	Living Area 1
1-27	St. Francis SS		McKim	1	1.8		Public-SCDSB	I	Living Area 1

WARD 2 - EXISTING PARKS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
2-1	Anderson Farm Museum	Cultural/Historical/ Special Purpose Park	Waters	2	5.7	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
2-2	Basilio Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	2	0.1		Public-CGS	R6-10	Living Area 1
2-3	Beaver Lake Sports and Cultural Centre	Cultural/Historical/ Special Purpose Pk.	Lorne	2	1.7		Private-Beaver Lake Sports & Cultural Club	A	Rural
2-4	Black Lake Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Waters	2	3.1		Public-CGS	RU, P	Living Area 1
2-5	Camp Wassakwa Day Camp	Neighbourhood Park	Denison	2	37.6	Special Purpose Park - Summer Camp with Shoreline	Public-CGS	P	Rural
2-6	Centennial Park (Whitefish)	Regional Park	Graham	2	38.9	Beach or Waterfront	Public-CGS	P	Rural/ Parks & Open Space
2-7	Den Lou Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Denison	2	1.6	In the Path of New Highway 17	Public-CGS	A	Rural
2-8	Diorite Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	2	0.6		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
2-9	East End Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Waters	2	0.3	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
2-10	Fielding Memorial Park	Natural Park	Waters	2	15.8	Regional Functions	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
2-11	Goodwill Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Waters	2	0.8		Church	I	Living Area 1
2-12	Kinsmen Sports Complex	Regional Park	Waters	2	7.1		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
2-13	Lively Playground	Community Park	Waters	2	0.9		Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
2-14	Meatbird Lake Park	Community Park	Waters	2	3.3	Swimming Hole	Public-CGS	P	Rural/ Parks & Open Space
2-15	Naughton Community Centre	Community Park	Graham	2	1.8	Cross-Country Ski Trails	Public-CGS	I-1	Living Area 1

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
2-16	Naughton Trail Centre	Regional Park	Graham	2	174.9		Public-CGS	P	Rural/ Parks & Open Space
2-17	Oja Playground	Community Park	Graham	2	12.5	Waterfront	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
2-18	Penage Road Community Centre	Community Park	Louise	2	0.7		Penage Road Community Association	RU	Rural
2-19	Pineheights Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Waters	2	0.9	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
2-20	R.H. Murray Park	Neighbourhood Park	Denison	2	4.8	Tot Lot	Public-SBE/ Private	RU, I	Rural/ Parks & Open Space
2-21	Simon Lake Park	Community Park	Graham	2	2.9	Waterfront	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
2-22	Spencer	Neighbourhood Park	McKim/ Snider	2	1.2	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	PS	Parks & Open Space
2-23	VLA Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Waters	2	2.8	Waterfront	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
2-24	Whitefish Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Graham	2	1.2		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
2-25	Copper Cliff Park & School	Community Park	Snider	2	8.3	Maintained by Vale Inco & CGS -School Park	Public-SBE/ Private-Vale Inco	I, PS	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
2-35	McClelland Arena	Facility	McKim	2	0.8	Arena/Squash Courts/Fitness Gym	Public-CGS	I	Institutional
2-36	Moxam Landing	Neighbourhood Park	Waters	2	0.4	Waterfront and Boat Launch	Public-CGS	R1.D2.5	Rural
2-37	R.G. Dow Pool	Facility	McKim	2	0.4	Pool	Public-CGS	I	Institutional
2-38	T.M. Davies Community Centre/ Arena	Facility	Waters	2	3.6	Arena	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
2-39	Hillfield Trails	Linear Park	Waters	2	6.5		Public-CGS, NDCA/Private	M3, P, RU	Rural/ Parks & Open Space

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
2-40	Kelly Lake Trails	Linear Park	Waters	2	26.5		Public-CGS, MTO	RU	Parks & Open Space/ Mining-Mineral Reserve
2-41	Lively Ski Hill	Community Park	Waters	2	26.0		Public-CGS	P	Rural/ Parks & Open Space

WARD 2 - OTHER PUBLIC LANDS AND OTHER RECREATIONAL LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
2-51	Fairbank Lake Provincial Park	Provincial Park	Trill/ Fairbank	2	83.7		Public-MNR	P	Parks & Open Space
2-52	Killarney Provincial Park Expansion	Forest Reserve	Dieppe/ Truman/ Roosevelt/ Hansen/ Goschen/ Caen	2	4722.5	Part outside CGS Limits, only portion within municipal boundary is counted	Public-MNR	RU	Parks & Open Space

WARD 3 - EXISTING PARKS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
3-1	Algoma	Neighbourhood Park	Balfour	3	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
3-2	Bathurst Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Balfour	3	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	A-18	Living Area 1
3-3	Cote Park	Neighbourhood Park	Balfour	3	1.4			I	Living Area 1
3-4	Dowling Tot Lot	Natural Park	Dowling	3	4.9	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
3-5	Fourth @Beech Tot Lot	Linear Park	Levack	3	2.7	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R2.D37	Rural
3-6	Gill Loop Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Dowling	3	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R2.D37	Living Area 1
3-7	Irene	Neighbourhood Park	Balfour	3	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1.D18	Living Area 1
3-8	Larchmont	Neighbourhood Park	Dowling	3	0.4	Tot Lot/Waterfront	Public-CGS	RU	Parks & Open Space
3-9	Larchwood P.S.	Community Park	Dowling	3	0.2		Public-SBE	I	Living Area 1
3-10	Levack Tot Lot Fourth @ Larch	Neighbourhood Park	Levack	3	2.8	Tot Lot	Private-Vale Inco	I	Institutional
3-11	Onaping Community Centre Park	Community Park	Dowling	3	1.8	Facilities	Public-CGS	I-4	Living Area 1/ Institutional/ Parks & Open Space
3-12	Onaping Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Dowling	3	0.3	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
3-13	Pine and Fir	Neighbourhood Park	Dowling	3	0.6	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
3-14	Rodrigue Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Balfour	3	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1.D18	Living Area 1
3-15	Russell Beaudry Playground	Community Park	Dowling	3	1.2	Curling Club and Rink	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
3-16	St. Charles School Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Balfour	3	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-SCDSB	I	Living Area 1
3-17	St. Etienne	Neighbourhood Park	Dowling	3	0.3	Tot Lot	Public-SCDSB	I	Living Area 1
3-18	St. Onge	Neighbourhood Park	Balfour	3	0.2	Tot Lot	Public-CGS/ Private	I, R3.D36-12	Living Area 1
3-19	Shirley	Neighbourhood Park	Balfour	3	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1.D18	Living Area 1
3-20	Vaillancourt	Neighbourhood Park	Balfour	3	0.3	Tot Lot /Could be part of Waterway Park	Public-CGS	R1.D18	Parks & Open Space
3-21	Vermilion Lake Park - 1	Community Park	Fairbank	3	3.5	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
3-22	Vermilion Lake Park - 2	Neighbourhood Park	Balfour	3	0.6	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Rural
3-23 a)	A.Y. Jackson Adjacent Lands	Regional Park	Dowling	3	5.3	Natural & Historic Features/Life science features of Provincial Significance	Public-CGS	RU	Rural/ Parks & Open Space/ Aggregate Reserve
3-23 b)	A.Y. Jackson High Falls rest area and trails	Regional Park	Dowling	3	28.2	Natural & Historic Features/Life science features of Provincial Significance	Public-CGS	RU	Rural/ Parks & Open Space/ Aggregate Reserve
3-24	Grand Marquis Park	Neighbourhood Park	Balfour	3	0.2		Private (for now)		Living Area 1
3-25	Levack Cenotaph	Neighbourhood Park	Levack	3	0.2		Public-CGS		Rural/Town Centre
3-26	Levack Drive/Copper Street Park	Neighbourhood Park	Levack	3	0.5	Tot Lot	Public-CGS		Living Area 1

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
3-27	Levack Tot Lot Fourth @Beech	Neighbourhood Park	Levack	3	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R2.D37	Rural
3-34	Chelmsford Community Arena	Community Park	Balfour	3	4.5	Facility	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
3-35	I.J. Cody Memorial Arena	Community Park	Levack	3	2.5	Facility	Public-CGS	I, I-2, R2.D37	Living Area 1
3-36	Onaping Community Centre/ Pool	Community Park	Dowling	3	0.3	Facility	Public-CGS	I-4	Institutional

WARD 3 - OTHER PUBLIC LANDS AND OTHER RECREATIONAL LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
3-47	Onaping Ski Hill		Dowling	3	20.8	Ski Hill	Private	C7	Rural/ Living Area 1

WARD 4 - EXISTING PARKS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
4-1	Beatty Municipal Park	Linear Park/ Natural Park	McKim	4	4.3		Public-CGS	R2, CO	Rural/ Parks & Open Space
4-2	Birch	Neighbourhood Park	Rayside	4	1.3		Public-CGS	R1.D18	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
4-3	Centennial Park/ Whitewater Park	Regional Park Community Park	Rayside	4	10.2	Waterfront	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
4-4	Dr. Edgar Leclair Community Centre/Arena/ Rick McDonald Sports Complex	Community Park	Rayside	4	4.4	Ball Fields/Arena	Public-CGS	I	Parks & Open Space/ Town Centre
4-5	Elm West Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	4	2.0	Ball Fields/ Outdoor Rink	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
4-6	Gauthier Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Rayside	4	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1.D18	Living Area 1
4-7	Gravelle	Neighbourhood Park	Rayside	4	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1.D18	Living Area 1
4-8	Heritage Park	Cultural/Historical/ Special Purpose Park	McKim	4	0.1	Under Review	Public-CGS	R4, R2	Living Area 1/ Mixed Use Commercial
4-9	Little Britain Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	4	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R6	Living Area 1
4-10	North End Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Rayside	4	2.2	Informal Ball Field	Public-CGS	A	Rural
4-11	Selkirk Park	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	4	10.0	Ball Field/Gazebo/ Link to Terry Fox Complex Linear Trail	Public-CGS	PS, P	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
4-12	Terry Fox Complex	Regional Park	McKim	4	24.5	Natural Park/ Trails/ Ball Fields	Public-CGS	P-2	Parks & Open Space
4-13	Shawn	Neighbourhood Park	Rayside	4	0.2	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R2.D14	Living Area 1
4-14	Victory Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	4	0.7		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
4-15	Antwerp Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	4	0.2		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
4-16	Antwerp Outdoor Rink	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	4	0.3		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
4-17	Spruce Meadows Park	Neighbourhood Park	Rayside	4	0.1	Under Review	Private (for now)	R1.D18	Living Area 1
4-18	Trottier-Belanger Subdivision	Neighbourhood Park	Rayside	4	0.1		Public-CGS	R1.D18	Living Area 1
4-28	Lionel E. Lalonde Centre	Neighbourhood Park	Rayside	4	16.3	Gymnasium Facilities/Museum and Field	Public-CGS	I-3	Living Area 1/ Institutional
4-29	Donovan Flags	Cultural/Historical/ Special Purpose Park	McKim	4	0.1	Neighbourhood Entrance (within Road ROW)	Public-CGS	PS	Parks & Open Space
4-30	Voyageur Ski Trails	Neighbourhood Park	Rayside	4	173.6	Ski Trails	Public-CGS	RU	Rural/ Mining-Mineral Reserve

WARD 5 - EXISTING PARKS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
5-1	Blezard Valley Playground	Community Park	Blezard	5	2.7		Public-CGS	P	Living Area 2/ Parks & Open Space
5-2	Carol Richard Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Hanmer	5	0.3		Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
5-3	Confederation Tot Lot @Raymond Plourde Confederation Arena	Community Park	Blezard	5	0.3	Tot Lot	Public-SBE	P	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
5-4	Daniel Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Blezard	5	0.6	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1.D18	Living Area 1
5-5	Flake Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Blezard	5	2.5		Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
5-6	Grandview	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	5	0.9	Link to Nickeldale Conservation Area	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
5-7	Guilletville Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Blezard	5	1.2	Tot Lot	Private-Xstrata	RU	Living Area 2/ Mining-Mineral Reserve
5-8	Kalmo Beach/Sandy Beach	Community Park	Blezard	5	12.9	Natural and waterfront	Public-CGS	RU	Parks & Open space
5-9	Joe McDonald Memorial Park	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	5	4.4		Public-CGS	I	Institutional
5-10	MacMillan Park	Neighbourhood Park	Hanmer	5	0.5	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R3.D5, P	Living Area 1
5-11	McCrea Heights Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Blezard	5	1.6		Public-CGS	P	Living Area 2
5-12	McLean Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	5	0.9	Linked with West Branch of Junction Creek Park	Public-CGS	R1, PS	Parks & Open Space
5-13	Pinecrest	Neighbourhood Park	Hanmer	5	1.3	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
5-14	Ryan Heights Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	5	0.7		Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
5-15	Sunnyside Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Blezard	5	0.8		Public-CGS	P	Living Area 2
5-16	Saddlecreek Park	Neighbourhood Park	Hanmer	5	1.2		Public-CGS	R1.D18, P	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
5-17	Valleyview Road-Dalron Park	Community Park		5	5.2		Private-Various	RU	Rural
5-20	Proposed Confederation Phase II (added Aug 2009)	Neighbourhood Park	Blezard	5	0.1		Private (for now)	R1.D18	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
5-21	Proposed Saddle Creek (added Aug 2009)	Neighbourhood Park	Hanmer	5	0.4		Private (for now)	R1.D18	Parks & Open Space
5-31	Cambrian Arena	Community Park	McKim	5	1.3	Arena	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
5-32	Raymond Plourde Confederation Arena	Facility	Blezard	5	0.4	Arena	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space

WARD 5 - OTHER PUBLIC LANDS AND OTHER RECREATIONAL LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
5-19	Lasalle Cemetery	Facility	McKim	5	18.4		Public-CGS	I	Parks & Open Space
5-42	Nickeldale Dam Area (NDCA Lands)	Natural Park	McKim	5	52.8		Public-NDCA	CP, PS	Parks & Open Space
5-43	Confederation Secondary School & surrounding property	Facility	Blezard	5	19.5	School/Ball Field/ Outdoor Track	Public-SBE	P, I	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/ Institutional
5-44	Langdon Park	Community Park	Blezard	5	12.9	Linked with Whitson River Linear Park	Public-NDCA	A, P	Rural/ Parks & Open Space

WARD 6 - EXISTING PARKS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
6-1	Centennial Arena	Community Park	Hanmer	6	21.3	Arena/Sugarbush Trail	Public-CGS	I	Parks & Open Space
6-2	Elmview Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Hanmer	6	1.1	Ball Field	Public-CGS	P, R1.D18	Living Area 1
6-3	Farmdale Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Hanmer	6	1.9		Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
6-5	Howard Armstrong Recreation Centre/Sports Complex	Regional Park	Hanmer	6	30.2	Trail Linkage/ Swimming Pool/ Fields	Public-CGS	I, I-3, RU	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/ Town Centre
6-6	Laval	Neighbourhood Park	Hanmer	6	0.2	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	I-1	Living Area 1
6-7	Lion's Playground/Sports Complex	Neighbourhood Park	Hanmer	6	2.3		Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
6-8	Rose Court Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Hanmer	6	0.4	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
6-9	Theresa Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Capreol	6	1.1		Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
6-10	Valley Acres Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Hanmer	6	0.7		Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
6-11	Leger Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Hanmer	6	0.6	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1.D18	Living Area 1
6-12	Gord Hope (Park Dedication)	Neighbourhood Park	Hanmer	6	3.8		Public-CGS	RI.D18, RU	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
6-13	Dominion Drive (Park Dedication)		Hanmer	6	10.5		Public-CGS	P, RU	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
6-14	Nature's Haven (Park Dedication)		Capreol	6	2.5		Public-CGS/ Private	P	Living Area 1
6-15	Proposed Katmic Subdivision (Park Dedication)		Hanmer	6	0.3		Private (for now)	R1.D18	Living Area 1
6-16	Chelsea Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Hanmer	6	0.3		Public-CGS	R1.D18	Living Area 1

WARD 6 - OTHER PUBLIC LANDS AND OTHER RECREATIONAL LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
6-4	Hanmer Secondary School	Neighbourhood Park	Capreol	6	4.9	Field Adjacent to School	Public-Conseil Scolaire Public du Grand Nord de L'Ontario	I	Parks & Open Space/ Institutional
6-37	Nelson Delta Geological Reserve	Ecological Reserve	Hanmer/ Lumsden	6	361.8		Public-MNR	RU, A	Parks & Open Space

WARD 7 - EXISTING PARKS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
7-1	Beech	Neighbourhood Park	Garson	7	0.7	Tot Lot	Public-NDCA	P	Town Centre
7-2	Brighton	Neighbourhood Park	Garson	7	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1.D7.5	Living Area 2
7-3	Ella Lake Park & Campground	Community Park/ Neighbourhood Park	Capreol	7	4.0	Waterfront/ Campground	Public-CGS	RU	Mining-Mineral Reserve
7-4	Capreol Lions Den Park	Neighbourhood Park	Norman	7	0.4		Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
7-5	Catherine Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Garson	7	0.4	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1/ Mixed Use Commercial
7-6	Cedar Green Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Garson	7	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1.D22	Living Area 1
7-7	Centennial Park	Community Park	Falconbridge	7	5.4		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
7-8	Doug Mohns Park	Neighbourhood Park	Capreol	7	1.1	Tot Lot, Special Purpose Park	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
7-9	Capreol Community Centre	Community Park	Capreol	7	5.8		Public-CGS	P-1, P	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
7-10	Gordon Street Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Garson	7	1.2	Outdoor Rink	Skead Road Community Club	I	Living Area 2
7-11	Lion's Park	Neighbourhood Park	Garson	7	0.2	Join with Garson Park Conservation Area	Public-NDCA	P	Town Centre
7-12	Matson Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Garson	7	0.3	Tot Lot	Public-CGS?	R1.D17	Living Area 1
7-13	Metcalfe Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Garson	7	0.8	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
7-14	McNicol Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Capreol	7	0.3	Tot Lot	Public-MNR	P	Parks & Open Space
7-15	Parkinson Park Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Falconbridge	7	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
7-16	Penman Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Garson	7	0.5	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
7-17	Pine St. Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Garson	7	2.0	Former Railbed Linkage	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
7-18	Ravina Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Garson	7	2.4	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
7-19	Saturn Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Garson	7	0.5	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R3.D60	Living Area 1
7-20	Silver Birch Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	MacLennan	7	0.0	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 2
7-21	Silver Birch Crescent Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	MacLennan	7	0.3	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	RU	Parks & Open Space
7-22	Skead Rink	Neighbourhood Park	MacLennan	7	0.8	Outdoor Rink	Public-CGS	R1.D7.5	Living Area 2/ Parks & Open Space
7-23	Thomas Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Garson	7	0.2	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1.D22	Living Area 1
7-24	Cenotaph Park	Historical/Cultural/ Special Purpose	Capreol	7	0.2		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
7-25	Fawcett Park	Historical/Cultural/ Special Purpose	Capreol	7	0.0		Public-CGS	C1	Living Area 1
7-26	Prescott Park	Historical/Cultural/ Special Purpose Park	Capreol	7	0.6	Railway Museum	Public-CGS/ Private-CN	C2, D1.D18	Parks & Open Space/ Town Centre
7-27	Tower Road	Natural Park	MacLennan	7	2.5	Waterfront	Public-CGS	RU	Rural/Living Area 2
7-28	Dunn Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Capreol	7	1.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1.D18	Rural/ Parks & Open Space
7-29	Donnelly Park	Neighbourhood Park	Garson	7	0.6		Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
7-39	Garson Citizen Service Centre/ Arena	Community Park	Garson	7	7.4		Public-CGS	I	Town Centre
7-40	Capreol Ski Hill		Capreol	7	6.1	Ski Hill	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space

WARD 7 - OTHER PUBLIC LANDS AND OTHER RECREATIONAL LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
7-51	Garson Park Conservation Area	Linear Park	Garson	7	4.1		NDCA	P	Parks & Open Space
7-52	Falconbridge Trail	Linear Park	Falconbridge	7	3.9	Special Purpose Features	Public & Private-Variou	C2, I, R1.D22 M4, RU	Parks & Open Space/ Living Area 1/ Mining-Mineral Reserve
7-53	Wahnapitae Provincial Park	Provincial Park/ Natural Park	Aylmer/ Rathbun	7	2864	Waterfront	Public-MNR	Crown	Parks & Open Space
7-54	Wolf Lake	Ecological Reserve	Mackelcan	7	1072.1	Old growth red pine forest, Provincial Significance and Natural Features	Public-MNR	RU	Parks & Open Space
7-55	Maley Drive - Conservation Area	Natural Park	Garson	7 & 5	357.2	Connected to Junction Creek (East) and Timberwolf Golf Course	Public-NDCA	RU, OR, OR-1	Parks & Open Space

WARD 8 - EXISTING PARKS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
8-1	Churchill Public-CGS School Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	8	2.7		Public-SBE	I	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
8-2	Carling Tot Lot (Madison Park)	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	8	0.7	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	RI, P	Parks & Open Space
8-3	Don Lita Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	8	0.4		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
8-4	Lansing Field	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	8	1.6		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
8-5	Lebel Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	8	0.3		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
8-6	Bonaventure Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	8	0.3	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1	Living Area 1
8-7	Place Hurtubise Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	8	0.3		Public-CGS	R4	Parks & Open Space
8-8	Porter	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	8	0.1		Public-CGS	R1	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
8-9	Rosemarie Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	8	0.7		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
8-10	Summerhill	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	8	0.2		Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
8-11	Trillium Park Tot Lot	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	8	0.4	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1	Living Area 1
8-12	Twin Forks	Community Park	Neelon	8	9.7	Linkage with Junction Creek Waterway and Trail Network	Public-CGS	P, CO	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
8-13	Valleystream Drive Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	8	0.3		Public-CGS	R1	Living Area 1
8-14	Westmount Community Centre Park	Community Park	Neelon	8	1.6	Linkage with Westmount School	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
8-15	Nickel District Pool & Community Park	Community Park	Neelon	8	8.2	Facility - linked with Grassy Hill	Public-CGS, SDCSB	I	Institutional

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
8-16	Grassy Hill	Natural Park	Neelon	8	1.8	School linkage to St. Charles & St. Bernadette	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
8-17 a)	Junction Creek Madison to Maley-CGS	Linear Park	Neelon	8	12.9	Waterway Park	Public-CGS	CO	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
8-17 b)	Junction Creek at Fairburn-CGS	Linear Park	Neelon	8	2.3	Waterway Park	Public-CGS	CO	Parks & Open Space
8-17 c)	Junction Creek at Lasalle-CGS	Linear Park	Neelon	8	0.2	Waterway Park	Public-CGS	M1	Parks & Open Space/ Regional Centre
8-17 d)	Junction Creek Lasalle to Lansing-CGS	Linear Park	Neelon	8	2.1	Waterway Park	Public-CGS	CO	Parks & Open Space
8-17 e)	Junction Creek Gary to Christina-CGS	Linear Park	Neelon	8	2.5	Waterway Park	Public-CGS	R1,CO	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space

WARD 8 - OTHER PUBLIC LANDS AND OTHER RECREATIONAL LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
8-38	St. Charles College		Neelon	8	3.1		Public-SDCSB	I	Institutional
8-39	LaSalle Secondary School		Neelon	8	7.8		Public-SBE	I	Institutional
8-40	Cambrian College		Neelon	8	62.1		Private	I	Parks & Open Space/ Institutional
8-41	NDCA Property South of Twin Forks		Neelon	8	0.8		Public-NDCA	CO	Parks & Open Space

WARD 9 - EXISTING PARKS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
9-1	Algonquin Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Broder	9	1.1	Rink associated with Algonquin Public School	Rainbow District School Board	I	Parks & Open Space/ Living Area 1
9-2 a)	Coniston Arena	Community Park	Neelon	9	4.1	Tot Lot/Arena Facility	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
9-2 b)	Coniston Centennial Park	Community Park	Neelon	9	2.3	Tot Lot/Arena Facility	Public-CGS	I	Parks & Open Space
9-3	East Street Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	9	0.1		Public-CGS	R1.D22	Parks & Open Space
9-4	Gateway	Neighbourhood Park	Broder	9	0.2	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1	Living Area 1
9-5	Long Lake Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Broder	9	1.8	Linkage to Crown Land/Rink/Playing Field/Linkage to School	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
9-6	Pond Hollow	Natural Park	Broder	9	4.5	Neighbourhood park	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
9-7	McFarlane Lake Park	Neighbourhood Park	Broder	9	0.8	Waterfront	Public	R1.D7.5	Living Area 2
9-8	McFarlane Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Dill	9	1.6		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space/ Institutional/Rural
9-9	Mountainview Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Dryden	9	1.7		Public-MNR	RU	Living Area 1
9-10	Ray Street Park	Neighbourhood Park	Dryden	9	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1.D18	Living Area 1
9-11	St. Christopher	Neighbourhood Park	Broder	9	0.4	Linkage with School	Public-SDCSB	I	Living Area 2
9-12	Wahnapiatae Community Club	Neighbourhood Park	Dryden	9	2.0	Water Access/Tot Lot	Public-CGS, MTO	I	Parks & Open Space/ Institutional

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
9-13	Countryside Arena	Community Park	Broder	9	11.1	Arena facility	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
9-14	Willowridge Park	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	9	2.6		Public-CGS	R1	Living Area 1
9-15	Kelley Lake Trail	Linear Park	Broder		11.5	Rainbow Routes	Public-MTO/ Private-Vale Inco	PS	Parks & Open Space/Mining-Mineral Reserve
9-27	Coniston Arena Hilltop	Community Park	Neelon	9	3.4		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
9-57 a)	Jane Goodall Park/Trail	Cultural/Historical/ Special Purpose	Neelon	9	0.7		Public-CGS	RU	Parks & Open Space
9-58	Silver Lake Beach	Facility	Broder	9	0.4	Waterfront	Public-CGS	RU	Rural

WARD 9 - OTHER PUBLIC LANDS AND OTHER RECREATIONAL LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
9-39	Long Lake Public School		Broder	9	3.0	School	Public-SBE	I,RU	Living Area 2/ Institutional/Rural

WARD 10 - EXISTING PARKS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
10-1	Bedford	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	0.3	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1.D10	Parks & Open Space
10-2 a)	Bell Park Hospital Parking Lot	Regional Park/ Cultural/Historical/ Special Purpose Park	McKim	10	4.8	Neighbourhood Park/ Tot Lot/Waterfront/ Beach/Play Structure /Amphitheatre/Trail and Boardwalk/ETC	Public-CGS	R1,P3	Parks & Open Space
10-2 b)	Bell Park	Regional Park/ Cultural/Historical/ Special Purpose Park	McKim	10	15.3	Neighbourhood Park/ Tot Lot/Waterfront/ Beach/Play Structure /Amphitheatre/Trail and Boardwalk/ETC	Public-CGS	P3	Parks & Open Space
10-2 c)	Bell Park Parking Lot	Regional Park/ Cultural/Historical/ Special Purpose Park	McKim	10	4.2	Neighbourhood Park/ Tot Lot/Waterfront/ Beach/Play Structure /Amphitheatre/Trail and Boardwalk/ETC	Public-CGS	P3	Parks & Open Space
10-2 d)	McNaughton Waterfront	Regional Park Cultural/Historical/ Special Purpose Park	McKim	10	0.9	Neighbourhood Park/ Waterfront/Trail/ETC	Public-CGS	R2,P3	Parks & Open Space
10-2 e)	Bell Grove	Regional Park/ Cultural/Historical/ Special Purpose Park	McKim	10	7.3	Waterfront/Boat Launch	Public-CGS	P4	Parks & Open Space
10-3	Durham Street Parkette	Cultural/Historical/ Special Purpose	McKim	10	0.0	Urban Street Park	Public-CGS	C8	Downtown
10-5	Lakeview Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	0.3		Public-CGS	R6	Living Area 1

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
10-6	James Jerome Sports Complex- Lily Creek	Regional Park Natural Park	McKim	10	17.5	Playing Fields/Creek/ Marsh & Boardwalk	Public-CGS	CO, P	Parks & Open Space
10-7	Lockerby Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	0.6	Tot Lot/Tennis Courts/Adjoins High School	Public-CGS	P	Institutional
10-8	LoEllen Community Centre Park	Community Park	Broder	10 & 9	3.0	Adjoins LoEllen Park Secondary School/ Outdoor Rink/ Playground	Public-SBE	I	Institutional
10-9	Memorial Park	Cultural/Historical/ Special Purpose	McKim	10	1.4	Commemoration	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
10-10	Nepahwin Lake Park	Community Park	McKim	10	1.4	Waterfront/Beach	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
10-11	Oriole	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	0.4	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1	Parks & Open Space
10-12	Riverdale Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	2.2	Outdoor Rink/Natural Area with Trail	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
10-13	Stewart	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	0.3	Tot Lot/Waterfront/ Beach	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
10-14	Sudbury Community Arena	Facility	McKim	10	1.2		Public-CGS	C8	Downtown
10-15	Worthington	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	0.1	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R6	Living Area 1
10-16	York Street	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	0.5	Tot Lot/ Play Structure	Public-CGS	R1	Living Area 1
10-17	North end of Lady Ashley	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	0.1	Adjoins R.L. Beattie Public School	Public-CGS	R2	Living Area 1
10-18	Stewart 2 (West)	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	0.1	Waterfront	Public-CGS	R1	Living Area 1

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
10-19	Cerilli (includes Road ROW)	Natural Park	McKim	10	0.3	Trail Connection/ Waterfront	Public-CGS	P, R1	Living Area 1/ Institutional
10-20 a)	Bethel Lake	Natural Park	McKim	10	1.6	Waterfront Trail	Public-CGS	P, FD, R1.D10-12	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
10-20 b)	Bethel Lake	Natural Park	McKim	10	5.0	Waterfront Trail	Public-CGS	P,FD	Parks & Open Space
10-21	Eden Point	Natural Park	McKim	10	0.2	Waterfront	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
10-22 a)	Junction Creek	Linear Park	McKim	10	0.7	Waterway Park	Public-CGS	CO	Parks & Open Space
10-22 b)	Junction Creek	Linear Park	McKim	10	0.9	Waterway Park-part of JC Waterway Park is on private land	Private-CPR	CO	Parks & Open Space
10-23	Maki Avenue Park	Natural Park	McKim	10	1.0	Waterfront/Unique Rock Formation	Public-CGS	R1	Living Area 1
10-24	Montel-Hunter CGS land	Natural Park	McKim	10	2.5	Trail Links	Public-CGS	P, R1	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
10-27 a)	Junction Creek Riverside to Regent	Linear Park	McKim	10	1.4		Public-CGS	I,R2,R6	Parks & Open Space
10-27 b)	Junction Creek Brady to Riverside	Linear Park	McKim	10	1.3		Public-CGS/ Private-Various	CO,R6	Parks & Open Space
10-28	Roxborough Greenbelt	Natural Park	McKim	10	2.7		Public-CGS	R2	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
10-29	Howey/Cartier Proposed Park Dedication	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	3.0		Public-CGS/ Private (for now)	R2	Parks & Open Space

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
10-30 a)	Roderick Avenue ROW - Lake Access		McKim	10	0.1		Public-CGS	R1.D10	Parks & Open Space
10-30 b)	Elliot Avenue ROW - Lake Access		McKim	10	0.1		Public-CGS	R1.D10	Parks & Open Space
10-30 c)	Woodlawn Road ROW - Lake Access		McKim	10	0.1		Public-CGS	R1.D10	Parks & Open Space
10-52	Sudbury Rowing Club	Facility	McKim	10	0.2		Public-CGS	P-3	Parks & Open Space
10-53	Sudbury Yacht Club	Facility	McKim	10	1.5		Public-CGS	P-4	Parks & Open Space
10-54	Navy League	Facility	McKim	10	0.1		Public-CGS	I-1	Parks & Open Space

WARD 10 - OTHER PUBLIC LANDS AND OTHER RECREATIONAL LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
10-4 a)	Lake Laurentian Conservation Area	Natural Park	McKim/ Neelon/ Dill/Broder	10 & 11	1073.6	Ecological Reserve/ Outdoor Ed. Chalet/ Ski & Hiking Trails	Public-MNR, NDCA	CO, P	Living Area 2/ Parks & Open Space/ Rural
10-4 b)	Ramsey Lake - Pike Island	Natural Park	Neelon	11	0.1	Pike Island, Ecological Reserve	Public-NDCA	RU	Parks & Open Space
10-40	Alexander P.S.	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	0.8	School	Public-SBE	I	Living Area 1
10-41	Algoma Hospital	Community Park Potential	McKim	10	13.7	Ruth McMillan	Private	R1.D10	Parks & Open Space
10-42	Idylwylde Golf & Country Club		McKim	10	74.0	Facilities/Joint Use/ Private Club/Cross- Country Ski Trails	Private	OR	Parks & Open Space
10-43 a)	Laurentian University	Community Park/ Natural Park	McKim	10	230.6	Trails/Walking/Skiing / Sports Facilities	Public-ORC	I	Institutional
10-43 b)	St. Joseph Villa	Community Park/ Natural Park	McKim	10	10.8	Trails/Walking/Skiing / Sports Facilities	Public-ORC	I	Institutional
10-43 c)	Laurentian University-North of Ramsey Lake Road	Community Park/ Natural Park	McKim	10	3.7	Trails/Walking/Skiing / Sports Facilities	Public-ORC	I	Institutional
10-44	Lockerby Public High School	Community Park	McKim	10	6.2	School	Public-SBE	I	Institutional
10-45	McLeod P.S.	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	3.7	School	Public-SBE	I	Institutional
10-46	St. Denis S.S.	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	1.3	School - Slated for Closure	SCDSB	I	Living Area 1
10-47	St. Michael S.S.	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	0.9	School	Public-SDCSB	I	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
10-48	St. Theresa S.S.	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	1.2	School	Public-SDCSB	I	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
10-49	Science North	Regional Park	McKim	10	9.8	Boardwalk/Waterfront	Public-CGS	I-1	Parks & Open Space
10-50	Wembley P.S. (Partnership)	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	1.1	School-Slated for Closure/Playing Fields/Waterway Park	Public-SBE	I	Living Area 1
10-51	Grotto	Cultural/Historical/ Special Purpose Park	McKim	10	2.0	S.S.M. Diocese	Roman Catholic Episcopal Corporation	I	Institutional
10-55	R.L. Beattie P.S.	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	2.4	School	Public-SBE	I	Living Area 1
10-66	Bennett Lake Watershed	Natural Park	McKim	10	27		Laurentian University	I, FD	Institutional/ Living Area 1

WARD 11 - EXISTING PARKS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
11-1	Adamsdale Playground	Community Park	Neelon	11	2.8	Outdoor Rink/Mini Soccer Fields	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
11-2	Autumnwood Park	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	11	1.4	Tot Lot/ Drainage Swale	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
11-3	Carmichael Arena Sports Fields & Blueberry Hill	Regional Park/ Natural Park	McKim	11	24.5	Skateboard Park/ Rink/Arena/ Ball Fields/Hilltop/ Natural Woodland	Public-NDCA	P	Parks & Open Space
11-4	Carmichael Community Centre	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	11	0.6	Community Centre/ Outdoor Rink/ Waterfront	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
11-5	Dorset	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	11	2.6	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
11-6	Downe Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	11	3.1	Tot Lot/ Natural Woodland	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
11-7	Lynwood	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	11	0.3	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
11-8	East End Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	11	8.0	Rink/Open Space	Public-CGS	P, R1	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
11-9 a)	Grace Park	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	11	0.7	Tot Lot/Adjacent to School/Watercourse	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
11-10	Moonlight Beach	Regional Park	Neelon	11	103.5	Camp Sudaca/Ball Field/Waterfront/ Beach/Picnic Area	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
11-11	Lonsdale Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	11	0.2	Fieldhouse	Public-CGS	R1	Parks & Open Space
11-12	Ridgemount Playground	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	11	1.0		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
11-13	Oak Forest	Natural Park	McKim	11	16.2	Natural Woodland	Public-CGS	CO, R1	Living Area 1, Parks & Open Space
11-14 a)	Minnow Lake Waterfront-Bancroft	Linear Park	McKim	11	0.3	Waterfront	Public-CGS	P, R2	Parks & Open Space/ Mixed Use Commercial
11-14 b)	Minnow Lake Waterfront-Bancroft	Linear Park	McKim	11	0.1	Waterfront	Public-CGS	C3	Mixed Use Commercial
11-15	Portage Avenue Beach	Neighbourhood Park/ Linear Park	Neelon	11	1.3	Waterfront	Public-CGS	P, R1	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
11-16	Minnow Lake Place	Cultural/Historical/ Special Purpose	Neelon	11	1.3	Waterfront	Public-CGS	I	Institutional
11-17 a)	Keystone-Kenwood Park	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	11	3.8	Adjacent to Pius XII School	Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
11-17 b)	Keystone Subdivision Park Allowance	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	11	0.2	Adjacent to Pius XII School/ 5% Park Dedication	Private (for now)	FD	Living Area 1
11-18 a)	Korpela Park North	Linear Park/ Natural Park	Neelon	11	2.5	Watercourse	Public-CGS	FD	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
11-18 b)	Korpela Park	Linear Park/ Natural Park	Neelon	11	0.6	Watercourse	Public-CGS	R1,FD	Parks & Open Space
11-18 c)	Korpela Park South	Linear Park/ Natural Park	Neelon	11	1.4	Watercourse	Public-CGS	FD	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
11-19	Buckingham Woodlot	Natural Park	McKim	11	1.2	Woodlot/Trail	Public-CGS	R1	Institutional
11-20	Greenway Park- Ramsey Lake Northeast Shorelands	Natural Park	Neelon	11	37.2		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
11-21	Avalon Road - Manor Road South		Neelon	11	1.8		Public-CGS	P, R4	Living Area 1

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
11-31	Memorial Cemetery	Cultural/Historical/ Special Purpose	Neelon	11	24.6	Soccer Field	Public-CGS	P, I	Parks & Open Space/ Institutional

WARD 11 - OTHER PUBLIC LANDS AND OTHER RECREATIONAL LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
11-9 b)	Ecole St-Pierre	Neighbourhood Park	Neelon	11	1.2	Tot Lot/Adjacent to Grace/Watercourse	Public-RCSSB	I	Living Area 1
11-41 a)	Daisy Lake Uplands East	Ecological Reserve Park	Neelon	9	86.7	Provincial Park/ Waterfront/Natural Heritage Features	Public-MNR	RU, CO, P	Parks & Open Space
11-41 b)	Daisy Lake Uplands	Ecological Reserve Park	Neelon/Dill	11	425.8	Provincial Park/ Waterfront/Natural Heritage Features	Public-MNR	RU	Parks & Open Space
11-41 c)	Daisy Lake Uplands West	Ecological Reserve Park	Neelon	11	90.1	Provincial Park/ Waterfront/Natural Heritage Features	Public-MNR	RU	Parks & Open Space
11-42	Adamsdale Public School		Neelon	11	1.5		Public-SBE	I	Living Area 1
11-43	Pius XII School		Neelon	11	3.7		Public-SCDSB	I	Living Area 1

WARD 12 - EXISTING PARKS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
12-1	Adanac Ski Hill/ Park	Regional Park/ Natural Park	McKim	12	101.4	Ski hill/trail system/ Rotary Park	Public- CGS/NDCA	P, CO, PS	Parks & Open Space
12-2	Cedar Park Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	12	2.2	Lion's Club playground	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
12-3	Cochrane Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	12	0.3	Tot Lot/road realign- ment/will eliminate park	Public-CGS	R2	Parks & Open Space
12-4	Eyre Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	12	0.3		Public-CGS	R1	Living Area 1
12-5	Hnatyshn Park	Cultural/Historical/ Special Purpose	McKim	12	0.6	Entrance to Junction Creek Waterway Park	Public-CGS	R6-14, P, C8	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
12-6	O'Connor Athletic Park	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	12	1.3		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
12-7	Percy Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	12	1.3		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
12-8	Redfern	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	12	0.5	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
12-9	Ridgecrest Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	12	1.1		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
12-10	Sunrise Ridge Park	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	12	2.2	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R1	Living Area 1
12-11	Orange Grove Gazebo	Special Purpose Park	McKim	12	0.0		Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1
12-12 a)	Junction Creek East of Notre Dame Avenue-Wetlands	Natural Park/ Linear Park	McKim	12	5.7	Adjacent to Percy Playground	Public-CGS	PS	Parks & Open Space
12-12 b)	Junction Creek East of Notre Dame Avenue (Train Tracks to King St.)	Natural Park/ Linear Park	McKim	12	1.6		Public-CGS, NDCA	PS,M1, R6	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
12-12 c)	Junction Creek East of Notre Dame Avenue (King to Queen St.)	Natural Park/ Linear Park	McKim	12	0.2		Public-CGS/ Private	R6	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
12-12 d)	Junction Creek East of Notre Dame Avenue (Queen to Bond St.)	Natural Park/ Linear Park	McKim	12	0.3		Public-CGS	R6	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
12-12 e)	Junction Creek East of Notre Dame Avenue (Bond to Leslie St.)	Natural Park/ Linear Park	McKim	12	1.9		Public-CGS/ Private-Various	R6,P, R2,M1	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/ General Industrial
12-12 f)	Junction Creek East of Notre Dame Avenue (Leslie to Louis St.)	Natural Park/ Linear Park	McKim	12	1.5		Public-CGS	P,R6, R4	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
12-12 g)	Junction Creek East of Notre Dame Avenue (Vincent to Fairview Ave.)	Natural Park/ Linear Park	McKim	12	0.7		Public-CGS	P,R4	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
12-22	Magnolia	Natural Park	McKim	12	1.5		Public-CGS	R1	Living Area 1

WARD 12 - OTHER PUBLIC LANDS AND OTHER RECREATIONAL LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
12-33	Sudbury Secondary High School		McKim	12	2.4		Public-SBE	I	Institutional
12-34	Queen Elizabeth PS		McKim	12	3.5		Public-SBE	I	Living Area 1
12-35	Sacre Coeur		McKim	12	7.0		Public-RCSSB	I	Parks & Open Space/ Institutional

Appendix F

Green Space Opportunities List – Private Owned Lands

WARD 1 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - PRIVATE OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
1-38	Summit of Corsi Hill	Natural Park	McKim	1	14.9		Private	PS	Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 3	5	5
1-39	CPR lands along Junction Creek at Martindale Road	Linear Park	McKim	1	12.6		Private-CPR	CO, M2	Parks & Open Space/General Industrial	Con 5 Rec 5	1	5
1-48	Robinson Lake North Shore - Walking Trail	Linear Park	McKim	1	2.2		Private	FD	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 3	4	5
1-49 a)	Robinson Lake South Shore	Linear Park	McKim	1	1.1		Private	RU, R1	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/Rural	Con 4 Rec 3	4	5
1-49 b)	Walking Trail	Linear Park	McKim	1	1.5		Private	RU, R1	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/Rural	Con 4 Rec 3	2	3
1-40	Devil's Falls Creek	Linear Park	McKim	1	3.6		Public-CGS/ Private	R1	Living Area 1	Con 4 Rec 3	2	3
1-45	Junction Creek/ Lily Creek Delta/ Kelley Lake Wetlands and extensions to Robinson Lake	Ecological Reserve	McKim	1	55.3	Also Linear and Natural Parks	Private	PS,CO, FD	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	2	3
1-54	Beverly Street to Martindale Road	Linear Park	McKim	1	1.8	Waterway	Public-CGS, NDCA/Private	CO, R2	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	1	3

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
1-44	Junction Creek Corridor - Kelley Lake to Martindale Road	Linear Park	McKim	1	4.4		Public-CGS/ Private	M2,M6, FD,CO	Parks & Open Space/General Industrial/Heavy Industrial	Con 3 Rec 3	3	2
1-53	Kelly Lake - Lands Northwest of Delta	Natural Park	McKim	1	75.1	Vale Inco and Fielding Lands	Private	PS,M4, M3-1	Parks & Open Space/Mining-Mineral/ Heavy Industrial	Con 4 Rec 1	1	2
1-57	Kelly Lake Island	Ecological Reserve	McKim	1	0.9	Bird Sanctuary	Private			Con 4 Rec 1	1	2
1-41	Green space between Buchanan and Brennan Sts	Natural Park	McKim	1	0.3		Public-CGS/ Sudbury & District Participation Projects	I	Institutional	Con 2 Rec 2	2	1
1-42	Green Space North of Rowat St.	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	1.1		Public-CGS/ Church	I	Institutional	Con 2 Rec 1	1	1
1-47	Marcel St. to Arnold St. Corridor	Ecological Reserve	McKim	1	2.0		Public-CGS/ Private	R1	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 2 Rec 2	4	1
1-51	Rudd Street Corridor	Linear Park	McKim	1	0.5	Connector	Public-CGS/ Private	R6, R2	Living Area 1	Con 1 Rec 2	2	1
1-52	East of Big Nickel Road	Natural Park	McKim	1 & 2	16.7	Large Expanse of Rock/Pond	Public-CGS/ Private- Vale Inco	R1, R2, PS	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 3 Rec 3	2	1
1-55	West End CIP Proposed Park		McKim	1 & 2	0.7		Private	M1	Mixed Use Commercial	Con 1 Rec 2	2	0
1-56	West End CIP Proposed Park		McKim	1	0.4		Private	C1-32	Mixed Use Commercial	Con 2 Rec 1	2	0

WARD 2 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - PRIVATE OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
2-66	O'Donnell Roast Beds	Cultural/ Historical/ Special Purpose Park	Graham	2	102.4	Vale Inco Owned - Potentially Under Threat	Private-Vale Inco	RU	Rural/General Industrial	Con 5 Rec 1	3	4
2-67	Vermillion River - Areas should be protected from future development	Natural Park	Creighton-Davies/ Graham/ Denison	2	795.8		Private-Vale Inco/Xstrata	RU, M4, M5, P	Rural/ Mining-Mineral Reserve	Con 5 Rec 4	3	4
2-65	Junction Creek Watershed - West of Kelley Lake	Linear Park	Waters	2	9.3		Public-NDCA/ Private	M3, P, RU	Parks & Open Space/Mining-Mineral Reserve/ Gen. Industrial	Con 4 Rec 3	2	3
2-63	Copper Cliff Hill between Power St. and Cobalt St.	Neighbourhood Park	Snider	2	2.0		Public-SCDSB	R1	Living Area 1	Con 2 Rec 3	3	2
2-70	Garrow Street Tobogganing Hill	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	2	1.5		Private - Vale Inco	P-1	Parks & Open Space	Con 2 Rec 3	3	2
2-64	North Shore of Kelley Lake	Natural Park	McKim/ Broder/ Snider	2	50.9		Public-NDCA/ Private-Variou	M3,M4, PS	Parks & Open Space/Mining-Mineral Reserve	Con 4 Rec 1	2	2
2-72	Kelly Lake Island	Ecological Reserve	Broder	2	0.1	Bird Sanctuary	Private			Con 4 Rec 1	1	2
2-68	West End CIP Proposed Park	Linear Park	McKim	2	41.3		Public-NDCA/ Private-Vale Inco	M4-1, PS,CO, M4	Parks & Open Space/Mining-Mineral Reserve	Con 3 Rec 2	1	1
2-62	Area between Azilda and Walden	Natural Park	Snider/ Creighton-Davies	2, 3, & 4	3136.6		Public-Variou/ Private (Vale Inco/Xstrata)	RU, M4	Rural/Mining-Mineral Reserve	Con 1 Rec 1	3	0

WARD 3 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - PRIVATE OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
3-60	Dowling Riverside Park - along Onaping River	Natural Park	Dowling	3	13.1	Linear Park Potential and Waterfront	Public-CGS/ Private - Various	P, M6, RU, R1.D18	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 3	1	4
3-66	Whitson Creek (Chelmsford)	Linear Park	Balfour	3	44.5		Public & Private-Variou	Multiple Zones	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/ Town Centre	Con 5 Rec 2	3	4
3-59	New Park in middle of Dowling behind the Plaza	Neighbourhood Park	Dowling	3	7.2		Private	R1.D1	Living Area 1/ Town Centre	Con 3 Rec 3	4	3
3-71	Vermilion River Undeveloped Land	Natural Park	Fairbank/ Creighton	3	344.1		Private	RU	Rural/Mining-Mineral Reserve	Con 4 Rec 3	2	3
3-73	Onaping River Corridor	Linear Park	Dowling	3	73.2		Private	RU	Parks & Open Space/Rural	Con 4 Rec 3	2	3
3-61	Parcel 1912 A.Y. Jackson Adjacent Lands	Regional Park	Dowling	3	62.3	Natural & Historic Features/Life Science Features of Provincial Significance	Private	RU	Rural/ Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 3	1	3
3-57	Area North of Creek that drains into Whitewater Lake @ 144 Bypass	Linear Park	Creighton-Davies	3	174.2	Wetland Features and Waterfront	Private & Public-Variou	RU, M4, C7-2	Rural/ Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	1	2

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
3-58	Clear Lake - Hwy 144 turnoff to Onaping/Levack	Natural Park	Dowling	3	56.5	Waterfront	Private-Xstrata	RU	Rural/Mining-Mineral Reserve	Con 4 Rec 2	2	2
3-64	Vermillion River and Vermillion Lake Delta Wetlands (PSW)	Ecological Reserve	Fairbank Dowling Balfour Morgan	3	1828.7	Canoe Route and Passive Recreation	Public & Private-Variou	Multiple Zones	Rural/Parks & Open Space/ Mining-Mineral Reserve	Con 5 Rec 3	2	2
3-65 a)	Vermillion Lake Basin	Linear Park	Fairbank/ Trill	3	494.1	Part Outside CGS Limits	Public & Private-Variou	RU, R7.D2.5	Rural/Mining-Mineral Reserve	Con 4 Rec 3	1	2
3-65 b)	Vermillion	Linear Park	Fairbank	3	60.5		Private-Xstrata			Con 4 Rec 3	1	2
3-67	1)Whitson River 2)Chelmsford - South Private Floodplain Lands Part of Whitson Park Conserv-ation Area	Linear Park	Balfour/ Creighton-Davies	3	250.4	Adjacent Wetlands and Waterfront	Private-Variou	A, M4, M5	Rural/Parks & Open Space/ Mining-Mineral Res/Aggregate Res/Agricultural Reserve	Con 4 Rec 2	1	2
3-69	Whitson River North - all adjacent lands & wetlands	Linear Park	Balfour	3	34.3		Private-Variou	OR, A, A-36, R1.D18	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/Rural	Con 5 Rec 2	2	2
3-63	Levack Former Ski Hill	Neighbourhood Park	Levack	3	11.6		Private - Vale Inco	RU	Rural/ Mining-MineralReserve/ Aggregate Reserve	Con 2 Rec 3	1	1
3-68	Tamarack Ski Trails (former)	Natural Park	Dowling	3	142.6	Ski Features (Trails)	Private - Vale Inco/ Xstrata	RU, M4	Mining-Mineral Reserve	Con 3 Rec 2	2	1

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
3-70	Onaping River @High Street	Natural Park	Levack	3	0.6		Private-Inco		Rural	Con 3 Rec 3	2	1
3-72	Dowling Community Centre Adjacent Lands	Natural Park	Dowling	3	21.5		Private	RU	Rural	Con 2 Rec 2	2	0

WARD 4 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - PRIVATE OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
4-44	Kathleen/Eva St (Squarebriggs)	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	4	0.1		Private	R6	Living Area 1	Con 1 Rec 4	3	4
4-51	Whitson River-all adjacent land and wetlands	Natural Park	Rayside	4	235.1		Various Private	A (mostly)	Rural/ Agricultural Reserve	Con 5 Rec 4	2	4
4-43	Donovan Mountain to McNeil Trail	Natural Park with Linear Component	McKim	4	46.7	Trail	Public-CGS/ Private-Variou	PS, M4	Parks & Open Space/Mining-Mineral Reserve	Con 4 Rec 2	1	3
4-47	Selkirk Bluff	Special Purpose Park	McKim	4	2.4	Geological Feature/ Hilltop	Public-CGS/ Private	PS, R4	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 2 Rec 1	1	1
4-48	St. Agnes Street to Generoux Street	Linear Park	Rayside	4	22.9	Potential Corridor (Rainbow Routes)	Private	A, M6, RU	Rural/Heavy Industrial/ Agricultural Reserve	Con 1 Rec 3	1	1
4-49	West End CIP Proposed Park-East	Natural Park	McKim	4	11.4		Public-CGS/ Private-Vale Inco	PS, M4	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/Mining-Mineral Reserve	Con 1 Rec 1	1	1
4-42	CPR Tracks Corridor - Azilda to Sudbury	Linear Park	McKim/ Rayside	4	237.3	Trail	Various Public & Private	Various	Rural/Parks & Open Space/ Mining-Mineral Reserve	Con 1 Rec 1	1	0
4-50	West End CIP Proposed Park-West		McKim	4	13.9		Private-Vale Inco	M4	Mining-Mineral Reserve	Con 1 Rec 1	2	0

WARD 5 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - PRIVATE OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
5-54	Whitson River-all adjacent lands & wetlands	Linear Park	Blezard	5	149.7		Public & Private-Variou	Various	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Spave/Urban Exp. Reserve/ Gen. Industrial	Con 4 Rec 4	3	4
5-56	Yorkshire to Whitson River Corridor - Rainbow Routes	Linear Park	Blezard	5	7.2		Private	RU	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/Rural	Con 2 Rec 4	3	4
5-58 a)	Whitson Lake - all adjacent undeveloped lands	Natural Park	Blezard	5	548.3	Waterfront	Various	Various	Living Area 2/ Mining-Mineral Reserve/Rural	Con 5 Rec 3	3	4
5-58 b)	McCrea Lake - all adjacent undeveloped lands	Natural Park	Blezard	5	23.7	Waterfront	Various	Various	Living Area 2/ Mining-Mineral Reserve/Rural	Con 5 Rec 3	3	4
5-57	MacMillan Drive Trails	Linear Park	Hanmer	5	16		Public-CGS/ Private-Variou	RU	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/Mixed Use Comm.	Con 1 Rec 3	4	3
5-62	Power Line Trail - Rainbow Routes	Linear Park	Blezard	5	1.9		Private-Variou	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 1 Rec 4	2	3
5-59	Ponderosa Floodplain	Natural Park	McKim	5	83.2	Potential Ecological Reserve	Private-Variou	M1-14, FD	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 1	2	2

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
5-55	Howard Armstrong to Whitson River - Rainbow Routes	Linear Park	Blezard/ Hanmer	5	23.8		Private- Various	RU, M5	Parks & Open space/Urban Expansion Reserve	Con 1 Rec 4	1	2
5-60	Sandy Beach/ Kalmo Beach Park Extension	Natural Park	Blezard	5	9.9	Waterfront	Private- Vale Inco	RU	Parks & Open Space/Mining- Mineral Reserve/Rural	Con 3 Rec 3	1	1
5-61	White Street to Whitson River Corridor - Rainbow Routes	Linear Park	Blezard	5	3.2		Public-CGS/ Private- Various	A, A-5, M1	Parks & Open Space/General Industrial	Con 1 Rec 2	1	1
5-63	Burton Street Trail Connector	Linear Park	McKim	4 & 5	1.6	Proposed Trail Link-Donovan to College Boreal	Private	R4.D27	Living Area 1	Con 1 Rec 2	1	1
5-64	Terry Fox & Cambrian Arena Hilltop connect- ing trailway park to Terry Fox Complex	Natural Park	McKim	4 & 5	14.1		Private- College Boreal	I-8	Institutional	Con 2 Rec 1	1	1

WARD 6 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - PRIVATE OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
6-36	Depatie Maple Sugarbush & Sugarbush Trail	Cultural/ Historical/ Special Purpose Park	Hanmer	6	32.7	Sugarbush (one of few in area - privately owned)	Private	RU	Urban Expansion Reserve	Con 5 Rec 3	3	4
6-40	Sugarbush Trail area-West of Centennial Arena	Linear Park	Hanmer	6	9.8		Private-Variou	RU	Parks & Open Space/Urban Expansion Reserve	Con 5 Rec 2	1	2
6-35	Carl Street - North end of Hanmer	Natural Park	Capreol	6	156		Private-Variou	RU,M5, M5-1, RU-3	Rural, Aggregate Reserve	Con 2 Rec 2	1	0
6-38	Vermillion River Wetland (PSW)	Ecological Reserve	Hanmer/ Lumsden	6	638.6		Public & Private-Variou	Various	Parks & Open Space (SW)	Con 2 Rec 2	1	0
6-39	Nelson Lake (Abandoned-Proposed Ski Hill)	Natural Park	Bowell	6	95.2		Private-Vale Inco	M4	Mining-Mineral Reserve	Con 2 Rec 2	1	0

WARD 7 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - PRIVATE OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
7-68	Green Falls - Vermillion River	Natural Park	Capreol	6 & 7	40.9	Water Conservation - Linear Park	Public & Private	RU	Rural/Parks & Open Space/ Aggregate Reserve	Con 4 Rec 4	4	5
7-71	Kettle Lakes	Ecological Reserve	MacLennan/ Falconbridge	7	164.5	Unique Geological Feature, Earth Science Features & Remnant of Pine Forest	Public-CGS/ Private-Vale Inco, Xstrata	RU, M5, M2-1	Parks & Open Space/Mining- Mineral Reserve /Aggregate Reserve	Con 5 Rec 1	3	5
7-72	Chiniguchi & Dewdney Lake Forest Reserve	Natural Park	Rathbun/ Mackelcan	7	3424.7	Linear Features and Waterfront	Public & Private-Various	Various RU zones	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 4	4	5
7-66	Capreol Highlands around Ski Area	Natural Park	Capreol	6 & 7	361.4	Cross-country ski facilities and conservation features	Public-CGS/ Private-Various	RU, P	Parks & Open Space/Gen. Industrial/Heavy Industrial/Rural	Con 5 Rec 5	3	4
7-73	Abandoned Rail Line/Maley Drive-Falconbridge Hwy	Linear Park	Garson	7	18		Private-Vale Inco	Various	Various	Con 1 Rec 4	2	3
7-76	Garson Park - Inco Headwaters	Natural Park	Garson	7	3.3		Private-Vale Inco	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 2	2	3
7-69	Fred Miles Park CN Property	Community Park	Capreol	7	4.7		Public & Private	P, RU	Rural/Parks & Open Space	Con 3 Rec 4	1	2

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
7-70	Maley Drive - Garson Lake Area North	Natural Park	Garson	7	616.6		Public-MNR	P	Parks & Open Space	Con 3 Rec 1	1	2
7-74	Islands of Lake Wahnapitae	Natural Park	MacLennan/ Scadding/ Rathbun	7	171.4		Public-MNR, Private- Various		Rural	Con 4 Rec 2	1	2

WARD 8 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - PRIVATE OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
8-53	Junction Creek-Lasalle to CNR Line	Linear Park	Neelon	8	1.2		Private	C5,M1	Parks & Open Space/Regional Centre/Mixed Use Commercial	Con 4 Rec 2	4	5
8-51	Hydro Substation @ Maley Drive	Linear Park	Neelon	8	4.1		Public-Hydro One	CO	Parks & Open Space	Con 3 Rec 2	2	3

WARD 9 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - PRIVATE OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
9-61	St. Charles Lake Northwest Shore and Hilltop	Natural Park	Broder	9	6.9		Private-Variou	RU, R1-9	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/Rural	Con 4 Rec 3	5	5
9-54	5 Lakes Recreation Area (St. Charles, Middle, Hannah, Robinson)	Natural Park	Broder	9	60.3	Waterfront	Public-MNR/ Private-Variou	RU, P, R1-9	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/Rural,	Con 4 Rec 3	3	4
9-63	Kelly Lake Island	Ecological Reserve	Water	9	0.6	Bird Sanctuary	Private			Con 4 Rec 1	3	4
9-50	Kelley Lake - Southwest Bypass @Southview Drive	Linear Park	Broder	9	12.3	Waterfront/Oak Forest/North-east Quadrant Parking	Public-MTO	PS	Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 3	2	3
9-51	INCO Kelley Lake Peninsula	Natural Park	Broder	9	3.4	Birch Forest/ Link to Trans Canada Trail	Private-Vale Inco	PS	Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 3	2	3
9-53	Long Lake School - Right-of-Way Access to South Crown Land	Linear Park	Broder	9	5	Linkage with Crown Land	Private	RU	Rural	Con 1 Rec 4	2	3
9-57 b)	Jane Goodall Park/Trail (2 of 2)	Cultural/ Historical/ Special Purpose Park	Neelon	9	8.6		Private-Vale Inco	RU	Parks & Open Space/General Industrial	Con 5 Rec 3	1	3

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
9-49	Alice and Bay Lakes Area	Ecological Reserve	Neelon/Dill	9	233.8		Private- MNR/ Private-Vale Inco	RU	General Industrial/ Aggregate Reserve/Rural	Con 5 Rec 3	1	2
9-29	Long Lake Park- Pennala Subdivision	Neighbourhood Park	Broder	9	0.5		In Trust?	P	Living Area 2/ Parks & Open Space	Con 2 Rec 4	1	2
9-56	Northeast Hilltop - Wahnapitae	Natural Park	Neelon	9	98	Geological Features	Public-CGS, MNR/ Private- Various	RU, M3	Rural	Con 4 Rec 1	1	2
9-59	Coniston Creek - Buffer	Linear Park	Neelon	9	6.9		Public- CGS,MTO/ Private- Various	RU, M6, M1-3	Parks & Open Space	Con 3 Rec 2	3	2
9-62	Broder Station (MNR)	Natural Park	Broder	9	40.5		Public-MNR	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 2 Rec 3		2
9-52	North of McFarlane Lake from Old Ski Hill to Crown Land	Natural Park	Broder	9	117		Public-CGS, MTO/ Private	OR, RU	Rural/Parks & Open Space	Con 2 Rec 2	1	1
9-60	Little Queen's Park Waterfront		Broder	9	1.4	Former Air Base	Public	I-6	Institutional	Con 1 Rec 3	2	1
9-55	Wanapitei River near OPG Station - Hilltop		Dryden	9	39.1		Public-MNR/ Private	RU	Rural	Con 2 Rec 1	1	0

WARD 10 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - PRIVATE OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
10-69	Keast Fault Zone	Natural Park	McKim	10	4.8	Waterfront/ Fault Feature	Private	FD	Living Area 1	Con 5 Rec 3	4	5
10-74	Ramsey Lake - Large Hill North & Southwest of Sudbury Curling Club	Natural Park	McKim	10	4.2		Public-CGS/ Private	R2, R4	Living Area 1	Con 4 Rec 3	5	5
10-83	Dalron Park Allowance @ Bennett Lake	Natural Park	McKim	10	1.8		Private	FD	Living Area 1	Con 4 Rec 3	4	5
10-70 a)	Lily Creek Escarpment/ Marsh	Natural Park	McKim	10	5	Wetland/ Boardwalk	Private	CO	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 4	3	4
10-79	Linear Park from Larch Street to Second Avenue along Easement	Linear Park	McKim	10	9.5	Trail Linkage	Public-CGS/ Private	FD, R1, I, R2, R4-27	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 1 Rec 4	3	4
10-26	Twin Lakes	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	2.9		Private (for now)	R1.D10 R1.D15	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 3 Rec 3	2	3
10-65	Bethel Lake North Shore	Natural Park	McKim	10	5.4	Waterfront	Private	R1.D10	Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 4	2	3
10-70 b)	Lily Creek Escarpment/ Marsh	Natural Park	McKim	10	0.3	Wetland/ Boardwalk	Public-CGS/ Private	CO	Paprks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 4	2	3
10-68	CPR Bay	Natural Park	McKim	10	4.6	Waterfront	Private	PS, R2, H25R1	Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 4	2	2

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
10-71 a)	Lily Creek/ Nepahwin	Linear Park	McKim	10	0.1		Private	C4-16, C4-13, R4, R4-2,C2	Living Area 1	Con 4 Rec 3	2	2
10-71 b)	Lily Creek at Paris Street	Linear Park	McKim	10	1.4		Private	C2	Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 3	2	2
10-71 c)	Lily Creek at Lake Nepahwin	Linear Park	McKim	10	0.1		Private	C2	Living Area 1	Con 4 Rec 3	2	2
10-72	McLeod/Walford Woodlot- Near Walford Road and Regent Street	Natural Park	McKim	10	4.3	Associated with McLeod Public School	Public-SBE	I, FD, R4	Living Area 1/ Institutional	Con 3 Rec 3	1	2
10-73	Beaton/Paris Woodlot (Across from Hospital)	Natural Park	McKim	10	1.8		Private	R1	Living Area 1	Con 3 Rec 2	3	2
10-75	Ramsey Lake Trail	Linear Park	McKim	10	12.9	Proposed- Rainbow Routes/ Shattercones	Public-CGS/ Private	I-1, I-20, P-4, I-15, OR, I, R1.D10	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/ Institutional	Con 1 Rec 5	1	2
10-76 a)	Ramsey Lake Potters Island	Natural Park	McKim	10	0.8		Private	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	2	2
10-76 b)	Ramsey Lake McCrea Island	Natural Park	McKim	10	1		Private	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	2	2
10-76 c)	Ramsey Lake Swiss Island	Natural Park	McKim	10	0.3		Private	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	2	2

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
10-76 d)	Ramsey Lake McCrea Island	Natural Park	McKim	10	1.2		Private	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	2	2
10-76 e)	Ramsey Lake Don Island	Natural Park	McKim	10	0.1		Private	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	2	2
10-76 f)	Ramsey Lake Berry Island	Natural Park	McKim	10	0.3		Private	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	2	2
10-76 h)	Ramsey Lake Bryn Heulog Island	Natural Park	McKim	10	0.6		Private	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	2	2
10-77	Roxborough Greenbelt (Wanted Lands)	Natural Park	McKim	10	0.3	In Addition to Roxborough Greenbelt (10-28)	Private- Various	R1,R2, R6	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 3 Rec 1	2	1
10-80 b)	Walford Road @Lake Nepahwin	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	0.1	Waterfront	Private-Golf Course	R2		Con 1 Rec 1	1	0
10-81 a)	CPR Yards - West Downtown	Brownfield	McKim	10	11.9	Imagine Sudbury	Private-CPR	M1-7, C8	Rural/Mixed Use Commercial	Con 1 Rec 1	2	0
10-81 b)	CPR Yards - East Downtown	Brownfield	McKim	10	8.6	Imagine Sudbury	Private-CPR	M1-7, CO	Rural/Downtown	Con 1 Rec 1	2	0

WARD 11 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - PRIVATE OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
11-59	Second Avenue to Bancroft	Linear Park	McKim	11	4.2		Public-CGS/ Private	PS, CO, R1	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/ Regional Centre (Commercial)	Con 1 Rec 4	4	5
11-55	Greenway Park Ramsey Lake NE Shoreland	Natural Park	Neelon	11	9.6	Waterfront	Private	R1.D2.5	Living Area 2/ Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 5	3	4
11-56 a)	Kingsway Hilltops	Linear Park	McKim	11	1.9	Linkage to Adanac/ Minnow Lake Trail	Private	CO	Parks & Open Space	Con 1 Rec 4	3	4
11-56 b)	Kingsway Hilltops	Linear Park	McKim	11	1.2	Linkage to Adanac/ Minnow Lake Trail	Private	CO, C5-1	Parks & Open Space/Mixed Use Commercial	Con 1 Rec 4	3	4
11-60 a)	Ramsey Lake-Galliard Island	Natural Park	Neelon	11	5.6	Galliard Island, Ecological Reserve	Private	CO	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 3	1	4
11-60 b)	Ramsey Lake Ida Island	Natural Park	McKim	11	0.5		Private	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	2	2
11-60 c)	Ramsey Lake Swansea Island	Natural Park	Neelon	11	0.4		Private	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	2	2
11-60 d)	Ramsey Lake Private Island	Natural Park	Neelon	11	0.1			RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	2	2
11-60 e)	Ramsey Lake Norway Island	Natural Park	Neelon	11	0			RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	2	2

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
11-53	South Shore Lake Ramsey Private Property	Natural Park/ Regional Park	Neelon	11	5.2	Acquire private land to add to Laurentian Conservation Area	Private	RU-1	Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 3	1	2
11-57	Moonlight Beach Parcel 1627	Regional Park Natural Park	Neelon	11	111.3	Greenway Plan	Private	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 2 Rec 2	1	0

WARD 12 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - PRIVATE OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
12-45	Kathleen Morin Hilltop	Natural Park	McKim	12	10.7	Hilltop/OMB Decision	Public-CGS/ Private	R4.D59-28, P	Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 3	3	4
12-47	Mountain Street to Adanac - hilltop and wetlands	Natural Park	McKim	12	52.1	Hilltop	Private-Variou	PS, M1-37	Parks & Open Space/ Gen. Industrial	Con 3 Rec 1	3	2
12-48	Oak Forest-Private Lands	Natural Park	McKim	12	1.1	Private Forest	Private	FD	Parks & Open Space/ Institutional	Con 3 Rec 2	3	2
12-49	Ponderosa Floodplain	Natural Park	McKim	12	37.7	Potential Ecological Reserve	Private-Variou	FD	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 1	2	2
12-46	Marymount to Notre Dame	Natural Park	McKim	12	1.6	Woodlot	Public-CGS/ Private-Variou	R1, I-17, R4, R5. D110-6	Living Area 1/ Institutional	Con 2 Rec 1	1	0

Appendix G

Green Space Opportunities List – City Owned Lands

WARD 1 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - CITY OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
1-50	Robinson Lake Wetland (east) and its extensions	Ecological Reserve	McKim	1	18.8		Public-CGS	CO	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 3	1	4
1-14	Southview Drive Greenbelt	Natural Park	McKim	1	4.0		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space	Con 3 Rec 2	2	3
1-46	Hilltop South of Robert Street	Natural Park	McKim	1	6.7		Public-CGS	PS	Parks & Open Space	Con 3 Rec 2	2	3
1-37	Byng St. to Edna St. Corridor	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	0.1	Unopened Road Allowance	Public-CGS	R2	Living Area 1	Con 1 Rec 2	2	2
1-43	Green Space West of Travers Street	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	0.3		Public-CGS/ SCDSB	I-4, PS	Living Area 1	Con 1 Rec 1	1	1

WARD 2 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - CITY OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
2-71	Copper Cliff Green Space	Natural Park	McKim	2	5.7		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space	Con 2 Rec 2	1	1

WARD 3 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - CITY OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
3-23 c)	AY Jackson Adjacent Land	Regional	Dowling	3	5.4		Public-CGS	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 3	1	4
3-23 d)	AY Jackson Adjacent Land	Regional	Dowling	3	22.3		Public-CGS	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 3	1	4
3-23 e)	AY Jackson Adjacent Land	Regional	Dowling	3	1.9		Public-CGS	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 3	1	4
3-37	Vermilion Lake South Shore Property	Natural Park	Fairbank	3	61.4		Public-CGS	RU	Rural	Con 4 Rec 2	1	4
3-48	City Owned Land adjacent to Boy Scout Camp	Natural Park	Dowling	3	5		Public-CGS	R7.D2.5	Rural	Con 4 Rec 1	1	4
3-62	Levack Dog Walk	Neighbourhood Park	Levack	3	0.5	Linear Park Elements	Public-CGS	R2.D37	Living Area 1	Con 2 Rec 2	1	1

WARD 4 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - CITY OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
4-31	Donovan Mountain	Natural Park	McKim	4	40		Public-CGS	PS	Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 3	1	4
4-46	Terry Fox & Cambrian Arena Hilltop connecting trailway park to Terry Fox Complex	Natural Park	McKim	4 & 5	3.4		Public-CGS	PS	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 1	1	4
4-45	Snowdon/Jean Street Hill	Natural Park	McKim	4	4	Potential for Linear Park (Non-Profit Housing)	Public-CGS	R2	Living Area 1	Con 3 Rec 2	2	3
4-52	Parkwood Poplar Proposed Green Space	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	4	0.4		Public-CGS	R2	Living Area 1	Con 3 Rec 1	1	2
4-32	Burton and Snowdon Street	Linear Park	McKim	4 & 5	0.8	Proposed Trail Link-Donovan to College Boreal	Public-CGS	P, R1, R2	Living Area 1	Con 1 Rec 2	1	1

WARD 6 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - CITY OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
6-25	Desmarais Subdivision-CGS Owned Lands		Hanmer	6	16.8		Public-CGS	A	Rural			

WARD 7 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - CITY OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
7-75	Capreol Beach Area	Neighbourhood Park	Capreol	7	0.2		Public-CGS	P	Rural/Parks & Open Space	Con 1 Rec 4	1	4
7-41	Garson Park	Linear Park	Garson	7	5.4		Public-CGS	P	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/Mining- Mineral Reserve	Con 3 Rec 3	2	3
7-65	Area between Balsam Cres. & German Mountain (Graveyard)	Natural Park	Capreol	7	8.8	High Point in Town	Public-CGS	I, P, R3.D18. 2	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/Rural	Con 3 Rec 3	2	3
7-67	Capreol Hotel across from Railway Station	Historical/ Cultural/ Special Purpose Park	Capreol	7	0.2		Public-CGS	C2	Town Centre	Con 1 Rec 2	2	1

WARD 8 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - CITY OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
8-28	Talon Street Subdivision (Future Park)	Natural Park	Neelon	8	2.1	Park Dedication	Private (for now)	R1	Living Area 1	Con 3 Con 2	1	2
8-52	Buffer Zone Park (CGS Landfill)	Natural Park	Neelon	8	9	CGS Landfill/ Buffer Zone S.E. of Industrial Park	Public-CGS	M6	Heavy Industrial	Con 1 Rec 1	1	1

WARD 9 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - CITY OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
9-28	Former National Defence (Department) lands	Natural Park	Dill/Broder	9	1,194.7		Public-CGS	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 2	1	4
9-26	McFarlane Lake - South Lane Road	Special Purpose Park	Dill	9	0.2	Informal Boat Launch	Public-CGS		Rural	Con 3 Rec 3	2	3

WARD 10 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - CITY OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
10-76 l)	Ramsey Lake Private Island	Natural Park	McKim	10	0.1		Public-CGS	RU	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	2	5
10-78	St. Michael's School - Hill and Ravine Area Behind/South of WembleyDrive	Natural Park	McKim	10	8.4	Hilltop	Public-CGS, SCDSB	R2, PS, I, R1	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 4	2	5
10-67 c)	Landcaster/ Boland Woodlot	Linear Park	McKim	10	0.1	Links Land-caster/Boland /Bell Park Parking Lot	Public-CGS			Con 3 Rec 4	1	4
10-25	Centennial Parkland	Neighbourhood Park Natural Park	McKim	10	1.1		Public-CGS	R5	Living Area 1	Con 3 Rec 2	2	3
10-82	Riverdale Addition	Natural Park	McKim	10	0.7		Public-CGS	R1	Living Area 1	Con 3 Rec 2	2	3
10-67 a)	York Woodlot	Natural Park	McKim	10	1.4	Bell Park Extension/Trail	Public-CGS	R1, I	Parks & Open Space	Con 3 Rec 1	1	2
10-67 b)	Landcaster Woodlot	Linear Park	McKim	10	0.1	Links Land-caster/Boland /Bell Park Parking Lot	Public-CGS			Con 3 Rec 1	1	2
10-71 d)	CGS and adjacent to Lily Creek/ Nepahwin	Linear Park	McKim	10	0.6		Public-CGS	I	Living Area 1	Con 3 Rec 3	1	2
10-80 a)	Walford Road East (ROW)	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	10	0.1	Waterfront	Public-CGS	R2	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 1 Rec 1	1	1

WARD 11 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - CITY OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
11-58	Rio Can - Second Avenue Dog Park	Cultural/ Historical/ Special Purpose Park	Neelon	11	5.2	Dog Park	Public-CGS	FD, P	Mixed Use Commercial/ Regional Centre (Commercial)	Con 1 Rec 4	2	5
11-54	Coniston Marshland	Natural Park	Neelon	11 & 9	63.4	Landfill Attenuation Zone	Public-CGS	M6, RU	Rural	Con 3 Rec 1	1	2

WARD 12 - OPPORTUNITIES LIST - CITY OWNED LANDS

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/ Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
12-23	CGS Lands North of Lonsdale (Tower)	Natural Park	McKim	12	19.4	Water Reservoir	Public-CGS	CO, FD	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 3 Rec 2	1	2

Appendix H

ACQUISITION PRIORITY ASSESSMENT FOR NON-CITY OWNED PROPERTIES

Value	Risk	Acquisition priority
High conservation value (4 or 5) e.g. contains a unique natural feature, has significant ecological value, contains a recognized natural heritage feature. <i>and/or</i> High recreational value (4 or 5) - there is no other park of that type in the service area - it fills a need for a neighbourhood or natural park in a neighborhood without	At high risk (5) - slated for development, or there is some other immediate threat (4) – zoned for development, or there is some other imminent threat	5
	Moderate risk (3) - no current or imminent threat, although risk is anticipated	4
	Low risk (1 or 2) -no anticipated threat and park development is needed to reach full potential	3
	Low risk (1 or 2) -no anticipated threat	2
Moderate conservation value (3) e.g. a healthy natural area with moderate ecological value and attractiveness <i>and/or</i> Moderate recreational value (3) e.g. has some recreational value in an area whose parkland is already sufficient; has potential for a unique recreational use in the area; traditional use demonstrates moderate value by residents	At high risk (5) - slated for development, or there is some other immediate threat (4) – zoned for development, or there is some other imminent threat	3
	Moderate risk (3) - no current or imminent threat, although risk is anticipated	2
	Low risk (1 or 2) -no anticipated threat	1
Low conservation value (1 or 2) <i>and</i> Low recreational value (1 or 2)	Any level of risk	0

Appendix I

ACQUISITION PRIORITY ASSESSMENT FOR CITY-OWNED PROPERTIES

Value	Risk	Acquisition priority *
High conservation value (4 or 5) e.g. contains a unique natural feature, has significant ecological value, contains a recognized natural heritage feature. <i>and/or</i> High recreational value (4 or 5) - there is no other park of that type in the service area - it fills a need for a neighbourhood or natural park in a neighborhood without	Risk level 2 (Council may potentially see value in selling this property at some time, the land use designation would allow development, or there is some other risk)	5
	Risk level 1	4
Moderate conservation value (3) e.g. a healthy natural area with moderate ecological value and attractiveness <i>and/or</i> Moderate recreational value (3) e.g. has some recreational value in an area whose parkland is already sufficient; has potential for a unique recreational use in the area; traditional use demonstrates moderate value by residents	Risk level 2 (Council may potentially see value in selling this property at some time, the land use designation would allow development, or there is some other risk)	3
	Risk level 1	2
Low conservation value (1 or 2) <i>and</i> Low recreational value (1 or 2)	Any level of risk	1

* If this site is a high priority to develop to meet a recreational need (e.g. trail development, park facilities, dog park...), add one to the acquisition priority, to a maximum of 5. In addition, mark the number with a '*' to flag it for the attention of leisure services when park development decisions are being made.

Appendix J

Park Land Disposal Policy

In determining whether or not a Park Land property shall be declared surplus and sold by the City, the following criteria and requirements shall apply:

Criteria

1. Consider parkland for disposal if site is deemed non-essential for current or future use, within the context of service area standards, and a balanced, connected parks system.
2. Consider parkland for disposal if there is ample supply and type of the same park and open space or facility in the neighborhood, ward, and community based on the adopted classification system, and service area standards.
3. Parkland disposal should conform to the policies of the Official Plan.
4. Waterfront properties owned by the municipality will not be offered for sale or disposal except in the case of municipal shore allowances
5. Other surplus Parks and Open Space lands may be considered for sale subject to:
 - a. There are overlapping service areas,
 - b. There are no facilities or site facilities are significantly underutilized,
 - c. There are no important ecological or environmental functions present, or no recognized natural heritage features,
 - d. The lands are located within an area that has an oversupply of existing and planned parkland, following the target of 4 ha per 1000 residents, within 800m of residential areas without crossing a major barrier. Generally, a neighbourhood should be served by both a neighbourhood park and natural park, based on the adopted classification system.
 - e. The lands are not needed for future parks as identified by the parks classification system or municipal infrastructure requirements.
6. Parkland should not be disposed if the site has an identified risk management function or liability or it protects significant municipal assets (i.e. well head protection).
7. Parkland should not be disposed where there are significant opportunities to add or link to existing green space or further create a more balanced parkland system.

8. Proposed site for disposal should have low or limited recreation potential, conservation potential, or attractiveness/sense of place.

Other Requirements

9. Disposal is based on an appraisal of fair market value both for full or limited marketability sites.
10. Following internal circulation/review, proposed disposals should be circulated to the ward councilor, area CANs, playground and neighbourhood association, or other community groups known to represent area interests, for input, and to all property owners within a 200 metre radius, requesting written comments if any within 30 days of mail-out. Area mail out radii may be increased based on the significance of the disposal on the advice of the ward councilor, or for properties valued at greater than \$100,000. For these more significant disposals, a small, clearly worded notice may also be placed in the appropriate media.
11. A generic sign will also be posted on the site for 30 days. This sign will have contact information (phone and website) regarding this potential disposal. A copy of the area mail-out, and a clear notice of the cut-off date for comments will also be affixed to the sign. The notice will also be posted to the city website, linked by a clearly visible and clearly labeled 'button' on the 'residents' page.
12. All residents who have submitted written comments will be informed of the date of the Planning Committee meeting at which the matter will be considered for decision.
13. The staff report regarding the proposed disposal should include: the rationale for the sale of parkland, a map localizing the site, and the expected benefits to the City and ward parks system from the sale. The staff report should also include attached copies of all public comments received, and a section relating the staff recommendation to these comments.
14. Funds from the sale of surplus parkland would be deposited in the Parkland Reserve. Fifty percent of the funds from any particular sale will be directed towards acquisition of parkland based on the adopted priority list. The other fifty percent of the funds from any particular sale will be directed towards acquisition of parkland or park development in the ward in which the sale was made.