

# 9 | Appendix

## Parks Level of Service, Provisioning & Acquisition Policies – Benchmarking & Best Practices Review | 2022

### Outline:

- [Park Provision Policies – Bylaws & Official Plans](#)
  - Limited overview of parkland dedication and conveyance policies and bylaws. Review is limited due to provincial legislative requirement to update bylaws if alternative dedication rate is to be used, which is employed by most larger municipalities in Ontario.
- [Park Provision Measures, By Type](#)
  - A review of the type of park provision measures used by comparable municipalities.
- [Park Provision Levels of Service & Targets, If specified, By Type](#)
  - A review of the most currently available park provision service levels amongst comparable municipalities, as well as planned targets (if available), by the types of measures noted in the second table above.
- [Park Classification Types](#)
  - An overview of the park classification systems, and types of parks classified, by comparable municipalities.
- [Access & Distribution Measure Access Evidence](#)
  - A summary review of available academic and professional literature on the rationale and usefulness of access/proximity measures, and evidence for the most commonly used, or supported, distances for walking access to an amenity.
- [Privately Owned Public Space & Strata Parks – Provision Policies & Precedent Considerations](#)
  - A review of the existing policies regarding privately owned public spaces (POPS) and strata-ownership structured parks in comparable municipalities and in cities with substantial experience in planning and managing POPS (e.g. New York City). A list of available academic reviews of the opportunities and challenges encountered with POPS based on experiences in large urban centres is included as reference information.
- [Alternative Parkland Acquisition Opportunities Review](#)
  - A review of the existing policies and tools used by comparable municipalities to acquire parkland outside of the standard parkland dedication and conveyance process.

## PARK PROVISION/DEDICATION/CONVEYANCE POLICIES *[limited scan given current changes]*

*Bylaws and Official Plans*

Municipality	Provision Policy Present (Y/N)	Provision Policy & Requirements Summary	Comments
City of Burlington	Yes –  Official Plan & Bylaw	<p><a href="#">Official Plan</a> (New Interim OP, Feb. 2021 Working Version), 12.1.16:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Parkland dedication for <b>residential development</b> required as condition of development.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ for low density residential development, with a proposed <b>density of less than fifteen (15) units per net ha</b>, parkland shall be dedicated at the rate of <b>five (5) percent of the land area</b>;</li> <li>○ Medium to High density, with a proposed <b>density of fifteen (15) to fifty (50) or greater units per net ha</b>, parkland shall be dedicated at the rate of <b>one (1) ha per three hundred (300) units</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>Commercial and Industrial – 2% of land area.</b></li> <li>● <b>Mixed Use</b> – residential portion as per above; commercial, industrial, institutional – 2% of land area for the percentage of total floor area for these uses.</li> <li>● <b>Waterfront (s.5.4.3(2e)) – min. 15m wide strip</b> (as per City and Conservation Halton) along shoreline. If this exceeds normal dedication requirements, proponent to receive compensation for difference.                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Land for links</b> to adjacent public open space, roadways, and properties. Same compensation above if exceeds dedication required.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>Cash In Lieu</b> - payment of money equal to the value of the land otherwise required to be conveyed for parks may be required at the discretion of the City, as specified in Bylaw</li> <li>● <b>Exceptions</b> - Lands required for drainage, shoreline protection, natural heritage, hazardous (steep slopes) not be accepted as parkland.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">Bylaw 57-2005</a><sup>*1</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Residential Development</b> – Greater of <b>5% of total land area or 1 Ha/300 du</b></li> <li>● <b>CIL:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Low Density – 5% of land value</li> <li>○ Medium Density – Lesser of \$6500 per proposed unit or units/300 x land value per Ha</li> <li>○ High Density – Lesser of \$5500 per unit or units/300 x land value per Ha</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><i>DC, CBC, and Parks Dedication By-Laws, Provision Master Plan In-Development</i></p> <p><a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect</p>

<sup>1</sup> Parkland Dedication Bylaw In Process of Being Revised to Include Alternative Method, As Required by Bill 197 (COVID-19 Economic Recovery Act)

<p><b>City of Hamilton</b></p>	<p>Yes – Official Plan &amp; Bylaw</p>	<p><b>Urban Hamilton <a href="#">Official Plan</a></b> (Effective August 16, 2013), Section F, 1.18.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Parkland dedication for <b>residential (re)development</b> required as condition of development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Greater of 5% of land or 1Ha per 300 du</b></li> <li>○ <b>Low Density</b> – less than 20 units/Ha, 5% of net land</li> <li>○ <b>Medium Density</b> – 20 to 75 units/Ha, 1 Ha per 300 du</li> <li>○ <b>Higher Density</b> – 75 to 120 units/Ha, 0.6 Ha per 300 du</li> <li>○ <b>Highest Density</b> – Greater than 120 units/Ha, 0.5 Ha per 300 du</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>Mixed Use</b> – pro rata portion.</li> <li>● <b>Single &amp; Semi-Detached</b> – max of 5% net land, regardless of density</li> <li>● <b>Rural Area</b> – Outside of Rural Settlement Area, Single-Detached, max. of 2.5% of 0.4 Ha lot</li> <li>● <b>Commercial</b> – Max 2%</li> <li>● <b>Institutional</b> – Max 5%</li> <li>● <b>Industrial</b> – No parkland dedication required, land or cash</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Cash In Lieu</b> – General Rate Above, except for 20 to 75 units/Ha, 1 Ha per 500 du maximum</li> <li>● <b>Exceptions</b> – SWMFs, valley and hazard lands, woodlots, enviro areas and utility corridors not considered eligible lands to satisfy dedication. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The above shall be excluded from land area calculations subject to dedication.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Rural Hamilton Official Plan</b>, Section F, 1.18.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Parkland dedication for <b>residential (re)development</b> required as condition of development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Greater of 5% of land or 1Ha per 300 du</b></li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>Rural Area, Commercial, Institutional, Industrial, and Exceptions in UHOP Also Apply in RHOP</b></li> </ul> <p><b><a href="#">Bylaw 18-126</a></b><sup>*2</sup></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <b>Development, Subdivision or Consent</b> – Same Content as Above in Ops</li> <li>● <b>Expansion of Existing Uses or Buildings</b> – Based on additional units or new commercial floor area proposed, pro rated</li> <li>● <b>Brownfield</b> – ERASE Program sites within Older Industrial or Urban Area will be 5% of net land regardless of density</li> <li>● <b>CIL: Specific by Area</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>CIL per unit values are capped for specific types of development, by area of the City:</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><i>Parks Master Plan In-Development</i></p> <p><a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan in Effect</a></p>
--------------------------------	--	--	---

<sup>2</sup> Parkland Dedication Bylaw In Process of Being Revised to Include Alternative Method, As Required by Bill 197 (COVID-19 Economic Recovery Act)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Townhouse Dwellings, Multiple Unit Dwellings, One additional Dwelling to Single Detached, additional dwellings to a Designated Heritage Building</li> <li>o Medium Density – Lesser of \$6500 per proposed unit or units/300 x land value per Ha</li> <li>o <b>Downtown Community Improvement Project Area:</b> \$5,000 per unit, for multiple dwellings, as of April 1 2022</li> <li>• <b>Exemptions</b> – Agricultural Use and Industrial Use, Some institutional uses, residential alterations (no new units), commercial floor space expansion limits, affordable housing.</li> </ul>	
<b>Town of Oakville</b>	Yes – Official Plan & Bylaw	<p><a href="#">Official Plan</a><sup>3</sup> (2009) – S. 28.12.8:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5% or 1 Ha per 300 units for residential development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 2% for commercial or industrial purposes</li> <li>o 5% of land in all other cases.</li> <li>o CIL – Equal value to land may be required, as per above.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Exceptions</b> – natural areas, hazard lands, drainage, connecting walkways not accepted.</li> <li>• <b>Waterfront Land</b> – dedication of lands below stable top of bank, and min. 15m back from top of bank.</li> <li>• <b>Natural Areas</b> – For dedication include mouth of creek, river or stream when they join Lake Ontario; hazard lanes associated with creek, river or stream; buffer along designated hazard lands as per Conservation Authority.</li> </ul> <p><a href="#">By-Law 2008-105</a></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contains same dedication requirements as outlined in the Official Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <i>Note: Assumed to be updated in 2022 to align with Planning Act amendments, given inclusion of alternative method</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Halton Region Municipality  <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan in Effect</a>
<b>City of Barrie</b>	Yes – Official Plan & CIL Bylaw	<p><a href="#">Official Plan (2022)</a> – S. 5.8.1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use of alternative requirement, as per S. 42(3) of the Planning Act</li> <li>• 2% of land for commercial and industrial development</li> <li>• 5% of land for all other development</li> <li>• <b>Exceptions:</b> natural heritage system lands, utility/hydro corridors. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Land to be dedicated requires street frontage. Linear parks or greenways may be accepted.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	GGH Outer Ring Municipality, County of Simcoe  <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan in Effect</a>

<sup>3</sup> Official Plan review underway to ensure alignment with Greater Golden Horseshoe Growth Plan, Greenbelt Plan, Regional Growth Plan and growth projections.

<b>City of Toronto</b>	Yes – Official Plan & Bylaw	<a href="#">Official Plan</a> – Chapter Three, S. 3.2.3.2: Standard and Alternative Rates Identified. Detailed policies, pages 3-34 to 3-35.	<i>GTAH Municipality; Comparable TRCA</i>
<b>City of Mississauga</b>	Yes – Official Plan & Bylaw	NOTE: Parkland Conveyance Bylaw, Along with DC and CBC Bylaws, are all currently being updated and in-development. Anticipated final draft in March 2022.	<i>GTAH Municipality, Peel Region</i>  <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect

## PARK PROVISION MEASURES

*By Type*

Municipality	Park Provision Measures Currently Used	Source of Provision Measures	Comments
<b>City of Burlington</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supply – City parkland total area per 1000 residents</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Parks, Recreation and Cultural Assets Master Plan (2009)</a>	<i>Parks Provision Master Plan In-Development</i>  <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect
<b>City of Hamilton</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supply – City parkland total area per 1000 residents</li> </ul>	Parkland Acquisition Strategy (2012)	<i>Parks Master Plan In-Development</i>

			<a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect
<b>Town of Oakville</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Amount of active parkland per 1000 residents</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Distribution/Access of specific amenities – by user group population and proximity/access (but not for parkland overall)</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Five Year Review of the 2012 Parks, Recreation and Library Facilities Master Plan (2017)</a>	Halton Region Municipality <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect
<b>City of Toronto</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply – City and natural parkland area (sq.m.) per person</li> <li>• Distribution/Access – amount of parkspace within 500m</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Toronto Parkland Strategy (2019)</a>	GTAH Municipality; Comparable TRCA
<b>City of Mississauga</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply – City parkland per 1,000 residents</li> <li>• Distribution/Access – at least one park within walking distance 400m to 800m</li> <li>• Special land supply percentage and access metric for Downtown and Growth Nodes</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Parks and Forestry Master Plan (2019)</a>  <a href="#">Draft Parks Plan and Parkland Conveyance Bylaw Material (2021-22)</a>	GTAH Municipality, Peel Region  <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect
<b>City of Brampton</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply – Parkland area per 1,000 residents</li> <li>• Supply or Distribution/Access of specific rec. amenities – by user group population and proximity/access (but not for parkland overall)</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Parks and Recreation Master Plan (2017)</a>	GTAH Municipality, Peel Region  <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect  Comparable Population & Growth Pressures

<b>City of Vaughan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply – parkland area per 1000 residents</li> <li>• Quality – Assessed condition of park infrastructure asset or amenity grouping (in Park Redevelopment Study (2018))</li> <li>• Amenity and Park Infrastructure – supply per population for various types of amenities</li> <li>• Distribution/Access – 5-10 minute walkability to local-level parks</li> </ul>	<a href="#">All Together Master Plan Review and Update (2018)</a>	<i>GTAH Municipality, Regional Municipality of York</i>  <i>Comparable Population &amp; Growth Pressures</i>  <i>Comparable TRCA Jurisdiction</i>
<b>City of Markham</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply – City parkland per 1,000 residents</li> <li>• Distribution/Access – 5 (400m) and 10 minute (800m) walks targets for community and neighbourhood parks, respectively</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Markham Official Plan (2014 Interim)</a>	<i>GTAH Municipality, Regional Municipality of York</i>  <i>Comparable Population &amp; Growth Pressures</i>  <i>Comparable TRCA Jurisdiction</i>
<b>City of Barrie</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply – City parkland per 1,000 residents</li> <li>• Distribution/Access – 500 to 800m access to active parkland</li> <li>• Supply and distribution for various outdoor recreation facilities/amenities</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Barrie Parks and Recreation Strategic Master Plan (2010)</a>	<i>GGH Outer Ring Municipality, County of Simcoe</i>  <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan in Effect</a>

<b>City of Guelph</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply – City parkland per 1,000 residents</li> <li>• Distribution/Access – parkland within 10 min. walk (800m) of residents</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Guelph Parks Plan (2022)</a>	GGH Outer Ring Municipality, Wellington County  Comparable GRCA Jurisdiction, Population and Growth Comparators
<b>Town of Milton</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply – City parkland per 1,000 residents</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Community Services Master Plan Update (2015)</a>	GTAH and Halton Region Municipality  <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect
<b>City of St. Catharine's</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply – City parkland per 1,000 residents</li> <li>• Distribution/Access – City parkland within 800m of residents</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Recreation Facility &amp; Programming Master Plan (2015)</a>	GGH Outer Ring Municipality, Adjacent to Hamilton  <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect
<b>Town of Halton Hills</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply – Amount of local parkland and non-local parkland per 1000 residents</li> <li>• Distribution/Access – 200 to 400m for local parkland, 600 to 800m for non-local</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Halton Hills Official Plan (2008, Consolidated 2019)</a>	Halton Region Municipality  <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect
<b>City of Richmond Hill</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply – City-owned active parkland per 1000 residents</li> <li>• Distribution/Access – 5 minute walk (400m) to a park</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Parks Plan, Recreation Plan and Cultural Plan Review (2022, In-Progress)</a>	GTAH Municipality, York Region

			<i>Comparable Population &amp; Growth Pressures</i>  <i>Comparable TRCA Jurisdiction</i>
<b>City of Kitchener</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supply – parkland area per 1,000 residents</li> <li>Distribution/Access – neighbourhood park or playground within 500m of all residents</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Parks Strategic Plan (2010)</a>	<i>GGH Outer Ring Municipality; Regional Municipality of Waterloo</i>  <i>Comparable population and GRCA Jurisdiction</i>
<b>City of Ottawa</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supply – City owned or leased parkland area per 1,000 residents</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Parks and Recreation Master Plan (2021)</a>	<i>Comparable urban size and development pressure; comparable agglomerated municipality and structure (to Hamilton)</i>
<b>City of Vancouver</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supply – parkland area per 1,000 residents</li> <li>Distribution/Access - % of residents with 10 minute and 5 minute walk access to a park</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Vancouver Parks Board Parks &amp; Recreation VanPlay Master Plan (2018)</a>  <a href="#">Vancouver Parks Provision Study (2018)</a>	<i>Included for comparable urban growth, redevelopment pressures.</i>

<b>City of Winnipeg</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supply – City and natural parkland area (sq.m.) per person</li> <li>● Distribution/Access - % of residents within 10 min walk of park (600m) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ % of residents within 10 minute walk of natural area and trail</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Quality – Assessed condition of infrastructure asset or amenity grouping</li> <li>● Amenities &amp; Function - Distribution/Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ % of residents within varying distances of access to a park amenity (playground, sportsfield, skatepark, flex green space, etc.)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Final Draft Winnipeg Parks Strategy (2021)</a>	<i>Comparable population and geographic size of municipality.</i>
<b>City of Edmonton</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supply – Amount of Public Open Space and Municipal Parks</li> <li>● Quality – Function of Park Program and Amenities, and Condition</li> <li>● Accessibility/Distribution – Within 400m of residents</li> <li>● Diversity – Types of open spaces and parks, multifunctionality</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Breathe: Edmonton's Green Network Strategy (2017)</a>	<i>Comparable urban intensification pattern with new City Plan; unique provision measures for consideration</i>

## PARK PROVISION LEVELS OF SERVICE & TARGETS

*If Specified, By Type*

Municipality	Park Provision Measures Currently Used	Source of Provision Measures	Comments
City of Burlington	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 586.4 hectares from 117 City parks</li> <li>○ 3.58 ha/1000 residents (2009)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No existing targets</li> </ul>	<p><a href="#">Parks, Recreation and Cultural Assets Master Plan (2009)</a></p>	<p><i>Parks Provision Master Plan In-Development</i></p> <p><a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect</p>
City of Hamilton	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1,223.04 hectares from 417 City parks</li> <li>○ 2.35 ha/1000 residents (2012)</li> <li>○ 4.5 ha/1000 residents (2021)<sup>4</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2.1 ha/1000 residents                                     <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 0.7 ha/1000 for each of neighbourhood parks, community parks, and city-wide parks   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Forecasted to 2031 and population of 660,190   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth of 140,211 since 2011 or 27%</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Distribution/Access                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 800m to a neighbourhood park</li> <li>○ 2km to a community park</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Function/Program &amp; Amenities</li> </ul>	<p>Parkland Acquisition Strategy (2012)</p> <p><a href="#">Park People Canadian Cities Parks Report 2021</a></p> <p><a href="#">Urban Hamilton Official Plan (2013), Chapter B</a></p> <p>Outdoor Recreation Study (2011) (currently being updated)</p>	<p><i>Parks Master Plan and Recreation Master Plan In-Development</i></p> <p><a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect</p>

<sup>4</sup> From Parks People 2021 Report – No info on data provided by Municipality for this measure

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Various outdoor facilities (play structures, sports fields, etc.) have provision targets based on distribution/access (e.g. playground within 500m access of residential areas) or amenity per number of residents (some are age specific)</li> </ul>		
<b>Town of Oakville</b>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 2.12 ha/1000 residents</li> <li>o 1,526 hectares of parkland, including passive nature/conservation space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 411 hectares of active use parkland</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 2.2 Ha/1000 residents of active parkland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Forecasted to 2031 and population of 246,400 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth of 52,568 since 2016 or 27%</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Amenity Provision &amp; Distribution: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Various amenities, including playgrounds (1 play structure within 800m of all residential areas), sportsfields (1 field per 100 organized youth participants), diamonds (1 per 5,000 population), other specialized fields (1 per 50,000 pop.)</li> <li>o Includes land needed to meet targets above, including typical land area required for recreational facilities and amenities</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Five Year Review of the 2012 Parks, Recreation and Library Facilities Master Plan (2017)</a>	<i>Halton Region Municipality</i>  <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan in Effect</a>
<b>City of Toronto</b>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 28 sq.m. per person of City parkland (includes ravines) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ With employment, 18 sq.m per person</li> <li>▪ With ravines and natural areas removed, 8.7 sq.m.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Distribution/Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 1.5 Ha of total park space within 500m</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o No specific targets</li> <li>o Strategic Acquisition and Provision Principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Areas with low parkland provision levels (areas with less than 12 square metres of parkland per person in 2033)</li> <li>▪ Low park supply (less than 1.5 hectares of parkland within a 500 metre walking distance, current state);</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Toronto Parkland Strategy (2019)</a>	<i>GTAH Municipality</i>  <i>Comparable TRCA Jurisdiction</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Impact of growth (areas projected to have over 5,000 residents per hectare by 2033)</li> <li>▪ Low-income residents (areas with 25% or more residents experiencing low-income, current state). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Forecasted to 2041 and population of 3,400,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth of 500,000 since 2019 or 17%</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Spatially Explicit Areas of Priority Identified</li> <li>○ Decision-Making Framework</li> </ul>		
<b>City of Mississauga</b>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2.28 Ha/1000 residents (2021), City parkland</li> <li>○ 3.7 Ha/1000 residents (2021), parkland and greenlands</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Amenity and Park Infrastructure – supply per population for various types of amenities (e.g. cricket, 1 per 108k residents; rectangular sports field, 1 per 3500 residents)</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1.2 Ha/1000 residents</li> <li>○ Parks as 12% of Land Area in Downtown and Growth Nodes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Forecasted to 2041 and population of 911,318 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth of 117,684 since 2021 or 14.8%</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Distribution/Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Park within 800m of residential areas</li> <li>○ Park within 400 to 800m from residents in Downtown Growth Area</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supply of outdoor recreation amenities/park infra. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Amenity per population supply for a wide range of amenities (e.g. 1 rectangular sports field (artificial or natural) per 3,000 residents).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Parks and Forestry Master Plan (2019)</a>  <a href="#">Draft Parks Plan and Parkland Conveyance Bylaw Material (2021-22)</a>	GTAH Municipality, Peel Region  <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan in Effect</a>
<b>City of Brampton</b>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1.8 Ha/1000 residents (2016), City parkland only</li> <li>○ 5.5 Ha/1000 residents (2021), total parkland<sup>5</sup></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Parks and Recreation Master Plan (2017)</a>  <a href="#">Park People Canadian Cities Parks Report 2021</a>	GTAH Municipality, Peel Region

<sup>5</sup> From Parks People 2021 Report – No info on data provided by Municipality for this measure; assumed parkland including conservation/natural areas

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amenity and Park Infrastructure – supply per population for various types of amenities (e.g. rectangular sports field, 1 per 4372 residents, diamond, 1 per 6052 residents; playground, 1 per 2089 residents)</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 1.6 Ha/1000 residents citywide</li> <li>o Provides specific amounts required in future per Park Master Plan planning areas/districts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Forecasted to 2031 and population of 837,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth of 223,000 since 2016 or 36%</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supply of outdoor recreation amenities/park infra. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Amenity per population supply for a wide range of amenities (e.g. 1 rectangular sports field (artificial or natural) per 75 registered players; 1 playground within 500 to 800m of residential areas).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p><a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan in Effect</a></p> <p>Comparable Population &amp; Growth Pressures</p>
<p>City of Vaughan</p>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 1.86 Ha/1000 residents (2017), City parkland only</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Amenity and Park Infrastructure – supply per population for various types of amenities (e.g. soccer field, 1 per 64 registered youth players, diamond, 1 per 37 registered youth players; playground, 1 per 222 children under 9)</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 2,0 Ha/1000 residents citywide – active city parkland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Forecasted to 2031 and population of 424,500 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth of 100,400 since 2015 or 31%</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Distribution/Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o All residential areas within 500m (noted as 5-10 min. walk) of local-level parks.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supply of outdoor recreation amenities/park infra. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Amenity per population supply for a wide range of amenities (e.g. 1 soccer field per 80 registered youth players; 1 ball diamond per 40 youth registered players; playground within 500m of residential areas).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><a href="#">All Together Master Plan Review and Update (2018)</a></p>	<p>GTAH Municipality, Regional Municipality of York</p> <p>Comparable Population &amp; Growth Pressures</p> <p>Comparable TRCA Jurisdiction</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Redevelopment prioritization areas, decision-making criteria provided in <a href="#">Parks Redevelopment Study (2018)</a></li> </ul>		
<b>City of Markham</b>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.41 Ha/1000 residents (2019), City parkland only</li> <li>1.54 Ha/1000 residents (2019), including available school fields</li> </ul> </li> <li>Amenity and Park Infrastructure – supply per population for various types of amenities (e.g. soccer field, 1 per 2700 residents or 81 participants; diamond, 1 per 4900 residents or 115 participants; playground, 1 per 2200 residents or 235 children under 9)</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.7 Ha/1000 residents citywide – active city parkland</li> <li>1.2 Ha/1000 residents minimum target in Official Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Forecasted to 2031 and population of 421,600 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Growth of 148,600 since 2006 or 54%</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>Distribution/Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All residential areas within 500m (noted as 5-10 min. walk) of local-level parks.</li> <li>Community parks within 800m of residents</li> <li>Neighbourhood parks within 400m of residents</li> </ul> </li> <li>Supply of outdoor recreation amenities/park infra. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amenity per population supply for a wide range of amenities (e.g. soccer field, 1 85 participants; diamond, 1 per 110 participants; playground, 1 within 400m of residential areas)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><a href="#">Integrated Leisure Master Plan Update (2019)</a></p> <p><a href="#">Markham Official Plan (2014 Interim)</a></p>	<p>GTAH Municipality, Regional Municipality of York</p> <p>Comparable Population &amp; Growth Pressures</p> <p>Comparable TRCA Jurisdiction</p>
<b>City of Barrie</b>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8.6 Ha/1000 residents, all City maintained parkland (2010)</li> <li>2.2 Ha/1000 residents of active parkland (2010)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.7 Ha/1000 residents, City parkland</li> <li>2.2 Ha/1000 residents, active parkland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Forecasted to 2019 and population of 170,000</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><a href="#">Barrie Parks and Recreation Strategic Master Plan (2010)</a></p>	<p>GGH Outer Ring Municipality, County of Simcoe</p> <p><a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth of 30,062 since 2009 or 21%</li> <li>• Distribution/Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Active parkland within 500 to 800m of residential areas (unobstructed).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Supply of outdoor recreation amenities/park infra. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Amenity per population supply for a wide range of amenities (e.g. soccer field, 1 80 participants; diamond, 1 per 100 participants; playground, 1 within 500 to 800m of residential areas)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>City of Guelph</b>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 3.1 Ha/1000 residents, City parkland (2020)</li> <li>○ 31 sq.m per person (2020) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regional Park – 1.1. ha/1000 residents</li> <li>▪ Community Park – 1.5 ha/1000 residents</li> <li>▪ Neighbourhood Park – 0.5 ha/1000 residents</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Distribution/Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 92-3% of residents live within 10 min. walk (800m) of a park.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 3.3 Ha/1000 residents, all City Parkland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regional Park – 1.3 ha/1000 residents</li> <li>▪ Community Park – 1.3 ha/1000 residents</li> <li>▪ Neighbourhood Park – 0.7/1000 residents</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Forecasted to 2051 and population of 208,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth of 68,000 since 2021 or 49%</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Distribution/Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 100% of residents live within 10 min walk (800m) of a park (implied).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><a href="#">Guelph Parks Plan (2022)</a></p> <p>Guelph Official Plan (1994, Consolidated to 2021)</p> <p><a href="#">Guelph Parks Plan (2022)</a></p>	<p><i>GGH Outer Ring Municipality, Wellington County</i></p> <p><i>Comparable GRCA Jurisdiction, Population and Growth Comparitors</i></p>
<b>Town of Milton</b>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 4.5 Ha/1000 residents, All parkland (includes passive open space and escarpment view lands (2015)</li> <li>○ 2.3 Ha/1000 residents, active City parkland only (2015)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p>	<p><a href="#">Community Services Master Plan Update (2015)</a></p>	<p><i>GTAH and Halton Region Municipality</i></p> <p><a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 4.0 Ha/1000 residents, all parkland (including passive and escarpment view lands) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Forecasted to 2025 and population of 159,240 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth of 57,970 since 2015 or 57%</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>○ 2.5 ha/1000 residents, for active City parkland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Community Park – 0.4 ha/1000 residents</li> <li>▪ District Park – 1 ha/1000 residents</li> <li>▪ Neighbourhood Park – 1 ha/1000 residents</li> <li>▪ Village Square - 0.1 ha/1000 residents</li> <li>▪ Linear Park – no standard</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>● Targets to 2025 population of 159,240 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Pop. Growth of 58k or 57% growth</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>City of St. Catharine's</b>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 4.0 Ha/1000 residents, All parkland and open space (2015) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Neighbourhood Parks – 0.95 ha/1000 residents</li> <li>▪ District Parks – 0.52 ha/1000 residents</li> <li>▪ City-wide Parks – 1.96 ha/1000 residents</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>● Amenity and Park Infrastructure – supply per population for various types of outdoor recreation amenities</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 3.0 Ha/1000 residents, all parkland and open space</li> <li>○ Forecasted to 2026 is 3.9 Ha/1000 residents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 2026 population of 142,800, pop. Growth of 2,140 or 1.5%</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>● Outdoor recreation amenities supply (e.g. 1 rectangular field per 90 registered participants; 1 ball diamond per 100 participants; 1 playground per 800m of residential areas).</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Recreation Facility &amp; Programming Master Plan (2015)</a>	GGH Outer Ring Municipality, Adjacent to Hamilton  <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan in Effect</a>
<b>Town of Halton Hills</b>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 0.9 ha/1000 residents of local parkland (2019)</li> <li>○ 2.5 ha/1000 residents of non-local parkland (2019)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p>	<a href="#">Town of Halton Hills Parkland Policy Review (2019)</a>  <a href="#">Halton Hills Official Plan (2008, Consolidated 2019)</a>	<i>Halton Region Municipality</i>  <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan in Effect</a>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1.2 ha/1000 residents of local parkland (2008)</li> <li>○ 2.5 ha/1000 residents of non-local parkland (2008)</li> <li>○ Forecasted to 2031 and population of 94,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth of 36,000 since 2006 or 62%</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>● Alternative Supply Recommendation (but not in force): 2.2 ha/1000 residents (2019)</li> <li>● Distribution/access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Parkettes – 200 to 400m access</li> <li>○ Neighbourhood Parks – 400 to 800m access, depending on population density</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>City of Richmond Hill</b>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1.7 ha/1000 residents - City active parkland (2021)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1.6 ha/1000 residents – City active parkland (2013 Parks Plan, maintained in 2021 Backgrounder)</li> <li>○ Forecasted to 2031 and population of 253,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth of 39,000 since 2021 or 18%</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>● Distribution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A park within 400m of residents (2021)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Parks Plan, Recreation Plan and Cultural Plan Review (2022, In-Progress)</a>	<p><i>GTAH Municipality, York Region</i></p> <p><i>Comparable Population &amp; Growth Pressures</i></p> <p><i>Comparable TRCA Jurisdiction</i></p>
<b>City of Kitchener</b>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 7.3 ha/1000 residents – all parkland (2021, includes natural areas, etc.) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Natural Areas – 5.1 ha/1000 residents (2010)</li> <li>▪ City-Wide Parks – 0.4 ha/1000 residents (2010)</li> <li>▪ District Parks – 0.7 ha/1000 residents (2010)</li> <li>▪ Neighbourhood Parks – 1 ha/1000 residents (2010)</li> <li>▪ Urban Greens – 0.07 ha/1000 residents (2010)</li> <li>▪ Greenways – 0.6 ha/1000 residents (2010)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1.5 ha/1000 residents – Neighbourhood Parks only (2010)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Parks Strategic Plan (2010)</a> <a href="#">Park People Canadian Cities Parks Report 2021</a>	<p><i>GGH Outer Ring Municipality; Regional Municipality of Waterloo</i></p> <p><i>Comparable population and GRCA Jurisdiction</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Forecasted to 2031 and population of 311,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth of 100,000 since 2010 or 47%</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Distribution/Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Neighbourhood Park or Playground within 500m of all residents</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>City of Ottawa</b>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 2.35 ha/1000 residents – municipal active parkland (2021)</li> <li>o Excludes significant amount of Federal/NCC open space</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 2 ha/1000 residents – active municipal parkland (2021)</li> <li>o Applicable Citywide and within each transect (planning area)</li> <li>o Forecasted to 2031 and population of 1,219,000 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth of 155,000 or 15%</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Ratio of large to small parks at 1:5 in each transect (planning area)</li> <li>• Redevelopment - City currently requests land for parks when the lot in question is a minimum of 4,000m2 in size and could generate a 400m2 park; this is essentially a small urban plaza and the smallest park size in the City. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o City takes cash-in-lieu if lot size less than 4000m2 (page 49).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Parks and Recreation Master Plan (2021)</a>	<i>Comparable urban size and development pressure; comparable agglomerated municipality and structure (to Hamilton)</i>
<b>City of Vancouver</b>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 2.02 Ha/1000 residents (2017)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Distribution/Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 99.5% of residents less than 10 minute walk from a park (800m)</li> <li>o 80% of residents less than 5 minute walk from a park (400m)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 1.1 ha/1000 residents (excludes Destination Parks)</li> <li>o No specific population growth target noted/found</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Vancouver Parks Board Parks &amp; Recreation VanPlay Master Plan (2018)</a>  <a href="#">Vancouver Parks Provision Study (2018)</a>  Vancouver Park Board Management Plan (1992)	<i>Included for comparable urban growth, redevelopment pressures.</i>
<b>City of Winnipeg</b>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Final Draft Winnipeg Parks Strategy (2021)</a>	<i>Comparable population and</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 44 sq.m. per person (2021)</li> <li>• Distribution/Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 93% of residents within 10 minute walk of a park (600m)</li> <li>o 64% of residents within 10 minute walk of a natural area (600m)</li> <li>o 96% of residents within 10 minute walk of a trail (600m)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Amenities &amp; Function – Distribution/Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 83% of residents within 10 minute walk of a playground (600m) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 1 playground per 1,000 residents provision</li> </ul> </li> <li>o 98% of residents within 2km of a picnic area</li> <li>o 27% of residents within 10 minute walk of multi-use greenspace (600m)</li> <li>o 96% of residents within 2km of rectangular athletic fields</li> <li>o Note: provision access also provided for basketball (600m), tennis &amp; pickleball, baseball and softball (all of the previous within 2km), outdoor skating rinks (within 2km), skateboard parks (within 5km), dogs off-leash areas (citywide access)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 30 sq.m. of parkland per person in Downtown</li> <li>o 40 sq.m. of parkland per person in all other communities (new and mature) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Forecasted to 2040 and population of 922,600 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Growth of 155,700 or 20%</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Distribution/Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100% of residents within 10 minute walk of a park (600m)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Amenities &amp; Functions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Provision and Access targets for various amenities (playgrounds, sportsfields, etc.)</li> <li>o E.g. 1 playground per 1,000 people; 100% of residents within 600m</li> <li>o E.g. 1 rectangular athletic field per 5,000 people; 100% within 2km; less than 5% in assessed poor condition</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<i>geographic size of municipality.</i>
<b>City of Edmonton</b>	<p><b>Park Provision Levels:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 7.6 hectares of all open space per 1000 residents</li> <li>o Average of 6.5 hectares of municipal parkland per 1000 residents <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Broken down by neighbourhood and planning areas</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Distribution/Access</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Breathe: Edmonton's Green Network Strategy (2017)</a>	<i>Comparable larger population and geographic size, unique provision</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 94% of residents within 400m of a publicly accessible open space</li> </ul> <p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 2ha of municipal parkland/1000 residents in suburban/greenfield development</li> <li>o No specific supply target in redevelopment/infill areas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Strategic direction and spatially explicit areas for prioritization</li> <li>▪ Informal target to achieve close to 10% as possible of gross developable land as park in all neighbourhoods (in alignment with Alberta MGA park dedication through subdivision amounts)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Distribution/Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 100% of residents within 400m of a publicly accessible open space</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Urban Parks Management Plan (2006)	<i>measures for consideration</i>
<b>Literature Review</b>	<p><b>Targets:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supply <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Research points to at least 9 m2 of green space per individual with an ideal UGS value of 50 m2 per capita (World Health Organization Recommendations).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Case study for an “ideal compact city” had urban green space available to all residents within 300m.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Rationale: “In order to contrast the urban heat island and effectively provide ecosystem services, sufficient and high-quality UGS and or other greenery elements should be readily made available to urban residents. Improving public health through urban development and greenery renewal of compact cities is an important part of the sustainable development concept.”</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Russo &amp; Cirella (2018). Modern Compact Cities: How Much Greenery Do We Need? <i>Int J Environ Res Public Health</i>, Oct; 15(10): 2180.</a>	<i>Evaluating accessible “urban green space”</i>

## PARK CLASSIFICATION TYPES

Municipality	Park Provision Measures Currently Used	Source of Classification System	Comments
Halton Region	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional Waterfront Parks                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ provide public access and recreational opportunities at strategic locations along Halton’s waterfront</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">ROPA 48 Notice of Adoption</a>	<i>Upper-Tier for Burlington</i>
City of Burlington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Special Resource Areas and Linkages                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Natural or conservation, trails and connections. May be utility/hydro RoWs, ravine lands.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• City Parks                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Citywide catchment, unique facilities and tournaments, festivals and events, destination water and skate parks, recreation facilities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Community Parks                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Serve a cluster of neighbourhoods, sports fields including spectator amenities, playgrounds, skateboard and water play.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Neighbourhood Parks                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Serve local neighbourhoods, neighbourhood-level recreation (playgrounds passive areas, trails, smaller and youth sportsfields)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Parkettes                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Small landscape areas contributing to urban design, passive rest areas, public art.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Windows to the Lake                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ small park settings along the shoreline, connecting Burlington residents to Lake Ontario</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Parks, Recreation and Cultural Assets Master Plan (2009)</a>  <a href="#">Parks Design &amp; Construction Webpage (2022)</a>	<i>Parks Provision Master Plan In-Development</i>  <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan in Effect</a>
City of Hamilton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City-Wide                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Size varies; Regionally and provincially significant; major recreation and leisure facilities</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Community                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ~7 hectares, serve multiple neighbourhoods or 20,000 people</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Neighbourhood                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 2 hectares, serve 5,000 people</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Parkettes                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Small open space with limited recreational facilities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Urban Hamilton Official Plan  <a href="#">Hamilton Parks and Open Space Development Guide (2020)</a>	<i>Parks Master Plan In-Development</i>  <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan in Effect</a>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General open space (golf course, trails and pathways, beaches, plazas, etc.)</li> <li>• Natural open space (woodlots, creeks and ravines, Niagara Escarpment, hazard lands, etc.)</li> </ul>		
<b>Town of Oakville</b>	<p>Active Parkland:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Town-wide parks with many sports and waterfront amenities</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Neighbourhood Park</li> <li>• Urban (Village) Squares and Parkettes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Small local parks or urban squares</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Passive Parkland and Open Space:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tableland Woodlot</li> <li>• Community Link Park</li> <li>• Minor Valley</li> <li>• Major Valley</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Five Year Review of the 2012 Parks, Recreation and Library Facilities Master Plan (2017)</a>	<i>Halton Region Municipality <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect</i>
<b>City of Toronto</b>	<p>Planned or Natural Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legacy Park (May be City or TRCA Owned) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ &gt;8ha</li> </ul> </li> <li>• City Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ 5-8ha</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Large Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ 3-5ha</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Medium Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ 1.5-3ha</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Small Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ 0.5-1.5ha</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Parkette <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ &lt;0.5ha</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Toronto Parkland Strategy (2019)</a>	<i>GTAH Municipality; Comparable TRCA</i>
<b>City of Mississauga</b>	<p>Public Open Space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destination Parks</li> <li>• Community Parks</li> <li>• Greenlands</li> <li>• Cemeteries</li> </ul> <p>Private Open Space (conservation, golf, gardens, agriculture, etc.)</p>	<a href="#">Parks and Forestry Master Plan (2019)</a>  Mississauga Official Plan	<i>GTAH Municipality, Peel Region <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect</i>

	<p>Recommended Additions from Downtown Growth Area Park Provision Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban Parks/Urban Squares</li> <li>• Pocket Parks</li> <li>• Sliver Open Spaces</li> <li>• Courtyards</li> <li>• Connecting Links (these and above may be privately owned)</li> </ul>	Downtown Growth Area Park Provision Strategy (2015)	
<b>City of Brampton</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• City Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Size varies, serves entire city, range of amenities and activities, rec facilities</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Community Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ 10-12 hectares, serves 15-20k people, passive and active with facilities</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Neighbourhood Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ 0.8 to 1.2 hectares, services 4-5k people within a 400m radius.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Recommended Additions from Master Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urban Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ For higher density urban areas</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Linear Connector</li> </ul> <p>Other Open Space:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation Authority Lands</li> <li>• Environmental Parks</li> <li>• SWMFs</li> </ul>	<p>Brampton Official Plan (2006)</p> <p><a href="#">Parks and Recreation Master Plan (2017)</a></p>	<p><i>GTAH Municipality, Peel Region</i></p> <p><a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect</p> <p><i>Comparable Population &amp; Growth Pressures</i></p>
<b>City of Vaughan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ &gt;15 hectares, supports large events and amenities</li> </ul> </li> <li>• District Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ &gt;5 hectares, many amenities, co-located with community centres</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Neighbourhood Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ 0.75 to 5 hectares, 10 minute walking access from local community</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Urban Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ &gt;1 hectare, highly programmed, serves areas of intensification</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Public Square <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ 0.2 to 1 hectare, less programmed (seating and street-related), serves areas of intensification</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>All Together Master Plan Update Recommended Additions:</p>	<p>Vaughan Official Plan</p> <p><a href="#">All Together Master Plan Review and Update (2018)</a></p>	<p><i>GTAH Municipality, Regional Municipality of York</i></p> <p><i>Comparable Population &amp; Growth Pressures</i></p> <p><i>Comparable TRCA Jurisdiction</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neighbourhood Park Type 1 for medium to high density areas. Provide more amenities than Urban Park, but smaller and higher quality than existing neighbourhood park.</li> <li>• Public Square Type 2 for low to medium density areas. Serve local needs where size of a neighbourhood park is not needed (e.g. would support a playground, or seating, or waterplay).</li> </ul>		
<b>City of Markham</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destination Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Regional destination, include conservation areas and Rouge National Park</li> <li>o Not considered as City parks providing services under the Planning Act</li> </ul> </li> <li>• City Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o City-wide Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ &gt;12 hectares, outdoor pools, tournament sites, rec. facilities</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Community Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ &gt;6 hectares, serve users within 800m, playgrounds and courts, water and skateparks, etc.</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Neighbourhood Parks, serve users within 400m <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Active Parks, 1 to 6 hectares, field sports and playgrounds, residential nbhd's</li> <li>▪ Urban Squares, 0.5 to 5 hectares, festivals and events, serve mixed-use nbhd's</li> <li>▪ Parkettes, 0.5 to 1.5 hectares, passive space for residential areas</li> <li>▪ Urban Parkettes, 0.2 to 0.5 hectares, passive space for mixed-use areas</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Markham Official Plan (2014 Interim)</a>	<p>GTAH Municipality, Regional Municipality of York</p> <p>Comparable Population &amp; Growth Pressures</p> <p>Comparable TRCA Jurisdiction</p>
<b>City of Barrie</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o &gt;15 hectares, major destinations, festivals, tournaments and events</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Community Park / District Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o &gt;5 hectares, variety of recreational and sport amenities</li> <li>o District parks associated with recreation facilities and transit</li> <li>o Community parks co-located with community facilities, where possible</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Neighbourhood Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 0.75 to 0.5 hectares, balance of active and passive uses (playgrounds, courts, unlit fields, gathering space, etc.)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Urban Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o &gt;1 hectare, support day-to-day use for designated growth centres and areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Village Squares <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 0.2 to 1 hectares, social space for small events, flexible hardscaped areas, small playground</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Barrie Official Plan 2051 (2022)</a>	<p>GGH Outer Ring Municipality, County of Simcoe</p> <p><a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Linear Parks / Greenways <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Greenways a minimum of 12.5m wide; linear parks a minimum of 25m wide.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>City of Guelph</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Regional Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Typically &gt;25 ha, regional attractions and cultural features</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Community Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 7-10 hectares, more than one neighbourhood, specialized recreation amenities and programming</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Urban Square <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ &lt;1 hectare, residents in dense neighbourhoods, passive and unstructured activities</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Neighbourhood Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ ~1 hectare, local neighbourhood, recreation for unstructured activities</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Guelph Official Plan <a href="#">Guelph Parks Plan (2022)</a>	<i>GGH Outer Ring Municipality, Wellington County</i>  <i>Comparable GRCA Jurisdiction, Population and Growth Comparators</i>
<b>Town of Milton</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Community Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 20 hectares minimum, town-wide, range of passive and active uses, festivals and events</li> </ul> </li> <li>● District Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 6 hectares minimum, per 1 or more planning districts, major outdoor sports and rec. facilities</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Neighbourhood Park <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 3 to 4 hectares, per several neighbourhoods within a Planning District, sportsfields, courts, outdoor pools, play areas</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Village Square <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 0.5 hectares, per several neighbourhoods within a Planning District, passive recreation with small or informal play areas, seating</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Linear Park (Core) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Size varies; linear forms of recreation.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Community Services Master Plan Update (2015)</a>	<i>GTAH and Halton Region Municipality</i>  <i><a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect</i>
<b>City of St. Catharine's</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● City-Wide Parks and Regional Open Spaces <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Passive and active indoor and outdoor recreation, cultural heritage amenities and events, specialized facilities</li> </ul> </li> <li>● District Parks and Playfields <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Organized and non-organized playing fields with passive use</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Neighbourhood Parks and Playgrounds <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Primarily for children's activities and passive recreation</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Linear Parks</li> </ul>	<a href="#">St. Catharine's Official Plan/Garden City Plan (2010)</a>	<i>GGH Outer Ring Municipality, Adjacent to Hamilton</i>  <i><a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan</a> in Effect</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Walking and cycling trails, connect open and community spaces, limited to extensive development</li> <li>• Special Urban Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Parkettes, urban squares or plazas, for higher density urban areas and ndoes</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		
<b>Town of Halton Hills</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Parkland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Parkettes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 0.2 to 0.6 hectares, serve 200 to 400m radius, range of active and passive opportunities for young children and older adults. Required when site conditions restrict access to other facilities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Neighbourhood Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 1.5 to 2.5 hectares, serve 400 to 800m radius, co-locate with elementary schools or community facilities, SWMFs, sportsfields, courts, and play areas.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Non-Local Parkland <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Community Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 6 hectare minimum, co-locate with secondary school or community facility, major sportsfields, courts, larger active uses</li> </ul> </li> <li>o Town Wide Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ 11 hectare minimum, major athletic facilities and sportsfields, courts, events and festivals, rec. and cultural facilities.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Linear Connector (Proposed, not in force, 2019) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Active transportation linkages</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Town of Halton Hills Parkland Policy Review (2019)</a> <a href="#">Halton Hills Official Plan (2008, Consolidated 2019)</a>	<i>Halton Region Municipality</i> <a href="#">Niagara Escarpment Plan in Effect</a>
<b>City of Richmond Hill</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destination Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o City-wide attractions, events and festivals, active parkland as well as natural and SWMFs</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Community Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Co-locate with indoor rec. facilities, high quality sports fields, mix of passive and smaller recreational activities</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Neighbourhood Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Located within 400m of residential areas, neighbourhood-oriented play and recreational opportunities</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Linear Parks and Urban Squares <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Serves intensification areas and corridors, gathering, play and water activities</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Parks Plan, Recreation Plan and Cultural Plan Review (2022, In-Progress)</a> Parks Plan (2013)	<i>GTAH Municipality, York Region</i> <i>Comparable Population &amp; Growth Pressures</i> <i>Comparable TRCA Jurisdiction</i>

<p><b>City of Kitchener</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Natural Areas (owned or managed by City) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Conservation and preservation of lands in natural state, passive uses</li> </ul> </li> <li>● City-Wide Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Size varies, provides multi-activity and multi-sport venue, specialized social functions</li> </ul> </li> <li>● District Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 4 to 8 hectares, district-level outdoor sports and recreation facilities, serve several neighbourhoods</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Neighbourhood Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1.0 to 2.5 hectares, 1.5 ha/1000 residents provision, local-scale outdoor facilities and amenities</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Urban Greens <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 0.2 to 1 hectare, high public use and aesthetics in urban core and neighbourhoods, may include small play areas or passive space.</li> <li>○ Subtypes include parkettes, lookouts, commons and plazas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Greenways <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Linear greenspaces and linkages among open spaces.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Trails <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Off-road pedestrian corridors.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><a href="#">Parks Strategic Plan (2010)</a></p>	<p><i>GGH Outer Ring Municipality; Regional Municipality of Waterloo</i></p> <p><i>Comparable population and GRCA Jurisdiction</i></p>
<p><b>City of Ottawa</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● District Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Min. 10 hectares, destinations for visitors from City and region, tourism as well</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Community Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 3.2 to 10 hectares, serve group of neighbourhoods, range of active and passive recreation.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Neighbourhood Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 1.2 to 3.2 hectares, provide active and passive recreation for a neighbourhood, should be within walking distance for residents [distance not specified].</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Parkettes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ 0.4 to 1.2 hectares, central gathering and green spaces within neighbourhoods, passive recreation. Residential or mixed-use neighbourhoods.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Urban Parkettes/ Urban Plazas</li> </ul>	<p><a href="#">Parks and Recreation Master Plan (2021)</a></p>	<p><i>Comparable urban size and development pressure; comparable rural and urban municipality and structure</i></p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 0.2 to 0.4 hectares, small typically hardscaped spaces in intensified areas, seating and other passive elements, may have courts in moderately intensive outer-urban areas.</li> </ul>		
<b>City of Vancouver</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Destination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o &gt;20 hectares, high number of amenities &gt;15, events and regional attraction</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o &lt;20 hectares with average of 6.4ha, large number of amenities (6-15), citywide attraction</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Neighbourhood <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o &lt;10 hectares with average of 2.6ha, medium number of amenities (2-7), neighbourhood residents</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Local <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o &lt;2.5 hectares with average of .54ha, select amenities mostly passive, neighbourhood residents</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Urban Plaza <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o &lt;0.4 hectares, select amenities (3 or less), in areas of high daytime population.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Vancouver Parks Board Parks &amp; Recreation VanPlay Master Plan (2018)</a>	<i>Included for comparable urban growth, redevelopment pressures.</i>
<b>City of Winnipeg</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o &gt;40 hectares, serves 100k people, 5km catchment</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Regional-Sport <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o &gt;40 hectares, serves 250K people, 10km catchment</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Community <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o &gt;5 hectares, serves 10k people, 1 per 3-5 nbhds or 2km catchment</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Neighbourhood <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o 0.2-5 hectares, serves 2k people, 1 per 1000 people or 600m catchment</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Nature</li> <li>• Linkage</li> </ul>	<a href="#">Final Draft Winnipeg Parks Strategy (2021)</a>	<i>Comparable population and geographic size of municipality.</i>
<b>City of Edmonton</b>	<p>Open Space: Publicly Owned and/or Publicly Accessible</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Municipal Parks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Metropolitan Park – Citywide and regional destinations</li> <li>o District Park – Serve multiple communities, multifunctional, can be located with rec. facilities or attractions</li> <li>o Community Park – Core unit of open space network, recreational and social amenities, often co-located with schools and community league facilities</li> <li>o Pocket Park – small open space, may have 1-2 amenities/functions</li> <li>o Greenway – linear parkland, active transportation and recreation links</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<a href="#">Breathe: Edmonton's Green Network Strategy (2017)</a>	<i>Comparable larger population and geographic size, unique (and expanded) classification</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Ecological Park – protect areas dominated by native vegetation and fauna (land and water)</li> <li>• Civic Spaces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Squares, Plazas, and Promenades</li> <li>o Main Streets</li> <li>o Pedestrian Priority Streets</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Corridors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Connectors – pathways with some associated green space, linking open spaces or communities together</li> <li>o Roadway Greens – green spaces within public or road right-of-way (shared use pathways, road island greens).</li> <li>o Utility Corridors</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Other Jurisdictional Parkland: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Provincial Parkland</li> <li>o Federal Parkland</li> <li>o Campus – Government centres, universities and colleges, and hospitals</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Other Public Open Spaces: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Special Purpose Facility – major cultural, recreational, or sporting facilities that typical require a fee to enter (e.g. Zoo, Commonwealth Stadium site, Fort Edmonton Park)</li> <li>o School Sites</li> <li>o Municipal Cemeteries</li> <li>o Municipal Golf Courses</li> <li>o Select Vacant City Holdings</li> <li>o Utility Lots (SWMFs)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p><i>system for consideration</i></p>
--	--	--	--

## ACCESS/PROXIMITY METRIC EVIDENCE<sup>6</sup>

Source of Information	Summary of Evidence & Considerations	Comments
El-Geneidy et al. (2013). New evidence on walking distances to transit stops: Identifying redundancies and gaps 44 using variable service areas. <i>Transportation</i> , 41(1), 193-210.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 400 metre proximity access is the most common industry standard in transportation planning and design for provisioning the closest available transit stop (typically bus stops).</li> <li>- 400 metre distance to closest available transit stop viewed in industry as furthest residents will walk.</li> <li>- Further distances up to 800m were standard for higher-order transit (e.g. rail).</li> <li>- Case study analysis resulted in percentile walking distance to bus transit service around 524 meters.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Key factors include population density surrounding amenity, level of service being provided, and equity/household characteristics.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<i>These standards noted by other researchers as comparable to provisioning other urban amenities and services.</i>
Y. Xiao, D. Wang, J. Fang (2019). <a href="#">Exploring the disparities in park access through mobile phone data: Evidence from Shanghai, China</a> . <i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i> , 181, 80-91.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Neighbourhood parks should be situated within a five-minute walk, corresponding to a maximum 400 m radius from a user's residence, if they are to be perceived as accessible.</li> </ul>	
C. Perry (1929). <i>The Neighbourhood unit</i> . Reprinted Routledge/Thoemmes, London, 25-44.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- ¼ mile (400m) was determined as the maximum walking distance to community features and amenities in the neighbourhood planning model for New York City.</li> </ul>	<i>Standard and planning precedent which was highly influential and replicated through 20<sup>th</sup> century planning.</i>
Guan et al. (2020). <a href="#">Delineating urban park catchment areas using mobile phone data: A case study of Tokyo</a> . <i>Computers, Environment and Urban Systems</i> , 81.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides a broad scan of different access and proximity measures from around the world, including:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Belgium requires 800m catchment for a neighbourhood park and 1600m for a district park.</li> <li>o Densely populated cities in Japan, Bangladesh and China have park access standards of 300 to 500m to a neighbourhood park.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Study of mobile phone 'big' data in Tokyo illustrates walking to a park decays beyond 1km.</li> <li>- Almost all the parks, regardless of its size and function, had the highest user density right around the vicinity.</li> </ul>	

<sup>6</sup> See Park Provision Measures Table above for benchmarking and review of access measures in use by comparable municipalities.

<p>Zuniga-Teran et al. (2019). <a href="#">Exploring the influence of neighborhood walkability on the frequency of use of greenspace</a>. <i>Landscape and Urban Planning</i>, 190.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Results suggest that perceptions of walkability, along with mode of travel, and proximity to greenspace are associated with the frequency of use of greenspace.</li> <li>- Walkability elements that were found to influence the probability of greenspace visitation include perceptions of traffic safety (pedestrian and biking infrastructure), surveillance (the extent to which people inside buildings can see pedestrians on the street), and community (spaces that allow social interaction).</li> </ul>	<p><i>Specific proximity distance/stand ard not specified.</i></p>
<p><a href="#">The Trust for Public Land</a>. National Recreation and Park Association (2018). <i>Open Space Radio: Parks and Recreation Trends</i> [Podcast]. <a href="#">Episode 014</a>.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Campaign to promote a 10-minute walk (half-mile, or 800m) for all residents in American cities to a park.</li> <li>- Focus on City &amp; County of San Francisco achieving all residents having 10-minute walking access to at least one park.</li> <li>- First city in the United States to achieve the above noted goal from TPL.</li> </ul>	
<p>Sallis, JF, et al. (2015). <a href="#">Co-benefits of designing communities for active living: an exploration of literature [accessed via Active Living webpage]</a>. <i>International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity</i>, 12:30.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Park presence/proximity had good to strong evidence of all studied co-benefits, including physical and mental health benefits, social benefits, environmental sustainability, and safety/injury prevention.</li> <li>- Current evidence supports a conclusion that having a park nearby with substantial programs and promotion produces a wide range of health and environmental benefits beyond physical activity</li> </ul>	<p><i>Proximity measure used varied by indicator, but generally from 1km to 3km.</i></p>

## PRIVATELY OWNED PUBLIC (OPEN) SPACE & STRATA – Policy Precedents

Source of Information	Summary of Policy and Guidelines In Place/Findings	Comments
City of Mississauga - <a href="#">2022 Parks Plan</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A POPS Policy recommended in Parks Plan, the Downtown Parks Provision Strategy (2015) and the Forestry and Parks &amp; Forestry Master Plan (2019).               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o A policy will be included in the updated Official Plan (anticipated 2023).</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Policy to address provision of POPS where unencumbered public parkland cannot be achieved.</li> <li>- POPS currently permitted on case-by-case basis through the development approval process.</li> <li>- POPS identified in plan as having some positive benefit to the public realm.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o However, POPS not counted towards satisfying parkland need and not counted towards parkland inventory or provision.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- <a href="#">Mississauga Parks &amp; Forestry Master Plan</a>:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Recommendation to use the Downtown Growth Area Parks Provision Strategy as guidance, to develop a policy to address the acceptance of portions of privately owned properties as public open space. Conditions could include:                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lands that remain in private ownership are covenanted as public space</li> <li>▪ The park is built to municipal standards and specifications</li> <li>▪ The park is maintained to municipal standards</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>● <b>Strata Parks:</b> Recommendations to explore strata/rooftop parks in the Parks &amp; Forestry Master Plan:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Examine the implications of developing parkland on roof slab or underground parking structures when constraint-free parkland cannot be achieved. The study will include at a minimum location criteria, design considerations, best practices review, capital and operating costs (including implications for trees related to the life cycle of underground parking structures), ownership considerations (stratified ownership, easement) and principles by which requests can be evaluated.                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ An agreement for the foregoing is in place RE: discounted dedication value due to the presence of encumbrances such as below ground infrastructure.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<i>Example POPS noted in the Plan include Square One Mall in Downtown area.</i>
City of Toronto - <a href="#">POPS Design Guidelines (2014)</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- City often negotiates with private developers to include POPS as part of the development application and review process.</li> <li>- POPS are intended to complement the City's public parks, open space and natural areas, not replace them.</li> <li>- The City's Official Plan is clear on the critical role that public open space plays in developing and nurturing the city. The draft Urban Design Guidelines for POPS build upon Official Plan direction by providing guidance on the location, programming and design of these spaces.</li> <li>- Design Guidelines build off of Official Plan direction on the importance, and need to expand, the urban public realm.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Development to provide amenity for adjacent streets and open spaces.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<i>Hundreds of existing POPS noted</i>

- 
- Design Guidelines note that siting and location of POPS is critically important. Should not be leftover space in a development, and review/acceptance of POPS should consider the following:
    - o Support and enhance city-building, urban structure and urban design objectives.
    - o Ensure access and visibility to POPS from adjacent public streets, open spaces.
    - o Provide appropriate signage to indicate the location of POPS.
    - o Optimize the siting and design of open space in new developments to enhance views or visual corridors to public streets, open spaces.
    - o Utilize mid-block pedestrian walkways to connect POPS with nearby public open spaces.
  - Planning Act, S. 37 (Community Benefits) frequently used given density and scale of development proposed in Toronto.

---

City of Vancouver

- [City of Vancouver Community Benefits from Development Document \(2019\)](#)
- [Downtown Public Space Strategy \(2020\)](#)

- POPS are frequent in Downtown Vancouver, and have typically been acquired through the development process through Community Amenity Contributions (requires rezoning) and (historically more prevalent) Density Bonus Zoning.
- Downtown Public Space Strategy recommends the development of a formal POPS policy framework to secure and retain existing POPS, and acquire new POPS.
  - o Recommendation to continue to secure new Privately Owned Publicly Accessible Spaces as part of the development process, where appropriate; with a focus on areas that are currently most underserved.
  - o Recommendation to update the current Plaza Design Guidelines (1992) for POPS, and expand to provide guidance for the design, wayfinding and access, operations, use and stewardship.
- **Strata Parks:** Vancouver Parks Board negotiated with private land owner for new 3.6 hectare partially on top of a redeveloped mall (Oakridge Mall), and has a ground floor access.
  - o Ownership structure includes a provision that park maintenance and future capital renewal are paid for and done by the landowner, not the Park Board.
  - o Negotiated due to the complexity of having multiple maintenance crews on site and liability if a Park Board staff person damaged the protective membrane. An operating committee including Park Board and mall staff will be created.

---

City of Richmond Hill  
 - [Parks Plan, Recreation Plan and Cultural Plan Review \(2022, In-Progress\)](#)

- Official Plan policy considerations for establishing public access to privately-owned open space by easement or other appropriate mechanism.
    - o Section 3.4.4.16 of the City's Official Plan identifies that "private urban squares created through the development process shall be encouraged to provide public access."
  - **Strata parks:** recommendation for parkland conveyance bylaw update and official plan review to strategically accept strata parks while considering a discounted conveyance rate relative to non-strata parks due to inherent encumbrances on the use and the development of the strata park (the value of the conveyance should be determined at the direction of Council).
-

---

City of Barrie  
- [Official Plan 2051](#)

- Official Plan, page 125:
  - o The City will encourage opportunities for other public spaces (such as schools), private amenity spaces and privately-owned publicly-accessible spaces (POPs) to abut the connected park system
  - o Page 130: Seek partnerships, easements, or joint provision of land, such as through the POPS model.
- **Strata** parks: Parkland dedication will not be accepted with underground parking facilities (page 129).

---

City of Markham  
- [Markham Official Plan \(2014 Interim\)](#)

- **Strata** parks are typically located in mixed-use neighbourhoods as an urban square or parkette.
  - o The value of the contribution to parkland conveyance is discounted relative to non-strata parks due to inherent encumbrances on the use and the development of the strata park (the value of conveyance is determined at the discretion of the City.
  - o The strata limit of the park is generally 200 mm above the top grate of the roof of the private structure.

---

City of Guelph  
- [Guelph Parks Plan \(2022\)](#)

- **Strata** parkland could be considered in unique circumstances.
  - o Definition in Plan: Strata parkland is a public park developed above a private infrastructure asset such as a parking garage or storm water infrastructure (public or private). The park space is deeded to the municipality by the property developer and is publicly owned (and typically publicly operated), whereas the underlying infrastructure will continue to be is maintained by the asset's private ownership.
  - o Strata parkland may not result in full parkland dedication credits and parkland should be provided above what is required for common-amenity space.
- POPS are not permitted within our Official Plan at this time and are not being considered.

---

New York City  
- [NYC POPS Website \(2022\)](#) & Zoning Resolution (Amended for POPS to 2009)

- Defined by City as privately owned public spaces, also known by the acronym POPS, are spaces dedicated to public use and enjoyment and which are owned and maintained by private property owners, in exchange for bonus floor area or waivers
- POPS have been permitted through density bonus zoning in NYC since 1961.
- Current NYC Zoning Resolution contains the process for the application, review and approval for POPS.
  - o Zoning Resolution Section 37-78 (a) for new public plazas, and Section 37-70 for applicable regulations.
- NYC has also developed POPS/public plaza design standards: Article III Chapter 7 Section 70.
  - o Design standards include: Dimensions & area; Configuration; Restrictions on Location and Orientation; Visibility; Through-Block Requirements; Sidewalk Frontages; Elevation; Step Height & Tread; Circulation Paths; Permitted Sky Obstructions; Seating; Lighting; Planting and Trees; Various Categories on other Site Furnishings; Signage; Bike Parking; Hours of Access; Accessibility and ADA (USA Requirement).

[Active map of POPS inventory maintained](#)

---

City of Vaughan

- [All Together Master Plan Review and Update \(2018\)](#)

- Privately-Owned Publicly-Accessible Spaces – While not a substitute for active parkland, privately-owned publicly-accessible spaces (POPS) can serve to supplement limited parkland in dense urban areas if designed to be publicly accessible. Trees, gardens, fountains, seating areas, public art, and outdoor seating or dining areas are all potential amenities that can animate an urban area and accommodate passive, drop-in use. The approvals process should include clear developer agreements to direct design, long term public use and maintenance.
- **Strata Parks** – Strata ownership refers to multi-layered ownership on a specific parcel of land, typically associated with high-rise condominiums. In the context of parks and recreation, it refers to public spaces or facilities that are developed on parking garages, stormwater infrastructure, or other roof slab construction. While strata parks are a potential solution for the delivery of new parkland in intensifying areas with land constraints, they present unique challenges associated with maintenance (e.g., waterproofing) and infrastructure replacement. The City of Vaughan has established principles for Strata Park Arrangements in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre Secondary Plan and recommends partial parkland credit.

---

Academic Research/Articles on POPS Considerations:

- Rahi, G., Martynkiw, A., Hein, E. (2012). [Accessing Vancouver's Privately Owned Public Spaces](#). *Trail Six Journal*.
- Nemeth, J., & Schmidt, S. (2011). The Privatization of Public Space: Modeling and Measuring Publicness. *Environment and Planning B*, Vol. 38, 5-23.
- Kaden, J.S. (2000). [Privately Owned Public Space: The New York Experience](#). John Wiley & Sons, Inc.: New York.

- Identifies opportunities and challenges with the public-ness of POPS, who is welcome and who is not, demarking and accessing the “public” space.
-

## ALTERNATIVE PARKLAND ACQUISITION OPPORTUNITIES – Policy Precedents

Source of Information	Summary of Policy and Guidelines In Place/Findings	Comments
City of Hamilton - <a href="#">CIP Webpage</a> - Parks Provision Strategy (2013)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Has an existing surplus park site strategy and joint-use agreement for school lands with schoolboards</li> <li>- Use of Community Improvement Plans:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o A Community Improvement Plans or CIP is a tool that allows a municipality to direct funds and implement policy initiatives toward a specifically defined project area. Section 28 of the Planning Act gives municipalities that have enabling policies in their official plans.</li> <li>o Community Improvement Plans are intended to encourage revitalization initiatives and/or stimulate development and redevelopment. Once implemented, the Plan allows municipalities to provide tax assistance, grants or loans to assist in the revitalization of lands and/or buildings within the defined Community Improvement Project Area (CIPA).                   <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The City may also acquire, hold, lease land and improve buildings within the CIPA as needed.</li> <li>▪ Hamilton has CIPA adopted for commercial corridors and brownfield sites within the urban area, in addition to others.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>- Provision Strategy Recommendation: Some of Hamilton’s parks are situated on former landfill sites, such as Kay Drage Park or Heritage Green Sports Park. The City should pursue innovative opportunities to place park-like amenities on lands secured for other purposes, While many of these may be not be long-term options, they could accommodate land-intensive activities such as recreational soccer or ball at a relatively reasonable price.</li> <li>- Provision Strategy recommendation: use rooftops, closing streets, or acquiring brownfield sites in industrial areas where possible.</li> </ul>	
City of Burlington - <a href="#">Parks, Recreation and Cultural Assets Master Plan (2009)</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Has an existing surplus park site strategy and joint-use agreement for school lands with schoolboards</li> <li>- Joint venture recommendation: That the City finalize the review of its Joint Venture Policy, ensuring that it is aligned with the principles and directions of Future Focus and the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Assets Master Plan (pg. 3-8).</li> <li>- Recommendations for environmental partnerships (pg. 4-2):               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Explore environmental stewardship efforts</li> <li>o Partner with Conservation Authority and other service providers to recognize and increase technical capacities and opportunities.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- potential partnerships with local school boards and other providers of open space lands (pg. iv)</li> </ul>	
City of Barrie - <a href="#">Barrie Parks &amp; Recreation Strategic Master Plan (2010)</a>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recommendation 7-18 (page 66): In areas of residential intensification (including, but not limited to, the Urban Growth Centre) and through Community Improvement Plans, make the preservation and enhancement of parkland and open spaces a priority. This may include giving consideration to the purchase of surplus</li> </ul>	

- Official Plan 2051	<p>school sites in the vicinity, improving linkages to existing park sites, renewing and/or redeveloping existing parks, implementing urban design practices that enhance connections with park/open space elements, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Official Plan, page 125: The City will encourage opportunities for other public spaces (such as schools), private amenity spaces and privately-owned publicly-accessible spaces (POPs) to abut the connected park system.</li> </ul>
<p>Town of Oakville</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="#">Five Year Review of the 2012 Parks, Recreation and Library Facilities Master Plan (2017)</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 6.5.1, 55.: consider both traditional and non-traditional means of securing parks and public open space in areas of intensification, including: development of new parks; improving connections and access to parks and facilities in other neighbourhoods; and enlisting the support of the development industry in the provision of alternate park spaces, including, but not limited to, strata parks, semi-public open space, use of Section 37 for public realm improvements, and 'shared streets' (pg. 92)</li> <li>- 56: In neighbourhoods planned for residential intensification, evaluate existing parks, open space lands, and other municipal properties for their potential to accommodate multi-functional spaces and expanded social and recreational opportunities to serve residents' needs</li> <li>- 57: Do not pursue the acquisition of non-municipal land or retain such lands for park purposes (e.g., schoolyards or surplus schools) in areas that presently have adequate supplies of active parkland unless there is a justified need for additional parkland</li> </ul>
<p>City of Vancouver</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="#">City of Vancouver Community Benefits from Development Document (2019)</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- City of Vancouver utilizes Development Cost Levies (Citywide), Community Amenity Contributions (requires rezoning), and Density Bonus Zoning to acquire and fund development of parkland and other community amenities (libraries, childcare, affordable housing), as well as POPS.</li> </ul>
<p>Town of Milton</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="#">Milton Community Services Master Plan Update (2015)</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alternative Means to Obtain Parkland Recommendations (pg. G-14): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o municipal purchase or lease of land;</li> <li>o negotiating financial agreements with landowners, as is presently done by the Town;</li> <li>o land exchanges or swaps, particularly if development is to occur in highly valued natural areas;</li> <li>o off-site conveyance of parkland (as the Town has recently pursued with lands negotiated outside of Secondary Plan areas);</li> <li>o establishment of a Parks Foundation (i.e., community, corporate and/or municipal donations to be put toward parkland acquisition);</li> <li>o reallocating surplus municipal lands to parks use;</li> <li>o negotiating access to non-municipal parks and facilities (e.g. through reciprocal agreements) and/or encouraging user groups to access these spaces on their own behalf;</li> <li>o seek to purchase 'over-dedication' of parkland associated with new development and/or infill areas;</li> <li>o partnership / joint provision of lands with community partners.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

- With a considerable supply of naturalized open space, as well as the demands that a growing population will require for recreational and cultural facilities and services, it is worth re-emphasizing that the Town should focus upon obtaining parkland for active recreational uses and social gatherings.
- Opportunities to obtain lands in the existing areas may arise if commercial, industrial or institutional lands become available for sale.
- Seek parcels that have appropriate frontages along collector roads (for Neighbourhood Parks) and arterial roads (for District and Community Parks). Village Squares should be located to provide a focal point and informal gathering place within neighbourhoods.
- Where possible and appropriate, the Town should continue its recent practice of locating parks along onstreet and off-street trail networks, and transit routes.
- In anticipation of intensification and build-out of the urban boundary, the Town should monitor opportunities to purchase or acquire parkland within established and developing areas, particularly along or near major road and transit corridors, in proximity to designated “Gateways” and “Nodes”, and possibly co-located with schools and other institutional or mixed uses to share common infrastructure such as parking.

City of Ottawa

- [Parks and Recreation Master Plan \(2021\)](#)

- Recommendation to complete a real estate strategy to actively acquire land to follow the parks master plan.
  - o targeted real estate acquisitions will be essential to address projected parkland deficiencies, as small-scale infill development in existing urban area will not generate parkland, only minimal CIL (pg. 55).
- Existing parkland shall retain active recreation as its primary function and shall not be sold or built upon with the exception of facilities that serve a parks and recreation function. Uses such as stormwater management, commercial purposes and commuter parking not permitted (pg. 49-50).
- DC Use:
  - o Amongst the designated services are parks development and recreation facilities.
    - Only those specific capital projects included in the current Development Charges Background Study are eligible for funding.
  - o Recreation, Culture and Facility Services is reviewing the process to generate urban park funding on a program approach rather than identified via individual development sites.
  - o This would allow the City to update the DC urban park list on an annual basis to fund urban park opportunities arising from new development applications and future land acquisitions. (pg. 53).
- Unlikely to be able to use CBC for consistent parks development funding (pg. 55).
- Surplus municipal land - Where surplus City-owned land is considered for disposal in areas where the parkland provision rate is less than 2 hectares per 1,000 people, the policy should direct that some or all of that land be made available to RCFS for new parkland (pg. 55).
- Reverse trend of small park parcels as remnant from redevelopment sites:
  - o where Site Plan Control applications generate parkland, smaller park parcels will be consolidated. If a site generates parkland:
    - of 400m2 to 1,800m2, the parkland is required to be consolidated into a single park

---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ greater than 1,800m<sup>2</sup> but less than 2,200m<sup>2</sup>, then the parkland may be divided into two parks, with no park smaller than 400m<sup>2</sup> (pg. 56).</li> </ul>
<p>City of Markham</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="#">Markham Official Plan (2014 Interim)</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 4.3.1.4(m): Partnerships: to cultivate strong, positive partnerships with public, private and non-profit organizations to assist with the acquisition, development and maintenance of parks, recreation facilities and open spaces.</li> </ul>
<p>City of Guelph</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="#">Guelph Parks Plan (2022)</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Alternative strategies considered (pg. 102): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Improving the quality and usefulness of existing parks through better design</li> <li>o Encouraging and working with the local School Boards to upgrade the design and development of some of their open space areas</li> <li>o Developing portions of certain community or regional parks to meet neighbourhood needs</li> <li>o Enhancing connections between park and open space areas.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Partnerships (pg. 103): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o The City has agreements with other public landowners to use their land for park or recreational purposes—specifically with Grand River Conservation Authority and the Wellington Catholic District School Board. Should these arrangements continue to be mutually beneficial, these agreements should remain intact and updated on a regular basis.</li> </ul> </li> <li>- Develop policies to support conversion of surplus land to parkland (pg. 103)</li> <li>- Develop design guidelines for developments adjacent to existing parks (pg. 103)</li> </ul>
<p>City of Vaughan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="#">All Together Master Plan Review and Update (2018)</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develop policies and practices to prioritize on-site parkland dedication and encourage front-end acquisition of parkland in intensification areas (pg. 62).</li> <li>- Consideration of Non-traditional Park Spaces: Other opportunities to secure parkland might include looking at non-traditional lands that could be used for parks and open space activities, such as greenways, shared facilities (e.g., co-located fields with school boards), Hydro lands and reclaimed brownfields.</li> <li>- Establish standards to direct the provision of non-traditional parks and public open space in areas of intensification, including: development of new parks; enhancing existing parks; and working with the development industry in the provision of alternate park spaces to supplement prescribed parkland dedication and/or cash-in-lieu (e.g., strata parks, privately-owned publicly-accessible spaces, indoor space in lieu of parkland, off-site dedication, use of cash-in-lieu for park improvements, etc.). This may be partially achieved by site-specific agreements or other implementing mechanisms, such as bonusing as per Section 37 of the Planning Act.</li> </ul>
<p>City of Toronto</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <a href="#">Toronto Parkland Strategy (2019)</a></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Priority Area Planning – using the gap analysis, more detailed, locally-oriented parks plans will be recommended in high-priority areas (unless existing planning work, including secondary plans, is already underway), which will enable the City to take a strategic approach to acquisitions and improvements (pg. 45).</li> <li>- In addition to identifying parkland dedication opportunities, more-detailed plans to identify:</li> </ul>

---

- 
- o Opportunities to leverage city-owned land for new parks and open spaces along with meeting other city-building priorities
  - o Potential improvements to parks and need for recreation facilities
  - o Natural features that should be protected and enhanced
  - o Opportunities to commemorate and celebrate Indigenous peoples or other cultures
  - Parkland Assessment Tool – Primary and secondary assessment criteria, organized into a checklist and matrix, to support supports more strategic acquisition opportunities when the City is in a position to consider whether a site or sites should be acquired for parkland purposes (pg. 48).
  - Prioritize acquisition to expand existing parks by acquiring and securing lands adjacent to existing parks and particularly in high-growth areas (pg. 38).

---

City of Winnipeg

- [Final Draft Winnipeg Parks Strategy \(2021\)](#)

- Decision-Making Matrix tool with priority factors for acquisition/investment – page 40.
  - 4.4.2.J: Leverage joint use agreements with school divisions where appropriate to secure public access to playgrounds and athletic fields outside of regular operating hours (pg. 125).
  - 4.1.1.31: Consider acquisition of school sites, golf courses, or other public lands that are made available for repurposing and suitable for designation as parkland (pg. 109).
  - 4.1.1.34: Seek creative alternatives to expand park access, such as exploring the possibilities and implications of publicly available private lands (ie. green roofs, private park spaces) to supplement the park provision (pg. 109).
  - **Rural Area Considerations:**
    - o Park provisioning in rural and agricultural areas could occur through purchase of land, but is most likely to be associated with dedication of park land as part of a future new community development process.
    - o Since the latter must be preceded by a secondary plan, and must have servicing capacity, a new community development is not expected for quite some time.
    - o Acquisition of parkland in rural and agricultural areas will focus on locations comprised of high-quality natural habitats in an effort to be proactive in protecting these areas in advance of development pressures.
    - o Larger tracts of these areas may be suited for regional parks.
    - o Strategic acquisition of land or reserve of City-owned property, in some instances, may be considered as assets to negotiate land swap for future parkland that may ultimately be more desirable as park space (pg. 58).
-