

Vision: *The City of Greater Sudbury is a growing, world-class community bringing talent, technology and a great northern lifestyle together.*

Vision: *La Ville du Grand Sudbury est une communauté croissante de calibre international qui rassemble les talents, les technologies et le style de vie exceptionnel du Nord.*



Agenda

Policy Committee

meeting to be held

Wednesday, February 17th, 2010

at 6:00 pm

Council Chamber, Tom Davies Square

Ordre du jour

réunion du

Comité des politiques

qui aura lieu

mercredi 17^e février 2010

à 18h 00

dans la Salle du Conseil, Place Tom Davies

POLICY COMMITTEE AGENDA

For the 53rd Policy Committee Meeting
to be held on **Wednesday, February 17, 2010**
Council Chamber, Tom Davies Square at 6:00 pm

COUNCILLOR DOUG CRAIG, CHAIR

Jacques Barbeau, Vice-Chair

(PLEASE ENSURE CELL PHONES AND PAGERS ARE TURNED OFF)

The Council Chamber of Tom Davies Square is accessible to persons with disabilities. Please speak to the City Clerk prior to the meeting if you require a hearing amplification device. Persons requiring assistance are requested to contact the City Clerks Office at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting if special arrangements are required. Please call (705) 674-4455, extension 2471. Telecommunications Device for the Deaf (TTY) (705) 688-3919. Copies of Agendas can be viewed at www.greatersudbury.ca/agendas/.

DECLARATIONS OF PECUNIARY INTEREST AND THE GENERAL NATURE THEREOF

COMMUNITY DELEGATIONS

PRESENTATIONS

1. Report dated February 4, 2010 from the General Manager of Growth & Development regarding Green Space Advisory Panel Update. **8 - 29**
(ELECTRONIC PRESENTATION) (RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)
(REPORT UNDER SEPARATE COVER)
 - Bill Lautenbach, General Manager of Growth & Development

(A presentation on progress and next steps relating to the Green Space Advisory Panel.)
2. Report dated February 3, 2010 from the General Manager of Community Development regarding CGS Pioneer Manor Strategic Plan 2010 to 2014. **30 - 32**
(ELECTRONIC PRESENTATION) (RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)
(REPORT UNDER SEPARATE COVER)
 - Ron Dupuis, Chair, Management Committee of Pioneer Manor
 - Catherine Matheson, General Manager, Community Development

(Pioneer Manor's new strategic plan maps the vision for the years 2010 to 2014.)

CORRESPONDENCE FOR INFORMATION

REFERRED & DEFERRED MATTERS

MANAGERS' REPORTS

3. Report dated February 5, 2010 from the General Manager of Community Development regarding Display Flower Bed Policy. **33 - 34**
(RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)

(A display flower bed policy has been prepared to allocate the three (3) display flower beds on an annual basis for Council's consideration. The policy will include a criteria application process and a recommended nominal fee to be collected in order to assist offsetting the purchase and annual maintenance cost.)

MOTIONS

ADDENDUM

CITIZEN PETITIONS

ANNOUNCEMENTS

NOTICES OF MOTION

9:00 P.M. ADJOURNMENT (RECOMMENDATION PREPARED)

(Two-thirds majority required to proceed past 9:00 pm)

Councillor Doug Craig
Chair

Franca Bortolussi
Council Secretary

COMITÉ DES POLITIQUES ORDRE DU JOUR

Pour la 53^e réunion du Comité des politiques
qui aura lieu le **17 février 2010**
dans la **Salle du Conseil, Place Tom Davies, à 18h 00**

CONSEILLER DOUG CRAIG, PRÉSIDENT(E)

Jacques Barbeau, Vice-président(e)

VEUILLEZ ÉTEINDRE LES TÉLÉPHONES CELLULAIRES ET LES TÉLÉAVERTISSEURS)
La salle du

La salle du Conseil de la Place Tom Davies est accessible pour les personnes handicapées. Si vous désirez obtenir un appareil auditif, veuillez communiquer avec la greffière municipale, avant la réunion. Les personnes qui prévoient avoir besoin d'aide doivent s'adresser au bureau du greffier municipal au moins 24 heures avant la réunion aux fins de dispositions spéciales. Veuillez composer le 705-674-4455, poste 2471; appareils de télécommunications pour les malentendants (ATS) 705-688-3919. Vous pouvez consulter l'ordre du jour à l'adresse www.greatersudbury.ca/agendas/.

DÉCLARATION D'INTÉRÊTS PÉCUNIAIRES ET LEUR NATURE GÉNÉRALES

DÉLÉGATIONS DE LA COMMUNAUTÉ

PRÉSENTATIONS ET EXPOSÉS

1. Rapport du directeur général de la croissance et du développement, daté du 04 février 2010 portant sur Compte rendu du Groupe consultatif sur les espaces verts. **8 - 29**
(PRÉSENTATION ÉLECTRONIQUE) (RECOMMANDATION PRÉPARÉE)
(RAPPORT SOUS PLI SÉPARÉ)
 - Bill Lautenbach, directeur général de la croissance et du développement(Présentation sur les progrès réalisés et les prochaines étapes relativement au Groupe consultatif sur les espaces verts.)

2. Rapport de la directrice générale des Services de développement communautaire, daté du 03 février 2010 portant sur Plan stratégique 2010-2014 du Manoir des pionniers de la VGS. **30 - 32**
(PRÉSENTATION ÉLECTRONIQUE) (RECOMMANDATION PRÉPARÉE)
(RAPPORT SOUS PLI SÉPARÉ)
 - Ron Dupuis, président du Comité de gestion du Manoir des pionniers
 - Catherine Matheson, directrice générale des Services de développement communautaire(Le nouveau plan stratégique du Manoir des pionniers indique la vision pour les années 2010 à 2014.)

CORRESPONDANCE À TITRE DE RENSEIGNEMENTS SEULEMENT

QUESTION RENVOYÉES ET REPORTÉES

RAPPORTS DES GESTIONNAIRES

3. Rapport de la directrice générale des Services de développement communautaire, daté du 05 février 2010 portant sur Politique en matière des massifs de fleurs décoratifs. **33 - 34**
(RECOMMANDATION PRÉPARÉE)

(Une politique en matière des massifs de fleurs décoratifs a été élaborée pour attribuer les trois (3) massifs de fleurs décoratifs chaque année pour les soumettre à l'étude du Conseil municipal. La politique doit inclure une démarche de demande selon des critères et des frais minimes recommandés doivent être recueillis afin d'aider à compenser les frais d'achat et d'entretien annuel.)

MOTIONS

ADDENDA

PÉTITIONS DE CITOYENS

ANNONCES

AVIS DE MOTION

LEVÉE DE LA SÉANCE À 21 H (RECOMMANDATION PRÉPARÉE)

(Une majorité des deux tiers est requise pour poursuivre la réunion après 21h 00.)

Le Conseiller Doug Craig,
Présidente

Franca Bortolussi,
Secrétaire du conseil

Request for Decision

Green Space Advisory Panel Update

Presented To:	Policy Committee
Presented:	Wednesday, Feb 17, 2010
Report Date	Thursday, Feb 04, 2010
Type:	Presentations

Recommendation

That the work of the Green Space Advisory Panel in draft format be released by Council for public input sessions before final reports are prepared and final presentation made to Council.

Background

On October 24th, 2007, Council appointed the Green Space Advisory Panel to:

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

Members of the Green Space Advisory Panel are:

Samantha Baulch
Peter Beckett
Don Brisebois
Elaine Comacchio-Blais
Gerard Courtin
Naomi Grant
Robert Hanson
Will Kershaw
Keir Kitchen

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Paul Baskcomb
Acting Director of Planning Services
Digitally Signed Feb 4, 10

Division Review

Paul Baskcomb
Acting Director of Planning Services
Digitally Signed Feb 4, 10

Recommended by the Department

Bill Lautenbach
General Manager of Growth and Development
Digitally Signed Feb 4, 10

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Feb 11, 10

Michel Lauzon
Franco Mariotti
Warren Maskell
Deb McIntosh
William R. Morin
Dr. H. Beaumont Nelson
John Rauh
Paul Sajatovic
Lorne Taylor
Roel A. Teunissen

The staff implementation team is:

Bill Lautenbach - General Manager of Growth & Development
Paul Baskcomb - Acting Director of Planning Services
Chris Gore - Manager of Community Partnerships
Keith Forrester - Real Estate Coordinator
Ian Wood - Chief of Staff to the Mayor
Kris Longston - Senior Planner, Community & Strategic Planning
Krista Carré - Senior Planning Technician
Stephen Monet - Manager of Environmental Planning Initiatives

Green space is a term commonly used to denote parkland, greenways, open space, natural heritage or environment lands, vacant lands and even lands such as golf courses, cemeteries, agricultural lands or green infrastructure such as drainage ditches. In the work of the Green Space Advisory Panel green space is being considered in its broadest context with the aim that priority sites would ultimately become public space. Private green space protection may be subject to a future mandate but is not the priority of this Panel.

Green space offers many benefits to society including: ecosystem benefits such as wildlife habitat, biological diversity, water storage and air quality/climate moderation; economic benefits such as enhanced property values, tourism opportunities, beautification and improved quality of life; social benefits such as outdoor recreation opportunities, health and wellness impacts, and active transportation links; and green infrastructure benefits such as storm water management. Green space to a significant degree helps to define the character of a community or city.

For the past several years green space issues have emerged throughout the City of Greater Sudbury. These issues have taken the form of citizen concerns regarding developments in their neighborhood which would eliminate private open space which they have been privileged to use over the years (Roxborough, Centennial Drive, Bennett Lake). Similar green space issues have also emerged when the City considered the appropriateness of disposal of surplus leisure services property to be placed on the open market. Green space issues have surfaced when the City considered acquisition of key natural assets (CPR Bay lands) in the context of the need and priority of the purchase. And green space issues have surfaced from local environmentalists advocating that the former City's Natural Asset Report should be reviewed and updated to include the entire City of Greater Sudbury. Green space issues are also emerging in the context of the City's Healthy Community Strategy which is advocating that the City should have more linked green space with connecting trails for active transportation networks within the green space.

Earlier green space issues had been addressed on an area basis in the development of secondary plans, local area plans, community improvement plans or in the former town recreation master plan documents where these existed. At various times, these plans had made recommendations with respect to trail

linkages, protection of sensitive areas, or acquisition of key properties.

To a certain extent the Parks, Open Space and Leisure Background Report and Master Plan, and the new City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan examined a number of these issues and made recommendations going forward. However, given the cost and time required to address all issues and develop additional background information, it was not possible to develop a number of green space issues further. Nor was it possible to identify new green space which should be added to the City's current park and open space public land inventory. As well, criteria for prioritizing future green space acquisitions, dispositions and land exchanges were not fully developed.

In the New Official Plan, Council established that two programs be undertaken with respect to green space as follows:

7.2.1 Programs

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

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

A parks and open space classification system is a critical component in developing a framework for the systematic evaluation of the park and open space system. Developing a park and open space classification is essential in understanding deficiencies and gaps within the current park and open space network. A classification system that addresses a range of different types and characteristics of parks and open spaces should be developed to guide the development, acquisition, and management of existing and future parks. The Green Space Advisory Panel has developed a proposed Classification System which is attached on Appendix 1 to this report. Appendix 2 is a map of a portion of Ward 1 illustrating the classification of various park properties.

At the same time the new Master Plan and Official Plan were being developed, the City amalgamation had brought all former town and city public lands into one common ownership. The Green Space Advisory Panel has taken on the challenge of assessing these lands as well as certain private lands as to their green space potential. The Evaluation Framework developed by the Green Space Advisory Panel is attached as Appendix 3. A sample chart of potential public and private green space acquisition opportunities for Ward 1 is contained in Appendix 4.

Finally, the Panel has developed a draft Parkland Disposal Policy which, if adopted, would guide decisions related to the disposal of surplus parkland in the future. A copy of the draft Parkland Disposal Policy is attached as Appendix 5.

Timeframe and Next Steps

The Green Space Advisory Panel plans to have a final report prepared by June 2010. Prior to completing their work, they wish to get feedback from the public on their findings to date.

Subject to the approval of Council, the Panel proposes a series of Open House Sessions to be held in April 2010. These sessions would be advertised in the media and invitations extended to community groups and stakeholders. Also, members of the Panel would speak to groups within their Wards to obtain their comments and input.

It is important to note that all of the information to be shared is in draft form and is intended for discussion and comments.

Recommendation

That the work of the Green Space Advisory Panel in draft format be released by Council for public input sessions before final reports are prepared and final presentation made to Council.

Appendices

1. Proposed Green Space Classification System
2. Existing City Parks Classified - Sample Chart - Ward 1
3. Green Space Evaluation Framework
4. Potential Public and Private Green Space Acquisition Opportunities - Sample Chart - Ward 1
5. Draft Parkland Disposal Policy

APPENDIX 1

Parkland Classification System

Summary:

Neighbourhood Park: A Neighbourhood Park's primary purpose is to meet the recreational needs of its immediate neighbourhood. *Depending on the needs of the residents, it could include a playground, community gardens, passive space with benches, paths, informal natural areas, or other options. In response to residents' needs, a neighbourhood park may change over time.*

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

A community park is characterized by sports fields and/or other sports facilities, but often includes opportunities for other uses such as play equipment, paths, picnic areas, or natural areas.

A Community Park will often meet nearby residents' needs for a park in their neighbourhood (and so is understood to play a dual role as a neighbourhood park for that area). However, distinct from a Neighbourhood Park, a Community Park is designed to serve the active recreational needs of the wider community.

The James Jerome playing fields is an example of a Community Park.

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

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

Bell Park is the classic example of a Regional Park.

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

Linear Parks will often run through, or connect to, other park types. These connections should be noted in the park description as they enhance all parks involved.

The Junction Creek Waterway Park, and the Rotary Trail are two examples of Linear Parks.

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

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

Cultural/Historical Special Purpose Park: The primary purpose of a Cultural/Historical Special Purpose Park is the protection of a site with historic, scientific, cultural, social, or spiritual importance.
Anderson Farm, Bell Park Estate, the Flour Mill Silos are all potential examples.

Ecological Reserve: The primary purpose of an Ecological Reserve is the preservation of a significant natural area with ecological and/or geological importance, or that captures a characteristic natural feature of the City.
Conservation Areas are potential examples of Ecological Reserves.

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

	Linear Park	Natural Park
Purpose	To be a connector linking different areas of the City	the protection of a natural area while meeting residents' needs for passive recreation
General Description	<p>Corridors connecting different areas – e.g. trails, waterways, cliff systems, and or habitat connectors.</p> <p>May be a tourist attraction.</p> <p>Park description must specify it as:</p> <p>‘trail’ – to connect parks and other points of interest. To provide the opportunity for alternative transportation;</p> <p>‘waterway’ – to preserve and provide public access to waterways, lake and river shorelands;</p> <p>‘habitat corridor’ – to connect core natural areas and provide the opportunity for wildlife movement between them.</p> <p>No new roads.</p>	<p>Landscapes in a predominately natural condition.</p> <p>Varies from a small patch of nature valued by the immediate neighbourhood to a large natural area drawing residents from throughout the City.</p> <p>Provides residents and visitors with access to natural areas with recreational, educational, and scenic value. May have a history of use by residents. Benefits include protection of watersheds, and critical wildlife habitat, educational uses, green infrastructure, aesthetic and economic value of the area, and economic activity such as berry-picking and tourism.</p> <p>Park description should specify the landscape and natural assets included:</p> <p>E.g., ‘aquatic’ - lakes, rivers, shoreline, wetlands; and, ‘terrestrial’ - valley lands, woodlots, cliffs, hill top, geological / geomorphological features</p>
Facilities/ Features	<p>Varies as appropriate to site.</p> <p>Possible facilities include trail heads, trail markers, rest areas.</p> <p>Adjacent natural areas may be included.</p>	<p>May have no facilities, but may include informal walking trails, educational signage, cross-country ski trails, and rest areas.</p> <p>No new roads.</p> <p>May be linked to trail system, public transport, and be easily accessible by car, with sufficient parking.</p> <p>Parking, washroom facilities, rest areas, or interpretive centres could be concentrated in a small area of the park (but will not use more than 1% of area).</p>
Size	<p>A width of 15 metres centred on a trail is a minimum to accommodate trail activity.</p> <p>Connectors of other park classes could have a width up to several kilometres where possible.</p>	<p>Varies</p> <p>Generally, a goal of > 15ha will be used where possible, but the importance of much smaller areas providing access to nature in existing neighbourhoods is also recognized.</p>
Service Area & Standard	<p>City of Greater Sudbury</p> <p>The object is connectivity of parkland and other key areas between and among wards.</p>	<p>Varies. Smaller natural parks (<5ha) may serve a neighbourhood; larger natural parks (>5ha) may serve Greater Sudbury.</p> <p>The objective is to provide all neighbourhoods with access to a natural area, with larger natural parks serving the wider community.</p>

	Cultural / Historical Special Purpose Park	Ecological Reserve
Purpose	The protection of a site with historic, scientific, cultural, social, or spiritual importance	The preservation of a significant natural area with ecological and/or geological importance, or that captures a characteristic natural feature of the City
General Description	Lands and or waters that may have aesthetic, historic, scientific, cultural, social or spiritual importance for past, present or future generations.	Lands and/or waters with ecological and/or geological importance. May have a natural or scientific importance as a particular natural asset. It may be deemed important to the community. The park description will further identify the type of natural assets, and landscapes included, as well as key features and sensitivities.
Facilities/ Features	May include archaeological sites, native heritage sites, built heritage, cultural landscapes identified by residents. May or may not have facilities such as signage, interpretive centres or walks, rest areas, etc, and/or may include conservation efforts to sustain a feature. Adjacent natural areas may be included.	Contains a natural feature worthy of protection for its natural function, uniqueness, sensitivity, or environmental value. May also capture a characteristic natural feature of Greater Sudbury May or may not be publicly accessible, depending on appropriate land use. If public access is appropriate may contain minimal supportive infrastructure such as trails, boardwalks, interpretive signage. This infrastructure will never exceed 0.5% of the area, or impinge on the natural value of the site. The protection of the natural assets is always the guiding principle.
Size	As determined by the site.	No new roads. Varies Generally >15ha, but recognizing that in some cases very small Ecological Reserves may have value (eg. for a specific habitat or nesting site)
Service Area and Standard	Greater Sudbury	The goal should be to protect the asset in its entirety if possible, with a further buffer zone from developed areas. Greater Sudbury

APPENDIX 2

WARD 1 - EXISTING CITY PARKS CLASSIFIED

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

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Park Size in Ha	Facilities/Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation
1-13	Robinson Playground	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	2.2	Boardwalk link to Nova Court	Public-CGS	P, CO	Parks & Open Space
1-14	Southview Drive Greenbelt	Natural Park	McKim	1	4.0		Public-CGS	P	Parks & Open Space
1-15	Copper Park	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	4.2	Tot Lot	Public-CGS	R2	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space
1-16	Corsi Hill	Historial/Cultural/ Special Purpose Park	McKim	1	0.4	Hilltop with Scenic Views/ Neighbourhood Park	Public-CGS	R1	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space

APPENDIX 3

Acquisition Priority – non-city-owned properties

This number gives an idea of how important it is to protect a site, and how quickly we must act to do so. To give a general idea:

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

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

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

High	5	This site has a high conservation value and/or high recreation value and a high level of risk. It is a high priority to include this site as part of the parks system, or protect it in some other way, and it is important to act very quickly to do so.
	4	This site has a high conservation value and/or high recreation value and a moderate level of risk. It is a high priority to include this site as part of the parks system, or protect it in some other way, and it is important to act quickly to do so.
	3	This site has a high conservation value and/or high recreation value, a low level of risk, and can only reach its potential through development of the site. It is a high priority to include this site as part of the parks system, or protect it in some other way. Although it is at low risk, it is of benefit to do so fairly quickly, so that it can reach its full value. OR This site has moderate conservation and/or recreation value and a high level of risk. It is a moderate priority to include this site as part of the parks system, or protect it in some other way, and it is important to act quickly to do so.
	2	This site has a high conservation value and/or high recreation value as is, and a low level of risk. It is a high priority to include this site as part of the parks system, or protect it in some other way, but the low level of risk means that a wait is acceptable. OR This site has moderate conservation and/or recreation value and a moderate level of risk. It is a moderate priority to include this site as part of the parks system, or protect it in some other way.
	1	This site has moderate conservation and/or recreation value and a low level of risk. It is a moderate priority to include this site as part of the parks system, or protect it in some other way, but the low level of risk means that a wait is acceptable.
Low	0	This site has a low conservation value and a low recreation value, and any level of risk. This site is a low priority for acquisition.


Note: It is important to keep these numbers up to date, as levels of risk change. Ideally, a hold should be put on any development or site alteration for sites with acquisition priorities 2-5.

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

I. Non-city owned property

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

Visual chart – land not owned by the city



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


II. City owned property

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

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

My hope would be that all city-owned properties from 2-5 would be included in a list to bring into park services, as a single by-law to get it all done quickly. Any site with 2 or 3 that Council wishes to question for inclusion in the parks system, should have to meet all the requirements of the draft parkland disposal policy before being taken off the list. No sites ranked 4 or 5 should be considered for removal from the list.

Visual chart – city owned land



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

What the numbers mean

Conservation Value

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

Recreation Value

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

Level of Risk

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

WARD 1 - POTENTIAL PUBLIC AND PRIVATE GREEN SPACE ACQUISITION OPPORTUNITIES

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
1-37	Byng St. to Edna St. Corridor	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	0.1	Unopened Road Allowance	Public-CGS	R2	Living Area 1	Con 1 Rec 2	1	1
1-38	Summit of Corsi Hill		McKim	1	14.8		Private	PS	Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 3	5	5
1-39	CPR lands along Junction Creek at Martindale Road	Linear Park	McKim	1	12.6		Private-CPR	CO, M2	Parks & Open Space/General Industrial	Con 5 Rec 5	1	5
1-40	Devil's Falls Creek	Linear Park	McKim	1	2.2		Public-CGS/ Private	R1	Living Area 1	Con 4 Rec 3	2	3
1-41	Green space between Buchanan and Brennan Streets	Natural Park	McKim	1	0.3		Public-CGS/ Sudbury & District Participation Projects	I	Institutional	Con 2 Rec 2	2	1
1-42	Green Space North of Rowat St.	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	1.1		Public-CGS/ Church	I	Institutional	Con 2 Rec 1	1	1
1-43	Green Space West of Travers Street	Neighbourhood Park	McKim	1	2.1		Public-CGS/ SCDSB	I-4, PS	Living Area 1	Con 1 Rec 1		0
1-44	Junction Creek Corridor - Kelley Lake to Martindale Road	Linear Park	McKim	1	4.4		Public-CGS/ Private	M2,M6, FD,CO	Parks & Open Space/General Industrial/Heavy Industrial	Con 3 Rec 3	3	1

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
1-45	Junction Creek/ Lily Creek Delta/ Kelley Lake Wetlands and extensions to Robinson Lake	Ecological Reserve	McKim	1	95.7	Also Linear and Natural Parks	Private	PS, CO, FD	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	2	3
1-46	Hilltop South of Robert Street	Natural Park	McKim	1	6.2		Public-CGS	PS	Parks & Open Space	Con 3 Rec 2	1	2
1-47	Marcel St. to Arnold St. Corridor	Ecological Reserve	McKim	1	2.0		Public-CGS/ Private	R1	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 2 Rec 2	4	1
1-48	Robinson Lake North Shore - Walking Trail	Linear Park	McKim	1	2.2		Private	FD	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 4 Rec 3	4	5
1-49	a) Robinson Lake South Shore b) Walking Trail	Linear Park	McKim	1	2.6		Private	RU, R1	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space/Rural	a) Con 4 Rec 3 b) Con 4 Rec 3	4 2	5 3
1-50	Robinson Lake Wetland (east) and its extensions	Ecological Reserve	McKim	1	18.8		Public-CGS	CO	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 3	1	4
1-51	Rudd Street Corridor	Linear Park	McKim	1	0.4	Connector	Public-CGS/ Private	R6, R2	Living Area 1	Con 1 Rec 2	2	1
1-52	East of Big Nickel Road	Natural Park	McKim	1 & 2	16.7	Large Expanse of Rock/Pond	Public-CGS/ Private- Vale Inco	R1, R2, PS	Living Area 1/ Parks & Open Space	Con 3 Rec 3	2	1
1-53	Kelly Lake - Lands Northwest of Delta	Natural Park	McKim	1	74.2	Vale Inco and Fielding Lands	Private	PS,M4, M3-1	Parks & Open Space/Mining-Mineral/ Heavy Industrial	Con 4 Rec 1	1	2

Number Location	Park Name	Park Classification	Township	Ward	Size in Ha	Facilities/ Features	Ownership Public/Private	Zoning	Other Pertinent Designation	Conservation & Recreation Value	Level of Risk	Acquisition Priority
1-54	Beverly Street to Martindale Road	Linear Park	McKim	1	1.8	Waterway	Public-CGS, NDCA/Private	CO, R2	Parks & Open Space	Con 5 Rec 2	1	24
1-55	West End CIP Proposed Park		McKim	1 & 2	0.7		Private	M1	Mixed Use Commercial	Con 1 Rec 2	2	0
1-56	West End CIP Proposed Park		McKim	1	0.3		Private	C1-32	Mixed Use Commercial	Con 2 Rec 1	2	0

APPENDIX 5

Draft Parkland Disposal Policy

In addition to Part IV Sale of Land in Bylaw Governing Sale of Land Items 7 - 21, Sale of City owned Parkland should adhere to the following criteria:

Criteria

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

Further Requirements

- Disposal is based on an appraisal of fair market value both for full or limited marketability sites.
- \$ Following internal circulation/review, proposed disposals should be circulated to the ward councillor, area CANs, playground and

neighbourhood association, or other community groups known to represent area interests, for input, and to all property owners within a 200 metre radius, requesting written comments if any within 30 days of mail-out. Area mailout radii may be increased based on the significance of the disposal on the advice of the ward councillor, or for properties valued at greater than \$100,000. For these more significant disposals, a small, clearly worded notice may also be placed in the appropriate media.

\$ A generic sign will also be posted on the site for 30 days. This sign will have contact information (phone and website) regarding this potential disposal. A copy of the area mail-out, and a clear notice of the cut-off date for comments will also be affixed to the sign. The notice will also be posted to the city website, linked by a clearly visible and clearly labelled 'button' on the 'residents' page.

\$ All residents who have submitted written comments will be informed of the date of the Planning Committee meeting at which the matter will be considered for decision.

\$ The staff report regarding the proposed disposal should include: the rationale for the sale of parkland, a map localizing the site, and the expected benefits to the City and ward parks system from the sale. The staff report should also include attached copies of all public comments received, and a section relating the staff recommendation to these comments.

\$ Funds from the sale of surplus parkland would be deposited in the Parkland Reserve. Seventy-five percent of the funds from any particular sale will be directed towards acquisition of parkland based on the adopted priority list. Twenty-five percent of the funds from any particular sale will be directed towards acquisition of parkland or park development in the ward in which the sale was made.

Request for Decision

CGS Pioneer Manor Strategic Plan 2010 to 2014

Presented To:	Policy Committee
Presented:	Wednesday, Feb 17, 2010
Report Date	Wednesday, Feb 03, 2010
Type:	Presentations

Recommendation

Whereas the 2003-2007 strategic plan has been completed in its entirety resulting in the North East Centre of Excellence for Seniors' Health; and

Whereas the long-term care facility is primarily comprised of resident accommodation areas meeting the highest standard of long-term care; and

Whereas partnerships with the Sudbury Alzheimer Society, City of Lakes Family Health Team and the North East Specialized Geriatric Services are now in place expanding services at the facility; and

Whereas the 2010-2014 Strategic Plan sets direction for the facility for the next four years,

Therefore be it resolved that the 2010 – 2014 Strategic Plan be received and supported by the City of Greater Sudbury Council.

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Catherine Matheson
General Manager of Community
Development
Digitally Signed Feb 3, 10

Recommended by the Department

Catherine Matheson
General Manager of Community
Development
Digitally Signed Feb 3, 10

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Feb 4, 10

Background

The Strategic Plan is a guide to creating synergy between the organization's mandate, mission, environmental pressures, opportunities, threats and assists in identifying key actions, objectives and goals for a period of time. It is a document which requires endorsement of the governing body, and serves as a point of guidance in establishing annual work plans. The strategic plan identifies a niche or area of expertise for an organization. To achieve a strong strategic plan, it is necessary to go through a series of analytical steps. This report highlights the 2010-2014 strategic plan for Pioneer Manor.

Pioneer Manor has been in operation since 1953, marking its 57th year of service. While the facility has grown from a 121 bed Home for the Aged to a 402 bed long-term care facility, what has remained the same is continued focus on best practice in resident care. Significant milestones in the planning of the facility have been achieved over the past several years. In 1993, the Master Plan established the vision and direction for redeveloped long term care beds and the creation of the seniors campus. In 2003, city council adopted the facility's strategic plan for the next 4 years and the direction for:

- Implementation of the seniors campus for northeastern Ontario
- Attracting specialized geriatric resources to the community
- Promoting the seniors campus within field of geriatrics
- Offering broad range of health care beyond standards in long term care
- - Creating a “smart technological” building
- Improving indicators of employee wellness
- Increasing involvement of families in seniors campus
-

2010 – 2014 Strategic Plan

A series of steps were undertaken in the development of the Pioneer Manor strategic plan for the years 2010-2014. An operational review which engaged all staff on all shifts at the facility was conducted in 2009 in preparation for the development of a new strategic direction for the home. The input of all staff and professional service agencies was gathered and formed the foundation for the new strategic direction. A team of managers at the facility was brought together in December to begin to formulate the recommended strategic direction. Input from the management committee and significant others was gathered to create the 2010 – 2014 Strategic Plan.

While the new strategic plan is circulated under separate cover, key facts and goals are listed below. This strategic document will also have a series of performance measurements from which to guide and monitor the development.

Vision

“Our vision is to be recognized as a leading provider of long-term care in the Province of Ontario

Mission

“Our mission is to provide long-term care while incorporating high standards of leadership, innovative approaches, research and development in concert with our community partners. Working as a team; residents, staff, families, volunteers and students offer residents dignity, respect and care that promotes their comfort and quality of life”.

Key Success Factors

- High quality services and practices
- Accreditation with Accreditation Canada
- Resident, family, and employee satisfaction
- Fiscal responsibility
- Research and modeling of best practices in long-term care
- Open and transparent communication and feedback

The goals to achieve the strategic direction are as follows:

- 1) Develop specialty areas of clinical care via internal champions, in areas such as palliation, pain management, dementia, wounds, fall and injury prevention.
- 2) Establish leadership and best practice research in dementia care through partnerships with research institutions and providing specialized care in a state-of-the-art 64 bed, dementia designed LEED's building
- 3) Upgrade building and equipment to maximize resident and staff safety and building deficiencies.
- 4) Establish stronger internal controls and accountability to maximize resources and bring increased value to residents.
- 5) Engage the residents of Pioneer Manor and the facility as a whole to work towards specific actions

which model and mentor a healthy sustainable community, recognized by the United Nations University.

The Management Committee for Pioneer Manor is composed of three appointed members of City Council. The Committee is composed of Councillor Ron Dupuis (chair), Councillor Jacques Barbeau and Councillor Ted Callaghan. The Committee meets regularly to ensure the strategic direction of the facility is in keeping with Council's vision and to ensure the activities of the Manor are reflective of the expectations of City of Greater Sudbury Council and the community as a whole.

Request for Decision

Display Flower Bed Policy

Presented To: Policy Committee

Presented: Wednesday, Feb 17, 2010

Report Date Friday, Feb 05, 2010

Type: Managers' Reports

Recommendation

WHEREAS in recent years there has been a significant increase in the number of requests from local community groups and organizations to promote their organization/special event at one of the display flower beds.

THEREFORE be it resolved that Council of the City of Greater Sudbury approve the Display Flower Bed Policy and that the policy be implemented for the 2010 season.

Finance Implications

The City develops and maintains three (3) display flower beds. There is currently no cost to have displays prepared. The cost per flower bed is estimated at \$5,000.00 (plants and maintenance). It is recommended that a fee of \$500.00 be charged per flower bed to assist with offsetting the total cost.

Background

The City of Greater Sudbury Parks Services prepares and manages three (3) display flower beds annually. The flower beds are located as follows:

- Amphitheatre Parking Lot (circular bed) - East side of Paris Street
- Parking lot across from Amphitheatre (circular bed) - West side of Paris Street
- Copper Cliff (rectangular bed) - Corner of Balsam and Hwy 17 West

In recent years, there has been a significant increase in the number of requests from local groups and organizations for consideration to promote their organization / events at one of the display flower beds. The City does not have an allocation policy in order to assist with the final approval. A policy will assist staff in ensuring that deadlines are realized to order the plants on time and will provide criteria to be used in the selection process.

Recommended Policies and Procedures:

Signed By

Report Prepared By

Kevan Moxam
Manager of Parks Services
Digitally Signed Feb 5, 10

Division Review

Real Carre
Director of Leisure Services
Digitally Signed Feb 5, 10

Recommended by the Department

Catherine Matheson
General Manager of Community
Development
Digitally Signed Feb 5, 10

Recommended by the C.A.O.

Doug Nadorozny
Chief Administrative Officer
Digitally Signed Feb 11, 10

The display flower beds will be awarded as per the following criteria:

1. City of Greater Sudbury sponsored events, with initial preference given to events with provincial or national significance.
2. Recognized community groups/organizations celebrating significant anniversaries.
3. Recognition of various community, volunteer, not for profit, charitable groups.

The display beds locations will be allocated in priority based on the following locations:

- Amphitheatre Parking Lot (circular bed) – East side of Paris Street
- Parking Lot Across from Amphitheatre (circular bed) – West side of Paris Street
- Copper Cliff (rectangular bed) – Corner of Balsam and Hwy 17 West

The application process will include:

- Applications are available at the Park Services Administrative Office located at 310 Brebeuf Avenue, at any Citizen Service Centre or online at www.greatersudbury.ca
- Completed applications to be returned to the Parks Services Administrative Office by no later than October 1st of each year.
- Applications must include a color copy of the official logo and or design requested.
- Manager and or his/her designate will review applications and advise successful applicants by early December.
- Parks Services will complete the approved flower bed by June (weather permitting).

Application fee:

The cost per flower bed is estimated at \$5000.00. The cost includes the purchase of plants along with the annual maintenance cost. In the past, there has been no charge to the successful applicant. As part of the recommended policy, a fee of \$500.00 is recommended to be charged per approved organization. The fee represents 10% of the cost of preparing and maintaining the flower bed display.