

FEBRUARY 2022

Parks Plan




Table of Contents

Introduction and Purpose	4
Vision, Principles and Value of Mississauga’s Parks	6
Vision.....	7
Implementation Principles.....	7
Value of Mississauga’s Parks.....	8
Overview of Consultation Supporting the Parks Plan	10
Existing Parks and Current Park Supply	13
Parks.....	14
Open Spaces.....	15
Current City Park and Open Space Assets.....	15
Table 1: Current City Park and Open Space Assets.....	16
Current City-Wide Parks and Open Space Supply and Park Provision Rate.....	16
Table 2: Current City-Wide Park Supply.....	16
Map 1: Mississauga Parks, Open Space and Schools.....	17
A Changing Context for Parkland Provision	18
Provincial Policy Context.....	19
The Shift from being a Suburban Area to an Urban Area.....	19
Challenges with Parkland Acquisition in an Intensification Context.....	19
The Case for Adjusting the Parkland Provision Standards	21
Elements to be Addressed.....	22
Alternative Provision Target for the Downtown and Major Nodes.....	23
Current and Future Parkland Provision	25
Why Use Character Areas (CAs).....	26
Assessing Amount of Parkland.....	26
Map 2: Mississauga Character Areas.....	27

Table of Contents

Rules for Calculating the Quantum of Parkland Provision	28
Current Parkland Provision (Quantum for 2021)	29
Map 3: Parkland Provision Map by Character Areas, 2021	30
Table 3: Mississauga Parkland Quantum 2021	31
Analysis and Preliminary Conclusions	31
Future Parkland Provision (Quantum for 2041)	33
Map 4: Parkland Provision Map by Character Areas, 2041	34
Table 4: Mississauga Parkland Quantum 2041	35
Proposed Parkland Provision Standards	37
A. Amount of Parkland (Quantum)	38
B. Walking distance to City-owned Playground (400 or 800 metres)	39
C. Access to Local Parks	39
D. Access to Park Facilities at the Local Level	39
Map 5: Walkability to Parks	40
Anticipated and Potential Future Parkland Growth	41
Tools for Securing Lands for Parks Purposes	43
Growth Related Capital Requirements under the Planning Act	44
Table 5: Maximum Land Conveyance and Cash-in-lieu	44
Table 6: Parkland Required as a Condition of Growth, 2022-2041	46
Other Tools	47
Appendix	48
Appendix 1: Definitions	49
Appendix 2: Summary of Consultation with School Boards	51
Appendix 3: Future Parkland	53
Appendix 4: List of Community Park and Destination Park Amenities	57

Parks Plan

Introduction and Purpose

This Parks Plan serves as Mississauga’s city-wide parkland provision strategy for City parks¹ and parks managed by the City (by agreements with Credit Valley Conservation, Toronto and Region Conservation Authority or Region of Peel).

The Parks Plan examines the need for parkland in Mississauga and guides the growth and improvement of the City’s parks and open space system. In doing so, it responds to the questions of how much parkland is necessary to meet the needs of Mississauga’s residents today and in the future, where and what type of parks are required, and how these lands can be acquired and made available to the public. Considerations in the preparation of the Parks Plan include a comprehensive inventory of existing municipal parks, forecast population change and future park demands, accessibility and environmental factors, among others. The plan focuses on parkland acquisition, the City uses other documents and studies to guide the development and improvements of parkland.

This document serves to fulfill the requirements of the *Planning Act*, specifically subsections 42(4.1) and 51.1(2.1), that require a municipality to prepare and make available to the public a Parks Plan, should it wish to utilize, via official plan policy and by-law, the full range of *parkland conveyance* measures permitted under the *Act*.

It also updates the criteria used as the basis of evaluation for acquiring public parkland in Mississauga. While the Parks Plan builds on analysis conducted for previous City parkland plans (Downtown Growth Area Parkland Provision Strategy, Future Directions Parks & Forestry Master Plan, Credit River Parks Strategy, Waterfront Parks Strategy, etc.), its recommendations override any of these previous parkland strategy documents in matters pertaining to parkland provision.

The Plan addresses the following objectives:

- Determine **parkland needs** across the City;
- **Identify and prioritize areas** of the City that present or are anticipated to present parkland deficit in connection to anticipated growth;
- Identify current **mechanisms to acquire parkland**, including parkland conveyance and direct purchase; and
- Satisfy the **requirements of the *Planning Act*** by demonstrating the need to require the dedication of land and/or cash-in lieu of land (CIL) for parks purposes as a condition of subdivision, development, or redevelopment for the purposes of the parkland conveyance by-law.

¹ **Park** means the land, including any body of water, buildings or structures located therein, that is owned by or made available to the City by lease, agreement, or otherwise, and that is established, dedicated, set apart or made available for use as public open space; but does not include a marina, golf course, or cemetery. Given the extensive use of the term ‘park’ in this document, it is not italicized as is the case for other defined terms.

The document is organized in nine sections covering the following themes:

1. Vision, Principles & Value of Mississauga's Parks
2. Overview of Consultation Supporting the Parks Plan
3. Existing Parks and Current Park Supply
4. A Changing Context for Parkland Provision
5. The Case for Adjusting the Parkland Provision Standards
6. Current and Future Parkland Provision
7. Proposed Parkland Provision Standards
8. Anticipated and Potential Future Parkland Growth
9. Tools for Securing Lands for Parks Purposes



A photograph of a paved path in a park. Two people, a man and a woman, are walking away from the camera on the path. The path is flanked by lush green grass and large, mature trees with dense foliage. The scene is bright and sunny, suggesting a pleasant day in a well-maintained park.

Vision, Principles and Value of Mississauga's Parks

VISION

People choose Mississauga for its connected, vibrant outdoor public spaces, creating memorable outdoor experiences, and recognize it as a leader in the stewardship of the natural environment.

IMPLEMENTATION PRINCIPLES²

Mississauga's parks will provide a wide array of park experiences for all seasons for people of all ages and abilities, and enhance the ecological features in the park system. The principles will guide the Parks Plan implementation and will form the basis of evaluation (criteria) for acquiring public parkland in Mississauga. Implementation Principles guide parkland acquisition to meet provision requirements, in addition to ensuring parkland is available to provide for recreation facilities, environmental benefits, and trail system connections which benefit all existing and future residents city-wide.

The principles in the Parks Plan are an update to the Parkland Securement Evaluation Criteria set out in the 2019 Parks and Forestry Future Directions Master Plan. Principle No. 4 in particular has been significantly updated relative to historical parkland provisions to better reflect and respond to current conditions, emerging needs and anticipated demands in the future. Analysis and details related to Principle No. 4 is provided in Chapters 5, 6 and 7.

² The principles in the Parks Plan are an update to the Parkland Securement Evaluation Criteria set out in the 2019 Future Directions Parks & Forestry Master Plan. Principle No. 4 in particular has been significantly updated relative to historical parkland provisions to better reflect and respond to current conditions, emerging needs and anticipated demands in the future. Analysis and details related to this change is provided in Chapters 5, 6 and 7.

These principles also align with the City's Strategic Plan, a key City document that guides decision-making, sets priorities and focus the City's efforts on those specific areas of strategic change that will make our Vision for Our Future Mississauga a reality.

Strategic Pillars for Change:



The Implementation Principles are:



Environment

Parkland supports a healthy community and environment. [Strategic Pillar: Green]

- Protects, enhances and/or connects naturally significant features
- Nurtures communities by providing access (physical and/or views) to natural features
- Provides opportunity for long term expansion of the urban tree canopy



Connectivity

Parkland expands and/or connects trail systems. [Strategic Pillars: Connect, Move, Green]

- Expands city-wide and /or local trail systems
- Provides for park trail connections in support of active transportation and walkable communities



Parkland Design/Development Potential

Parkland has qualities that support good design. [Strategic Pillars: Connect, Green]

- Complementary to neighbouring land uses
- Good street frontage and visibility
- Size is appropriate for park use and/or increases size of existing parkland
- Has cultural significance
- Is not encumbered by easements, ownership arrangements or other significant encumbrances



Population Growth and Complete Communities

Parkland provision supports communities at a local level. [Strategic Pillars: Connect, Green]

- Provides the required quantum³ of parkland at the local level
- Supports walking distance requirements
- Provides access to local parks
- Provides access to park facilities at the local level



Facility Development

Parkland provides for recreational, program, and operational facilities. [Strategic Pillar: Connect]

- Provides for City-wide recreational and program facility needs identified in Future Directions
- Supports park operational needs

VALUE OF MISSISSAUGA'S PARKS

The social and health benefits of a strong park and open space system are well documented. Parks promote physical activity, support psychological and social development, improve the environment and reduce crime. Parks also play a role in climate change mitigation (e.g. carbon sequestration by park trees and natural areas) and climate change adaptation (e.g. reducing heat).

Put simply, parks make cities more livable. In addition, research indicates that investments in parks achieve measurable economic benefits. Examples of related studies include Natural Capital by the David Suzuki Foundation, Natural Capital Valuation of Vancouver's Parks by the City of Vancouver,

³ *Quantum* refers to the calculated amount of existing parkland. This calculation informs whether minimum parkland targets are being met in residential character areas.

Beyond Business as Usual by Park People, An Economic Impact Assessment of the Green Infrastructure Sector in Ontario by the Green Infrastructure Ontario Coalition, and Revitalizing Our Waterfront by Waterfront Toronto. In Canada, 82% of the population lives in urban areas (Statistics Canada, 2016). City parks were once thought of as places to escape urban life. Today, they help define it, and are inextricably linked to our quality of life.

In the most recent Citizen Satisfaction Survey of Mississauga (2019), which measures overall satisfaction of local residents with the services provided by the City, it was noted that there continues to be a high level of satisfaction with the quality of life in the city as 89% of respondents rated their quality of life as excellent or good. Parks play a significant role in this regard, as having “lots of parks and open spaces” was the second most appealing characteristic about Mississauga according to the survey. Also, 84% of residents were satisfied with Parks and Forestry Services.

Parks also provide economic benefits for communities, including: increased tourism, increased private capital invested into communities, reduced storm water management costs, reduced air pollution, and enhancement of the city’s attraction.

Parks and open spaces are a large part of the broader public realm which additionally includes the connecting street system comprised of green boulevards, sidewalks, multi-use trails and bicycle lanes. It is important to connect and extend the function of the open space system, providing safe and attractive connections for pedestrians and cyclists, contributing to the greening of the city and the expansion of the urban forest canopy.

Mississauga’s parks and open space system supports a diverse range of recreation, leisure, and cultural activities including sports facilities, gardens, trails, cultural events, and heritage sites. The parks and broader *natural heritage system* include valley and stream corridors, woodlands and other natural features. These are important contributors to the city’s physical and environmental health, social well-being, and quality of life. They support healthy lifestyles, economic growth and establishing a legacy for future generations.



An aerial photograph of a modern playground. A prominent feature is a winding path made of bright blue safety matting that snakes through the play area. To the left, a white slide is set on a blue mat. The playground is filled with various wooden structures, including a large, complex climbing frame made of logs and branches in the foreground, and other smaller wooden play elements. The ground is covered in light-colored wood chips. In the background, there are several young trees and a building with a distinctive facade of vertical wooden slats. A green rectangular box is overlaid on the top right of the image, containing white text.

Overview of Consultation Supporting the Parks Plan

The Parks Plan builds upon extensive public consultation including the Citizen Satisfaction Survey, and outreach conducted as part of preparing the 2019 Future Directions (FD) Parks & Forestry Master Plan. More recently, to ensure the Parks Plan fulfills the requirements of the Planning Act, the City conducted consultation with local school boards and additionally, the development industry. Feedback received through these processes was considered and informed the preparation of the Parks Plan.

Citizen Satisfaction Survey

The City of Mississauga conducts a citizen satisfaction survey on a biennial basis. The Survey is undertaken by an independent third party and covers a broad range of services, helping the City to better understand residents' opinions on a range of topics related to Mississauga's overall quality of life. As it is regularly undertaken, the survey allows the City to monitor and review trends over time to understand how citizen needs and perceptions are changing. According to the survey, conducted in 2019, the top three most appealing elements of Mississauga are Location/close to amenities (29%), Parks and open spaces (26%), and Cleanliness (18%).

Consultation for the 2019 Future Directions (FD) Parks & Forestry Master Plan

Community engagement was at the core of the plan, which provided ample opportunity for residents, stakeholders and City staff to help shape the vision of Mississauga's parks and forestry system. Key consultation tools employed included public surveys, and stakeholder focus groups.

The following summarizes the process followed:

- a. Public Survey:** A public survey was made available to the general public between June 15 and July 7, 2017. A total of **1,758** surveys were completed. The results from the survey are presented in Appendix 1 of the 2019 FD plan.
- b. Public Meetings and Survey:** In December 2018, the City undertook a series of consultations with the community on the draft plan prior to its finalization. The City hosted public information centres that presented each of the key themes from the plan and promoted a community survey that garnered **932** responses. The themes from consultations conducted are presented in Appendix 3 of the 2019 FD plan.
- c. Additional Engagement Tools:** In addition to these surveys the following was in place:
 - An online project portal under the City's "Your Say" platform, accessible via <https://yoursay.mississauga.ca/yourfuture>
 - An email address (yourfuture@mississauga.ca) for residents to direct questions and comments.
 - 311 call centre for phone requests or comments.

Consultation with the School Boards and Development Industry

- a. Consultation with local School boards:** three meetings with the school boards were conducted focusing specifically on the Parks Plan and the Parkland Conveyance by-law:

- The first meeting took place on June 14, 2021, with the French Catholic School Board (Conseil scolaire catholique MonAvenir)
- The second meeting took place on June 15, 2021, with the Peel District School Board (PDSB).
- The third meeting took place on June 16, 2021, with the Dufferin-Peel Catholic District School Board (DPCDSB) and the French Public School Board (Conseil scolaire Viamonde).
- Summary notes of these meetings are included in Appendix 2.

b. Consultation with the Development Industry: five stakeholder meetings were conducted with the development industry focusing on presenting background information and introducing the study processes for the Development Charges DC Study, Community Benefits Charge CBC Strategy, Parkland Conveyance By-law and Parks Plan. Here is a summary of the meeting topics related to parks:

- The first meeting took place on April 29, 2021. Discussion topics included an update on recent legislative changes, and an overview of the Parks Plan and the Parkland Conveyance By-law projects.
- The second meeting took place on July 7, 2021. Discussion topics included policy issues related to the Parkland Conveyance By-law and the provision of parkland in the City of Mississauga.
- The third meeting took place on November 10, 2021. Discussion topics included an update on the Parks Plan

and the Parkland Conveyance By-law, including the range of draft *cash-in-lieu* rates for medium and high-density residential development.

- The fourth meeting took place on December 6, 2021. Discussion topics included addressing industry feedback, parkland requirements and preliminary cash-in-lieu alternative rate methodology.
- The fifth meeting took place on January 31, 2022. Discussion topics included the cash-in-lieu alternative rate modeling and rate options, phasing and indexing considerations, and updated the Parks Plan and Parkland Conveyance By-law key dates. At the time of writing the Parks Plan, industry consultation is ongoing.



Existing Parks and Current Park Supply



The City of Mississauga aims to provide a variety of parks that offer diverse experiences and amenities enhancing the lives of residents and visitors. The city has 470+ parks (when including destination parks, community parks and greenlands) covering 2,950 hectares (7,290 acres) of parkland.

Number of Municipal Parks	470+
----------------------------------	-------------

Source: Capital Planning, List is current as of Sep 2021.

PARKS

Municipal parks include destination parks, community parks and *greenlands*, which are identified based on the characteristics or predominant attributes that these parks present.

In the past, portions of some *greenlands* have been developed to include community or destination park-type amenities. More recently, changes in municipal and provincial policy have brought more protection to *greenlands* and more stringent conditions for their use, which limit the ability to freely accommodate park amenities in these lands. For this reason, these lands are not considered appropriate for the purposes of *parkland dedications* and, subsequently, are differentiated from other municipal parks when assessing parkland provision levels.

Parks vary in their size, function and uses, and some variation and overlap does occur between classifications. Generally, the above descriptions align with facilities to support appropriate park activities in the different park types (e.g. a community park may have a small spray pad, whereas a destination park may have a larger spray pad). A destination park typically warrants a higher level of investment for planning, development and maintenance, in comparison to, for example, a community park or *greenland*.

Destination Parks are designed to attract park users on both a local and regional scale. They tend to be large parks with high-usage that support the needs of the community and/or serve the larger geographic area. They accommodate a variety of active and *passive recreational activities*. Destination parks can contain historical, cultural or significant natural areas and may serve a unique function.

Community Parks are intended to serve the immediate neighbourhood. They accommodate active and *passive recreational activities* of local residential areas with organized and informal activities. These parks may include segments or remnants of woodlands and may play a role in the preservation of woodlands.

Greenlands are municipally owned lands that are generally associated with natural hazards or significant natural areas where development is restricted to protect people and property from damage and to provide for the conservation of *natural heritage* features and areas (e.g. woodlands, valleylands). Greenlands are generally for *passive recreational activities* where they are compatible with the viability of the natural areas while respecting buffers from watercourses and valley slopes.

OPEN SPACES

In addition to parks discussed above, Mississauga's open space system includes golf courses, cemeteries, some utility corridors under agreement for active transportation purposes, some school property used under agreement, and *Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPS)*.

Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPS)

Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPS) refer to privately owned and maintained outdoor space that is universally accessible and open to the public.

POPS are becoming more common place in urban centres. Both, the Downtown Growth Area Parks Provision Strategy 2015 and the 2019 FD Parks & Forestry Master Plan recommend that the City develop a policy to address the provision of *POPS* where unencumbered public parkland cannot be achieved. In response to those recommendations, a new *POPS* policy will be included in the Official Plan.

It is recognized that *POPS* can make a positive contribution to the public realm and as such *POPS* will be considered on a case-by-case basis where parkland is needed and the acquisition of unencumbered parkland cannot be achieved. A *POPS* may be provided through the development approval process. An example of an existing *POPS* is the park located on the southern section of Square One Mall in the Downtown Core character area.

Although complementary to the public realm system, *POPS* are not counted towards our parkland provision requirements given that they are limited in how their space can be developed and

programed, both initially and in the future. As such, *POPS* are not conducive to addressing Implementation Principles outlined in this document and do not satisfy parkland need. Provision of *POPS* does not replace the requirement for *conveyance* of unencumbered parkland and parkland credits are not applicable to *POPS*.

School Facilities

The city recognizes the role of school system grounds that complement the city's parks and open space network (e.g. sport fields, playgrounds and general open space).

The occasional shared use of certain school ground amenities is typically established through share-used agreements, which are limited in scope. They are commonly set for a limited time frame and only for specific purposes. School facilities are typically only used by the general public during off school hours or when schools are not in session. School grounds are otherwise not consistently available for public use.

CURRENT CITY PARK AND OPEN SPACE ASSETS

The City has approximately 250 kilometers of paved park trails and over 1,000 park and open space assets (sports fields, courts, playgrounds, bridges, splash pads, etc.), including 370+ sports fields, 260+ play sites, two marinas, two golf courses and 11 publicly owned cemeteries. Mississauga has 26 waterfront parks situated along the City's approximately 22-kilometer Lake Ontario shoreline. In addition, there are 300+ publicly owned woodlands and *greenlands* covering 1,140 hectares (2,817 acres).

The table below shows a detailed list of public park and open space amenities.

Table 1: Current City Park and Open Space Assets

City Park Assets
375 Sports fields (includes 241 soccer fields, 124 ball diamonds, 9 cricket pitches and 1 football lit natural turf)
300+ Publicly owned woodlands and natural areas
263 Play sites
150 Tennis courts at 45 locations (50 with pickleball)
139 Bridges
81 Seasonal natural ice rinks
28 Spray pads
40 Current outdoor ice rink locations
32 Outdoor fitness locations
27 Basketball courts and 24 half courts
26 Waterfront parks
19 Bocce courts at 7 locations
15 Ball diamonds City maintains in school properties
11 Cemeteries
9 Community gardens
9 Multi-use ramp facilities
8 Leash-free zones
8 Volleyball courts
4 Dirt jump facilities
3 Outdoor artificial rinks
2 Golf courses
2 Marinas
1 Lawn bowling location

Source: Capital Planning, List is current as of October 2021.

CURRENT CITY-WIDE PARKS AND OPEN SPACE SUPPLY AND PARK PROVISION RATE

Map 1 shows the geographic distribution of parks and open space across Mississauga.

Table 2: Current City-Wide Park Supply

Type of Park	Total Area
Community & Destination Parks ⁽¹⁾	1,810 ha (4,473 ac)
Greenlands ⁽²⁾	1,140 ha (2,817 ac)
Total Parks Area ⁽³⁾	2,950 ha (7,290 ac)


(1) Includes total area of all **community parks** and all **destination parks** in Mississauga.

(2) Includes total area of **greenlands** in Mississauga

(3) Sum of (1) and (2)

The estimated population for Mississauga in 2021 is 795,000. Dividing the total park areas by the 2021 population yields a current park supply of 2.28 ha/1000 people for community and destination parks and 3.7 ha/1000 people when *greenlands* are added.

Map 1: Mississauga Parks, Open Space and Schools



A vibrant autumn scene in a city park. The foreground is filled with fallen yellow leaves on a paved path. A row of young trees with bright yellow foliage lines the path. In the background, a modern glass building is visible on the left, and a clock tower stands prominently among other city buildings under a blue sky with wispy clouds. A few people are walking on the path.

A Changing Context for Parkland Provision

PROVINCIAL POLICY CONTEXT

In terms of the provincial policy context, the *Provincial Policy Statement, 2020* (PPS) provides municipalities direction with respect to public spaces, recreation, trails and open space that support healthy and active communities. This includes planning and providing for a full range and equitable distribution of publicly-accessible built natural settings for recreation, including facilities, parklands, public spaces and open space. The PPS also provides direction on the protection of natural areas and *natural heritage systems*.

More locally, the *Growth Plan for Greater Golden Horseshoe* seeks to accommodate forecasted growth in complete communities, including those centrally located in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA). Complete communities support quality of life and human health by encouraging the use of active transportation and providing high-quality public open space, adequate parkland, opportunities for recreation, and access to local and healthy food. The Growth Plan supports the achievement of complete communities that have, among others, an appropriate supply of safe, publicly-accessible open spaces, parks, trails, and other recreational facilities.

In support of these objectives, the *Planning Act*, through Section 42 and Section 51.1, permits a municipality to require the *conveyance* of land for park and/or recreational purposes, or *cash-in-lieu (CIL)* of land, through the subdivision and development approvals processes. More details on these tools are provided in Section 9 of this Parks Plan (Tools for Securing Lands for Parks Purposes).

THE SHIFT FROM BEING A SUBURBAN AREA TO AN URBAN AREA

In the early 2000's, city planning and provincial land use policy shifted away from expanding urban boundaries with low-density residential development and segregated land use planning to a focus on intensification and urbanizing within existing built-up areas. Around the same time, the City of Mississauga's growth reached its borders and triggered a shift in development styles from greenfield to infill development. The shift has also triggered a significant change to Mississauga's municipal parkland provision strategy that recognizes the challenges in securing parkland through purchase or as a condition of development in the face of increasing densities and rising land values.

A hallmark characteristic of urban intensification is developing more with less land. In most cases, this means building up instead of out. When park planners review development applications, a decision needs to be made to either require a *parkland conveyance* or, if not viable, *cash-in-lieu of parkland*. Given that many sites subject to intensification are smaller, parkland conveyances are increasingly challenging.

CHALLENGES WITH PARKLAND ACQUISITION IN AN INTENSIFICATION CONTEXT

The City acquires parkland through direct acquisition and *conveyance* through development. Historically, a significant amount of the City's parkland was conveyed to the City through the subdivision process, as permitted under Section 51.1 of the *Planning Act*. However, with Mississauga having effectively reached build out, most future growth is anticipated to be accommodated through infill redevelopment of existing lands. As such, being able to acquire land through parkland conveyances from the development approval process,

as permitted under Section 42, is important particularly for providing local and accessible parks and playgrounds. Whenever conveyances are not possible the City will acquire parkland via purchases, funded by *cash-in-lieu* revenue.

New Trends in Parks

- Increasing land values
- Smaller parkland conveyances
- Population growth and diverse socio-demographic profiles
- Higher standards for accessibility and inclusion
- Higher expectation from residents, more sophisticated needs

The majority of *cash-in-lieu* revenue in Mississauga is generated by medium – and high-density residential development. Under the City’s *parkland conveyance* by-law (at the time of this report), medium and high-density residential projects are required to provide a contribution for each residential unit in line with the City’s Fixed Unit Rate (FUR), which serves as the City’s alternative requirement. The FUR is based on a time adjusted, average city-wide land value for medium density, with regularly indexed increases occurring on a semi-annual basis. Despite these regular increases, the FUR has not kept pace with increases in the market value of land. As parkland acquisition

is funded by *CIL* revenue, to have sufficient funds to purchase parkland, the City must collect *CIL* funds at a level that is consistent with market value.

Mississauga is currently experiencing the most urban development in areas served by higher order transit – Major Nodes and within its *Urban Growth Centre* (UGC). The Mississauga Official Plan directs varying levels of urban intensification to the Urban Growth Centre, and Major Nodes. There are some instances where intensification can also occur in Community Nodes (CN) or residential Neighbourhoods (NHD) as well, but the majority of new development will take place in first two aforementioned Areas.

This shift from a suburban community to an urban community with higher densities resulted in land becoming scarcer and more expensive. These areas have the most urbanization and pressure on parkland, translating into less parkland per capita.

Parkland background reports have concluded that the Urban Growth Centre is significantly deficient in park space: “The provision of urban park spaces, as well as their design and programming opportunities, must also evolve in lock-step with the changing and intensifying urban structure”⁴

4 Downtown Growth Area Parkland Provision Strategy DGAPPS (2015).



The Case for Adjusting the Parkland Provision Standards

The City's historic minimum parkland target is **1.2 ha per 1,000 people**. This provision standard was historically applied on a city-wide and Service Area⁵ scale. Parkland counted for provision included destination parks, community parks and select *greenlands*.

The target of 1.2 ha per 1,000 people was established largely to address active recreation needs in line with historic provision rates, both within Mississauga and as considered common amongst many North American community development contexts. As per the Zoning by-law, zones that allow active recreational uses are OS1 zones (Open Space – Community Park) that correspond to community parks, and OS2 zones (Open Space – City Park), that correspond to destination parks. These two types of parks, community and destination parks have been included in the park provision calculations.

While community and destination parks may also contain portions of G1/G2 zones (*Greenlands*), typically, the predominant features and amenities in the park determine the type of park. Parks identified as *greenlands* are excluded from the parkland provision calculation as their recreational potential is limited. However, some *greenlands* were historically developed and have community and/or destination park-type amenities. The City accounts for these exceptions in its calculation of historic parkland provision. Please refer to the Rules for Calculating the Quantum of Parkland Provision in Chapter 6.

As discussed in the previous chapter, the City of Mississauga is faced with many challenges when it comes to the provision of parkland in an urban context. In order to address these challenges, the City is taking a nuanced approach to how it approaches its local parkland provision targets.

5 *Service Areas* are geographic units used for the FD Parks & Forestry Master Plan.

6 Canadian City Parks Report 2021, Park People.

ELEMENTS TO BE ADDRESSED

a. Parks to address different resident needs and lifestyles

To adequately meet the evolving needs of city residents, consideration should be given to needs beyond active recreation, such as unstructured play and activities or *passive recreational activities* at large.

b. Avoid over-reliance on a single parkland provision indicator

Applying solely the current provision standard of 1.2 ha per 1000 people at the city-wide level is not enough. This metric alone has not provided the 'full picture' of parkland need. For illustration, considering the information provided on Table 1, the current city-wide parkland supply level is 2.28 ha per 1000 people for community and destination parks and 3.7 ha/1000 people when *greenlands* are added. This creates an illusion of meeting and 'exceeding' the parkland provision target. This number however does not reflect reality, overlooking key aspects such as the uneven geographic distribution of existing parkland as well as distribution of park type and amenities, explained below.

Of note, the overall supply for Mississauga (3.7 ha/1000 people) is below other comparable municipalities (e.g. Brampton 5.5 ha/1000 people, Guelph 10.4 ha /1000 people or Hamilton 4.5 ha/1000 people)⁶.

c. Uneven Geographic Distribution of Parkland

The traditional city-wide approach analysis described above, leads to an undercount of needed parkland across the various communities. To correct the undercount, this Plan uses an approach that accounts for parkland based on specific local needs.

d. Uneven Geographic Distribution of Park Types/Amenities

If the City is to meet the goal of providing a wide array of all-season park experiences and options for people of all ages and abilities, then consideration should be given to the distribution of park types and facilities to allow for fair access for all residents.

e. Policy Guidance

Previous studies have concluded that an evaluation at the local level is a better determination of whether each area of the city is well-supplied with parkland and positioned to accommodate forecasted population growth.⁷

f. Greenlands as Existing Parks and as Part of Future Parkland Provision

The City's parks inventory includes *greenlands*. Many *greenlands* were historically developed as parks. As the City policies evolved, the use of these lands became more restricted. Whereas active uses have historically been developed in some *greenlands*, this is no longer the case. Lands zoned *greenlands* come with many restrictions to protect natural areas.

ALTERNATIVE PROVISION TARGET FOR THE DOWNTOWN AND MAJOR NODES

Considering the various elements discussed above, the City is revising its approach from an overall provision standard across the City to a locally-scaled approach. This allows a better understanding of local parkland needs, and how to address them in a targeted way.

A key change is the inclusion of a new parkland provision standard for the Urban Growth Centre⁸ and major nodes.

Per the *City of Mississauga Official Plan*, these areas are considered the primary locations to accommodate future growth on account of their concentration of existing and planned infrastructure and amenities. However, as these communities continue to grow and build out, fewer sites will be available to develop as parks, with land and development costs increasing in step, making it increasingly difficult to maintain the City's original per capital parkland provision level target.

Recognizing these challenges, the City applies an alternative provision target equivalent to a minimum of 12% of total gross land area for the UGC and major nodes. The percentage of gross area target is based on a detailed comparison of developed urban centres, and is comparable to dense urban areas such as: New York's Lower Manhattan (11.6%), Downtown Ottawa (10.4%) and Downtown Portland (10.3%). More locally, Markham's planning for its Langstaff Gateway area identifies 14% of the total area as public parkland, while the Vaughan Metropolitan Area identifies 15%⁹. This approach acknowledges the challenges of limited land supply and more appropriately reflects the realities of providing parkland in high-growth infill neighbourhoods.

Outside the Urban Growth Centre and Major Nodes, the City's minimum per capita parkland provision target of 1.2 ha per 1,000 people remains a viable and achievable standard. Prevailing development densities, the availability of land, and land costs in these residential character areas allow more flexibility for the City to provide both community and destination parks that will be able to serve both the local neighbourhood and the broader City, including residents of the UGC and the Major Nodes. An analysis of current parkland inventory by character area provides a better differentiation and understanding of parkland needs across the City.

7 Future Directions Master Plan for Parks and Forestry (2019), page 31.

8 Future Directions Master Plan for Parks and Forestry (2019), page 35.

9 Downtown Growth Area Parks Provision Strategy DGAPPS (2015), page 60.

The City will:

- Maintain the parkland provision standard of 1.2 ha per 1000 people at the city-wide level mainly as a benchmark for parkland supply.
- Use a minimum parkland provision target of 12% of total area to determine minimum parkland needs at the local level for the Urban Growth Centre (as a whole) and individual major nodes.
- Use the minimum parkland provision target of 1.2 ha per 1000 people to determine parkland needs at the local level for all residential character areas excluding the Urban Growth Centre and major nodes.



Current and Future Parkland Provision



WHY USE CHARACTER AREAS (CAS)

In order to understand local service levels and access, the City of Mississauga analyzes parkland need by smaller character area (CA) geographies.

CAs are part of The Growth Management Strategy that the City established in response to the Growth Plan (2006). [Schedule 9](#) of the Official Plan identifies all character areas across the city. There are two groups of CAs:

- **Residential** character areas which include Neighbourhood (NHD), Community Node (CN), Major Node (MN), and Downtown (DT) and
- **Non-residential** character areas include Corporate Centres (CC), Employment Areas (EA) and Special Purpose Areas (SPA).

The City considers parkland provisions only for residential CAs. There are a total of 40 residential character areas. Map 2 shows the residential CAs in Mississauga. For each of these CAs, *quantum* provision rates have been calculated cross-referencing population, parkland provision and parkland in relation to the character area.

The City will continue to provide parkland to address parkland needs outside of CAs such as destination parks whose purpose is to satisfy city-wide needs.

ASSESSING AMOUNT OF PARKLAND


For the purpose of establishing if a CA is deficient, meeting, or exceeding the minimum parkland provision targets (12% of total land area for the *UGC* and Major Nodes, and 1.2 ha per 1000 people for the rest of residential CAs), the following criteria apply:

1. **Deficient:** Character area does not meet the minimum targets.
2. **Meeting and exceeding up to 150%:** CA has between 100% and 150% of the minimum parkland targets required, based on the applicable standards noted above.
3. **Exceeding 150%:** Character area has more than 150% of the minimum parkland target required, based on the applicable standard noted above.

In SPAs, CCs and EAs, there is no provision standard because there are, in most cases, no residents. Parkland is, however, still provided in these areas for strategic purposes such as the provision of city-wide recreation facilities and natural area systems management that benefits all residents of Mississauga.



Map 2: Mississauga Character Areas



RULES FOR CALCULATING THE QUANTUM OF PARKLAND PROVISION

The park provision standard of 1.2 ha per 1000 people is based on lands needed for passive and active recreational purposes.

The following *rules* shall apply when determining which lands are included as part of the parkland provisions and for calculating the *quantum* of population-based and area-based parkland provisions.

Rule 1. Parks located in residential character areas

Parkland provision is calculated only for residential character areas. *Parkland dedication* rates are based on new growth and new growth is limited to residential character areas. With limited exceptions, *quantum provisions* do not apply for non-residential character areas.

Rule 2. Destination parks and community parks

These parks, when fully located within a residential character area, are counted in their entirety.

Rule 3. Portions of *greenlands* that include destination or community park amenities

In general, *greenlands* are not counted toward the parkland provision. However, where a greenland (or a portion of it) includes destination or community park amenities¹⁰, further analysis was undertaken to determine how much of the respective park area should be included in the provision to carve out those spaces based on the maintained area (*ELC boundary - manicured*¹¹) around the amenities.

Rule 4. Parks partially located in more than one character area

These *rules* have been applied to recognize that parks that straddle multiple character areas are functionally used by each of the character areas. In an effort to avoid double-counting and to ensure each character area has an equitable amount of parkland, the following *rules* outline how parks that straddle multiple character areas are allocated from a *quantum provision* perspective.

Parkland is allocated considering the following three scenarios:

- **4A.** If a park is located in two or more NHD or CN residential character areas: Assign actual extension of land to each character area based on their actual size/proportions.
- **4B.** If a park is located in one or more NHD or CN residential character area and one or more DT or MN character areas: Assess on a case-by-case basis, favouring parkland allocation to areas with parkland deficit (i.e. Urban Growth Centre). Lands get allocated wholly, unless there is a physical barrier that prevents access to the whole park, and ensuring in either case that land is assigned only once in order to avoid double counting.
- **4C.** If a park is partially located in a residential character area (NHD, CN, MN, DT) and in a non-residential character area (EA, SPA, CC), then the entire park is counted fully as part of the residential character area.

¹⁰ Refer in appendices to the Park Inventory Report for a list of amenities considered.

¹¹ ELC boundary-manicured refers to an Ecological Land Classification. The manicured label refers to areas that are maintained in a way that prevents naturalization.

Rule 5. The following parks and open spaces do not count toward the parkland provision:

- **5A.** Any parks that are not within a residential character area (unless included under rule 4C).
- **5B.** Any *greenlands* that do not have destination or community park amenities.
- **5C.** Corridor Trails as these areas are typically zoned for utilities and protected for this purpose, therefore not included in the parkland provisions.
- **5D.** Golf courses – Public golf courses are not included in the parkland provision because they offer a single pay-for-use recreation service. They are not accessible to the general public for use of community or destination park type amenities.
- **5E.** Cemeteries.
- **5F.** Non-accessible parkland.
- **5G.** *Privately-Owned Public Spaces (POPS)* are not counted towards our provision requirements. See explanation in the POPS section of Chapter 3.
- **5H.** School facilities under shared use agreements or similar are not counted towards our provision requirements. See explanation in the School Facilities Section of Chapter 3.

In addition to the minimum *quantum* targets (12% and 1.2 ha per 1000 people provision standards) there are other types of provisions standards that may result in the identification of additional parkland needs across the city. These standards are described in Chapter 7 Proposed Parkland Provision Standards.

CURRENT PARKLAND PROVISION (QUANTUM FOR 2021)

An analysis of current parkland provision provides a snapshot of Mississauga’s Character Areas as they exist today¹². This analysis presents a baseline for understanding parkland demand, identifying where areas have a surplus of parkland, where areas are meeting the City’s stated objectives, and where areas are currently underserved as a result of historic development patterns, population change, land acquisitions and investments in community infrastructure.


Calculation of the *quantum provision* for 2021 includes:

- 2021 community parks and destination parks;
- Application of the Rules (see Rules for Calculating the *Quantum* of Parkland Provision).

Table 3 details the parkland provision levels in the City by residential character areas. A positive area value indicate the local parkland supply meeting or exceeding the minimum provision target, while a negative area value (shown in red) will indicate the hectares of parkland deficient of the minimum provision target.

¹² Statistical information presented in this document is based on the best information available. This study involves reviewing, using and analyzing complex sets of data to understand the evolving nature of our parkland. The City of Mississauga continues to do its best to capture and monitor the accuracy of the information provided, however, complete accuracy cannot be guaranteed.

Map 3: Parkland Provision Map by Character Areas, 2021



Source: City of Mississauga, Geomatics, February 2022.

Table 3: Mississauga Parkland Quantum 2021

Parkland Provision by Character Areas, Quantum 2021

Area-based Provisions (For UGC and MNs) & Population-based Provisions (for CNs and NHDs)

Character Area	Population 2021 (*1)	Size of Character Area (ha)	Parkland Supply 2021 (*2)	Parkland Provision as % of CA or in ha/1000 people(*3)	Hectares (ha) above or below the Target Provision Standard
----------------	----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	--	--

Urban Growth Centre (UGC) and Major Nodes (MNs)

DT Cooksville	10,204	92.5	5.4	5.8%	-5.7
DT Core	36,602	254.7	18.6	7.3%	-12.0
DT Fairview	17,626	98.6	7.8	7.9%	-4.1
DT Hospital	14,220	112.7	16.2	14.3%	2.6
Central Erin Mills MN	7,559	122.6	7.1	5.8%	-7.6
Lakeview Waterfront MN (*4)	0	104.6	7.0	N.A.	N.A.
Uptown MN	11,971	98.0	5.2	5.3%	-6.5
Sub-Total CNs & NHDs	98,183	883.7	67.1	Deficits:	-35.9

Other Areas: Community Nodes (CNs) and Neighbourhoods (NHDs)

Applewood NHD	41,514	688.6	46.1	1.1	-3.8
Central Erin Mills NHD	33,127	856.8	79.8	2.4	40.0
Churchill Meadows NHD	55,096	731.6	65.1	1.2	-1.0
Clarkson-Lorne Park NHD	40,671	1,620.2	136.2	3.3	87.3
Clarkson Village CN	3,179	44.3	0.4	0.1	-3.4
Cooksville East NHD	9,229	301.1	17.1	1.9	6.0
Cooksville West NHD	16,674	398.3	21.0	1.3	1.0
Creditview NHD	11,657	261.0	19.0	1.6	5.0
East Credit NHD	72,113	1,608.9	75.2	1.0	-11.3
Erin Mills NHD	43,746	1,127.2	93.4	2.1	40.9
Erindale NHD	23,522	798.9	107.9	4.6	79.7
Fairview NHD	7,886	216.7	20.8	2.6	11.3
Hurontario NHD	54,886	1,065.7	106.6	1.9	40.7
Lakeview NHD	24,317	1,042.3	104.2	4.3	75.0
Lisgar NHD	35,166	586.2	36.9	1.0	-5.3
Malton CN	3,200	38.5	5.0	1.6	1.1
Malton NHD	36,095	634.7	34.3	1.0	-9.0
Meadowvale CN	2,848	40.3	2.3	0.8	-1.1
Meadowvale NHD	40,781	766.3	67.4	1.7	18.5
Meadowvale Village NHD	33,158	944.7	53.8	1.6	14.0
Mineola NHD	10,889	532.1	15.3	1.4	2.2
Mississauga Valleys NHD	14,450	278.9	39.1	2.7	21.8
Ninth Line NHD (*5)	68	350.1	76.7	N.A.	N.A.
Port Credit CN	6,353	80.7	14.8	2.3	7.2
Port Credit East NHD	2,663	74.1	0.9	0.3	-2.3
Port Credit West NHD	3,588	125.1	18.1	5.0	13.8
Rathwood-Applewood CN	3,340	49.5	7.0	2.1	3.0
Rathwood NHD	29,091	690.1	57.8	2.0	22.9
Sheridan CN	3,882	47.1	0.0	0.0	-4.7
Sheridan NHD	13,811	738.5	35.0	2.5	18.4
South Common CN	5,297	69.1	11.9	2.2	5.5
Streetsville CN	1,476	54.2	0.7	0.5	-1.1
Streetsville NHD	11,676	439.2	24.7	2.1	10.7
Sub-Total CNs & NHDs	695,451	17,301.0	1,394.5	Deficits:	-42.9

TOTAL CITY:	793,634	18,184.7	1,461.7	Total Deficit:	-78.8
--------------------	----------------	-----------------	----------------	-----------------------	--------------

NOTES:

(*1) Population projections, City of Mississauga 2021. Value for Total City refers to population of all residential character areas

(*2) Includes Community, Destination Parks and Programmed Greenlands as per Rules + Acquisitions for 2018-2021

(*3) In ha/1000 people (for CN & NHD), or as % of parkland over character area for the UGC (four DTs) & MNs

(*4) Lakeview-Waterfront MN has currently no population. No parkland provision has been calculated for this area

(*5) Ninth Line NHD has a population of only 68 people for 2021. Current Parkland will serve future population.

(*6) Figures have been rounded to a single decimal, thus values of 1.2 may still be below minimum provision

(*7) Values for character areas shown in red represent parkland deficits

ANALYSIS AND PRELIMINARY CONCLUSIONS

It was observed that 15 out of Mississauga's 40 residential character areas are in deficit. These deficits by type of character areas are as follows:

Urban Growth Centre (UGC) and Major Nodes

Parkland Provision Standard: Minimum of 12% of total area:

- DT Hospital meets the minimum standard with a current provision of 14.3% (2.6 ha or 6.4 ac above the minimum)
- The other three of the four character areas that comprise the **UGC** present deficits as follows:
 - DT Cooksville 5.8% (5.7 ha or 14.1 ac)
 - DT Core 7.3% (12.0 ha or 29.7 ac)
 - DT Fairview 7.90% (4.1 ha or 10.1 ac)
- Calculated together at 12% minimum target, these four areas should provide a minimum of 67 ha. Currently they only provide 47.9 ha of parkland. This translates to a deficit of **19.14 ha** (47.3 ac) or a provision of 8.6%.
- As for **Major Nodes**, Lakeview Waterfront is not considered in the calculations given that there is currently no population in that CA. The other two Major Nodes, Uptown and Central Erin Mills do present deficits. Calculated at 12% minimum target, these two areas should provide a minimum of 26.5 ha. Currently both only provide a total of 12.3 ha (30.4 ac) of parkland, a deficit of **14.2 ha** (35.1 ac) or 5.92% for the Major Nodes.

- As of the end of 2021, the combined deficit for the UGC and Major Nodes is **33.3 ha** (82.3 ac). This number factors in the 2.6 ha above the minimum noted in DT Hospital, however, if only deficits were to be considered, the number increases to **35.90 ha** (88.7 ac).

Community Nodes (CNs) and Neighbourhoods (NHDs)

Parkland Provision Standard: Minimum of 1.2 ha per 1000 people

- Four out of the eight **Community Nodes** (Clarkson Village, Meadowvale, Sheridan and Streetsville) present deficits. In order to achieve the minimum provision target of 1.2 ha per 1000 people, these four areas would need to provide at least 13.7 ha of parkland. Currently they only provide 3.4 ha (a deficit of **10.2 ha** (25.2 ac)). In addition, Malton CN has a parkland provision just above the minimum, with 1.56 ha per 1000 people.
- Six out of the 25 **Neighbourhoods** (Applewood, Churchill Meadows, East Credit, Lisgar, Malton, and Port Credit East) present deficits. Calculated at 1.2 ha per 1000 people, these six areas should provide a minimum of 291.2 ha. Currently they only provide 258.5 ha of parkland, a deficit of **32.7 ha** (80.8 ac). In addition, three Neighbourhoods (Cooksville West, Creditview and Mineola) have a parkland inventory just meeting the minimum, ranging from 1.26 to 1.63 ha per 1000 people.
- As of 2021, the combined deficit for Community Nodes and Neighbourhoods is **42.9 ha** (106.0 ac).

Preliminary Conclusions:

- The City is currently meeting its city-wide parkland benchmark standard of 1.2 ha per 1000 people. However, **relying solely on a city-wide metric is misleading**. The cumulative area of parkland measured city-wide regularly

‘exceeded’ the minimum parkland target of 1.2 ha per 1000 people, which has led to the false believe that there are no parkland deficiencies across the City.

- **Local parkland deficits within character areas in 2021 amount to a total of 78.8 ha (194.8 ac).**
- The analysis reveals that as of 2021, **15 out of the 40 residential character areas (38%) are in a state of local parkland deficit.**
- **The amount of parkland quantum deficits in the UGC and MNs are comparable to the combined parkland deficit of the rest of the city.** Deficits in the UGC and MNs represent 46% of city-wide deficits with **35.90 ha** (88.7 ac) while the rest of residential character areas (CNs and NHDs) represent 54% of the deficit with **42.9 ha** (106.0 ac).
- **There is an uneven geographic distribution of parkland supply across the city.** Some character areas enjoy parkland inventories well above provision standards while other communities, mainly in the UGC and Major Nodes, are struggling with a limited amount of parkland supply. There are some residential character areas that have very little parkland or none at all, e.g. Streetsville CN (0.7 ha), Clarkson Village CN (0.6 ha) and Sheridan CN (0 ha).
- **Having a surplus of parkland in some character areas does not resolve the deficits in other communities.** If the City, in complying with the *Provincial Policy Statement*, is to plan and provide for a full range and equitable distribution of publicly-accessible built and natural settings for recreation, including facilities, parklands, public spaces, open space areas, trails and linkages, then deliberate efforts need to be made to provide parkland to areas in deficit and especially in areas of significant deficit.

- In addition to the *minimum Quantum* targets (12% and 1.2 ha per 1000 people provision standards) there are other types of provisions standards that may result in the identification of additional parkland needs across the city.

The analysis above only reflects deficits in the parkland provision *quantum* to which other type of provisions may need to be added, e.g. walking distances or parkland type distribution.

Deficiencies identified in the 2021 analysis provide context as to which parts of Mississauga are currently experiencing the highest levels of parkland need. This context helps to inform the equitable allocation of resources towards the acquisition and improvement of parkland, including areas where the City should prioritize the *dedication* of land and expenditure of funds on new acquisitions. However, it is important to note that these deficiencies are the product of historic investments, or lack thereof, and not the pressures created by new growth – which is discussed in the next section. This is an important distinction, as growth-related capital policies, such as requiring parkland or *CIL* as a condition of development, should not be calibrated based on existing surpluses or shortfalls, but rather the need created by the growth which triggers their application.

FUTURE PARKLAND PROVISION (QUANTUM FOR 2041)

The future parkland provision analysis estimates the changing demand for parkland in each character area by 2041, respecting both forecast changes in population and parkland conveyances that the City has already secured beyond 2021. As such, it presents an idea of how parkland provision would change *if no additional new parks were added*. It is anticipated that the total population in the residential character areas will continue to grow to **911,318¹³** people by 2041, an increase of **117,684** people or **14.8%**, compared to the 2021 population of 793,634.


It is assumed that most growth will locate in high-density areas. As such, it will be critical to plan for adequate provision of parkland to ensure that the City deliver parks that support the quality of life in these communities. It is also important to consider that as Mississauga’s communities become more diverse, so will their park needs and preferences.

Calculation of the *quantum* provision for 2041 includes:

- Area of community parks and destination parks in 2021, after applying the Rules (see Rules for Calculating the Quantum of Parkland Provision) and factoring in acquisitions from 2018 to 2021 (See Appendix 3A) and;
- Confirmed future parkland conveyances to be received from 2022 onward (see Appendix 3B)

¹³ Corporate Report – Mississauga’s Population and Employment Forecasts for the Development Charges and Community Benefits Charge By-law Review, March 8th, 2021 (see page 49-51 / Item 9.3): <https://pub-mississauga.escrimemeetings.com/FileStream.ashx?DocumentId=10925>

Map 4: Parkland Provision Map by Character Areas, 2041



Source: City of Mississauga, Geomatics, February 2022.

Table 4: Mississauga Parkland Quantum 2041

Parkland Provision by Character Areas, Quantum 2041

Area-based Provisions (For UGC and MNs) & Population-based Provisions (for CNs and NHDs)

Character Area	Population 2041 (*1)	Size of Character Area (ha)	Parkland Supply 2041 (*2)	Parkland Provision as % of CA or in ha/1000 people(*3)	Hectares (ha) above or below the Target Provision Standard
----------------	----------------------	-----------------------------	---------------------------	--	--

Urban Growth Centre (UGC) and Major Nodes (MNs)

DT Cooksville	15,988	92.5	5.4	5.8%	-5.7
DT Core	68,652	254.7	18.6	7.3%	-12.0
DT Fairview	19,967	98.6	7.8	7.9%	-4.1
DT Hospital	16,127	112.7	16.2	14.3%	2.6
Central Erin Mills MN	14,098	122.6	7.1	5.8%	-7.6
Lakeview Waterfront MN	14,918	104.6	21.9	21.0%	9.4
Uptown MN (*1)	24,942	98.0	5.7	5.8%	-6.1
Sub-Total CNs & NHDs	174,692	883.7	82.6	Deficits:	-35.5

Other Areas: Community Nodes (CNs) and Neighbourhoods (NHDs)

Applewood NHD	41,729	688.6	46.1	1.1	-4.0
Central Erin Mills NHD	32,552	856.8	79.8	2.5	40.7
Churchill Meadows NHD	53,802	731.6	65.1	1.2	0.6
Clarkson-Lorne Park NHD	41,108	1620.2	136.2	3.3	86.8
Clarkson Village CN	4,205	44.3	0.6	0.1	-4.4
Cooksville East NHD	10,699	301.1	17.1	1.6	4.3
Cooksville West NHD	17,012	398.3	21.0	1.2	0.6
Creditview NHD	11,318	261.0	19.0	1.7	5.4
East Credit NHD	72,153	1608.9	75.2	1.0	-11.3
Erin Mills NHD	42,930	1127.2	93.4	2.2	41.9
Erindale NHD	22,982	798.9	107.9	4.7	80.3
Fairview NHD	7,784	216.7	20.8	2.7	11.4
Hurontario NHD	57,095	1065.7	106.6	1.9	38.1
Lakeview NHD	33,048	1042.3	104.2	3.2	64.6
Lisgar NHD	34,670	586.2	36.9	1.1	-4.8
Malton CN	3,862	38.5	5.0	1.3	0.4
Malton NHD	35,382	634.7	34.3	1.0	-8.1
Meadowvale CN	3,873	40.3	2.3	0.6	-2.3
Meadowvale NHD	41,206	766.3	67.4	1.6	18.0
Meadowvale Village NHD	35,169	944.7	53.8	1.5	11.6
Mineola NHD	11,370	532.1	15.3	1.3	1.7
Mississauga Valleys NHD	15,404	278.9	39.1	2.5	20.6
Ninth Line NHD	6,799	350.1	76.7	11.3	68.5
Port Credit CN	9,485	80.7	20.3	2.1	8.9
Port Credit East NHD	4,178	74.1	0.9	0.2	-4.1
Port Credit West NHD	12,460	125.1	18.1	1.5	3.1
Rathwood-Applewood CN	5,497	49.5	7.0	1.3	0.4
Rathwood NHD	28,676	690.1	57.8	2.0	23.3
Sheridan CN	5,098	47.1	0.0	0.0	-6.1
Sheridan NHD	14,294	738.5	35.0	2.4	17.9
South Common CN	5,472	69.1	11.9	2.2	5.3
Streetsville CN	3,479	54.2	0.7	0.2	-3.5
Streetsville NHD	11,837	439.2	24.7	2.1	10.5
Sub-Total CNs & NHDs	736,626	17,301.0	1,400.1	Deficits:	-48.7

TOTAL CITY:	911,318	18,184.7	1,482.7	Total Deficit:	-84.2
--------------------	----------------	-----------------	----------------	-----------------------	--------------

NOTES:

(*1) Population projections, City of Mississauga 2041. Value for Total City refers to population of all residential character areas

(*2) 2041 Parkland includes the 2021 totals + anticipated conveyances for 2022-2041

(*3) Provision in ha/1000 people (for CN & NHD), gr as percentage of parkland over the Character Area (for UGC: DT & MN)

(*) Values for character areas shown in red represent parkland deficits

Anticipated changes in 2041, in relation to 2021 parkland provision include (see Table 4):

- Accumulated parkland **deficit city-wide shows an increase from 78.8 ha (194.7 ac) to 84.2 ha (208.1 ac).**
- Parkland deficits are projected to continue in **14 character areas** (one less than in 2021).
- **Churchill Meadows NHD is the only character area that will move from deficit (1.18 ha/1000) in 2021 to meeting provisions in 2041 (1.21 ha/1000).** This is the result of a reduced future population in this Character Area, declining from 55,096 in 2021 to 53,802 in 2041. This gradual reduction is the result of an assumed decline in current occupancy patterns amongst established NHDs, where little to no net new residential unit growth is anticipated within the forecast window.
- There are **three character areas that are expected to see a noticeable drop in their provisions if no new parks are added:** Port Credit West NHD (from 5.04 to 1.45 ha/1000 people), Rathwood-Applewood CN (from 2.10 to 1.27 ha/1000 people) and Streetsville CN (from .47 to .20 ha/1000 people).
- **Malton CN shows a light drop in its provision from 1.56 to 1.29 ha/1000 people,** which bring it close to the minimum parkland provision.

- In addition, Future Direction identified *Service Area 5* as the only Service Area expected to have parkland deficits by 2041. When planning for parkland location for recreational purposes, efforts should be made to acquire additional parkland for future park facilities needs in this geography.

The City will:

Follow the *Implementation Principles*, prioritize parkland acquisition (by dedication and/or direct purchase), in the following areas with anticipated future parkland deficits by 2041:

- **Urban Growth Centre:** All four character areas; DT Cooksville, DT Downtown Core, DT Fairview and DT Hospital.
- **Two Major Nodes:** Central Erin Mills and Uptown.
- **Community Nodes:** Clarkson Village, Sheridan, Streetsville and Meadowvale.
- **Neighbourhoods:** Applewood, Churchill Meadows, East Credit, Lisgar, Malton, and Port Credit East.
- **Service Area 5:** Consider acquiring additional parkland for future park facilities needed in this geography.



Proposed Parkland Provision Standards



The City of Mississauga aims to provide all residents of Mississauga with equal opportunities to enjoy our public park network. This requires the City to ensure that sufficient amounts of parkland, in a variety of forms, are located throughout the City. Therefore, in support of Implementation Principle No. 4, Population Growth and Complete Communities, provision includes parks that support population growth, sustainable community design and the creation of complete communities considering parkland provision standards based on population, growth areas, walking distances, and a balance of parkland type distribution.

The city will no longer solely use the benchmark of 1.2 ha per 1000 people provision on a city wide bases but instead will use 1.2 ha per 1000 people by character area and 12% for *UGC* and Major Nodes as identified in Schedule 9 of the Mississauga Official Plan and described in Section 5 of this Plan.

The City's parkland provision standards are assessed at the local level and include four provision measures related to the following considerations:

- **Population size and growth prospects:** addressed by the amount of parkland (*quantum*) standard
- **Local geographic distance:** addressed by the walking distance to City-owned playground standard
- **Achieving complete communities:** addressed by the access to local parks
- **Access to park facilities:** addressed by the accommodation of a walk-to park facility that is needed in the area

A. AMOUNT OF PARKLAND (*QUANTUM*)

The *quantum* of parkland refers to the extent of the parkland supply. It is addressed by two types of provisions; population-based provision and area-based provision.

The **population-based provision** standard relates to the quantity of parkland and the existing population in a character area. This provision applies to Neighbourhoods (NHDs) and Community Nodes (CNs). The City considers 1.2 ha per 1000 people to be the minimum standard for providing residents of these areas with parkland. This provision standard is based on the assumption of an average of 2.8 residents per household, and 1 hectare of parkland for every 300 residential dwelling units. This translates into a parkland provision of approximately 12 sq. m per person.

“The minimum target provision parkland in character areas across the City identified as Neighbourhoods or Community Nodes is 1.2 ha per 1000 people”

The **Area-based Provision** standard relates to the quantity of parkland supply to the size of the character area. This provision recognizes population growth anticipated for the Urban Growth Centre (*UGC*) and Major Nodes (MNs). The City considers a minimum target provision of 12% of the total gross land area of the *UGC* (all DTs combined) and 12% of the total gross land area of each Major Node.

“The minimum target provision for parkland in the Urban Growth Centre is 12% of its total area and 12% of the area in each Major Node”

The identification and allocation of parkland that would be counted toward parkland provision follows the detailed “Rules for Calculating the *Quantum* of Parkland Provision” presented in Section 6.

B. WALKING DISTANCE TO CITY-OWNED PLAYGROUND (400 OR 800 METRES)

There are other considerations beyond the sole amount of parkland in a given area. Achieving a minimum 1.2 ha per 1000 people or 12% alone does not guarantee that all parkland needs will be met.

A walking distance provision addresses service gaps within the park network by establishing that, City owned playgrounds should generally be provided within 800m of residential areas or where appropriate, 400m within strategic growth areas, unimpeded by major pedestrian barriers e.g. rivers, railroad tracks and major roads. Map 5 reveals that while certain character areas may meet or exceed the City’s provision standard, there may still be localities within the character area that are not served by parkland.

“City owned playgrounds should generally be provided within 800m of residential areas or where appropriate, 400m within strategic growth areas, unimpeded by major pedestrian barriers”

C. ACCESS TO LOCAL PARKS

In some instances, the amount of parkland (*quantum*) requirement and the walking distance to City-owned playground requirement may be met by a destination park located within a particular residential character area. In order to achieve complete communities with a balanced park type distribution, it is also important for residential areas to have local parks that provide residents with park space where they can go to interact with their neighbours at the local level.

“Complete communities will have a balanced park type distribution”

D. ACCESS TO PARK FACILITIES AT THE LOCAL LEVEL


This provision standard is dealt with on a case-by-case basis as it requires a detailed understanding of the local site conditions and *Service Area* needs in accordance with park facility provision rates. If for example, a Character Area meets the minimum amount of parkland target and the walking distance targets, but there is not sufficient space within existing parks to accommodate a park facility that is needed in the area, then a specific parkland need may arise.

“All parks are subject to an additional analysis of more encompassing parkland need assessment to ensure access to an array of recreational options for local residents in the area”



Map 5: Walkability to Parks - Playsite Distance Map

400 metre distance (in the UGC and Major Nodes) or 800 metres (in all other residential areas)



Source: City of Mississauga, Geomatics, August 2021.

Note: This map is for quick reference purposes only and it is based on distances measured as straight lines ('crow fly'). A more detailed walkability analysis is to be undertaken on a case-by-case, as part of analysis for land acquisition through purchase or development approval process. Also, this map doesn't differentiate between access to a local playground versus access to a destination playground.

Anticipated and Potential Future Parkland Growth



The following are the various sources for future parkland growth in the City:

Future Parkland Conveyances via Development Approval Process

These are lands that are anticipated will be conveyed to the City through development applications. Although not all development applications will go from a preliminary application to complete construction, this gives a rough estimate of the scale of parkland that would be dedicated. Refer to Appendix 3B for a list of future parkland conveyances totaling to 21.1 ha and a map of parkland conveyances.

Future Parkland Acquisition Through Direct Purchase

- **Opportunity Acquisition** – These are lands that occasionally become available from surplus declarations or from private sources, and that are otherwise offered to the City. The City evaluates these opportunities against the established set of Implementation Principles (described in Chapter 1) and considers the overall conditions of existing parkland and current priorities, and makes a decision whether or not to pursue acquisition.
- **Properties of Interest for Parkland Purposes** – These are lands that the City proposes to acquire through direct purchases. These lands are generally individual parcels that have been identified for potential purchase because they score highly against the Implementation Principles (described in Chapter 1).

Parcels approved by Council for acquisition are purchased using the *cash-in-lieu* reserve funds and planned within a ten-year horizon (10-yr continuity) that aligns with the larger capital planning process. Information on location of these potential purchases remains internal and confidential given the sensitivity of the information used for negotiation purposes.

- **Areas of Strategic Acquisition** – As population in the City increases and needs continue to evolve, the opportunities to secure parkland will become more challenging, the City should look proactively for opportunities to acquire parkland that would satisfy strategic needs. Areas of strategic acquisition may include a number of contiguous individual properties that would be consolidated to create new parkland. An example of this type of strategic acquisition is the Cooksville Parkland Acquisition project.

Also, strategic acquisitions could be identified, for example, in areas that present two or more types of parkland need as described under the parkland provision criteria (ie. in parkland *quantum* and gaps in the 800 walkability distances) and where there is no single parcel of land that would address the need.

Parcels approved by Council for acquisition are purchased using the *CIL* Reserve funds and planned within a ten year horizon (10-yr continuity) that aligns with the larger capital planning process. Information on location of these strategic areas of potential purchases remains confidential given the sensitivity of the information used for negotiation purposes.



Tools for Securing Lands for Parks Purposes

The City of Mississauga has a number of implementation tools that enable the acquisition of land for park purposes.

GROWTH RELATED CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE PLANNING ACT

The *Planning Act* permits a municipality to establish a by-law which enables the municipality to require a *conveyance* of land for parks purposes, or payment of *cash-in-lieu* thereof, as a condition of the following:

- the development or redevelopment of land (Section 42);
- the subdivision of land (Section 51.1)¹⁴; or
- the granting of a consent (Section 53).

In the case of Section 42 and Section 51.1, the *Planning Act* sets limits on the amount a municipality may require depending on the proposed land use, and whether the municipality requires a *dedication* of land or *cash-in-lieu*. In addition, the municipality may establish an Alternative Requirement for residential uses, so long as the City has appropriate policies in its Official Plan that speak to the need for parkland, and enable the use of the Alternative Rate. The limits of each of these options are described in the following table:

Table 5: Maximum Land Conveyance and Cash-in-lieu Requirements under the Planning Act Mississauga Parkland Quantum 2041

Land Use	Land Conveyance Requirement (Up to)	Cash-in-lieu Requirement (Up to) ¹⁵
Commercial or Industrial Purposes	2% of the land	2% of the value of the land
All Other Uses	5% of the land	5% of the value of the land
Alternative Requirement for Residential Purposes ¹⁶	1 hectare of land per 300 dwelling units	The value of 1 hectare of land per 500 dwelling units

¹⁴ This provision may also be triggered as a condition of S.9 of the *Condominium Act*.

¹⁵ For the purpose of valuing the land for CIL conveyance, the land shall be determined as of the day before the day the first building permit is issued in respect of the development or redevelopment, or as of the day before the day of the approval of the draft plan of subdivision.

¹⁶ Provided the City has appropriate policies in its Official Plan that enable the use of the Alternative Requirement.

The City of Mississauga utilizes these requirements as part of its Parkland Conveyance By-Law. In the case where land is to be conveyed to the City for park purposes, it must be in a condition acceptable to the City.

At their core, the *parkland conveyance* policies follow the principle that growth pays for growth, offsetting the increased pressure new development will place on existing infrastructure and community amenities. In order to ensure equity and accountability under the core tenants of this ‘growth-related capital framework’, the requirements of these by-laws must be set such that they reflect a reasonable standard that can be expected to be provided by each new development project relative to the demand they create.

In the case of Mississauga’s Parkland Conveyance By-law, the expectation is that new growth also provides for the minimum parkland provision targets identified in this plan, specifically:

- A minimum of 12% of total area by 2041 for the UGC and MNs; and
- A minimum of 1.2 ha per 1000 net additional residents for all other residential character areas.

Based on the anticipated population change in Mississauga between 2022 and 2041, and based on the anticipated parkland conveyances to be conveyed in the coming years as a condition of existing development approvals, these standards result in the following parkland need over the course of this Parks Plan:



Table 6: Parkland Required as a Condition of Growth, 2022-2041

UGC and Major Nodes	Location Area	Parkland Area 2021	Expected Future Parkland Conveyances	Net Parkland Req. by 2041 (12% of Land Area)
UGC (DT Cooksville, DT Core, DT Fairview and DT Hospital)	558.5 ha	47.9 ha	0.0 ha	19.1 ha
Uptown Major Node	98.0 ha	5.2 ha	0.5 ha	6.1 ha
Central Erin Mills Major Node	122.6 ha	7.1 ha	-	7.6 ha
Lakeview Waterfront Major Node	104.6 ha	7.0 ha	15.0 ha	-
Total Requirement (Urban Growth Centre + Major Nodes):				32.8 ha
Other Character Areas	Estimated Population Growth 2022-2041	Parkland Req. by 2041 (1.2 ha per 1000 people)	Expected Future Parkland Conveyances	Net Parkland Req. by 2041 (1.2 ha per 1000 people)
Other Character Areas	41,175	49.4 ha	5.6 ha	43.8 ha
Total Requirement (Other Character Areas):				43.8 ha
Total Citywide Parkland Requirement:				76.6 ha

The 76.6 ha of required parkland is attributed specifically to growth, and serves as the basis for calculating the Alternative Rate for the *parkland conveyance* by-law on the principle that growth pays for growth. This parkland requirement does not account for the need linked to existing local deficiencies, as these needs are the result of historic investments and not the impacts of future growth. While these deficits are ineligible for inclusion in the calculation of the need created by new growth, this does not preclude the City from directing *CIL* funds collected from the Parkland Conveyance By-law to projects that address both new parkland demand and existing gaps in the park system.

The City is updating its Parkland Conveyance By-law to reflect this requirement, along with an updated understanding of market land values. Current rates for *cash-in-lieu of parkland (CIL)* are not reflective of market land values and translate into increasing gaps in parkland provision. While the City's preference is for *parkland dedication*, in an infill context *CIL* of parkland is increasingly necessary where a *dedication* is not practical. The City is at a point in its development where significant future parkland will be acquired via purchase as opposed to *conveyance* through the development approval process. As parkland acquisition is funded by *CIL* revenue, the City must collect *CIL* that is reflective of market value in order to remain competitive when seeking to purchase land and to achieve the City's strategic parkland goals.

OTHER TOOLS

Real Estate Transactions

The City can purchase property just like any private or public entity, through an Agreement of Purchase and Sale. In these instances, City staff recommends to Council that the City pursue acquisition of certain property.

Similarly, the City may enter into an Agreement to exchange land with another land owner. This type of transaction follows the same process as a standard Agreement of Purchase and Sale.

The Expropriations Act

The Expropriations Act R.S.O 1990, c.26, as amended, grants municipalities in Ontario the ability to acquire land from a land owner without the land owner's consent. This can mean a full or partial taking of property, or an easement. Due to additional legal considerations and costs required under the Expropriations Act, lands acquired via this approach tend to be more expensive than those acquired through private sale. As such, expropriation of land for parkland purposes is not business as usual practice in the City of Mississauga and Council support would be required if this securement tool were to be used.

Failed Tax Sale

The City can also acquire land through a failed tax sale. This occurs when property taxes are not paid on a property. The property is then seized by the municipality and offered for sale. Should the property not be sold, the municipality retains ownership of the property.




Other Reserves and Sources of Funding

In addition to reserve funds collected via cash-in-lieu payments made to the City to satisfy the requirements of the Parkland Conveyance By-Law, other sources of funding are available to Mississauga for the purposes of acquiring parkland, including:

- Levying property taxes;
- The use of other capital reserves;
- Debt financing;
- Federal and Provincial grants;
- Donations and partnerships;

While the Parkland Conveyance By-law serves as Mississauga's primary tool to enable the acquisition of land for parks and recreation uses, these other tools supplement the City's ability to develop and improve the municipal parks system.

Appendix



Appendix 1

DEFINITIONS

Cash-in-Lieu means a payment of money for park purposes which is collected in lieu of a *conveyance* of land which would otherwise be required to be conveyed pursuant to the Parkland Provisions of the *Planning Act*.

ELC boundary - manicured means Ecological Land Classification. The manicured label refers to the boundary of the areas where grass is mown to prevent naturalization.

Greenlands are generally associated with natural hazards or significant natural areas where development is restricted to protect people and property from damage and to provide for the conservation of *natural heritage* features and areas (e.g. woodlands, valleylands). Greenlands are generally for *passive recreational uses* where they are compatible with the viability of the natural areas while respecting buffers from watercourses and valley slopes.

Natural Heritage System means a system made up of *natural heritage* features and areas, and linkages intended to provide connectivity (at the regional or site level) and support natural processes which are necessary to maintain biological and geological diversity, natural functions, viable populations of indigenous species, and ecosystems. (PPS 2021)

Park means the land, including any body of water, buildings or structures located therein, that is owned by or made available to the City by lease, agreement, or otherwise, and that is established, dedicated, set apart or made available for use as public open space; but does not include a marina, golf course, or cemetery. (Parks By-law 0197-2020)

(Parkland) conveyance or (parkland) dedication means a gratuitous *conveyance* of land to the City for park or other public recreational purposes.

(Parkland) provision quantum refers to the existing parkland area at any given time calculated for population-based provisions (1.2 ha per 1000 people) and area-based provisions (12% of total gross land area). It is made up of all destination parks and all community parks in residential character areas, plus programmed areas in *greenlands (programmed greenlands)*. This calculation informs whether minimum parkland targets are being met in residential character areas.

Passive recreational activities involve the use of parks, trails and open space to engage in activities other than active recreation.

Privately Owned Public Spaces (POPS) are privately owned and maintained outdoor space that is universally accessible and open to the public.

Programmed greenlands are *greenlands* that have at least one amenity typically found at destination and community parks (for a list of amenities, see Appendix 4: List of community parks and destination parks amenities) given that some *greenlands* in Mississauga have historically been used as parks. In these cases the programmed area is carved out using the ***ELC boundary - manicured*** to be considered as part of the *parkland provision quantum*.

Public Open Space includes parkland and greenbelt lands. It is the land base required for active and *passive recreational activities* and the preservation and protection of natural areas and features. Formal linkages between open spaces shall be encouraged to enhance the use of park space and to foster the development of a network of community trails. (Dedication of Land or Cash in Lieu Thereof, for Public Open Space Policy Number: 07-07-01)

Quantum (see Parkland Provision Quantum).

Rules refer to the decision rules applied to assign *quantum* of parkland to each character area. A full description of the rules is presented in the section “Calculating the Quantum of Parkland Provision” (Chapter 6).

Service Areas are geographic units used for the Future Directions Parks & Forestry Master Plan. There are six Service Areas in the city. A map of these areas could be found in that master plan.

Strategic Growth Areas within settlement areas, nodes, corridors, and other areas that have been identified by municipalities or the Province to be the focus for accommodating intensification and higher-density mixed uses in a more compact built form. Strategic growth areas include urban growth centres, major transit station areas, and other major opportunities that may include infill, redevelopment, brownfield sites, the expansion or conversion of existing buildings, or greyfields. Lands along major roads, arterials, or other areas with existing or planned frequent transit service or higher order transit corridors may also be identified as strategic growth areas.

Urban Growth Centres are defined as mixed-use, high-density, and public-transit oriented development, which are meant to become focal points within the GGH.

Urban growth centres will be planned-

- as focal areas for investment in institutional and region-wide public services, as well as commercial, recreational, cultural and entertainment uses
- to accommodate and support major transit infrastructure
- to serve as high density major employment centres that will attract provincially, nationally or internationally significant employment uses
- to accommodate a significant share of population and employment growth.

In this document, Urban Growth Centre or UGC refers to the Mississauga City Centre UGC, which will be planned to achieve, by 2031 or earlier, a minimum gross density target of - 200 residents and jobs combined per hectare.

Appendix 2

SUMMARY OF CONSULTATION WITH SCHOOL BOARDS

Summary of Consultation Meetings with Local School Boards

Three meetings were held by City Staff and the project consultant with local school boards. Purpose of the meetings was to present an overview of the Parks Plan and discuss connections between Schools and City Parks. Meetings were held on:

- June 14, 2021: **French Catholic Board Conseil scolaire catholique MonAvenir** (Richard Kayitare)
- June 15, 2021: **Peel District School Board PDSB** (Randy Wright – Controller of Planning and Accommodation, Nick Gooding, Phillip Sousa, Nicole Hanson)
- June 16, 2021: **Dufferin and Peel Catholic District School Board DPCDSB** (Stephanie Cox – Manager of Planning, Joanne Rogers – Senior Planner) and **French Public School Board Conseil scolaire Viamonde** (Daniel Stojc – Supervisor of Planning)

Questions & Answers:

1. How do you see your school facilities in relation to Mississauga’s parks and recreation facilities?

- Concerns in the face of increasing intensification, which means for some boards challenges securing school sites. Limited sites available specially if coming in late in development process
- Agreement on strong relationship between schools, public parks and how they support local areas.

- Agreement in that future schools will need closely coordinated planning between parks and school boards for topics of common interest e.g. site selection, Boards remain open to discuss sharing facilities
- However, there could also be some de facto facility sharing without formal agreements. Informal use of city parks is helpful for smaller boards
- A board noted that students use of public park can also be challenging as supervision becomes a concern

2. Are there areas of overlap or opportunities for partnerships that should be recognized in the Parks Plan?

- School boards struggling to find sites of sufficient size from developers, may require partnership to meet overall need in some areas.
- In contrast, the DPCDSB is not planning on building any more school sites in Mississauga at this time, may actually be looking at disposing of some. Sites might present opportunities for the City to acquire land or new partnerships
- PDSB outdoor play areas are frequently used by community outside hours but also internal gyms as well – library also used, design for school security is a concern
- PDSB committed to public access to Britannia Farm after hours, this could be equivalent of major municipal park
- Boards interested in identifying parks near schools as drop off point to alleviate school traffic

3. What does the future of school development look like in high-growth neighbourhoods? Are there any areas you are seeing rising need?

- Unanimous interest from school boards to working with the City to identify sites where these sites can be developed in partnership with the various boards
- PDSB is having difficulties securing land for schools or access to open space in intensification areas such as Downtown, Brightwater, Lakeview. There are challenges finding land that developers are willing to sell at fair market value.

4. Are there other issue the Parks Plan should consider as it relates to schools in Mississauga?

- **Securing land for schools:** This issue remains a common concern (availability, cost, physical access, access to surplus land, limited opportunity for schools located in industrial areas to partner with City)
- **Design limitations:** Design of existing facilities does not lend itself to public access
- **French newcomers:** Mississauga appears to be a destination for francophone workers from Quebec, creates demand for the French boards
- **Suggestion for park mapping:** Recommend adapting walking accessibility parkland mapping to show actual walking routes rather than 800m as-crow-flies sphere
- **CIL:** Request for City to consider that schools not be required to pay Cash-in-lieu contributions, given that boards also contribute to the public park system
- **Funding school land acquisition:** Challenges with funding model for school development based on Ministry approval

Appendix 3

FUTURE PARKLAND

3A: RECENTLY COMPLETED ACQUISITIONS (2018-2021)

Future Park #	Type of Parkland	Size (ha)	Address	Character Area
F-411	Community park	0.79	465 Webb Drive	DT Core
F-418	Community park	2.41	0 Camilla Road	DT Hospital
F-455	Community park	0.14	2182 Corsair Road	Cooksville NHD East
F-456	Community park	0.27	2171 Camilla Road	Cooksville NHD East
F-481	Community park	14.10	7568 Ninth Line	Meadowvale Business Park CC
F-484	Community park	2.80	0 Ninth Line	Ninth Line NHD
F-486	Community park	0.32	38 Elm Drive W	DT Fairview
F-514	Community park	0.28	2277 South Millway	South Common CN
F-517	Community park	0.14	105 Paisley Boulevard East	DT Hospital
F-521	Community park	0.50	2247 Hurontario Street	DT Hospital
F-524	Community park	0.23	2407 Shepard Avenue	DT Hospital
F-525	Community park	0.42	2435 Shepard Avenue	DT Hospital
F-526	Community park	0.42	2441 Shepard Avenue	DT Hospital
F-527	Community park	0.42	2465 Shepard Avenue	DT Hospital


3A: RECENTLY COMPLETED ACQUISITIONS (2018-2021) (cont'd)

Future Park #	Type of Parkland	Size (ha)	Address	Character Area
F-528	Community park	0.42	2475 Shepard Avenue	DT Hospital
F-529	Community park	0.42	2477 Shepard Avenue	DT Hospital
F-530	Community park	0.42	2481 Shepard Avenue	DT Hospital
F-531	Community park	0.41	2491 Shepard Avenue	DT Hospital
F-532	Community park	0.42	2501 Shepard Avenue	DT Hospital
F-534	Community park	0.13	2515 Shepard Avenue	DT Hospital
F-535	Community park	0.14	2519 Shepard Avenue	DT Hospital
F-541	Community park	0.20	90 Paisley Boulevard East	DT Hospital
F-551	Community park	3.95	2380 Loreland Avenue	Dixie EA
F-562	Community park	9.80	7248 Ninth Line	Ninth Line NHD
F-563	Community park	3.46	2850-2890 Drew Road	Northeast EA (included in provision for Malton NHD)
F-585	Community park	2.02	3351 King's Masting Crescent	Erin Mills NHD
F-616	Community park	11.20	377 Barondale Drive	Hurontario NHD

3B: FUTURE PARKLAND CONVEYANCES VIA DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL PROCESS (CONFIRMED)

Future Park #	Type of Parkland	Size	Address	Character Area
F-303	Destination park	14.97 ha	985 Hydro Road	Lakeview EA (included in parkland provision for Lakeview NHD)
F-327	Community park	0.19 ha	2007 Lakeshore Road West	Clarkson Village CN
F-464	Community park	0.46 ha	91 Eglinton Ave. E. Future Thornwood Drive	Uptown MN
F-590	Destination park	0.58 ha	70 Mississauga (Bright Water B16, B19)	Port Credit CN
F-591	Community park	0.28 ha	70 Mississauga (Bright Water B15),	Port Credit CN
F-592	Community park	0.75 ha	70 Mississauga (Bright Water B18, B26),	Port Credit CN
F-593	Community park	0.31 ha	70 Mississauga (Bright Water B20),	Port Credit CN
F-594	Destination park	3.52 ha	70 Mississauga (Bright Water B21, B25, B28)	Port Credit CN

Future Parks - Parkland Conveyances



Source: City of Mississauga, Geomatics, December 2021

Appendix 4

LIST OF COMMUNITY PARK AND DESTINATION PARK AMENITIES

Park Inventory Report - Amenities

11v11	Multipurpose diamond unit
5v5	Multipurpose diamond lit
7v7	Outdoor fitness clusters
9v9	Pickleball club lit
Accessible community play site	Pickleball lit
All inclusive barrier free play site	Pickleball portable net club lit
Ball diamond batting cage	Pickleball portable net club unlit
Baseball diamond lit	Pickleball portable net public lit
Baseball diamond unlit	Pickleball portable net public unlit
Basketball hoops	Pickleball public lit
Bocce court indoor	Pickleball public unlit
Bocce court lit	Pickleball unlit
Bocce court unlit	Picnic area
Boxed soccer	Shade structure
Community play site	Slo pitch diamond lit
Cooling station (*)	Soccer - cricket multipurpose
Cricket batting cage	Soccer - football multipurpose
Cricket pitch	Soccer artificial lit
Cricket pitch major	Soccer lit
Day camp (*)	Softball diamond lit
Dirt jump park	Softball diamond minor unlit
Fish cleaning station (*)	Softball diamond unlit
Football lit	Spray pad
Fresh air fitness bench (*)	Spray pad medium
Fresh air fitness circuit	Spray pad small
Green space artificial (*)	Tennis club lit
Green space garden (*)	Tennis club unlit
Green space major artificial (*)	Tennis club with pickleball lit
Ice rink artificial lit	Tennis club with pickleball unlit
Ice rink artificial unlit	Tennis public lit
Ice rink natural	Tennis public unlit
Lacrosse	Tennis public with pickleball lit
Lawn bowling	Tennis public with pickleball unlit
Leash-free zone	Toboggan hill (*)
Major artificial lit	Track and field equipment
Multi pad	Track and field track
Multi use ramp facility lit	Universal diamond lit
Multi use ramp facility unlit	Volley ball

Note: Amenities shown with an asterisk (*) require further review. They will be mostly considered as site furnishings, supporting existing amenities and can be excluded. Yet, in some cases like toboggan hills, there is currently a List of six formally protected hills across the city which would make those hills be considered as amenities.

