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SECTION 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 OVERVIEW

The City of Mississauga, with a current estimated population of 665,000 people, is a dynamic, progressive and increasingly diverse community that ranks as Canada's sixth largest City. Mississauga's excellent recreation and parks system provides a significant contribution to the community's high quality of life. As the City's population grows, recreation and parks facilities and services need to continue to adapt to the emerging demands of both current and future generations.

The City of Mississauga 2004 Future Directions for Recreation and Parks provides the municipality with a set of comprehensive strategies respecting parks, open space, and recreation facility needs to serve both existing and future populations (to the year 2031). This plan identifies recreation infrastructure and service needs through a careful examination of public opinion, past planning studies, and appropriate service levels. The Future Directions Plan is designed to be a living document that is updated regularly to reflect changes within the social, cultural, informational, and educational environments of the City. This plan is a five-year update of the City's 1999 Future Direction for Recreation and Parks.

Recreation and parks facilities and services are essential to individual well being and the cohesive development of communities. They provide a fundamental building block toward improving the overall quality of life in Mississauga. These activities include a wide range of artistic, cultural, athletic, social and educational interests.
1.2 GOAL & OBJECTIVES

In developing the 2004 Future Directions, the goal is to research, develop, design and produce a fiscally responsible Master Plan for recreation and parks facilities and services in Mississauga. To achieve this goal, a number of specific objectives have been developed:

1. Employ a “market-driven” and “sustainable” approach to planning.
2. Facilitate the clarification of the City’s mandate in the provision of recreation and parks services in the short and long-term and develop the guiding principles for the provision and distribution of these services.
3. Thoroughly review existing research information and strategies and determine if any additional research is necessary.
4. Conduct any additional research necessary and provide findings.
5. Taking into consideration studies already completed and new primary research findings, make recommendations regarding the provision, distribution and timing of recreation and parks facilities in the City of Mississauga for the short and long-term.
6. Develop and conduct a comprehensive and innovative public consultation process that solicits public input and promotes public “buy-in” to an affordable result.
7. Revise and update the open space strategy.
8. Identify potential areas of synergy between the City’s Recreation and Parks Division and the Library System’s services and facilities.
9. Conduct a thorough review of trends, issues and best practices regarding parks.
10. Identify and determine service delivery processes in offering opportunities to persons with disabilities.
11. Develop and recommend a mechanism to assess and solicit partnership opportunities.
12. Develop and provide a framework to deal with special requests for facilities not traditionally provided by the municipality.
1.3 SCOPE

This plan is an update of the City's 1999 Future Direction for Recreation and Parks, which established both short and longer term facility and park requirements for Mississauga. Both plans concentrate on changes in direction that are a result of changes in demographics, attitudes, and the creation of an established infrastructure for recreation. While the scope of the two documents is quite similar, considerable change over the past five years has precipitated the need for the Future Direction Plan to be updated. Most notably, the City has grown faster than anticipated and has become more culturally diverse, which has created additional pressures on existing infrastructure and resources. Although the rate of growth is beginning to level off (for the next few years) the City will continue to play “catch-up”. The City has partially addressed this through the recent redevelopment of five of its major community recreation facilities.

The Future Directions Plan addresses not only facility and parks needs, but also issues such as the delivery of services, the mandate of the Recreation and Parks Division, synergies with the Mississauga Library System, and partnership arrangements. The study has been guided by input solicited from a variety of sources (e.g., the public, key stakeholders, City staff and officials), primary and secondary research (e.g., trends / best practices, demographic data, etc.), past studies, and the experience of the Consulting Team. A key component of the study process was a statistically valid public opinion survey conducted in October/November 2003.

In instances where the directions and strategies proposed by past studies remain valid, these recommendations have been carried forward into the Future Directions. Consideration has also been given to ensure these recommendations reflect the expressed needs of the public and the current realities of service delivery and facility provision. The development of a comprehensive, City-wide Future Directions Plan has also required that higher-level directions, such as a continued emphasis on youth, remain first and foremost in our minds when integrating the recommendations of past studies.

The study area is the entire City of Mississauga and all of its public recreation and parks facilities and services.
1.4 METHODOLOGY / PROCESS

The Future Directions Plan process began in July 2003 with the initial meeting of the project steering committee comprised of key City Staff. The planning process was designed to incorporate the findings of past studies; to be comprehensive in nature; and to provide clear and justifiable direction for the future provision of recreation and parks facilities and services. A Consulting Team comprised of Monteith Brown Planning Consultants, The JF Group, and Leger Marketing was retained to facilitate the project.

"Planning together" is the best way to describe the Future Directions that have been developed for the Recreation and Parks Division. Since the City started planning for the provision of recreation and open space in a master plan format back in 1983, the City has attempted to work closely with the public, volunteers, the business community, and the private sector to prepare a strategy that reflects the needs of residents and responds to issues that we face in Mississauga.

A schematic of the planning process and its various components is shown on the next page (Figure 1-1). Numerous meetings with the steering committee were held throughout the project in order to gather information, review the Plan’s progress and background documents, and to provide direction for the Plan’s recommendations and strategies.

The timing of this process is intended to coincide with the preparation of the City’s Development Charges By-law (2004). Also of note, the City’s 2004 Future Directions for Library Services is being prepared concurrently with this plan, resulting in the identification of service and facility provision synergies within the Community Services Department, as well as efficiencies related to the planning process.

Community Services staff are preparing an Implementation Plan to provide detailed information on the process, methodology and cost required for each aspect of this Plan. The Development Charges Review will provide a 10-year project list of items recommended by Future Directions that can be funded through the Development Charges.
Figure 1-1: 
THE PLANNING PROCESS
1.5 ORGANIZATION

The 2004 Future Directions for Recreation and Parks consists of seven sections plus an Implementation Plan (under separate cover):

1. **Introduction** - provides an overview of the Plan’s purpose, objectives, scope and planning process;

2. **Public Input** - summarizes the input received from the public, stakeholders, and City staff/officials through the household survey, workshops, and public meetings;

3. **Planning Context** - identifies the primary demographic and leisure trends and their relevance to Mississauga’s recreation and parks system;

4. **Mandate, Guiding Principles, & Service Delivery** - describes proposed modifications to the mission, vision and values of the Recreation and Parks Division and addresses issues related to co-ordination with the Mississauga Library System;

5. **Facility Requirements** - identifies short and long term recreation facility needs and a strategy to achieve these needs.

6. **Parkland Requirements** - establishes parkland needs and presents various parkland provision strategies.

7. **Service Delivery and Partnership** - offers some guidance on accessibility issues and provides recommendations related to the City developing relationships (e.g., partnerships, alliances, contracts, etc.) with entities outside of the municipal structure.

Sections 1 to 3 provide a summary of the background research and contextual information through which the recommendations in Sections 4 to 7 have been derived. Greater detail can be found in the Future Directions’ supporting background documents.
SECTION 2  PLANNING CONTEXT

2.1 A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE RECREATION & PARKS SYSTEM

The City of Mississauga Recreation and Parks Division, which operates within the Community Services Department, has prepared long-range comprehensive planning documents since the mid-1980s when its first master plan was completed. The City continues to prepare innovative and community-responsive planning studies to ensure that resources are maximized and services are efficiently delivered to those who need them the most.

The City plays an important role in providing recreation and leisure opportunities that promote personal development and enhance the quality of life for all of its citizens. A majority of Mississauga residents rely on the City to provide most of their recreational services and this is consistent regardless of age, income, ethnicity, or place of residence. The City’s recreational services – which are broadly defined to include the municipal programs, support services, facilities, parks and open space that support leisure time activities – benefit those who live, work and play in Mississauga.

Recreation programs and services are provided directly and indirectly by the municipality. In addition to the numerous programs and unscheduled activities offered by the City at its community centres, arenas, parks, etc., the City supports and facilitates the efforts of affiliated volunteer and private sector organizations through a community development model. The importance of non-municipal agencies and groups in providing facilities, services and other resources to Mississaugans cannot be over-stated.
2.2 1999 FUTURE DIRECTION FOR RECREATION AND PARKS

In 1999, the Future Direction for Recreation and Parks was adopted. This strategic planning document focused on answering three core questions:

- What should the City be providing?
- Where should facilities and services be located?
- How should we pay for these services?

The main thrust of the 1999 Future Direction for Recreation and Parks was an emphasis on:

- quality programs;
- services for youth;
- maintenance of existing facilities;
- pathway development;
- a market-driven delivery of facilities and services; and
- a new pricing strategy.

Significant progress has been made since the 1999 study with over $37 million invested in the development and redevelopment of community facilities. With various internal and external factors impacting the provision of recreation and parks services, there is a need to reconfirm and update the 1999 strategic directions through the 2004 Future Directions. In updating the plan, it quickly became apparent that many of the previous recommendations remain relevant and valid within the current planning context and, where appropriate, have been carried forward into this new plan.
2.3 SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS

Current and projected demographic characteristics – combined with knowledge of common activity patterns and preferences held by people of various ages, ethnicities, and income levels – provide valuable insight into the demands that will be placed on the recreation and parks system in the future.

Since the 1999 Future Direction was prepared, a number of significant demographic shifts have occurred in Mississauga. While the emphasis is on population and age composition, other socio-demographic variables that are known to influence leisure participation (e.g., income) are highlighted in this section. A higher level of detail is provided in earlier work titled “Issues Report”, which should be referred to for demographic details.

2.3.1 Total Population

Mississauga’s population has grown more rapidly than was anticipated in 1999 – the City is experiencing a period of significant growth (9.5% between 2001 and 2006) which will begin to level off after 2006. The 1999 Future Direction did not anticipate this happening until 2011. The next five years will require the greatest amount of attention in terms of expanding recreation and parks resources in order to meet the needs of projected growth.
Population estimates are shown in Table 2-1 and illustrated in Figure 2-1.

![Figure 2-1: City of Mississauga - Population Forecast](image)

Population projections are essential ingredients in the planning of recreation and parks services. It is imperative that demographic data be monitored and reviewed on a regular basis to allow for adjustments to Future Directions recommendations as the rate and location of population growth fluctuates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>636,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>696,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>715,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>721,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>725,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>728,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>732,740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Hemson Consulting 2003 and Monteith Brown Planning Consultants 2003
2.3.2 Population Distribution

For the purposes of this study, the City has been divided into six "Service Areas". The Services Areas were established to provide greater depth in assessing the spatial distribution of the population, recreation facilities and parks facilities. The boundaries of the Service Areas are based upon postal code forward sortation areas to assist in current and future data collection and, where possible, have been defined by major physical barriers such as the Credit River and 400-series highways.

The Service Areas and population densities with the sub-areas are illustrated on Map 2-1. Table 2-2 and Figure 2-2 contain the current and forecasted population figures for each Service Area.

Service Areas 1, 2 and 5 (City Centre) are expected to be the main areas of population growth over the next thirty years. These areas are also currently under-supplied with facilities, yet they are the communities that have the greatest concentrations of children and youth. The largest percentage of overall growth will occur within these areas over the next five to ten years.

Service Areas 3 and 4, on the other hand, are forecasted to gradually decline in population as household sizes continue to decrease. Service Area 6 will experience a slight population increase.

The greatest pressures for additional recreation and parks resources over the short-term are expected to occur in Service Areas 1, 2 and 5. Furthermore, a continued emphasis should be placed on adapting existing facilities and services to the changing demographics across the City, especially in Service Areas 3 and 4.
Population Distribution by Service Area
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City-Wide Distribution Analysis
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Current and Projected Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>132,144</td>
<td>162,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>140,199</td>
<td>156,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41,345</td>
<td>37,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>102,769</td>
<td>95,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>163,638</td>
<td>189,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>84,452</td>
<td>89,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>664,547</td>
<td>729,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Hemson Consulting 2003 and Monteith Brown Planning Consultants 2003

Base Mapping Provided by: City of Mississauga Community Services Department
2.3.3 Age Composition

Mississauga's population, like those of most municipalities, is aging. Figure 2-3 illustrates the projected changes in total population by age group.

All of the younger age groups are expected to decrease in numbers – the 0 to 9 age group has already begun to decrease, except in the north and northwest areas of the City. Youth are the primary users of recreation services and the City is, in effect, currently dealing with a peak demand for services. There is an expectation that more opportunities will become available for adults as the number of children and youth decline. Given the concerns for the health and fitness levels of our children, however, it is important that this age group remains a top priority for the City.

The only age group that is expected to grow substantially is the 55+ age group. The 55+ age group currently accounts for 17% of the City's population and is expected to nearly triple in absolute numbers by 2031, when 39% of residents will be age 55 and over.
The aging of the population will require a modest re-allocation of resources from young adult populations to the older adult demographic. Although this is discussed in greater detail in Sections 4, 5, and 6, trends show that the aging population will be looking for less vigorous forms of exercise, trails, passive park opportunities and general fitness programs that emphasize active living. This shift will apply more to programs than it will facilities, as the current complement of community and older adult centres is considered to be adequate to meet the needs of older adults for a number of years.

Between now and 2031, the 0 to 9 and 10 to 19 age groups are expected to decline in total population in each of the six Service Areas. The greatest concentrations of children and youth (now and in the future) are located in Service Areas 1, 2 and 5 due to the larger overall populations of these areas. In terms of percentage of the population, Service Areas 1 and 2 currently have the highest proportion of children (0-9) and are joined by Service Area 4 in having a high ratio of teens (10-19). This is not expected to change significantly over the course of the planning period – Service Areas 1 and 2 will continue to contain the largest percentage of children and youth.

Although the greatest concentration of residents aged 55 and over are in Service Area 5, as a percentage of the population, Service Area 6 has a significantly greater proportion of older adults.

2.3.4 Ethnicity

Mississauga is becoming more culturally diverse as 47% of the population were born in a Country other than Canada, compared to 26% for Ontario and 51% for Toronto. Multiculturalism has introduced new sports and activities to the City and has created substantial demand for what would have once been considered "non-traditional sports" (e.g., cricket). As the City becomes more diverse, it is important to involve immigrant groups directly in the delivery of programs to help break down barriers that may limit their participation in leisure pursuits.
2.3.5 Education & Income

People with high levels of educational attainment and higher income levels are known to participate in leisure activities more often. Furthermore, participation in sports such as hockey and golf has also been associated with higher incomes. Although education and income levels are higher in Mississauga compared to the Provincial average, there is disparity within the City. For instance, Service Areas 3 and 5 have lower average household income, potentially indicating lower levels of participation. In this regard, it will be important to ensure that core programs remain reasonably priced and that financial assistance is made available to those who need it the most.

2.3.6 Summary

The City’s growth rate has peaked and its population is expected to nearly stabilize by the year 2011. In the twenty-year period following 2011, growth is anticipated to occur at a rate of less than 1,000 new residents per year – a rate that pales in comparison to that witnessed in recent years. However, the north and northwest areas of the City will be the exception to this rule, as these areas continue to develop and attract new families.

While the population’s growth rate will level off following 2011, the composition of the City will likely remain ethnically diverse and the median age will increase dramatically. These considerations will have significant ramifications on the provision of parks and recreation facilities. Most notably, the need for developed parkland and additional facilities will be largely concentrated in the period between 2004 to 2011, while the 2011 to 2031 timeframe will require a greater emphasis on managing programming and adapting existing infrastructure. This Plan attempts to strike a balance between the provision of new/expanded leisure opportunities and adapting existing resources and practices to the changing demographic profile of the community.
2.4 LEISURE TRENDS & BEST PRACTICES

The analysis of trends is a critical factor in recreation and parks planning. An understanding of past and emerging trends will help Mississauga anticipate future demand for recreation facilities and programming. These trends are not just limited to those affecting participation in leisure activities. Values and attitudes that people place on leisure also influence the environment, willingness to pay for services, and expectations that special needs will be explored. Trends and best practices that have been identified through background research and the public opinion poll are detailed below.

2.4.1 1999 Future Direction: Key Trends & Their Relevance Today

The key trends identified in the 1999 Future Direction are noted below. Continued research across North America has confirmed that all trends noted are still applicable today.

- **Lack of time** is a main barrier to participation for adults, youth and children. There remains an increasing emphasis on individual, self-driven activities that fit into personal schedules rather than long-term scheduled programs.

- People continue to prefer quality facilities to total quantity. Although there are some geographic variances, most residents are generally satisfied with the facilities that are available in Mississauga. In response, rather than building new facilities, the City recently implemented an aggressive community facility redevelopment program.

- One’s ability to pay, not their age, should dictate the level of subsidy that they receive. The latest Census data confirms that wealth and family income increase with age and that the highest net worth is associated with the 55-64 age bracket. As income is strongly identified as a factor affecting leisure-time participation, the “ability to pay” should be the basis for offering subsidies to older adults.

- Not much has changed relative to the popularity of major activities (see Table 2-3). Walking, swimming, exercising, and cycling remain the favoured activities of Mississaugans. The commonality here is the continued popularity of unstructured opportunities that can be done on one’s own time. Hockey and soccer remain the favoured team sports, with soccer still experiencing increased participation, especially with girls and at the adult level.

---

**Table 2-3: Summary of Key Leisure Participation Trends**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Trend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboarding</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racquet Sports</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.2 Emerging Age-Specific Trends

- For reasons related to the importance of recreational participation to the physical and social health and well being of children, this age group will remain an important target market for municipal recreation departments despite declining population figures.

- Affordable and accessible facilities such as gyms, pools and skate parks appeal most to youth/teens. Teens need a place to hang out, counseling and peer support programs as well as affordable computer and Internet access. With a gradual shift away from team sports, youth are seeking opportunities to “play” sports rather than “compete” in them. The preferred approach is to focus on spontaneous, unstructured activities that may not require high skill levels, such as cycling, in-line skating, basketball and skateboarding. If the activities involve the two most important sources of enjoyment for this age group, that being friends and music, they are more likely to be successful. Public input indicates that there is a need (real or perceived) to do more for youth in Mississauga.

- While there will be an inevitable shift towards less vigorous forms of exercise for many, there is strong evidence that the adult active recreation market is growing. More adults are interested in pursuing the recreational activities of their youth – this is true of both hockey and soccer.

- Trends indicate that older adults, on average, have a greater interest in fitness than previous generations, resulting in increased demand for facilities such as warm-water swimming and therapeutic pools. The “shortage of time” factor is also prevalent amongst the retired population, leading to greater demand for prime time (evening and weekend) time slots. Older adults also have less need for program subsidies due to higher average income levels; as mentioned earlier, income should be the basis for any subsidy, not age.
2.4.3 Emerging Socio-Economic & Health Based Trends

- Despite an increasing awareness of the long-term social, health and economic costs associated with unhealthy lifestyles, Canadians are becoming increasingly sedentary. Studies indicate that around half of those living in Ontario are not sufficiently physically active and nearly one third of Canadian children are considered to be overweight.

- Studies also indicate that levels of inactivity are 50% higher among recent immigrants, although other indicators reveal that they are healthier than the Canadian born population. Combining social services and recreation opportunities at the same location may be a model that reaches out most effectively to newcomers.

- Public opinion polls in Mississauga have not identified a significant correlation between ethnicity and recreational participation patterns. Nevertheless, as Mississauga’s population becomes more ethnically diverse, there will be a need to minimize some of the barriers imposed by factors such as language and to be sensitive to ethno-cultural issues as they relate to programming.

- The economic disparity between the rich and the poor is becoming wider in Mississauga as well as the rest of Canada. With income being a key factor influencing one’s ability to participate in recreational activities, children from lower-income households are far less likely to participate in organized sports.

- The range of recreational activities, both competitive and non-competitive, for people with disabilities has increased significantly in recent years. Unfortunately, people with disabilities still face considerable barriers (e.g., transportation, cost, etc.) when it comes to participating in leisure activities. The City should continue to offer “inclusive” activities as well as adaptive programming and facilities (e.g., playgrounds).
2.4.4 Emerging Service Delivery Trends

- The "volunteer crunch" – Across North America there is a decline in the number of volunteers and with fewer volunteers there is more volunteer burnout.

- Benefits-based performance measures are becoming more common. For example, in the past, municipalities measured outputs (e.g., number of people participating), while now the question is one of outcomes (e.g., how has this program benefited my community and at what cost?).

2.4.5 Emerging Activity Trends

- Extreme sports and adventure opportunities continue to increase in popularity, particularly skateboarding, freestyle skating and trick biking across North America.

- In general, participation and attendance at arts and cultural activities is declining, although there is optimism that the aging trend will create renewed interest in cultural activities.
2.4.6 Emerging Facility Trends

- To boost local economies, some municipalities are developing facilities that cater to the sport tourism sector.

- Recreation facilities are increasingly being designed to serve as "entertainment" venues (e.g., leisure and wave pools) that appeal to the younger age groups and families.

- Large, multi-purpose facilities that generate economies of scale and present opportunities for cross-programming are quickly becoming the standard across the nation.

- The private sector is providing both niche and traditional facilities to serve the adult market (e.g., hockey arenas, indoor soccer facilities), as well as the youth market in cases where municipal supply is lower than demand.

- Spray pads and leisure pool elements remain popular options for the design of aquatic facilities.

- With baseball in decline and soccer and other field sports on the rise, there is a trend toward establishing a multi or universal field template that allows for ease of conversion.

- To address emerging sports and increased adult demands, many municipalities are developing indoor field houses (also referred to as multi-purpose activity centres) designed to serve broad markets, such as indoor soccer, field hockey, lacrosse, volleyball, basketball, badminton, etc.

- Aging infrastructure is one of the major issues affecting municipal recreation departments today. The creation of capital conservation funds/renovation funds allow municipalities to set money aside to renovate and upgrade facilities based on life cycle assessments.

- Municipalities are becoming more proactive in investigating partnerships and joint ventures in the development and operation of new leisure facilities.

- Community access to school facilities is in decline due to rising costs, liability concerns and difficulty in reaching agreements on the shared use of facilities.
2.4.7 Emerging Parks & Open Space Trends

- Parks and trails are key ingredients to healthy lifestyles. When asked what factors would assist in maintaining an active lifestyle, Canadians are most likely to identify: (1) access to safe streets and public places; (2) paths, trails and green spaces; and (3) affordable facilities.

- While park and trail inventories and maintenance responsibilities have increased, staffing levels have typically not kept pace, forcing municipalities to do more with less. Naturalization projects that reduce maintenance requirements is a trend, but is not universally popular with residents.

- Within the parks systems, municipalities are finding room for a growing demand for allotment gardens, especially within densely populated areas.

- Municipalities are dealing with demands for higher quality amenities (e.g., rest areas, benches, field turf, etc.) and mandated play structure improvements.

- Awareness of the natural environment is increasing, resulting in greater demand for more passive areas and greenspace.

- The health of trees and the "urban forest" is a concern. Drought and disease are taking their toll and in many older areas where trees are reaching the end of their remaining life, tree removal and replacement costs are soaring.

- As it is with facilities, bigger is generally better when it comes to parks. Finding a balance that continues to provide residents with convenient access to playgrounds in local parks while also consolidating park features such as playing fields in larger parks is the challenge.
SECTION 3 PUBLIC INPUT

3.1 OVERVIEW

An important piece of primary research for the 2004 Future Directions was the wide-ranging public and municipal consultation program, which was completed in conjunction with the Future Directions for Library Services. Key features of this program include:

- a random sample household survey;
- workshops with stakeholders and City staff;
- interviews with City Council members and key staff; and
- public meetings (ten undertaken in April/May 2004).

3.2 STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS

Three workshops were held with various members of the public and leisure stakeholders to discuss issues related to the improvement of recreation and parks services. The outcomes of these sessions are summarized below and have been integrated into the Future Directions recommendations. In general, participants were pleased with the range and quality of facilities offered, however, suggestions were received for more unstructured activities and spaces (e.g., special events, trails) and improved park and trail amenities, to name a few.

1. In relation to recreation and parks facilities and services, what does “Mississauga” do best?
   - ice surfaces / arenas
   - community centres (multi-purpose)
   - soccer fields
   - baseball diamonds
   - skateboarding park
   - older adult centres
   - pool facilities/leisure pools
   - bike trails/paths
   - lakeshore trails and parks
   - program guide
   - program variety

An important piece of primary research for the 2004 Future Directions was the wide-ranging public and municipal consultation program.
2. In relation to recreation and parks facilities and services, what does “Mississauga” need to do better?

- outdoor washrooms and storage facilities
- support amenities and safety features in parks
- awareness and accessibility to arts / public art displays
- venues for extreme sports
- outdoor theatre areas/bandshells
- seasonal celebrations to build the community
- greenspace and gardens in City Centre
- improved maintenance
- better relationship with schools boards

3. How can these deficiencies be addressed?

- keep user fees reasonable so all income levels can participate
- link with shopping malls to develop areas for community groups
- adapt and modify existing facilities
- work more with community groups to organize special events
- pursue corporate sponsorships to fund facility improvements
- assist groups in obtaining liability insurance

### 3.3 HOUSEHOLD SURVEY

In October and November 2003, Leger Marketing completed a household survey for the purpose of understanding the recreation and leisure activities and habits of Mississauga residents. A total of 750 residents were interviewed for an accuracy of ±3.6%, 19 times out of 20. The relevant highlights of the survey results are briefly described below.
3.3.1 Leisure and Recreation Activities

- Walking, swimming, reading and exercise are the most popular leisure and recreation activities in Mississauga (see Table 3-1). As age increases, so too does the propensity to visit a park or facility to walk.
- Swimming is the preferred activity for children and youth, although each age group has slightly different favoured activities (see Table 3-2).
- Generally speaking, residents rely on public facilities or parks when participating in many activities such as: soccer, softball, swimming, hockey, and bicycling.
- On average, residents are willing to travel 26 minutes to make regular use of a municipal recreation facility.

### Table 3-1: Household Survey Leisure & Recreation Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk (includes walking dog)</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise, aerobics, etc.</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to the public library</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Soccer</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Table 3-2: Household Survey - Main Activities for Children and Youth (in order to preference)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Child / Youth</th>
<th>0 to 4</th>
<th>5 to 10</th>
<th>11 to 17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td>Swimming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to movies</td>
<td>Hockey</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercising</td>
<td>Skating</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Exercising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2 Parks and Park Pathways

- 79% of Mississauga residents use City parks. Of those who use the parks, walking is the most popular reason for using them. The majority use neighbourhood parks close to home rather than a larger City park that they may have to drive to.

- Parks are frequented by Mississauga residents approximately 17 times per year while park pathways are only frequented 11 times per year. Residents visit Mississauga’s waterfront parks 7 times per year on average.

- 50% of those who visit the waterfront parks do so to view the scenery while 42% are attracted by the park pathways.

- When engaging in such activities as rollerblading, walking, running, or jogging, Mississauga residents tend to use park pathways and city sidewalks in equal amounts. Women tend to use city sidewalks more for such activities, which could be a function of the perceived level of safety in park pathways.

- When visiting park pathways, the main purpose is recreation for 79% of residents who use the pathways. Very few use them as a mode of transportation.

- 71% of residents prefer that the City keep more of its parkland as open spaces, treed areas, and trails, as opposed to developing more sports fields within them.
3.3.3 Drivers and Barriers to Using a Program or Facility

- Lack of time to get involved is cited as the number one barrier to using a City of Mississauga facility or participating in a City program (see Table 3-3).

Table 3-3: Household Survey - Barriers to Participation by Service Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Time</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Interest</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Money</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Comfort with English Language</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- While only 53% of residents say that lack of convenient hours are a key "barrier" to participation, convenient hours are a key "driver" for 78% of residents. Quality of the instructors, presence of a particular program, and selection of programs are also important factors that influence the decision to use a City facility, program or public library.

3.3.4 Subsidizing City Programs / User Fees

- When it comes to subsidizing City programs, residents feel that retired adults, whether they are over or under the age of 75, are the highest priority. Conversely, 81% indicated that program fees for adults should be set at a level that allows the City to cover the actual cost or to post a profit.

- 62% feel that the decision to subsidize a person using programs should be based on the user’s ability to pay.

- Of those who have recently paid to participate in a recreation program or activity, 44% indicated that they are willing to pay more in the future.
3.3.5 Level of Service

- More than half of residents feel that the City should increase its current level of service (programs and/or facilities) for teen centres, seniors’ centres, trails, and parklands (see Figure 3-1).

3.4 PUBLIC MEETINGS

Ten public meetings were scheduled throughout the City during April and May 2004. Input received from these sessions showed a strong support for the recommendations contained within the Future Directions. In particular, strong support was received for:

- the development of more multi-purpose trails for both walking and cycling;
- the development of additional soccer fields and indoor soccer facilities;
- developing better partnerships with the school boards in order to ensure access to gymnasiums and fields and other facilities paid for by the public;
- more emphasis on accessibility from a physical, social and financial perspective;
- the development of a teen strategy and resulting programs and facilities;
- the development of a better understanding of the needs of the “new” older adults;
- greater emphasis on branch libraries as a place that reflects their community; and
- more unstructured recreational facilities for persons of all ages – multi-use trails, basketball, skateboard, bmx, libraries, drop-in opportunities, fitness centres, etc.
Overall the residents agreed that the City has done an excellent job in planning recreational facilities and parkland. They were pleased with what is available for them but also agreed there is a need for more facilities in certain areas and for certain services.

The only question the public disagreed with was the option of the City eliminating or reducing service levels rather than increasing user fees or raise taxes. Although the survey was not scientific in nature, it allowed all present to speak their mind.

On some controversial topics, such as the potential elimination of outdoor pools in exchange for spray pads, the residents attending supported the concept by 4 to 1.

In the area of “new topics raised” two groups were present at several meetings to make sure their interest group was heard. The first group represented the competitive swim community and believe Mississauga needs an additional pool and that it should investigate a 50 metre pool. The second group represented the badminton community and made a strong plea for a dedicated facility for badminton. Swim facilities and badminton facilities are addressed in Section 5.
SECTION 4  MANDATE & GUIDING PRINCIPLES

4.1 ELEMENTS TO ACHIEVE EXCELLENCE

The Trust for Public Land, a USA, nonprofit agency that helps to protect land for human enjoyment and well being, has identified seven factors as key elements in helping cities achieve excellence in their parks system. The seven factors are:

1. a clear expression of purpose;
2. an ongoing planning and community involvement process;
3. sufficient assets in land, staffing and equipment to meet the system’s goals;
4. equitable access;
5. user satisfaction;
6. safety from crime and physical hazards; and
7. benefits for the city beyond the boundaries of the parks.

The City of Mississauga scores well in achieving these elements for success within its parks system.

The "Issues Report" prepared for the 2004 Future Directions Plan assessed the community profile, trends, stakeholders concerns, public opinion and existing reports that address a wide range of issues in Mississauga. Key findings from these sections have been brought forward and weighed against the "elements for success" to help clarify the mandate of the Community Services Department (Recreation and Parks Division). The key findings have also been used to develop a series of “guiding principles” that will act as core directional statements for the development and implementation of the recommendations of the Future Directions Plan.
4.2 MANDATE - MISSION & VISION STATEMENTS

The current mandate of the Recreation and Parks Division is contained in the following statements.

**Vision Statement**

Mississauga Recreation and Parks will anticipate and respond to the needs of our communities as a committed partner in fostering the City of choice in which to live, work, and play.

**Mission Statement**

Mississauga Recreation and Parks is a dynamic and dedicated team of staff, volunteers and partners who are committed to strengthening individuals, families, and our communities and the environment by offering and engaging lifelong learning, leisure and recreation experiences.

The following strategies are designed to help achieve the Division's Vision and Mission.

a) **Research and Development**

To utilize appropriate information to continuously improve our quality and to proactively provide opportunities for staff to identify and apply best practices.

b) **Human Resources**

To demonstrate we value our staff and volunteers by attracting, retaining and developing a dynamic team who are committed to our Vision and Mission.

c) **Partnerships**

To develop mutually beneficial partnerships that ensure quality leisure and recreation experiences for all individuals, families and communities that live, work and play in Mississauga.
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d) Facilities and Technology
   To provide safe, clean, and accessible facilities, parks, and equipment and wisely use
technology to support our programs and services.

e) Environmental Stewardship
   To provide a balanced approach to the provision of both active and passive parkland
   and provide stewardship to ensure environmental sustainability.

f) Finance
   To maximize revenue and other resources and ensure optimal community value for all
   expenses while meeting budget targets and ensuring full accountability.

g) Products and Services
   To provide quality products and services that strengthen individuals, families, and our
   communities by maximizing our resources.

h) Image
   To be known as a dedicated and competent team who are innovative and effective in
   strengthening individuals, families, and communities; making Mississauga the most
   livable community in Canada.
4.3 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The Recreation & Parks Division operates under the following ten principles:

1. The Division will strive to ensure that the broadest range of recreation opportunities are provided to meet individual and community needs of Mississauga's diverse and changing public. Examples of broad range recreation opportunities include physical, cultural, artistic, and passive activities.

2. The Division will endeavour to provide programs and services to all segments of the population in order to ensure that delivery is fair, impartial, accessible and equitable.

3. The Division will recognize the uniqueness of each community in order to take these important differences into account when planning and delivering recreation programs.

4. The Division will strive to provide programs based on the concept of user-pay. That is, all participants will pay a registration fee towards the direct operating costs of the program. The only exceptions would be those activities specifically authorized and approved by City Council and this will encompass those program areas which are identified as a service.

5. The Division will encourage individuals and groups to be self-sufficient in their operations and will facilitate processes to encourage volunteer commitment.

6. The Division will strive to encourage citizen participation in the delivery of services, since community involvement enhances the effectiveness of recreation services and assists in the development of cohesive communities.

7. While the Division will strive to meet the needs of all age groups and levels of abilities, the needs of children, youth, seniors, persons at risk, and participants at the amateur level of recreational endeavours will be given priority should issues such as availability of time and facilities require choices to be made.

8. The Division recognizes the need to maintain existing resources and facilities and plan for capital replacement costs associate with aging facilities.
9. The Division recognizes the importance of the natural environment and will strive to provide appropriate protection and management of open space resources.

10. The Division will maintain inventories of the City's recreational resources and the participant program/registration data to ensure accurate monitoring and planning for future actions.

### 4.4 PROGRAM STANDARDS

Programs and activities are provided by recreation and community centres through direct and indirect means:

- **Directly**: Programs and activities initiated and operated by Recreation and Parks.
- **Indirectly**: Programs and activities initiated and operated by the private sector or volunteer groups affiliated with Recreation and Parks in terms of a support service.

Program standards help ensure that a consistent level of service is provided, uniform procedures are established in writing, and quality measures are applied consistently. These standards (listed below) also serve as performance goals for all stages of program organization.

- All recreation programs must be tested against established Division quality criteria in order to be implemented.
- All part-time staff must be selected, trained, and evaluated according to established Division performance criteria.
- All recreation programs will meet the Division's criteria for safety.
- All requests for indoor and outdoor sport facility allocations will be evaluated in accordance with Council approved priorities.
- The recreation program registration process will meet Division criteria and guidelines for timeliness and good public relations.
SECTION 5  FACILITY REQUIREMENTS

5.1  OVERVIEW

Facility and park needs have been analyzed for the City as a whole and, where appropriate, for the six Service Areas in an effort to identify under-supplied and over-supplied communities (see Map 2-1).

The planning period of Future Directions is 2004 to 2031. As indicated earlier, demographic considerations suggest that need for additional parkland and facilities will be largely concentrated in the period of 2004 to 2011, while the 2011 to 2031 timeframe will require a greater emphasis on managing and adapting existing infrastructure.

To assist with implementation and in defining priorities, a timeframe for carrying out each recommendation has been suggested. These timeframes are described as follows:

- Short Term  2004 to 2011
- Medium Term  2012 to 2021
- Long Term  2022 to 2031

5.2  FACILITY TYPES

All park and facility types have been placed into a four-tier classification system (described below), and as developed through the City of Mississauga Outdoor Recreation Facility Study (March, 2004).

Group A - Scheduled Facilities: Organized use / City-wide Demand

Group A facilities serve large and generally well-organized markets with broad appeal. Population-based and/or market-driven provision standards are appropriate for most of these facilities.

- Arenas
- Ball Diamonds
- Cricket Pitches
- Football Fields
- Lacrosse Boxes
- Multi-Purpose Fields
- Soccer Fields
Group B – Major Facilities: Unstructured Use / City-wide Demand

Group B facilities serve large and unorganized markets where the decisions to provide the facility and the manner in which it is provided is community-specific and guided by major planning studies. Population-based provision standards are **not** appropriate for these facilities.

- Cemeteries
- Festival and Special Event Sites
- Golf Courses
- Multi-use Trails
- Public Gardens

Group C – Specialized Facilities: Organized Use / Community-Specific Market

Group C facilities serve specialized markets and loosely-organized community interests. Facilities are often the product of community development initiatives. Population-based provision standards are **not** appropriate for these facilities.

- Arts and Heritage Facilities
- Bocce Courts
- Day Camps
- Indoor Soccer Facilities
- Lawn Bowling Facilities
- Leash Free Zones
- Marinas
- Outdoor Track
- Sport Complex

Group D – Community Facilities: Unstructured Use / City Serving

Group D facilities serve local, unorganized markets with broad appeal. Population-based and/or market-driven provision standards are appropriate for most of these facilities.

- Active Living / Fitness Centres
- BMX Facilities
- Community Centres (Major & Minor)
- Gymnasiums
- Indoor Aquatics
- Multi-Purpose / Basketball Pads
- Outdoor Rinks
- Outdoor Swimming/Wading Pools
- Picnic Areas
- Playgrounds
- Older Adult Centres
- Skate Parks
- Spray Pads
- Tennis Courts
- Trick Bike Facilities
5.3 METHODOLOGY / PROVISION STANDARDS

The schematic shown below illustrates the relationship of the inputs and outputs in the determination of park and facility needs.

How Park and Facility Needs are Determined...

```
  Inventory of Supply
    - Demographics
    - Transportation Constraints
    - Travel Distance
    - Capacity

  - Market Research
  - Demographics
  - Leisure Trends

  Service Area Development

  Needs (How Many?)

  Recommendations

  Gaps (Where?)

  Provision Standard Development

  Public Consultation
```
For most Group A and D facilities, demand was assessed through the application of provision standards. Also referred to as level of service standards, provision standards represent a recommended measure of the demand for recreation areas and facilities in an area. They are targets for facility/park provision that are based upon a combination of accepted industry standards and targets employed by other comparable municipalities, market-driven factors (such as demand, trends, and demographics), and the past and present circumstances of the community.

Provision standards help to identify current and future park and facility requirements in terms of total demand, but do not provide direction on the geographic areas of need. It is important to remember that the recommended provision standards are objectives that the City and other providers in Mississauga should strive to achieve — although many of them may not be realized for a variety of reasons, the key is to continue to work toward meeting them.

Through a review of recent studies and additional research, provision standards for major facility types within the City of Mississauga have been established (see Tables 5-2 to 5-5). An estimated population of 664,547 (year 2003) has been used to calculate current provision levels. In many instances, the City's supply is well below the recommended standard, thereby indicating a need for additional facilities. In cases where its supply is above the standard, anticipated population growth may create the need to develop additional facilities in future years in order to maintain the standard.

Given the decreasing population of the more physically active 0-34 age groups, using a supply standard based on a ratio of the overall population as the only criteria is not entirely appropriate as a long-term strategy. It is strongly recommended that the City undertake a review of these standards on a regular basis to ensure that significant demographic shifts are accounted for. Where appropriate, it is also recommended that the City continue to employ provision standards based upon specific age cohorts (e.g., 10 to 19 for skateboarding, 55+ for older adult centres, etc.), rather than relying on per capita standards that include the entire population.
Table 5-2:  
Inventory & Standards for Group A Facilities (Organized Use/City-wide Demand)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility / Park Type</th>
<th>2004 Supply</th>
<th>2004 Provision Level</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arenas (# of ice pads)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1:26,583</td>
<td>1:29,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball Diamonds 3 (unlit)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1:4,077</td>
<td>1:5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball Diamonds 3 (lit)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1:221,516</td>
<td>1:135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket Pitches 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1:664,547</td>
<td>No standard recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Football Fields 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:332,274</td>
<td>No standard recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse Boxes 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:87,9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose Fields 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>monitor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Fields 3 (unlit)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1:339</td>
<td>1:2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Fields 3 (lit)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Provision standards are not appropriate for this group of facilities.

Table 5-3:  
Inventory of Group B Facilities  
(Unstructured Use / City-wide Demand)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility / Park Type</th>
<th>2004 Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Festival and Special Event Sites</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses (sites) 2 4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Trails (Class 1) (km) 3</td>
<td>87.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Gardens 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Provision standards are not appropriate for this group of facilities.

Table 5-4:  
Inventory of Group C Facilities  
(Organized Use / Community-specific Market)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility / Park Type</th>
<th>2004 Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts and Heritage Facilities 2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bocce Courts (indoor)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bocce Courts (outdoor) 3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day Camps</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Soccer Facilities</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Bowling Facilities 3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leash Free Zones 2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marinas 2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Track 2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Provision standards are not appropriate for this group of facilities.
### Table 5-5:
Inventory & Standards for Group D Facilities (Unstructured Use / City Serving)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility / Park Type</th>
<th>2004 Supply 1</th>
<th>2004 Provision Level</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Living / Fitness Centres 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1:94,935</td>
<td>No standard recommended 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMX Facilities 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:332,274</td>
<td>1:200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centres (Major) 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1:60,413</td>
<td>1:65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Centres (Minor) 2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1:73,838</td>
<td>No standard recommended 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gymnasiums 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1:110,757</td>
<td>No standard recommended 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Aquatics Centres 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1:60,413</td>
<td>1:65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose / Basketball Pads 3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1:13,291</td>
<td>1:10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Rinks 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1:221,516</td>
<td>No standard recommended 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Swimming Pools 2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>94,935</td>
<td>No standard recommended 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Wading Pools 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1:221,516</td>
<td>No standard recommended 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds 3</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1:2,690</td>
<td>No standard recommended 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adult Centres (dedicated) 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:332,274</td>
<td>No standard recommended 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Adult Centres (program location) 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1:60,413</td>
<td>1:65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Parks 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:664,547</td>
<td>1:100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray Pads 3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1:47,468</td>
<td>1:30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts (Public)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1:9,919</td>
<td>1:5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis Courts (Community Club) 3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1:9,919</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trick Bike</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1:200,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Note: Current Supply includes those facilities owned and/or operated by the City of Mississauga, as well as those facilities that are allocated by the City (e.g., select playing fields owned by the Peel Public School Board, etc.); current supply also includes those facilities that are under construction or in planning/design stages.
2. Source: City of Mississauga staff.
4. Note: Britannia Hills Golf Course is currently under redevelopment and is scheduled to re-open in 2005.
5. Note: No standard is applicable due either to requirements relating to geographic distribution or additional facilities are not proposed.

Identifying the total number of each facility type required in the City of Mississauga as a whole and by Service Area through the use of provision standards is only the first step in analyzing facility needs. The distribution of facilities and parkland is equally important, as it is essential that the facilities be located close to the people who use them.
In order to assess the distribution of current and proposed/future facilities, service (catchment) areas were developed for major facilities and parks. The radius of each service area was established through an analysis that considered:

- the capacity of each facility type;
- the population-based standards;
- reasonable distances for walking, cycling, and driving;
- existing and future population densities; and
- the existence of major physical barriers that would disrupt accessibility (e.g., major highways, river crossings, etc.).

Once the service areas were established, the location of existing facilities and parks and their respective service areas were examined to allow for the identification of areas that are under-serviced (gaps).

Each "gap" area was then analyzed to determine if and when it will warrant the development of a new facility or the expansion of an existing facility. By comparing the number of "gap" areas (distribution) to the number of facilities required (provision), recommendations regarding the level and timing of facility development were formulated.
5.4 GROUP A: SCHEDULED FACILITIES

5.4.1 Arenas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility / Park Type</th>
<th>2004 Supply</th>
<th>2004 Provision Level</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
<th>Recommended number of pads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arenas (# of ice pads)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1:26,583</td>
<td>1:29,000</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City’s primary market for the provision of ice time is children and youth and the needs of this group will continue to be a primary responsibility for the City. Declining population in the under 55 age group will result in decreased demand for arena facilities to the point that, by the year 2016, the City's current arena supply will be sufficient. In order to satisfy unmet demand between now and 2016, the City’s Arena Provision Strategy Update (2004) proposes that the City attempt to facilitate acquisition of ice time from neighbouring municipalities or private enterprise.

Changing demographics, coupled with the affluence associated with the sport of hockey, are two factors that the City should consider should they decide to build a multi-pad arena. If this is the preferred alternative, the facility should be adult oriented, priced for cost recovery/profit and result in the conversion of selected/abandoned single pad facilities to be converted to other functions (indoor soccer, gymnasiums, etc).
**Arena Recommendations**

In order to meet the current and future ice time requirements of arena user groups for ice time, the City should investigate facilitating the acquisition of blocks of ice in arenas located in adjacent municipalities or from private sector operators. The ice time would be included in the City's inventory and allotted to user groups utilizing the allocation policy.

If the preceding recommendation is either not possible or if insufficient ice time is available for purchase, then the City should reassess the provision standards and undertake a development strategy. If ice demands are reduced with the aging population the long-term objective should be to eliminate one or more single-pad arena facilities or convert them to an alternate use.

In undertaking this development strategy:

- The City should perform a life cycle study of its single pad arenas to determine the threshold that would dictate decisions not to renovate or improve the facility when it would be more financially prudent to convert the arena to another use.
- Based on the life cycle study findings and the research conducted for the Arena Provision Strategy including an analysis of recent experiences in other jurisdictions as well as the quality expectations of Mississauga user groups, it is recommended that the City only pursue facilities designed for efficient full-season operations. This would preclude considerations of facilities that are of an interim or temporary nature.
5.4.2 Ball Diamonds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility / Park Type</th>
<th>2004 Supply</th>
<th>2004 Provision Level</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
<th>Recommended # of Diamonds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ball Diamonds (unlit)</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1:4,077</td>
<td>1:5,000</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball Diamonds (lit)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participation in baseball and softball is in decline. This trend is most evident at the youth level, a factor that may create a ripple effect upon adult ball participation over the next twenty years as the youth of today age. All of the younger age groups are expected to decrease in total population after peaking in 2006; in fact the 0 to 9 age group has already begun to decline.

In terms of supply, there are currently 163 ball diamonds scheduled by the City, 27 of which are owned by the Peel Public School Board but maintained by the City for public use. With each lit softball diamond being considered to be equivalent to two unlit diamonds, there are a total of 192 diamonds. There is a current oversupply of 65 diamonds and a projected long-term (2031) oversupply of 46 diamonds. It is recommended that the City not proceed with the development of any additional ball diamonds in the short-term and that the excess supply of 46 diamonds be decommissioned to allow for the land to be used for alternative uses. In an effort to serve the adult ball market, the City should focus on decommissioning lower quality, under-utilized diamonds and only build or upgrade new diamonds in growth areas with severe shortages. It is also recommend that efforts be made to eliminate any poor quality school fields from the permitting system and that improvements such as the installation of lighting or the transformation of existing hardball diamonds for softball use be considered in under-serviced areas.
When considering which diamonds should be decommissioned the following criteria should be considered during the decision making process:

1. Is the diamond being programmed or used?
2. Is the site suitable for conversion to soccer fields especially in areas currently under served with soccer fields?
3. If the site is a school site, is the City already maintaining other fields at this location and, therefore, are maintenance crews already attending at the site?
4. Would keeping a school site allow the City to utilize parkland more extensively for soccer or other field sports?
5. What is the input of community groups and affiliated users?
6. Have there been conflicts or problems with the site in the past?
7. Are there other planning matters to be considered such as opportunity driven redevelopment?
8. If school diamonds are to remain and be maintained by the City, agreements with the school boards need to be in place.

School diamonds should be utilized to the greatest extent possible and feasible. By continuing to use the best available school diamonds, the City will be better positioned to provide neighbourhood-level ball opportunities and to utilize excess municipal diamonds for other, more pressing uses.
### Ball Diamond Recommendations

Except for one diamond in Churchill Meadows, no new diamonds should be developed.

The extent of surplus capacity (and the feasibility of surplus diamonds in Service Areas 1 and 2 meeting future facility needs) should be determined in consultation with users to: establish the potential for these diamonds to meet requirements in terms of programming, design and travel for children, youth and adults.

After verifying the extent of under-utilized ball diamonds and determining how many facilities may be deemed surplus, the City should conduct a study to assess the potential and suitability of these diamonds for conversion to soccer fields, multi-purpose fields or open space.

At a provision level of 1:5,000, facility requirements to the year 2031 will total 146 diamonds, suggesting long-term potential for up to 46 diamonds to be redeveloped to meet needs for other outdoor recreation facilities.

Improvements (such as the transformation of existing hardball diamonds for softball use) should be considered in Service Area 1.

The City should negotiate agreements with the local School Boards in order to use the best available school diamonds (most of which are at secondary schools and within the separate school system). This will better position the City to provide neighbourhood-level ball opportunities and to utilize excess municipal diamonds for other, more pressing uses (e.g., soccer, cricket, etc.).

For each softball diamond that the City lights, one unlit diamond in an over-supplied area should be eliminated from the inventory.

The City should implement a mechanism to accurately measure and monitor the actual use of ball diamonds. The results of monitoring should be used to revise the recommended provision standard, as warranted, and to identify potential surplus capacity.
5.4.3 Cricket Pitches

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility / Park Type</th>
<th>2004 Supply</th>
<th>2004 Provision Level</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
<th>Recommended number of pitches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cricket Pitches</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1:221,516</td>
<td>1:135,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City currently has three cricket pitches to serve a membership that has grown considerably at both the youth and adult levels in recent years. There is considerable unmet demand for cricket facilities.

While cricket is attracting more child and youth participants, it is likely that much of the additional cricket pitch demand can be attributed to the needs of adults.

Up to 2 additional cricket pitches can be justified over the short-term, and only when sufficient youth demand and/or financial support from adults have been realized. The acquisition of sufficient land should be identified first before such opportunities are lost to development. Cricket participation rates and usage levels at the new Iceland field should be monitored in order to adjust the recommended provision standard over time.

In the City of Mississauga Recreation Facility Outdoor Study (March 2004), upwards of 9 cricket pitches were considered necessary to meet current and projected demands. The development of 9 pitches would mean a provision standard of 1 pitch per 65,000 people. The Future Directions Plan is recommending two additional pitches for a total of 5 pitches and that the City carefully monitor the usage patterns, scheduling and permitting issues and the growth in youth participation. If additional pitches are warranted, the recommended standard of 1:135,000 would be adjusted to accurately reflect need.
# Cricket Pitch Recommendations

The City shall develop a reasonable, achievable, and gradual implementation plan to phase in the development of the recommended cricket pitches over the course of the planning period, including implementing the two planned facilities as soon as possible. 2 additional pitches (for a total of 5) are recommended over the short-term. Local cricket clubs should be consulted regarding potential locations for the new pitches.

As with other adult or competition oriented recreational programs, the local cricket clubs and tournament organizers should be encouraged to partner in the finance of a portion of costs when construction of new cricket facilities are for adult or competition level play.

Usage levels of new and existing cricket pitches should be reviewed in five years, at which time the cricket pitch provision standard should be adjusted (if necessary).

Depending on usage and youth participation the provision level may be increased from 1:135,000 to 1:65,000, making facility requirements to the year 2031 for a total 9 additional pitches.

The City should implement mechanisms to accurately measure and monitor actual use on all pitches and other fields used for cricket. The results of monitoring should be used to revise the recommended provision standard, as warranted.
### 5.4.4 Football Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility / Park Type</th>
<th>2004 Supply</th>
<th>2004 Provision Level</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Football Fields</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1:664,547</td>
<td>No standard recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City owns one football field and allocates a number of Peel District Secondary School fields. The aging demographic profile of the City suggests no additional dedicated football fields are required. The City’s strategy of developing multi-use and artificial turf fields will sufficiently address future football activities.

**Football Field Recommendations**

- No additional football-only fields are required based on current registration data and trends.
- That the City continue to work with the School Boards to maximize the community’s access to football fields on school property, especially at schools with higher quality fields.
- The City, when developing artificial turf and/or multi-purpose fields, should have regard to the field requirements of football.

### 5.4.5 Lacrosse Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility / Park Type</th>
<th>2004 Supply</th>
<th>2004 Provision Level</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lacrosse Boxes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1:332,274</td>
<td>No standard recommended</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two outdoor lacrosse boxes in Mississauga, both of which are not currently operating at capacity. All arenas are capable of being used for lacrosse. No new lacrosse boxes are required. In terms of field lacrosse, future demand for this sport can be addressed through the development of multi-purpose fields.

**Lacrosse Box Recommendations**

- No additional lacrosse boxes are required.
5.4.6 Multi-Purpose Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility / Park Type</th>
<th>2004 Supply</th>
<th>2004 Provision Level</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
<th>Recommended number of fields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Purpose Fields</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>* (monitor)</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multi-purpose fields are capable of accommodating any field sport requiring a large flat turf surface, such as football, rugby, field hockey, field lacrosse, ultimate frisbee, and soccer. Many of these field sports are growing in popularity and soccer activities prevent many of these sports from being accommodated in soccer fields.

There are currently no designated multi-purpose fields in the City, although the two artificial “soccer fields” at Iceland may be permitted for sports other than soccer (field lacrosse and field hockey). While previous studies did not identify sufficient demand to support additional development of dedicated football, lacrosse or rugby fields, when these and other playing field needs are viewed collectively, sufficient demand exists for the development of shared multi-use fields.

As this field type has yet to be monitored as to actual demand, it is recommended that no provision level be introduced until it can be justified. School fields are currently accommodating the needs of many of these field sports (with the exception of baseball/softball and soccer).
*Note: The actual total number of multi-purpose fields (grass, artificial and/or composite turf) that will be required by the year 2031 is not clear until a monitoring system is in place to accurately assess need and usage patterns. We suggest that the development of such fields be gradually phased in over time, an approach that would allow the City to adjust the service level (if necessary) to better reflect the demand for this facility type, which is currently untested in the City. The provision level will also be influenced by the ability to decommission underutilized baseball diamonds and the determination of whether or not the diamonds can be redeveloped as multi-purpose fields.

### Multi-Purpose Field Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No multi-purpose fields are recommended until justification has be presented, however, sufficient land base should be identified for future field allocations and field rotation assuming 1 field per 135,000 population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The phasing of field development should be driven by the verification of demand among potential user groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usage levels of new multi-purpose fields to be reviewed in five years, at which time the multi-purpose field provision standard should be adjusted (if necessary).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City should provide multi-purpose fields as opportunity presents itself through the decommissioning of ball diamonds in order to provide space for those sports that represent smaller components of demand for fields (i.e., football, field hockey, field lacrosse, etc.), for rapidly growing field sports such as ultimate disc/disc football, and to capture current un-permitted activity in park spaces, as appropriate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.4.7 Soccer Fields

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility / Park Type</th>
<th>2004 Supply</th>
<th>2004 Provision Level</th>
<th>Recommended Standard</th>
<th>Recommended Number of fields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Fields (unlit)</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>1:3,339</td>
<td>1:2,800</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer Fields (lit)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1:3,339</td>
<td>1:2,800</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Soccer has been the most popular youth team sport in Mississauga since the last Future Directions Plan and has continued to grow since that time. Children and youth remain the dominant participants in soccer. Participation amongst adult populations is expected to increase over the course of the planning period as the number of children and youth decline (post-2006) and more fields become available for other users. Furthermore, Mississauga is home to many cultures that are known to have higher soccer participation rates, a fact that makes soccer even more popular at the local level. Increased demand for mini-soccer and adult soccer are anticipated in the coming years.

There are 199 scheduled soccer pitches in Mississauga, 181 of which are owned by the City. With each lit field being considered to be equivalent to two unlit fields, and the two new artificial turf fields at Iceland considered to each being equivalent to three unlit fields, there are a total of 214 fields. Many fields are overused and waiting lists are commonplace. Furthermore, inequalities exist in terms of geographic distribution, with Service Areas 2 and 5 having the lowest proportion of pitches per capita.

By applying a provision standard of 1 soccer field per 2,800 people, a long-term need for 262 total fields is identified. The City needs 24 additional fields now and 24 additional fields by the year 2031. Given the immediate need for fields, the City should continue to use school soccer fields over the short-term and review this strategy at regular intervals.

With the number of current deficiencies, a range of solutions must be considered. To assist in providing additional field time as soon as possible, we recommend that the City identify potential candidate sites for the installation of artificial/composite turf, which would allow for more intense use of the current field supply without impairing field quality. Secondly, installing lighting on existing fields (where appropriate) will help to extend the hours of use. The redevelopment of surplus baseball diamonds also presents a viable solution, especially in the City’s older neighbourhoods where soccer deficiencies are more prevalent. New pitch
development in existing and new parks must also continue to be a priority; where possible, it is recommended that fields be clustered to allow for tournaments and economies of scale. The cost benefit of land versus lighting and artificial turf must be carefully examined. Finally, in the short-term, the City should consider increasing the number of school fields that it allocates, especially at schools with higher quality fields (e.g., high school and separate school sites).

**Soccer Field Recommendations**

The City should implement mechanisms to accurately measure and monitor use on soccer fields, including new outdoor artificial fields and proposed indoor fields when built. The results of monitoring should be used to revise the recommended provision standard, as warranted.

The City should consult with users to establish field needs in terms of programming, design, and distribution in relation to travel considerations for child and youth players.

The City should confirm the feasibility of lighting and upgrading existing soccer fields for adult and older youth play, both for soccer and as multi-use facilities, as appropriate. If feasible, these fields should be lit as an alternative to acquiring new parkland for unlit fields.

The City should negotiate agreements with both School Boards to maximize the community's access to outdoor recreation facilities (soccer fields) on school properties, especially at schools with higher quality fields (e.g., high school and separate school sites).

The City should consider lit artificial turf fields to be equivalent to three natural grass unlit fields. Field allocation/scheduling practices should be adjusted to reflect this.

The City should plan to provide a minimum of 6 additional artificial fields over the next ten years, with actual provision levels to be confirmed based on the experience with the two new fields at Iceland. Decisions regarding the installation of full or composite artificial turf fields should be based on cost-benefit analyses of various options in relation to users' needs and preferences and intended field uses.

At a provision level of 1:2,800, facility requirements to the year 2031 will total 48 additional fields, of which 24 are required now, and 24 will be needed to meet the needs of population growth. (Note: each natural turf lit field equals 2 natural turf unlit fields and each artificial turf lit field equals 3 natural turf unlit fields.)

Fields to accommodate young adults should be the focus of future development.
5.5  GROUP B: MAJOR FACILITIES

5.5.1  Cemeteries

Cemeteries provide venues for leisurely walks and are valuable components of the City’s open space and trail system. Furthermore, given the significant aging of the community and the fact that all cemeteries will eventually become the responsibility of the City, it is recommended that the City investigate the feasibility of the establishment of an additional cemetery. An active cemetery can be a revenue generating facility to assist in providing the funds needed to maintain the existing and future cemeteries for which the City will be responsible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemetery Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigate the feasibility of the establishment of an additional cemetery in the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.5.2  Festival and Special Event Sites

Festivals and special events provide a valuable contribution to the quality of life in Mississauga. Because there are no designated special event sites in the City, many outdoor events held in local parks often place a great deal of pressure on existing infrastructure and displace other activities. With demographic and leisure trend data indicating that demand is increasing for special events, particularly those that engage various ethnic communities, it is recommended that the City investigate developing a number of community-based outdoor festival sites, including locations along the waterfront and within future "urban" parks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Festival and Special Event Site Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Investigate the feasibility of establishing lands for a community level festival site (e.g., Hershey Centre).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City should pursue recommendations in previous studies to accommodate community serving festivals and events in the Mississauga parks system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued…)
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Festival and Special Event Site Recommendations

Space within one or more existing parks along the waterfront should be developed to accommodate open-air theatrical and music events, with an emphasis on sites in Service Area 6.

When developing urban parks/plaza, the City should consider appropriately designed open air spaces capable of accommodating portable stages and other event based facilities.

5.5.3 Golf Courses

The City has a stake in two golf courses, one of which (Britannia Hills Golf Course) is currently undergoing redevelopment and expansion. Residents are generally pleased with the level of municipal involvement in golf facilities and it is recommended that the City maintain its current level of service. As the population ages, however, there are strong indications that the demand for public facilities will continue to increase. Should sufficient future demand for a municipal course become apparent, municipal investment should be predicated upon a favourable business plan that incorporates both capital and operating cost recovery scenarios. Revenues from future golf facilities (if developed) should assist in offsetting the costs of other recreational programming.

Golf Course Recommendations

Until policy regarding the City’s role in the provision of golf courses is in place, the municipality should not expand its provision of facilities.

If additional golf facilities (courses and driving ranges) are to be developed, they should be within a “profit generation” model to assist in offsetting other recreational programming costs. The need for additional golf facilities should be substantiated by a business plan that incorporates both capital and operating cost recovery scenarios.
5.5.4 Multi-Use Trails

Leisure trends suggest an increasing demand for "un-programmed" active living recreational opportunities that are more compatible with the lifestyles of the aging population. The use of trails is unorganized and spontaneous and thus more attractive for busy individuals whose leisure time is at a premium and often unplanned. Trails appeal to people of all ages and abilities because of their flexibility, low cost, and accessibility. Skill is not a factor – the same trail is equally attractive to people with varying levels of fitness and expertise.

In addition to the obvious recreational advantages, trail development in urban communities provides numerous positive benefits for local residents, including an increase in community liveability, additional transportation options, opportunities for improved personal health and fitness, tourism development, scenic beautification, and improved air and water quality.

Walking is the second most popular leisure activity amongst Mississauga residents (behind reading). As age increases, so too does the propensity to identify walking as a favourite leisure time activity, indicating that demand for multi-use trails will increase in response to the aging demographic profile.

The current Multi-use Recreational Trail system is comprised of three classes: off-road trails (Class I), bicycle lanes (Class II), and sign routes (Class III). There are currently 157 kilometres (98 miles) of trails, including 88 km (55 miles) of Class I, and 69 km (43 miles) of Class II and III lanes and road routes. In addition, there are approximately 117 km (73 miles) of park pathways (8’ (2.4 m)) within existing parks. Implementation and timing of trail development is dependent on a number of variables, including the ability to combine development with other infrastructure projects.

The 2001 Mississauga Multi-use Recreational Trail Study has served as the master plan document for trail planning and implementation. The conclusions of this Study still remain relevant, however, it is recommended that a five-year review be undertaken to update the implementation section, validate route recommendations and investigate additional long term opportunities for Class I pathway installations in greenbelts or boulevards. Recreational trail development should concentrate on completion of the significant major Class I multi-use Class I trails and park pathways through “green” corridors and park systems.
Multi-Use Trails: Short Term Priorities (2004 - 2011)

1) Goal: To complete the “Regional” Trail systems as identified in the 2001 Multi-use Trail Master Plan by 2011. These are for the most part Class I trails and park pathways that take advantage of the largest inventory of the City’s main “green” river valley and parkway resources. The majority of surveyed users have expressed their desire to walk, cycle or rollerblade in park settings. Initiatives in this group (in order of priority) would include:
   - Completion of the Culham Trail
   - Completion of the Etobicoke Creek Trail
   - Completion of the Burnhamthorpe Trail
   - Completion of the Queensway Trail

2) Goal: To complete significant local Class I pathways in “green” river valleys and boulevards at the community level and, where possible, to connect them to the Regional trail system and other local trail systems. Though many of the local shorter trails were anticipated in the longer term in the 2001 plan, given the expressed desire for walking opportunities in parks, completion of key routes (especially in under serviced areas such as Service Area 3) should be made a priority in conjunction with the larger “Regional” routes noted. Examples of initiatives in this group in order of priority would include:
   - Completion of the Malton Greenway Trail from Brandon Gate to Airport Road

3) Goal: To maximize opportunities in appropriate parks for internal pathway systems that provide more opportunity for leisure walking, including looped pathway systems, rest or congregating areas and other supporting amenities. Implementation would be through new park development plans, park redevelopment and pathway reconstruction opportunities in existing parks.
4) Goal: To work with Transportation and Works and the Ministry of Transportation to ensure that they preserve connections across major barriers such as the 400 series highways as redevelopment opportunities arise. The following are anticipated to arise during the 2004-2011 window:

- Highway 10/QEW Interchange
- MacLaughlin Road/401 Flyover
- Ridgeway Drive/403 Flyover
- Creditview Road/401 Flyover
- Confederation Parkway/403 Flyover
- Second Line Bridge/401 Flyover

Multi-Use Trails: Medium Term Initiatives (2012-2021)

1) Goal: To continue to complete local Class I trails and park pathways in “green” river valleys and boulevards, where possible, connecting to other local systems and the Regional trail.

2) Goal: To preserve connections across major barriers such as the 400 series highways as redevelopment opportunities arise.

Multi-Use Trails: Long Term Initiatives (2022+)

1) Goal: To complete extensions or new Class I trails and park pathway segments in areas where the City has not in the current plans identified routings being feasible due to current property availability or other restrictions. Appendix 4 of the 2001 study captures a list of long range suggestions that would greatly enhance the network. Examples that could be considered include:

- Establishment of additional trail connections across all major highways.
- Establishment of additional bridge crossings of the Credit River south of Dundas St.
- Re-routing of sections of the Waterfront Trail closer to the Lake.
- Extension of the Culham Trail to Port Credit.
- Extension of existing systems along creeks through areas currently under private ownership.
### Multi-Use Trail System Recommendations

A five-year review of the Mississauga Multi-use Recreational Trail Study (2001) should be undertaken to validate route recommendations and investigate additional long term opportunities for Class I trails and park pathway installations in greenbelts or boulevards.

The priority should be given to multi-use, off-road trails which are either Class I (over 3-metres wide, usually paved) or Park Pathways (under 3-metres wide through parks). The others, bike lanes (Class II) and sign routes (Class III) are not multi-use as they are on-road for bicycles only. For recreation, the latter should be used only to provide linkage.

The City should continue to implement the multi-use trails system to meet anticipated growing demand for all trail-based activities.

Needs and interests within the trail component of the City’s outdoor recreation system should be regularly reviewed to help establish priorities for development.

An increasing emphasis on trail development is supported by trends and community interest, and higher priority should be assigned to recreational trail development.

The short, medium and long term trail priorities are identified and described in the preceding text.

The City should explore and develop programs that are complementary to the development of a comprehensive linking multi-use trail system, including the installation of bicycle racks at major parks, community centres, and on buses, as well as trail promotion initiatives (e.g., maps and signage).
5.5.5 Public Gardens

The City is currently developing the first phase of its Garden Park along the Credit River. Given the community’s strong support for parkland and trails, the interest in gardening in the over 55 age group, the strong interest in a greener City, as well as the associated tourism benefits, full implementation of the Garden Park project over the next few years is recommended. Priority should also be placed on completing the Culham Trail, which runs alongside the Public Gardens site, and improving its connectivity to other trail systems.

Public Garden Recommendations

Finalization and implementation of the public garden project.
5.6 GROUP C: SPECIALIZED FACILITIES

5.6.1 Arts and Heritage Facilities

Arts and heritage facilities and opportunities are necessary for Mississauga's development as a mature and diverse community. The City is fortunate to have a number of excellent arts and heritage facilities and sites, although there are a number of heritage structures with the potential for bigger and better uses. Specialized and multi-purpose spaces in community centres also assist the City in providing community-based arts and heritage programming for all ages.

The directions contained in the City's Arts and Heritage Community Plan are appropriate, including the recommendation to optimize the use of all types of existing arts and heritage venues. While the aging of the population may create increased demand for activities such as arts/crafts programs and theatrical events, existing facilities are anticipated to be sufficient to accommodate demand. Future initiatives, especially those that are tourism-oriented, may, however, precipitate the need for additional or redeveloped arts and heritage facilities.

### Arts and Heritage Facility Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive re-use plans should be established for all City-owned heritage properties to increase their productivity and increase their financial viability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalize the Arts and Heritage Community Plan (2003).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to provide opportunities for the arts through multi-purpose spaces at community centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain and enhance existing heritage facilities and programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No additional arts facilities are required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No additional museum facilities are required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6.2 Bocce Courts

The sport of bocce is predominantly played by a relatively small percentage of older adults. There are currently 17 municipal outdoor bocce courts and no indoor bocce facilities. Given the small segment of the population that participates in this adult-oriented sport, no additional outdoor courts are required and it is not recommended that the City be a direct provider of indoor bocce courts.

Should there be sufficient community interest for an indoor facility, the City may assist local organizations in finding suitable accommodation through community development channels. The City, however, should not be required to incur any capital or operating costs until such time that it can be proven that there is adequate demand for the long-term provision and financial sustainability of the facility. In the event that an indoor bocce facility is developed within an existing municipal facility that has the potential to be redeveloped into a higher-need use (e.g., gymnasiums), provisions should be made to ensure that an appropriate alternate location is secured for the higher-need facility elsewhere in the City.

**Bocce Court Recommendations**

The City should, as an interim measure, assist the Mississauga Indoor Bocce Club in developing a facility on private land or in an existing structure in an arrangement where the group(s) would be responsible for the initial set-up and maintenance while the City would hold the lease.

The provision of a permanent facility would hinge on the demand and success demonstrated by the interim facility developed in partnership with the Mississauga Indoor Bocce Club in conformity with the partnership criteria of the Future Directions Plan.

The City should not provide additional outdoor bocce courts.

Potential future need for outdoor facilities should be determined through City-initiated community development activities and the impact that possible facilities may have on demand.
5.6.3 Day Camps

The City operates an outdoor day camp at Park Totoredaca that has provided a valuable service to hundreds of children every year. Recently participation levels have been dropping and, with increasing concerns about smog days and West Nile Virus, there is an increasing emphasis on indoor day camp programs. Due to reduced interest in the camp and environmental concerns, consideration should be given to eliminating this service and placing a greater emphasis on community-based day camps at community centres due to their increased popularity.

**Day Camp Recommendations**

Attendance at the day camp should be monitored and the facility should be considered for closure should enrolment decline below reasonable levels. The City should look at alternative ways to provide this service.
5.6.4 Indoor Soccer Facilities

As soccer participation increases, indoor soccer facilities are becoming more commonplace in Canada. Although there are no municipal indoor soccer facilities at present (the City offers indoor soccer programs through municipal and school gymnasiums), the proposed Community Sports Complex is proposed to contain three indoor fields.

Participation data and public input suggests that a lack of indoor facilities is likely limiting growth in this sport and experiences in other municipalities indicate that large indoor turf facilities are in moderate to high demand.

**Indoor Soccer Facility Recommendations**

- Continue with plans to develop 3 indoor soccer fields at the Community Sports Complex in the short-term.
- An additional 3 indoor soccer fields are required. Develop a feasibility study for the operation of an indoor facility in the North West of Mississauga.

5.6.5 Lawn Bowling Facilities

Although the older adult population is expected to increase dramatically during the coming years, there are no statistics to indicate that lawn bowling is a growth sport. No additional facilities are recommended at this time, however, participation rates should be closely monitored to see if the aging population translates into increased demand for the sport.

**Lawn Bowling Facility Recommendations**

- The City should not provide additional lawn bowling facilities at this time.
- Potential future need for facilities should be determined through City-initiated community development activities and careful monitoring.
5.6.6 Leash Free Zones

Mississauga is a leader in terms of designated leash free zone provision, with a key aspect in their success being the involvement of community groups in the establishment, financing, maintenance and ongoing management of the zones. New leash free zones may be required in Mississauga as usage at existing sites increases. A provision standard has not been established for leash free zones as they are best established by way of opportunity and should be developed only when an affiliated organization is willing to take responsibility for their operation.

Leash Free Zone Recommendations

The City should continue to provide leash free zones in association with Leash Free Mississauga, and monitor demand to determine an appropriate number and distribution of facilities.

5.6.7 Marinas

The City of Mississauga currently owns and operates two marina facilities (Lake Front Promenade Marina and Credit Village Marina). There are a number of private businesses and clubs that offer similar marina facilities and it is recommended that the City maintain its current level of provision.

Marina Facility Recommendations

The City should continue to supply 2 marina facilities.
5.6.8 Outdoor Track

The City's only running track, developed in partnership with the School Board, is considered to be substandard by many local organizations. Demand exists for a higher quality facility suitable for community-level training and competition (e.g., all-weather, rubberized surface).

The City should investigate partnership options for the development of an outdoor track facility; however, the need for new track facilities should be justified based on sufficient demand at the community-level. New facilities for provincial or national level competitions should only be provided where they are essential to achieving the City’s tourism or economic development objectives. Should a new track be developed, the City should terminate its involvement with the Woodlands School track and develop a strong partnership agreement for the new track.

**Outdoor Track Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The City should investigate opportunities to provide the new rubberized, all-weather track in partnership with other authorities, such as School Boards.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City should provide one outdoor track appropriate for community training and competitions in conjunction with local School Boards, provided potential users can guarantee sufficient use to warrant provision and that the partnership criteria of this Plan can be met.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.6.9  Sports Complex

The City has plans to construct a sports complex containing 1.5 gymnasiums, three indoor sports fields, a gymnastics centre, and two outdoor lit artificial turf soccer fields by 2007. The need for each of these facilities is considerable and has been justified by past studies. The viability of developing the complex in partnership with the Healthy City Alliance and designating the site as a major festival venue should also be considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sports Complex Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a community sports complex consisting of indoor sports fields, multi-use gymnasiums, a gymnastics facility, and outdoor soccer facility at the Hershey Centre site. Where appropriate, pursue partnerships for the development and/or operation of the centre and its components.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.7 GROUP D: COMMUNITY FACILITIES

5.7.1 Active Living / Fitness Centres

There are 7 municipal fitness centres in the City. As long as the centres remain successful, the City should continue to run the fitness centres for a period of another ten years. Over the long-term, however, the rapid aging of the population suggests that the City should shift its focus to a more inclusive active living concept that recognizes the health benefits of a physically active lifestyle. A focus on active living would also help to create a niche for the City in the fitness market. Due to the capital investment involved with the fitness centres, enrolment needs to be carefully monitored to determine the best exit plan for any phasing out of the fitness business.

Until the active living concept is fully adopted by the City, it would not be appropriate to develop any additional facilities. Given the amount of multi-purpose space in existing community centres, it is anticipated that additional dedicated space for active living activities will not be required; however, the City should continue to reassess and further develop the active living concept.
Active Living Centre Recommendations

Once the redevelopment of the community centres has been completed, the Civic Centre facility will orient to the area’s needs for hours of operation.

For the next ten years (approximately), the City should continue to operate the seven existing fitness centres.

All community centres will increase programming, over time, to a more participatory active living format based upon utilization, demographics and market needs.

Over time, the number of court, weight and cardiovascular training facilities will be concentrated at fewer locations.

The City will shift focus, over time, to a more inclusive active living concept.

No additional fitness centres are required but the City should continue to monitor usage.
5.7.2 BMX Facilities

BMX, trick biking, hard track racing, and skateboarding are rapidly becoming established sports that are popular among youth and young adults. Public input has indicated a need to create more unorganized and spontaneous leisure opportunities for youth and BMX bike facilities partially address this need.

The development of a BMX bike park for dirt surface biking activities is an appropriate service for the municipality to provide. As facilities of this type are relatively untested in the City, only one additional BMX bike facility is recommended at this time. The feasibility of developing a site that would accommodate a BMX bike facility, a trick bike facility and a skateboarding facility all on the one site should be explored. The recommended BMX facility should be designed in consultation with youth/user groups.

**BMX Facility Recommendations**

- Develop a BMX bike park with a preference given to locating the facility in Service Area 1 or 2.
- The feasibility of developing a park site capable of accommodating the recommended BMX bike facility, as well as a trick bike facility and a skateboarding facility, should be explored.
5.7.3 Community Centres

The City of Mississauga provides 11 major community centres, each of which are staffed full-time and generally include multiple programmable spaces such as a gymnasium, indoor aquatic facility, fitness centre, multi-purpose rooms, branch library, etc. Given the excellent geographic distribution of major community centres in the City (see Map 5-1) and the range of activities available at each location, a provision standard of 1 major community centre for 65,000 people is appropriate. Based on this standard no new major community centres are required.

Minor community centres, also referred to as community halls, are not staffed on a full-time basis and are typically smaller in size and offer fewer amenities than most major community centres. The City currently owns and/or operates 8 minor community centres. The application of a provision standard is not appropriate for minor community centres because these facilities are typically created largely as a result of opportunity or community-specific need and support.

As a case-in-point, public input for this Plan noted demand for community centre space in the Churchill Meadows / Lisgar area of the City. With population forecasts indicating that this area will account for 42% of Mississauga's growth between 2001 and 2031, additional recreation facilities will be required in this community. Furthermore, the City's Future Directions for Library Services has recommended that a branch library be constructed in the Churchill Meadows area; this has created an excellent opportunity to provide community recreation space (e.g., gymnasium, multi-purpose rooms) in association with other civic facilities. It is recommended a strong recreational presence be established in Churchill Meadows through the development of a minor community centre in the short term. If the community centre/library is to be developed in conjunction with a local school, firm agreements regarding the use of facilities and guaranteed access to facilities must form part of any partnership.
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Public input and trend research indicates a strong preference for newer, more modern community centres over older facilities. This has created disparity in usage amongst the City's community centres in the past. With this in mind, there is a need to develop a “life cycle” standard that will dictate when a facility should be renovated or replaced. Older facilities (e.g., minor community centres) should be assessed to determine whether they should be disposed of, used for alternate uses, or upgraded through the addition of flexible multi-purpose space to meet the changing needs of the community (e.g., teen centres). Furthermore, where minor community centres such as Brookmede, Clarke Memorial Hall, or Lion’s Hall overlap with each other or with major community centres, their function should be reassessed when major capital improvements are required.

Recent and ongoing improvements at existing municipal facilities, however, will increase the size and flexibility of existing community centres considerably. In fact, once the latest redevelopment phase is completed, all of the City's major community centres will have been built or significantly upgraded since the early 1990s. The only exception to this is the Meadowvale Community Centre, which is an aging facility located within a service area that is anticipated to witness significant population growth over the coming years. Along with this growth is the need for additional gymnasium space and/or teen space, as well as an opportunity to relocate the local branch library to the community centre site. Given the limited amount of land available for expansion, a review of the Meadowvale Community Centre site needs to be conducted to determine the limitations of expanding this facility.

Lastly, the household survey revealed that residents were most likely to identify “teen centres” as an area where the City should expend more resources. While teen activities are scheduled within all major community centres, there are no dedicated municipal teen centres in the City. A strategy for addressing the needs of teens should be developed in partnership with local groups/agencies and in consultation with teens. Assessing the need for teen-oriented space and activities should be a requirement in the development, expansion and/or renovation of every community centre.
Community Centre Recommendations

A strategy for addressing the needs of teens should be developed by the City in partnership with the Library, the Neighbourhood Watch Youth Outreach Program, the School Boards, and the Region of Peel. The “Youth Strategy” should identify issues related to the recreational and social support needs of Mississauga teens and how these needs can be addressed through City programs, facilities and services.

Recreation and Parks should co-ordinate with the Library Board and local community groups to establish a strong recreational presence in the area through the development of a minor community centre and library in Churchill Meadows prior to 2011. If the facility is developed in conjunction with the School Board, firm agreements regarding the use of, and guaranteed access to, facilities must form part of the partnership.

The Future Directions for Library Services has identified the need to develop Meadowvale Library. In addition, gymnasium space and/or teen space has also been noted as a possibility at this site. Prior to any redevelopment/expansion of Meadowvale Community Centre for library or other recreational uses, a site review should be conducted to determine the limitations, if any, to adding to this centre.

The City should continue to undertake life cycle assessments of its community centres in order to identify and budget for the next wave of community centre redevelopment.

No new major community centres are required.

Minor community centres with service areas overlapping other community centres should be evaluated to determine whether they should be disposed of, used for alternate uses, or upgraded through the addition of flexible multi-purpose space to meet the changing needs of the community (e.g., teen centres). Cooperation and coordination with the School Boards should be pursued in developing these facilities.
5.7.4 Gymnasiums

Indoor gymnasiums are able to accommodate a wide variety of activities ranging from active team sports to banquets to day camps. In particular, youth basketball and badminton, as well as many adult team sports, have grown in popularity in recent years, placing additional demands on the City's already well-used gymnasiums. With multi-purpose gymnasium space being a facility capable of serving the needs of youth and "teen centres" being the most requested facility identified in the household survey, it will be important for the City to continue to place an emphasis on gymnasium provision.

The City has 9 gymnasium facilities (River Grove and South Common gymnasiums have each been counted as a "half" due to their limitations) and community use of school gymnasiums is considered to be equivalent to approximately 1 gymnasium. Map 5-2 illustrates the locations of the gymnasium facilities.

Previous studies indicate that a total of 19 City-allocated gymnasiums are required to satisfy demand, which is expected to occur between 2006 and 2011. Recommended strategies to address this shortage include:

- the development of 1.5 gymnasiums at the Mississauga Sports Complex;
- reconfiguring the Gymnastics Mississauga building to accommodate 2 gymnasiums (once this group moves to the Sports Complex);
- establishing formalized agreements with local school boards to maintain and/or increase accessibility and affordability of school gyms to the public; guaranteed access to school gyms should be a requirement of any partnership (e.g., Courtnerypark proposal);
- consider developing a gymnasium as part of the community centre space to be provided in the Churchill Meadows area; and
- consider developing a gymnasium as part of the redevelopment of the Meadowvale Community Centre (if space permits).

During the public consultation process, representatives of Badminton clubs noted their concern over an absence of dedicated space for badminton. They identified the overhead constraints in some gymnasiums due to insufficient ceiling height and/or the existence of basketball hoops and the growing interest in the sport as reasons for their request.
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*3 Gymnasiums provided in partnership with School Board; City/Community access is limited*
All of the newly developed gymnasiums have more than sufficient ceiling heights and have retractable basketball hoops. All gymnasiums are capable of accommodating non-competitive badminton play. Dedicated space requests should be assessed following the guiding principles of appropriate partnerships as contained in the City’s Partnership Framework. An Opportunities Audit, as outlined in the City’s Service Delivery Assessment and Partnerships Report, should be undertaken as part of the evaluation.

**Gymnasium Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop 1.5 gymnasiums at the Mississauga Sports Complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To satisfy needs in peak periods, as well as neighbourhood-level needs during non-peak times, it is recommended that the City formalize an agreement with local school boards to maintain and/or increase accessibility and affordability of school gyms to the public (e.g., at Courtneypark, Churchill Meadows, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City should consider including a gymnasium as part of the community centre space to be provided at the Churchill Meadows Branch Library Site and/or as part of the Meadowvale Community Centre redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convert the existing Mississauga Valley Gymnastics Club space to a multi-purpose gymnasium where residents can play basketball, volleyball, badminton, dance, aerobics and other activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake a Partnership Opportunities Audit regarding the creation of a dedicated badminton facility.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.7.5 Indoor Aquatic Facilities

The City has 11 indoor aquatic facilities, one at or near each major community centre (see Map 5-3). Two sites contain leisure pools and four are combined with local schools. There are over 1 million visits a year to Mississauga's indoor aquatic facilities.

Swimming is the third most popular recreational activity amongst Mississauga residents age 16 and over (behind only reading and walking). Trends suggest that demand for indoor pools will remain relatively stable over the coming year’s period. Although some concern was expressed at public meetings regarding capacity issues in the north west portion of the City a careful examination of enrolment numbers and capacity reveal that none of the pools are at capacity. There is sufficient capacity to accommodate the anticipated growth within this sector of Mississauga.

Given this view, a provision standard of one indoor aquatic facility per 65,000 people is recommended. This standard does not necessitate the need for an additional pool before 2031.

It is, however, imperative that the City continue to upgrade its existing facilities in order to meet the needs of changing demographics (2 pools are currently undergoing renovations as part of the City's community recreation facility redevelopment strategy). It is clear that quality matters when it comes to major recreation facilities and the City has a number of older pools that do not offer a comparable level of services to newer facilities. Older existing indoor pools (e.g., Meadowvale, etc.) should be upgraded and/or redeveloped through:

- developing therapeutic pools, especially in areas with high percentages of older adults;
- constructing family change rooms, especially in areas of new population growth;
- improving physical accessibility through the use of ramps and/or lifts;
- offering warmer water temperatures; and/or
- re-developing traditional lane pools as multi-purpose pools (lane and leisure elements) where justified by a life cycle study and community support.
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Furthermore, the school pools have the lowest usage levels of all City pools and also contain outdated mechanical systems that limit their ability to accommodate competitive swimming activities. Given the aging condition of these four pools, the uncertain nature of future access to the facilities, and the potential challenges in upgrading associated amenities, it is recommended that the City develop a School Pool Strategy. This strategy should address improvements and continued access to school pools, as well as options to maintain the current supply of eleven indoor aquatic sites should a school pool be closed. Following the completion of a School Pool Strategy, the aquatic recommendations of this Plan should be reassessed.

### Indoor Aquatic Facility Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City should implement strategies to increase capacity for learn to swim programs within the north west sector of the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City should develop a strategy to address the long-term viability and suitability of the four pools it currently programs in partnership with the School Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City should modernize older indoor aquatic facilities in order to accommodate the needs of the aging population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No additional indoor aquatic facilities are required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.7.6 Multi-Purpose Pads / Basketball Nets

There are 50 multi-purpose pads/basketball nets within the City. Most asphalt pads provide venues for basketball, tennis, and other unstructured activities such as street hockey.

Trend research indicates that basketball is a growing sport and is one of the most favoured activities for both children and youth. Basketball's flexibility and low cost also increase its appeal amongst all cultures and ethnic communities.

Using the recommended provision standard of one court per 10,000 people, the City will require 23 additional pads/nets by the year 2031. Provision standards for neighbourhood-level facilities such as multi-use pads/nets cannot be simply applied City-wide; these service levels need to be maintained at a more local level (i.e., one court per 10,000 population within each Service Area). Per capita supplies vary widely by service area, with Service Areas 3 and 6 having the most pads/nets per capita and Service Areas 2 and 4 having the lowest.

Given that the youth population is forecasted to peak in 2006, court development in Service Areas 1, 2 and 5 needs to occur immediately, especially in the established residential areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-Purpose Pad/Basketball Net Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At a provision level of 1:10,000, a total of 73 multi-purpose pads/basketball nets (23 additional pads) will be required by the year 2031.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose pad/net development is a priority in Service Area 5, where long-term supply will be deficient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority should be given to developing half courts over full courts. Only facilities in non-residential areas should be lit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City should identify under-used tennis courts that would be appropriate for conversion into multi-purpose pads/basketball nets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.7.7 Adult Centres

The City operates 2 dedicated older adult centres that are intended to serve a City-wide market (Mississauga Seniors' Centre and Square One Older Adult Centre). Recreation programs for more localized seniors' markets are also delivered out of 9 community centre/hall locations for a total of 11 delivery points across the City.

The aging of the population (the 55+ age group in Mississauga is expected to nearly double in size between 2001 and 2016), coupled with a trend toward more active lifestyles, will have a significant impact on the need for recreation services and facilities for older adults. Service Areas 1, 2 and 5 will experience the greatest increase in older adult populations and existing facilities must be poised to accommodate this. In fact, the household survey revealed that 52% of residents feel that the City should “do more” in providing older adult centres and those in Service Area 2 were the most likely to support this statement.

Community-based, decentralized multi-purpose (not dedicated) facilities for older adults serve a greater number of people, offer more variety and flexibility in programming, operate more cost effectively and are preferred by the City's older populations. Multi-purpose space for older adults should continue to be included in community centres and/or libraries. The anticipated increase in demand for older adult programs and facilities should be sufficiently met through the utilization of existing planned space in community facilities.

Because multi-use older adult space is integrated with most major community centres, the same provision standard for major community centres should be applied to older adult centres / multi-use program locations, that being 1 such facility/location per 65,000 population. No new older adult centres are recommended prior to 2031.
Adult Centre Recommendations

Additional programming efforts and/or expanded multi-use facilities at community centres will be required in Service Area 2 to serve the growing population of older adults.

No new stand-alone dedicated older adult centres are required.

The design of new community centre and library facilities - and any renovations to existing facilities - should consider the needs of older adults.

The City should undertake a study to assess the needs of the different age groups that make up the over 55 age group. A clear understanding of the different needs of 55-64, 65 to 74, 75 plus should result.
5.7.8 Outdoor Rinks

The City has three artificial outdoor ice surfaces, one of which is proposed to be covered for the 2004/05 season. Due to their short and unpredictable season, high capital and maintenance costs, and availability of other opportunities, no additional artificial outdoor rinks should be developed. Furthermore, the operation and usage of the existing facilities should be evaluated prior to undertaking any major repairs or site redevelopment.

### Outdoor Rink Recommendations

The City will not build any additional outdoor artificial ice rinks and will evaluate the operation and usage of the existing three facilities prior to any major repair or site redevelopment.
5.7.9 Outdoor Swimming/Wading Pools

The City provides 7 outdoor swimming pools and 2 wading pools, most of which are located in Service Area 6 and associated with waterfront parks. No additional outdoor pools or wading pools are recommended due to the availability of other alternatives (e.g., indoor pools, spray pads), declining child populations, and the high costs and narrow market of these facilities.

Existing outdoor pools should continue to be maintained by the City as long as they remain economically and functionally viable. As outdoor and wading pools reach the end of their life span, however, needs assessments should be carried out with consideration being given to either eliminating or replacing the facilities with spray pads. Maintaining the existing supply of outdoor pools should be a priority in high density areas and neighbourhoods where the backyard pool count is relatively low (e.g., Service Areas 5 and 6). Furthermore, decisions to close pools in lower income areas should involve “outreach” assessments with the community.

**Outdoor Pool Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No additional outdoor pools or wading pools should be built. Prior to any major repairs or site redevelopment, evaluations of the operation and usage of existing facilities are to be undertaken.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The feasibility of replacing wading pools with spray pads will be assessed on a site by site basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within higher density areas such as Area 5, maintenance of existing pools should remain a priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost benefit analysis and community consultation will be undertaken prior to any pool closure.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.7.10 Playgrounds

There are 247 play structures within City parks, the distribution of which is extremely consistent City-wide. Playgrounds are an essential facility that all children regardless of age, ability or place of residence should have reasonable access to. Because of this, geographic accessibility should be the dominant criteria for the installation or removal of a play structure, rather than a per capita standard. It is recommended that the City maintain its policy of providing a play structure within a park that is within 800-metres of all residential units. This is the same objective used for acquiring City/Community Parkland in the City.

While this Plan supports the development of new play structures where required, future sites should be assessed to ensure that they are truly required to achieve the 800-metre objective. In the meantime, an overall provision level of 270 play sites should continue to be followed. Furthermore, playgrounds accessible to children with disabilities should be distributed at a reasonable level across the City.

Removal of play sites should only occur in instances where two or more structures are located in proximity to each other. Consultation with the local community should be required before removing any play sites from the inventory. Although a decrease in population does not necessarily warrant the removal of a play site, significant decreases in the child population of a neighbourhood may warrant the replacement of existing play equipment with smaller structures at the time that major repairs are required.
Playground Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Play sites should be provided at a level that is consistent with the demographic profile and needs of residents in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the population in communities’ age and the need for play equipment decreases, replacement of play structures will be assessed on a site-specific basis, keeping in mind the desire to provide a play structure within a park that is within an 800-metre radius of all residential units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger-sized play equipment shall be provided in open spaces that serve markets beyond the local community (e.g., destination waterfront parks).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain a minimum provision standard of 270 play structures. This provision standard may be exceeded in order to achieve appropriate geographic coverage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All planned and proposed play sites should be reassessed to ensure that they are truly required to achieve the objective of providing play structures within 800-metres of all residential units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and monitor play equipment gaps (areas where play structures are not located within 800-metres of residential units).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a minimum of one playground for children with disabilities in each quadrant of the City.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.7.11 Skate Parks

Skateboarding and freestyle skating continue to grow in popularity, particularly amongst older children and teenagers – a demographic that has traditionally been challenging to serve. In response to this demand, the City recently constructed its first and only skate park, which is viewed as a great success by many.

Skate park development should be a priority for the City. The preferred approach is to build modestly sized parks throughout Mississauga, rather than building additional large, City-serving facilities. This concept substantially decreases overcrowding at any one park – thereby reducing conflicts between users – and better serves individual communities. Using a provision standard of 1 skateboard park per 100,000 residents, 5 new satellite skate parks are required and should be developed as soon as possible. Smaller scale, introductory skate facilities should also be incorporated into the park design of the City’s newer developing areas where the youth population is more likely to exist.

Skate Park Recommendations

| Facility use should be monitored to revise the provision standard, as warranted. |
| Smaller scale, introductory skateboarding features should also be incorporated into park design where the youth population exists (equal to a play apparatus or play feature). |
5.7.12 Spray Pads

The City of Mississauga has been a leader in the provision of spray pads, with a current supply of 14 such facilities. Eight of these facilities have been developed over the past five years.

The core user of such facilities is children ages 2 to 14, however, spray pads can also be entertaining for all members of the family. The size and number of features per spray pad can vary tremendously, depending on the neighbourhood that it is intended to serve.

A provision standard of one spray pad per 30,000 population is proposed, translating into a requirement for 9 additional facilities (a total of 23). Distribution is equally as important as total supply, meaning that the under-served Service Area 4 should be a high priority for spray pad development in the short-term.

### Spray Pad Recommendations

At a provision level of 1:30,000, 9 additional spray pads will be required by the year 2031. Location should be at the Community level park or destination parks.

The City should develop facility design guidelines that consider the scale of a spray pad relative to the size of the market it is required to serve.
5.7.13 Tennis Courts

There are a total of 134 tennis courts in the City, half of which are programmed by community clubs; the other half is available for unscheduled public play. Service levels vary considerably across the City, with the fewest courts per capita being in Service Areas 2 and 3.

Data and trends suggest that interest in tennis will likely remain steady over the short-term. The household survey noted a relatively low interest level in tennis, however, the stakeholder workshops identified demand for more and/or better public tennis courts.

With the understanding that community tennis clubs will provide some level of public access to their courts, it is reasonable to adopt a provision standard of one court (public or club) for every 5,000 residents. Application of this standard requires a total of 146 courts over the long-term.

While it is generally suggested that public tennis courts should be provided at most new community parks, the inventory data indicates that Service Areas 1 and 2 (growth areas) are already well supplied with public courts and the existing supply is sufficient to meet long-term public tennis needs. As such, the City should not develop any additional public courts in Service Areas 1 and 2, unless market demand justifies their development and only if an equivalent number of under-utilized courts elsewhere are decommissioned or replaced with multi-purpose/basketball courts.

Two new community club courts should be developed in Service Areas 1 and 6 in the short-term and eight additional club courts by 2031 to service growth in Areas 1 and 2 (subject to the further development of club activity). The distribution of club courts is far from consistent and additional facilities could be justified based upon the principle of geographic accessibility.

Previous plans recommended that some tennis courts in the southern service areas be considered for conversion to multi-purpose pads. This has yet to be done, but continues to be a desirable objective, especially in areas that are grossly deficient in multi-purpose pads/basketball courts (i.e., Service Area 5). Furthermore, because Service Areas 4 and 6 contain significantly more club courts than public courts, it is recommended that the City work with community groups to identify surplus courts suitable for conversion to public-use facilities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tennis Court Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 new tennis courts are needed to meet community-specific <strong>club needs</strong> in Service Areas 1 and 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City should continue to work with the local community in Service Areas 1 and 2 to assess the potential to further develop the existing tennis club or establish a new club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public tennis court utilization in Service Area 5 should be assessed for the purpose of identifying courts that would be good candidates for conversion to multi-purpose pads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City should consider adopting a provision standard of 1 tennis court (public and club) per 5,000 population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City should work with community clubs to identify surplus courts suitable for conversion to public-use facilities in Service Areas 4 and 6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City should provide a minimum of 2 tennis courts for public/ casual use in Service Area 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject to the further development of club activity, 8 additional <strong>courts</strong> are needed to 2031 to provide new population growth in Service Areas 1 and 2 with a service level equivalent to that currently provided City-wide. Preference would be for clubs to be associated with new court development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New <strong>courts</strong> should be developed in groups of at least 4 to support the provision of ancillary facilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.7.14 Trick Bike Facilities

The popularity of trick biking is increasing rapidly among youth and young adults. Input from the public has identified a need for more unorganized and spontaneous leisure opportunities for youth and trick bike facilities assist in addressing this need.

The development of a trick bike park for hard surface biking activities is an appropriate service for the municipality to provide similar to the skateboard park at Ireland. As facilities of this type are relatively untested in the City, no provision standard is recommended at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trick Bike Facility Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop a park with facilities to accommodate trick bikes. Preference should be given to locating the facility in Service Areas 1 or 2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 6  PARKLAND REQUIREMENTS

6.1 OVERVIEW

Public open space is the land base required for recreational activities and outdoor recreational facilities. Among other benefits, open space also contributes to the preservation and conservation of natural features, provides opportunities for passive recreational activities, provides physical linkages for the movement of humans and animals, and contributes to the aesthetic value of the community.

The City of Mississauga has excellent park coverage that is virtually unparalleled among other large urban municipalities. City parks and open spaces provide a variety of high quality recreational, social, educational, historic, interpretative, and cultural opportunities to citizens and visitors alike. A well-balanced park system engages people of all ages, denominations and ethnic backgrounds and enhances the overall quality of life. Open space is provided by both public and private organizations within the City.

6.2 CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

In Mississauga, decisions relating to the future planning, acquisition, development, and management of park resources are guided by the park hierarchy identified in the Mississauga Plan. These levels establish park classifications and define the various aspects of each park type, including such items as the general intensity of development, intended service area, and potential complement of facilities.

Park classifications help to focus planning, development and management efforts in a manner that balances public needs and expectations with dimensions related to physical, natural and financial resources. Through a classification framework, a consistent management approach can be created that improves equity and responsiveness to community needs.

Key park categories in Mississauga include public (city and community), greenbelt, cemetery, and private open space. The current classification system remains appropriate and is flexible
enough to meet the emerging needs of City residents. Attributes of each park type are summarized in **Table 6-1**.

**Table 6-1:**
**City of Mississauga Parkland Classification System**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Parkland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Parks</strong> accommodate recreation interests of City residents through the provision of major facilities (e.g., golf course), the preservation of unique historical, cultural or significant natural areas. They may also meet the need for community-level parkland or serve an area greater than the City. City parks may serve a unique function such as a waterfront park, major tournament sports park, or special use park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Community Parks are intended to accommodate recreation interests for the local residential area through provision of sports fields for organized use, space/equipment for unorganized activities and passive use, preservation of woodlands, multi-purpose year-round activities (where feasible), visual relief and aesthetic qualities. Parkland provision for Community and City parks should be 1.2 hectares per 1,000 population and parks should generally be accessible for residents within 800 metres from their homes (this guideline is intended to be applied to new growth areas and is not intended to be used as an argument for the provision of additional lands in older established residential areas). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenbelt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Greenbelt designation refers to public or privately owned lands within a defined valley system, watercourse channel, or floodplain that have a number of specific site characteristics. Greenbelt systems can offer limited passive recreation such as bicycle/pedestrian path linkages, cross-country skiing, hiking, picnicking, and nature interpretation. Development is limited to recreational trails and other passive recreation facilities, where compatible and ecologically feasible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cemeteries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries are part of the open space network and those that are publicly owned are available for certain passive open space activities (e.g., walking). Cemeteries are discussed separately under section 5.5.1 of this report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Private Open Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses are generally non-intensive outdoor uses such as private cemeteries, conservation, nursery gardening, golf courses, agriculture and recreation. Private Open Space is not necessarily accessible to the public.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 EXISTING SUPPLY

Table 6-2 illustrates the existing supply of municipal parkland by type and service area as of February 2004 (including parks under design/construction and existing parks). In total, there are 2,613 hectares of public parks and open space within Mississauga. Parkland is generally well distributed throughout the City.

Table 6-2: Summary of Municipal Parks and Open Space (hectares)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Area</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Parks</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Parks</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelt</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Accessible</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>2,613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parkland per capita is a useful tool to monitor or measure how the City is achieving parkland goals in comparison to both historical measurements, as well as future projections. With a City-wide average provision of 2.6 hectares per 1,000 population (City/Community parks), the City is achieving its objective of 1.2 hectares per 1,000 population in all Service Areas.

The current supply of Greenbelt lands translates into a ratio of 1.3 hectares per 1,000 population; provision standards, however, are not appropriate for Greenbelt lands due to the unique functions of these sites and their role in land and nature preservation. Since the 1999 Future Direction Plan, the City has increased its per capita supply of Community Parkland, while the supply of City Parkland and Greenbelt lands has not grown at the same pace. Due to anticipated future parkland dedications and slowing population growth, the amount of parkland per capita is not anticipated to change considerably over the course of the planning period.

Service Area 5 has the lowest per capita supply of parkland at 1.6 hectares per 1,000 people. This area is expected to see an increase in population due to growth in the City Centre.
planning district. The value placed on land in this area, however, will make it impossible to provide parkland at a standard comparable to other areas of the City. It is recommended that a strategy for recreational services be developed to address the future needs of the City Centre area. The characteristics of this area are unique within the City (e.g., urban parks, government centre, privately owned amenities, etc.) and it is suggested that the area be examined in this light.

6.4 FUTURE PROVISION

The public indicated strong support for the acquisition of more open space and the expansion of passive, nature-oriented recreation activities (e.g., walking, nature appreciation, picnicking, outdoor reading and reflection, un-programmed open space, etc.). Furthermore, the household survey found that 70% of residents would prefer that the City keep more of its parks as open spaces, treed areas and trails as opposed to developing more sports fields within them. 52% of residents feel that the City should “do more” in providing parkland. Despite that the City is meeting or exceeding its targets in relation to parkland acquisition, it would appear that increasing public expectations are driving demand for more recreational open space.

Greenbelt and waterfront acquisition should become the number one parkland acquisition priority for the City, particularly given the increased emphasis on trail system development and connectivity.

In general terms, the provision of parkland should be geared to socio-demographic variables such as age, socio-economic status, population density, etc. When a community is faced with diverse population characteristics, such as Mississauga is, flexibility and choice should be the operative elements in implementing a meaningful parks and open space system.

It is also necessary to relate the supply of land and its function to the population it serves within a geographically defined area. The primary issue pertaining to the provision of parkland is whether or not the needs of residents are being met by the current supply. This issue also relates to the provision of quality and optimum recreational opportunities.
It is recommended that the City continue to ensure that appropriate levels of Community parkland be acquired/dedicated in new residential communities.

Data provided by the City indicates that there will be sufficient parkland to meet the land-based active recreation needs identified in this Plan; however, other factors, such as the distribution of these lands, unidentified future park needs, and the desire to provide passive open space areas, indicate that the City should look at alternatives to relying solely on future parkland dedication. The following options are available to the City in meeting current and future land-based recreation facility needs:

- Upgrade existing facilities (e.g., lighting);
- Extend the use of existing facilities / design for intensified use (e.g., artificial turf);
- Convert under-utilized facilities to meet other facility requirements;
- Restrict access by non-priority users;
- Expand service areas to maximize use of facilities in all area of the City; and
- Use non-municipal resources to expand supply (e.g., soccer fields).

### Parks and Open Space Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The City should undertake a review of the recommended facility requirements and the City's park holdings to determine the need for additional parkland.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A strategy for the provision of recreational services should be developed to address the future needs of the City Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City should assess the potential for disposing of any land surplus to the Corporation’s requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelt acquisition should become the number one parkland acquisition priority for the City, particularly given the increased emphasis on trail system development and connectivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City should actively pursue alternatives to land acquisition for the provision of future City-serving sports fields (Group A facilities).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.5 WATERFRONT PARK SYSTEM

The goal for the Lake Ontario waterfront, as stated in the Mississauga Plan (2003), is to: "create a waterfront with physical and visual access; enhanced natural forms, functions and linkages; a diversity of appropriate and compatible activities related to the water; and enhanced heritage resources; having regard for the Mississauga Waterfront Plan and the need to protect people and property from natural hazards". One of the specific objectives for this area is "to ultimately achieve continuous physical public access along the waterfront".

The household survey data indicates that older residents (age 55+) visit the City’s waterfront parks more frequently than younger residents do; and therefore, demographic projections suggest usage levels will increase in the future. The scenery is the main attraction to Mississauga’s waterfront park system, although a considerable number also use the pathways and picnic areas. The waterfront is a unique component of the City’s parks, open space and trail systems and deserves special in-depth study in order to provide appropriate long-term acquisition, management and development strategies. It is, therefore, recommended that the City develop an updated Waterfront Master Plan for this area.

The protection and development of the Waterfront as a public place needs to continue to be a high priority for the City of Mississauga. This limited non-renewable resource needs to be in the public domain to ensure the greatest enjoyment by the greatest number of people. Continuation of land acquisition and continued trail development are important projects that will meet the needs of this community.

Waterfront Park System Recommendations

- Prepare an updated Waterfront Master Plan to continue to improve and expand unique waterfront parks and open space resources.
- Review current and proposed parks and recreation uses, and assess implications of appropriate waterfront parkland uses for future outdoor recreation facility development.
6.6 THE URBAN FOREST AND NATURAL AREAS

All of the trees located throughout the City comprise Mississauga's "urban forest". The urban forest is a living, breathing entity that provides a wide range of social, community, economic and environmental benefits. It is constantly undergoing change and must be maintained to ensure that it remains an asset rather than a liability. City trees are found along streets, in parks and in established woodlots. The City does not, however, have an accurate tree inventory of its more than 250,000 estimated city-owned trees. An inventory is required to ensure detailed knowledge of this asset and to allow for future planning.

Detailed environmental assessments of the woodlots are required to determine which woodlots are capable of accommodating trails and which sites should be managed as nature preserves. The community is strongly supportive of the preservation of natural areas and woodlots not just for public use, but also for their aesthetic and environmental benefits.

**Urban Forest & Natural Area Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Urban Forest needs to be inventoried and assessed for degree of vulnerability to withstand negative impact from human interaction as well as for fiscally responsible forestry management. First priority should be the inventory of City street trees and the inventory needs to be maintained on a regular basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing by-laws and policies regarding criteria for the conservation and protection of trees should be reviewed and updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City should identify spaces within existing and future parks for naturalization/restoration initiatives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look to partnerships with the community to increase public awareness of best management of natural and forested areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City should undertake a review to determine natural areas that would be appropriate for inclusion within the open space system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.7 PARK WASHROOMS

The City’s current inventory of park washrooms includes twenty-one (21) City-operated facilities, and another seven (7) user group built and operated facilities. Existing City-operated park washrooms are typically found in city wide destination parks such as waterfront parks, parks with large permitted picnicking sites, sports parks with clustered fields, and combination parks with multiple fields and informal activities.

City-operated park washrooms are open to the public from May to September/October during regular park hours (7:00 am to 11:00 pm). Group-operated washrooms are typically built as part of the groups’ Clubhouse/Storage facility and allow public access to park users as long as the club is open. Hours of operation may vary depending upon the club, but usually occur in the evening for the ball groups and throughout the day and evening for the tennis clubs.

In the 1998 City of Mississauga Outdoor Recreation Facility Study, “washrooms were the most frequently identified amenity by participants in the on-site survey of selected Mississauga Parks.” A Park Washroom Study was initiated in 2002 to clarify the City’s basic level of service and is scheduled for completion in the summer of 2004. The study focuses on two main issues: (1) a park’s eligibility to receive a washroom; and (2) investigation of various building types and configurations.

A Park Washroom Ranking List has been developed in the study which ranks a base list of forty-seven (47) of the City’s most active existing and future park sites against four weighted criteria including: City Wide Destination, Weekly Permitted Sports Events, Permitted Picnicking Sites, and Informal Unscheduled Activities. Criteria were weighted according to importance with respect to the potential number of park users and the length and frequency of visits. Characteristics of those parks which scored the best on the Park Washroom Ranking List are: city wide destination parks such as waterfront parks, parks with large permitted picnic sites, sports parks with very high weekly permitted events such as artificial turf fields, and combination parks with three major predominantly lit fields or four unlit fields, and two or more unscheduled activities.
Extensive stakeholder consultation including the Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) Committee and the Accessibility Advisory Committee (AAC) confirmed the need for washroom buildings that are durable, accessible, easy to clean, meet regulatory requirements and cost effective. The study evaluates several different building types against stakeholder needs and concludes that brick and mortar, or prefabricated concrete buildings are the most suitable option.

**Park Washroom Recommendations**

- That the Park Washroom Ranking List Methodology as per the 2004 Park Washroom Study be used to determine a park’s eligibility to receive a park washroom.

- That both Brick and Mortar and Prefabricated Concrete Buildings and the proposed floor plan configurations identified in the 2004 Park Washroom Study be adopted as the basic level of service for a park washroom building.
SECTION 7  SERVICE ASSESSMENT & PARTNERSHIPS

7.1  OVERVIEW

The City of Mississauga’s Future Directions for Recreation and Parks is to offer advice related to the City developing relationships – partnerships, alliances, contracts, etc. – with entities outside of the municipal structure.

Section 5 of Future Directions Plan (Facility Requirements) describes a market-driven approach to determine the community demand and need for recreation facilities and programs. The assessment of the service delivery system and the associated recommendations has incorporated a similar theme – focusing on meeting the specific requirements of various target audiences in different jurisdictions of the municipality. Care was taken to ensure that recommended strategies are sensitive to both the needs of the City’s external and internal customers – the general public and staff.

7.2  FEES AND SUBSIDY PROGRAM

The Division values creative approaches to the delivery of leisure services and encourages staff to be innovative and entrepreneurial. The need to maximize revenues and bolster the Division’s financial performance suggests that staff be unencumbered in their pursuit of all possible opportunities to “run like a business”. However, the philosophical underpinnings of traditional community service include the fundamental principles of accessibility, affordability and recreation for all. Consequently, staffs are constantly required to balance the delivery of affordable services with the expectation of financial productivity.

The Division intends to clarify the fees and prices situation by identifying a simple and systematic process to classify programs according to their cost structure and targeted outcomes. The process, directed by a Task Force with representation from a variety of City departments, will begin by clearly defining the desired outcomes of the classification system and by identifying where the categories fit into the Division’s mission and mandate for the delivery of leisure services. Criteria will be developed and employed to classify programs and services into each category.
It has been suggested that the classification process will likely result in three broad categories that will define the fee structure and operating approach applied to the Division's activities:

1. free programs and services that are operated on a fully subsidized basis;
2. programs and services that are partially subsidized yet priced so that they generate revenues sufficient to offset a pre-established portion of the delivery cost; and
3. programs and services that are priced according to market conditions attracting fees that would be established with the intent of producing net operating income (i.e., profits).

The development process should consider and define the Division’s responsibilities and when it is reasonable for Social Services to become involved. The process could therefore result in decisions regarding a departmental financial assistance program similar to those administered by other municipalities.

Throughout the public meeting process concerns were raised about the financial accessibility to programs by many of Mississauga’s residents. Currently, only the Jerry Love fund exists to off-set programming costs. As a volunteer based fund-raising program, funds generated each year are limited.

The free and subsidized programs need to be marketed within the areas of the City where it is known that income levels are below Provincial averages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fees &amp; Subsidy Program Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement the fee classification process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a cost accounting system so that a fee strategy can be based upon the accurate cost of program and service delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake the development of a thoughtful, fair, equitable and sensitive financial assistance policy that would subsidize individuals and groups who may not otherwise be able to access programs or facilities due to an inability to pay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.3 PARTNERSHIPS

Mississauga's Recreation and Parks Division has a history of providing services utilizing a number of alternate delivery approaches. For many years the City has forged operating and development relationships with community and not-for-profit groups, (e.g. Gymnastics Mississauga) entered into service contracts, management agreements, leased space to private interests and instituted joint use agreements.

The Division's vision indicates an intention to collaborate with others in the pursuit of quality services. Furthermore, partnerships have been identified as one of the key strategies to achieve the Division's vision and mission.

It would appear that there is a need for a standardized approach to assist the Division in identifying appropriate projects for which partnerships are suitable, a mechanism to fairly and equitably deal with unsolicited proposals and a framework to help guide decisions related to partnering with outside interests.

Clearly, decisions related to service delivery alternatives must be made on a case-by-case basis. Methods of selecting appropriate service delivery management approaches vary between municipalities and frequently, departments employ a variety of methodologies, depending upon the circumstances and complexities of the services in question. For example, an operating relationship between the Department and a not-for-profit group may be completely appropriate for the delivery of social programs in a community centre whereas the same group may be completely unqualified to operate an aquatic facility. A standardized framework provides a backdrop for fair and equitable evaluation of acceptable service delivery or facility development approaches.

Figure 7-1 on the following page illustrates the continuum of potential alternative service delivery approaches employed by recreation departments across the country. An example of a framework through which the most appropriate facility development or service delivery alternative could be determined is discussed in the background report to this Plan.
Frameworks to guide decisions associated with service delivery alliances or facility development partnerships should provide a process of logical thinking about key issues and consequences involved in working with others toward a common goal. An effective framework will help municipal decision makers answer several important questions:

- Is the proposed service/facility needed in the community?
- Is the proposed service/facility consistent with municipal values?
- Who is best equipped to deliver the service/operate the facility?
- Will municipal interests be protected within the selected approach?

The City's Partnership Framework should be supported by principles that articulate the City's position on important partnership matters. Normally staff, elected officials and key stakeholders engage in a process to consider the municipal response to a number of issues.
• To what extent will potential partners be expected to comply with municipal values and philosophies? Sample Principle: All potential partners will be expected to demonstrate a public service attitude and, where appropriate, comply with the values and philosophies embedded in the Department's mission, vision and strategy statements.

• What are the minimum attributes a potential partner must bring to a relationship with the City and what mechanisms will be necessary to validate the partner’s true capacities? Sample Principle: All potential partners must be able to demonstrate, to the City’s satisfaction, adequate capacity to fulfill the roles and obligations outlined in the project proposal including, at a minimum organizational matters (history, stability, structural, ownership, secession plan (NFP), etc.) functional capabilities, and financial resources.

• Under what conditions will the City absorb risk and what will determine the municipality’s risk tolerance threshold? Sample Principle: The City will absorb risk commensurate with its investment, involvement and control of the project and will expect an adjusted return on investment (both monetary and other resource investment) based upon its risk exposure.

• How (if at all) will stakeholders and others with a vested interest in the project be included in deliberations regarding the partnership? Sample Principle: Stakeholders will be as involved as necessary in the deliberations regarding the potential partnership.

• What will be the municipality’s financial expectations for a partnership and under which conditions will certain types of investments to a partnered project be considered? Sample Principle: The City will only partner on projects that are consistent with its core businesses, respond to a demonstrated community need, do not conflict with existing municipal, not-for-profit or private endeavours in Mississauga, are supported by a well researched and sound business plan and represent a reasonable business opportunity for the City.
The following steps are generally included in the opportunities audit process:

- Identify a range of services/facilities that may be potential partnership candidates.
- Determine cost and revenue implications of the traditional municipal model.
- Determine the preferable partner contributions to the project.
- Identify a range of potential partners.
- Determine appropriate public sector contribution to the project.
- Identify potential partnership models.
- Identify areas where services must fall outside identified models.
- Identify potential stakeholder concerns.
- Identify mitigating factors to stakeholder concerns.
- Identify service delivery mechanisms that fit within the model.
- Determine potential cost/revenue gains by applying a model.
- Determine operating gains to the system inherent with implementing the model.
- Determine potential costs to the system inherent with implementing the model.
- Identify the priority of the opportunity within the leisure system.
- Identify procedures and desired timetable for the pursuit of partners.

**Partnership Recommendations**

Implement the comprehensive Partnership Framework to ensure the identification of suitable partnership projects and the pursuit and/or evaluation of potential partners.