




City of Greater Sudbury

Parks, Open Space & Leisure **MASTER PLAN REVIEW**

June 2014



mbpc

Monteith♦Brown
planning consultants



City of Greater Sudbury

Parks, Open Space & Leisure Master Plan Review

June 2014



Acknowledgements

Parks, open space, and leisure services and facilities are vital to our community's health, vibrancy, and identity as residents of Greater Sudbury. We would like to sincerely thank members of City Council, the Staff Team, and most importantly, the great numbers of residents who have helped to shape this plan – your dedication and valued feedback have contributed to the creation of responsive strategies for enhancing the City's parks, open space, and leisure assets and services for many years to come.

City Council

Mayor Marianne Matichuk	André Rivest, Ward 6	We would like to acknowledge the many valuable contributions made by the late Councillor Fabio Belli who had a particular interest in recreation in our community.
Joe Cimino, Ward 1	Dave Kilgour, Ward 7	
Jacques Barbeau, Ward 2	Doug Craig, Ward 9	
Claude Berthiaume, Ward 3	Frances Caldarelli, Ward 10	
Evelyn Dutrisac, Ward 4	Terry Kett, Ward 11	
Ron Dupuis, Ward 5	Joscelyne Landry-Altmann, Ward 12	

Staff Team

Catherine Matheson, General Manager of Community Development
 Réal Carré, Director of Leisure Services
 Helene Colburne, AA to Director of Leisure Services
 Robert Blackwell, Co-ordinator Quality Assurance & Performance Measurement
 Paul Baskcomb, Director of Planning Services
 Mark Simeoni, Manager of Community and Strategic Planning
 Bill Tanos, Co-ordinator GIS
 Chris Gore, Manager of Community Partnerships
 Cindi Briscoe, Community Development Co-ordinator
 Sherri Moroso, Community Development Co-ordinator
 Mark Vainio, Community Development Co-ordinator
 Cindy Dent, Manager of Recreation
 Ginette Forget-Rose, Recreation Co-ordinator
 Anne Gervais, Recreation Co-ordinator
 Lori Henri, Recreation Co-ordinator
 Jeff Pafford, Recreation Co-ordinator
 Ray Mensour, Manager of Arenas
 Gord Leblanc, Assistant Manager of Arenas
 Cory Piche, Assistant Manager of Arenas
 Dawn Roussel, Assistant Manager of Arenas
 Debbie Chartrand, Co-ordinator of Events
 Pam Cranston, Manager of Parks Services
 Ken Furlotte, Superintendent of Parks and Ski Hills
 James St. John, Superintendent of Horticulture
 Frank Taylor, Superintendent of Parks

Project Consultants

Monteith Brown Planning Consultants

Table of Contents

<u>Section</u>	<u>Page</u>
Section 1. Introduction	1
Section 2. Strategic Framework	2
2.1 Parks, Open Space & Leisure Benefits	2
2.2 Department/Division Profile	3
2.3 Guiding Principles	4
Section 3. Context	6
3.1 Background Studies	6
3.2 Accomplishments	7
3.3 Ongoing Initiatives	10
3.4 Key Parks, Open Space & Leisure Trends	11
3.5 Community Profile and Population Forecasts	15
Section 4. Public Engagement Program	23
4.1 Online Survey	23
4.2 Public Open Houses	32
Section 5. Leisure Facilities	33
5.1 Methodology	33
5.2 Inventory Comparison	34
5.3 Arenas	35
5.4 Indoor Pools	38
5.5 Fitness Centres	42
5.6 Gymnasiums	43
5.7 Community Centres & Halls	45
5.8 Dedicated Space for Youth & Seniors	47
5.9 Indoor Turf Facilities	50
5.10 Arts & Culture Facilities	51
5.11 Playgrounds	52
5.12 Soccer Fields	55
5.13 Ball Diamonds	58
5.14 Other Sports Fields	60
5.15 Outdoor Basketball Courts	61
5.16 Outdoor Tennis Courts	64
5.17 Splash Pads & Beaches	65
5.18 Off-Leash Dog Parks	67
5.19 Outdoor Ice Rinks	68
5.20 Running Tracks	70
5.21 Skate & BMX Parks	71
5.22 Ski Hills	73
5.23 Other Leisure Facilities	74
Section 6. Parkland & Trails	75
6.1 Parkland	75
6.2 Trails & Connectivity	85

Section 7. Delivery of Services and Programs.....	89
7.1 Healthy Community Challenges & Priorities.....	89
7.2 Municipal Role in Service Delivery.....	91
7.3 Affordable Access to Recreation.....	92
7.4 Program Delivery	93
7.5 User Fees & Cost Recovery	95
7.6 Community Engagement, Marketing, and Customer Service.....	96
7.7 Sport & Leisure-Based Tourism.....	97
7.8 Staffing & Volunteer Management.....	98
7.9 Partnerships	99
Section 8. Implementation	101
8.1 Implementation Strategy	101
8.2 Monitoring and Updating the Master Plan.....	114
Appendix:	
A Complete Online Survey Results	
B Record of Public Input	
C Neighbourhood-Level Outdoor Leisure Amenity Mapping	

Section 1. Introduction

Parks, open space, and leisure facilities are essential contributors to the Greater Sudbury's quality of life. Each provides meaningful opportunities for social engagement and physical activity to residents and tourists, individuals and groups, young and old, and people of all abilities. The strategic provision and management of these parks and facilities is the primary objective of this Master Plan.

The City of Greater Sudbury has been successful in implementing much of its 2004 Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan and the time has come to reassess needs and strategies through a Master Plan Review and Update. This Review builds upon the 2004 Plan and other recent studies, including but not limited to the City's Strategic Plan, Leisure Services Strategic Plan, and Healthy Communities Strategic Plan. This planning process has also been coordinated with the five-year review of the City's Official Plan.

The focus of the Master Plan Review is on recreation facilities, parks, trails, leisure services, and programming with a view to meeting the changing needs of the community over the next twenty years. Inventories of existing facilities and services, new initiatives, and changes in leisure demands and trends are also a part of the Review.

This report represents the output from both phases of this two phase planning process:

- Phase One was focussed on identifying park and facility requirements. It examined the status of recommendations from the previous Master Plan, considered internal or external challenges and opportunities, and identified current park and facility gaps, along with needs based on population scenarios and established provision targets. Also included was an analysis of parks policies for consideration during the Official Plan Review.
- Phase Two was focussed on leisure programming and service delivery assessments (e.g., partnerships, promotion and marketing, youth opportunities, barriers to recreation, etc.), with reference to the challenges identified in the Healthy Community Strategy. This phase included a public engagement program to gather community input and present draft action plans relative to both phases. Lastly, a high-level implementation strategy (e.g., location, priority, timing, and estimated costs) for capital improvements was developed.

This project was a collaborative process undertaken in cooperation with municipal staff, who assisted with the transfer of background information and issue identification.

A key objective of this process is to ensure that this Master Plan becomes a living document that provides the City and its residents with long-term currency and consistency in planning through the application of market-driven targets and decision-making frameworks. In this way, it is vital that this Plan is responsive to community needs and realities, with consideration of applicable trends, population projections, consultation, and local context informing the assessments and action plans.

Section 2. Strategic Framework

This section contains an overview of the benefits of parks and leisure services, a profile of the Leisure Services Division, and a description of the key guiding principles upon which this Master Plan is based.

2.1 Parks, Open Space & Leisure Benefits

Individuals, households, and entire communities all benefit greatly from universal access to quality parks and leisure facilities and services. Examples include:

- Physical benefits (health and wellness) from participation in active endeavours
- Intellectual benefits from access to information resources and lifelong learning opportunities
- Social benefits from opportunities to be engaged in meaningful community activities
- Environmental benefits from the protection of open spaces
- Economic benefits made possible through the attraction of sport tourism and new residents due to the high quality of life that leisure services provide

Over the years, the Canadian Parks and Recreation Association and Province of Ontario have produced summary documents of research findings that highlight the benefits of providing parks, recreation, and culture services. An adapted version of these benefits is identified below.

Essential to Personal Health

- Combats diabetes, heart disease, cancer and respiratory illnesses
- Prevents site specific cancers (colon, breast and lung)
- Reduces stress, depression and contributes to emotional/psychological well-being
- Restores physical, mental and social capacities and abilities
- Reduces levels of obesity among children and adults

Key to Human Development

- Strengthens social, motor, creativity and intellectual capabilities
- Develops people to full potential (social, intellectual, mental, creative, physical and spiritual)
- Positively impacts child and youth development

Essential to the Quality of Life

- Builds self-esteem and positive self-image
- Enhances life satisfaction levels
- Nurtures growth and the acquisition of life skills for those with a disability

Reduces Anti-Social Behaviours

- Reduces self-destructive behaviours and negative social activities in youth
- Provides an antidote to smoking, substance abuse, suicide and depression
- Reduces crime, particularly effective with at risk/delinquent youths
- Builds understanding between diverse cultures
- Reduces isolation, loneliness and alienation; brings seniors together
- Exposes youth to positive role models

Builds Families and Communities

- Families that play together, stay together; children and youth remain connected
- Provides safe, developmental opportunities for youth who are unsupervised before and after school
- Produces leaders that support communities in many ways
- Builds social skills and stimulates participation in community life
- Provides the catalyst that builds strong self-sufficient communities
- Strengthens community engagement

Pay Now or Pay More Later

- Reduces the costs of social services, social interventions and foster care
- Reduces crime and social dysfunction – police, justice and incarceration costs
- Reduces the long-term costs of health care provision for obesity-related diseases

2.2 Department/Division Profile

The Community Development Department delivers programs and services to the residents of the City of Greater Sudbury through five operational divisions: Housing Services; Centre of Excellence for Seniors' Health (Pioneer Manor); Citizen Services (Children Services, 3-1-1, Libraries); Social Services; and Leisure Services.

The City's Leisure Services Division provides opportunities for citizens to access physical recreation and leisure activities through direct provision and support to volunteers. The Division provides both management and coordination to the community's leisure and recreation system, as well as fostering and developing community partnerships and community engagement. Leisure Services manages the operation of community arenas, community centres and halls, recreational facilities, playing fields, parks and aquatics, all of which are community resources that support both direct and indirect program delivery. The Division is organized into four sections: Community Partnerships; Arenas; Recreation; and Parks.

The following strategic framework is identified in the Leisure Services Strategic Plan (2011-2015):

Vision:

Exceeding the leisure needs of Greater Sudbury through programs, partnerships and equitable access to facilities, programs and open spaces.

Mission:

Parks, open spaces and leisure programs and facilities contribute to the social, cultural and economic well-being of residents and enhance overall quality of life.

Values:

- safe environments
- reliable, professional and responsive service
- inclusive and culturally diverse opportunities
- collaboration with community partners
- volunteer involvement

Goals for the Leisure Services Division:

1. Continued effort in the infrastructure renewal of both small and large scale projects
2. Implement the Sustainable Mobility Plan
3. Parks development and maintenance
4. Advance communication for citizens, user groups and partners
5. Promote sport tourism and special events
6. Further develop inclusive, dynamic and fiscally responsible leisure and recreation programming under the Healthy Community Human Health and Well-Being pillar

2.3 Guiding Principles

The following Guiding Principles are core directional statements that will guide the development and implementation of the Plan's action plans and future decision-making. The Guiding Principles are grounded in the recognition that parks and leisure provide numerous physical, social, economic, and environmental benefits that are essential to creating a healthy community for all current and future citizens. These principles are goals to which the City and community aspire. The principles are largely complementary – no one principle takes priority over another – and should be read and interpreted as a set.

The following principles were initially developed for the City's 2004 Master Plan and have been modified and/or reaffirmed as part of this Master Plan Review and Update.

- a) The long-term financial sustainability of the City's parks and leisure delivery system will be ensured through the cost-effective and efficient management of resources, the appropriate and reasonable application of user fees, and the maximization of community resources.
- b) Generally speaking, the City's parks and leisure infrastructure is aging and in need of strategic renewal. Sustainable investment in parks and leisure infrastructure provides physical, social, cultural, environmental, and economic benefits that help to build a healthy community.
- c) The City will continue to implement a community development approach to leisure service delivery through the support of volunteers, community engagement, and capacity building.
- d) The City will continue to be the primary provider of parks and leisure infrastructure within the community.
- e) The City will be a direct provider of leisure programs that benefit core markets and the community at large.
- f) Multi-purpose leisure facilities are preferred over single purpose facilities, although these may not be appropriate for all communities.
- g) The City's natural environment is a key contributor to a healthy community and this asset will be protected and integrated into the leisure system where possible.

- h) Within the parks and leisure system, the City will continue to foster and support sustainable mobility opportunities for residents and visitors.
- i) Partnerships and collaborations with outside parties in the provision and delivery of parks and leisure facilities and services are desired where there is sufficient benefit to the City and community.
- j) All citizens deserve universal access to inclusive and responsive parks and leisure opportunities; children, older adults, and vulnerable populations will continue to be priority markets.
- k) The City will strive to provide an affordable, accessible, and equitable distribution of parks and leisure facilities and services, recognizing the City's large geographic area and the unique local values of Greater Sudbury's distinct ethnic, cultural, and geographic communities.
- l) All decisions with respect to parks and leisure will be based on a balance between the impact on individual well-being, community benefit, and financial sustainability.

Section 3. Context

This section captures key changes within the community since the previous Master Plan, including departmental accomplishments, socio-demographic trends and forecasts, and trends in leisure participation.

3.1 Background Studies

In 2004, the City prepared its first Parks, Open Space & Leisure Master Plan, which established guidelines for the provision of parks, recreation, and leisure services and facilities based on an extensive needs assessment process. The Master Plan was to provide direction for the next 10 years (to 2014) and many of its higher priority recommendations have been or continue to be implemented. The 2004 Master Plan has served as a valuable resource to the City; however, the passage of time and the emergence of new challenges have necessitated its review.

Several other studies and plans prepared by the City of Greater Sudbury have been reviewed for the purposes of this study, including the following:

- Adanac Park Master Plan and Business Plan (2005)
- Arena Renewal Strategy (2013)
- Bell Park Master Plan (2000)
- Building Condition Assessments for Arenas and Indoor Pools (2012)
- Capital Budget documents (2012-13)
- Constellation City: Building a Community of Communities in Greater Sudbury (2007)
- Development Charges Background Study (2009) & Draft Growth-Related Capital Program (2014)
- East End of Ramsey Lake Master Plan (2001)
- Grace Hartman Amphitheatre Business Plan Review (2013)
- Green Space Advisory Panel Final Report (2010) & Update (2013)
- Growth Outlook to 2036 (2013)
- Healthy Community Initiative (2010) and Strategic Plan, 2010-2014 (2010)
- Leisure Services Strategic Plan, 2011-2015 (2011)
- MPMP Report to Citizens (2012)
- Memorial Park Master Plan (1999)
- Multi-use Recreational Complex Feasibility Study (2007)
- Official Plan (2006; consolidated to 2013)
- Parks, Open Space & Leisure Background Report to the Official Plan (2004)
- Parks, Open Space & Leisure Master Plan (2004)
- Strategic Plan, 2012-2014 (2012)
- Sustainable Mobility Plan (2010)
- Therapeutic Pool Feasibility Study (2014)

3.2 Accomplishments

The City has been very successful in its implementation of the 2004 Master Plan, thus creating a need to refresh and update portions of the Plan. Since 2004, the City of Greater Sudbury has initiated and completed several ambitious projects that support the Human Health and Well-Being pillar of the Healthy Community Strategy. Many of these projects are identified below, along with the approximate capital investment.

Community Facilities

- completed upgrades to Cambrian Arena in 2010/11, as well as lighting retrofits at several arenas (\$1.2 million)
- undertook substantial renovations to McClelland Arena in 2008/09 following extensive fire and smoke damage (\$2.0 million)
- constructed a second ice pad at the Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex in 2011 (\$10.3 million)
- initiated upgrades to Chelmsford Arena, including replacement of the rink slab, boards, bleachers, and dressing room enhancements (\$2.3 million)
- re-opened the Dow Pool
- replaced the Grace Hartman Amphitheatre in Bell Park with assistance of government funding (\$5.97 million)
- completed exterior wall repairs at Howard Armstrong Recreation Centre with assistance of government funding (\$1.9 million)
- completed a lifecycle analysis on arena and pool facilities (\$80,000) and initiated lifecycle analysis on community centres, parks depots, and playground buildings (\$80,000)



Parks

- Adanac/Rotary Park has re-opened and undergone a transformation into a four-season destination with the addition of a new chalet, carpet lift, ski rental building, snow-making equipment, trails, and a BMX facility (\$1.7 million); the Park was an important host site for 2010 Ontario Summer Games
- undertook several improvements at James Jerome Sports Complex with government funding, including the installation of lights on a full field and the development of a new lit artificial turf field, accessible playground, and new support building (\$3.6 million)
- replaced the Laurentian Community Track Complex (\$2.9 million)
- established the City's first off-leash dog park (on Second Road, south of Kingsway) (\$77,000)
- installed several new splash pads, including Kinsmen Sports Complex, Howard Armstrong Recreation Centre, Coté Park, Westmount Playground, Ridgecrest Playground, and Victory Park (\$900,000)
- installed several new playgrounds and accessible play structures, including James Jerome Sports Complex, Howard Armstrong Recreation Centre, Ridgecrest Playground, and Theresa Playground (\$450,000)
- developed new soccer fields, including at Howard Armstrong Recreation Centre, Adanac/Rotary Park, Lionel E. Lalonde Centre, Robinson Playground (\$900,000)
- established several new skate parks, including at Carmichael Arena, Rick McDonald Sports Complex, Coté Park, Central Lane, Lions Club Den, Russell Beaudry Outdoor Rink, Lively Playground, Delki Dozzi Park, and Berthiaume Park (\$600,000)
- development of beautification and landscaped areas, including the Lorne Street





berm, Joe MacDonald Memorial Park, Loughheed Park, Errington Park, Azilda Senior Park, and Ash Street/Water Tower Park

- created new community gardens, including the Chelmsford Community Garden
- initiated a new park and facility signage program in 2013/14 (\$250,000)
- completed the Green Space Advisory Panel Report in 2010 (and 2013 update)
- completed Accessibility Audits on City playgrounds
- enacted a new Parks By-law in 2013, which included restrictions on smoking in parks
- created a dedicated Parks Services Section (previously under Infrastructure Services)

Other

- completed a Healthy Community Strategy (2005)
- developed a Sustainable Mobility Plan and undertook various trail development projects in concert with Rainbow Routes
- established a Sport Tourism Advisory Panel
- completed a Public Participation Policy
- established an Affordable Access to Recreation Policy
- enhanced protocols for inter-departmental coordination
- harmonized rental and user fees across entire City
- established a Leisure Services Strategic Plan (2011-15)
- Integrated Human Services approach projects
- launched a Community Mapping initiative ("Feel Free to Feel Fit")



3.3 Ongoing Initiatives

The City has a number of notable ongoing projects and initiatives relating to parks and leisure facilities, including (but not limited to) those listed below. The online survey completed for this Master Plan found that 86% of respondents agree that “Investing in parks and leisure services should be a high priority for City Council”, thus continued investment is locally supported.

Community Facilities

- implementation of the Arena Renewal Strategy; key projects include a review of the Sudbury Community Arena (an Expression of Interest for private sector involvement was issued in 2013) and improvements to Chelmsford Arena
- completing public consultation on Community Hall fees, booking practices, amenities, and utilization
- undertaking a Facility Assets Management Plan
- undertaking a Therapeutic/Leisure Pool Feasibility Study focussed on the Lionel E. Lalonde Centre in Azilda
- development of the Northern Water Sports Centre on Ramsey Lake is anticipated for 2014 (with multi-partner funding); this site will be home to the Sudbury Rowing Club, Sudbury Canoe Club, Sudbury Dragon Boat Festival, and a public boat launch
- consideration of the Grace Hartman Amphitheatre Business Plan Review
- the Azilda Community Action Network is fundraising toward establishing an off-leash dog park at North End Playground

Parks


- private sector residential redevelopment of the former St. Joseph’s Hospital site adjacent to Bell Park (opportunity to improve park connections, amenities, and parking); City is also undertaking the redevelopment of a parking lot associated with the former hospital
- reviewing parking requirements and improvements for Bell Park
- annual updating of existing parks infrastructure, including (but not limited to) playfield fencing, parks signage, safety retrofits, landscaped areas / flower beds, park furnishings, etc.
- ongoing implementation of Green Space Advisory Panel Report and Sustainable Mobility Plan


Other


- undertaking several studies in 2014, including:
 - Official Plan Review
 - Development Charges
 - Active Transportation Master Plan
 - Seniors’ Perception Survey and Report
- continued work on a universal Affordable Access to Recreation Policy for opportunities based on social determinants of health

3.4 Key Parks, Open Space & Leisure Trends


Understanding current trends can assist with anticipating shifts in the demand for facility and program requirements. The following trends – based on provincial and national research – may be directly or indirectly related to the potential demand, usage, design, and operation of parks and leisure facilities in the City of Greater Sudbury. Local implications of these trends are discussed in greater detail in subsequent sections of this report.







* In 2011, the obesity rate for the population aged 18 and over in the Sudbury & District Health Unit area was 28.2%, significantly higher than both the national (18.3%) and provincial (18.4%) rates.



3.5 Community Profile and Population Forecasts

Understanding the City of Greater Sudbury's demographic profile and its anticipated changes over the life of this Plan are essential to forecasting parks and leisure demands and providing direction on facility needs. For example, higher proportions of children and youth may drive the need for facilities that support more rigorous and active opportunities, whereas a large older adult population may require less intensive facilities that focus on health, wellness, and socialization.

Based on Statistics Canada data and other relevant sources such as the City's "Growth Outlook to 2036" report (May 2013), a community profile has been developed that identifies demographic characteristics that may influence the current and future demand for parks and facilities in Greater Sudbury.

Note: The 2011 short-form Census contains the most recent figures of the City's population and age breakdown; however, it did not collect information regarding immigration, income or place of work. This information is contained in the 2011 National Household Survey¹ (NHS), but is not directly comparable to past Censuses due to the change in methodology.

Geographic Context

The City of Greater Sudbury is a large regional urban centre located in Northern Ontario. With an area of over 3,200km², it is the largest city by area in Ontario. Formed through municipal amalgamation in 2001, the City is comprised of the former Regional Municipality of Sudbury (Sudbury, Capreol, Nickel Centre, Onaping Falls, Rayside-Balfour, Valley East and Walden), as well as several unincorporated townships.

The City of Greater Sudbury began as a small railroad outpost in the late nineteenth-century and continued through several decades of rapid growth made possible by the region's vast mineral resources. While mining remains a major influence on the local economy, the City has diversified significantly in recent years to establish itself as a major centre of financial and business services, tourism, health care and research, education and government. The City boasts three post-secondary institutions, a host of valued health care services, and tourist attractions such as Science North and Dynamic Earth. The region's success in re-greening surrounding lands and rehabilitating local lakes has earned Sudbury worldwide recognition for its environmental efforts.²


Historical and Forecasted Population Change

In the 2011 short-form Census, Statistics Canada reported a population of 160,274 for the City of Greater Sudbury; adjusted for Census net under-coverage, the population is reported as 166,300.

Given its past reliance on primary industries, there have been notable swings in population in past decades, having peaked in 1971 at 169,580, then declining to 152,470 in 1986 (Census figures, exclusive of under-coverage).

¹ The National Household Survey was a voluntary, self-administered survey conducted for the first time in 2011 as a replacement for the long census questionnaire. Due to the survey methodology, the City of Greater Sudbury data has a non-response rate of 27.9%, which may affect data quality.

² <http://www.greatersudbury.ca/living/about-greater-sudbury/key-facts/> Accessed November 2013




In the next 25 years, the City of Greater Sudbury is expected to continue to see growth in its population; however, the amount of which will depend on the level of economic and employment growth. Past variability suggests that population forecasting remains a challenging exercise in the City of Greater Sudbury; the following factors in particular are expected to influence future projections:

- variability in the mining sector
- shifting patterns in fertility and mortality rates
- age structure of the population

Population forecasts over the study period are based on estimates contained in the City's "Growth Outlook to 2036" draft report (May 2013). This draft forecast provides two population scenarios:

- Reference Forecast: A lower end scenario based on a combination of moderate employment growth and the Ontario Ministry of Finance migration assumptions for the City of Greater Sudbury. Under this scenario, the 2036 population projection is 176,800.
- High Forecast: A more optimistic outlook based on expansion in the mining and related sectors. Under this scenario, the 2036 population projection is 188,300.

While both forecasts have been examined in this Master Plan, the more conservative outlook (Reference Forecast) was deemed to be the most appropriate in the Growth Outlook to 2036 draft report.



Source: City of Greater Sudbury. Growth Outlook to 2036. Draft, May 2013. Hemson Consulting Ltd.

Population by Community


The following tables illustrate the forecasted population amongst the City of Greater Sudbury's communities between 2011 and 2036 based on the Reference and High Forecasts. A map illustrating the communities and key settlement areas is provided on the following page (note: the NE and SE Townships are contained under the "rural" community).

Reference Population Forecast – Distribution by Community

Community	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031	2036	Growth (2011-2036)	
Sudbury	91,570	92,240	93,160	94,160	94,720	95,080	3,510	3.8%
Capreol	3,390	3,400	3,420	3,440	3,450	3,460	70	2.1%
Nickel Centre	10,970	11,240	11,530	11,780	11,940	12,030	1,060	9.7%
Onaping Falls	3,880	3,960	4,040	4,120	4,160	4,180	300	7.7%
Rayside-Balfour	11,860	12,160	12,470	12,750	12,910	13,010	1,150	9.7%
Valley East	21,150	21,630	22,160	22,640	22,930	23,090	1,940	9.2%
Walden	7,670	8,140	8,590	8,960	9,180	9,310	1,640	21.4%
Rural (All)	15,800	16,210	16,440	16,660	16,790	16,870	1,070	6.8%
Total	166,300	169,000	171,800	174,400	175,900	176,800	10,500	6.3%

Source: City of Greater Sudbury. Growth Outlook to 2036. Draft, May 2013. Hemson Consulting Ltd.

Communities within the City of Greater Sudbury




High Population Forecast – Distribution by Community

Community	2011	2016	2021	2026	2031	2036	Growth (2011-2036)	
Sudbury	91,570	92,940	94,840	96,760	98,580	99,970	8,400	9.2%
Capreol	3,390	3,420	3,470	3,520	3,570	3,610	220	6.5%
Nickel Centre	10,970	11,390	11,890	12,360	12,780	13,090	2,120	19.3%
Onaping Falls	3,880	4,010	4,150	4,280	4,400	4,490	610	15.7%
Rayside-Balfour	11,860	12,330	12,860	13,360	13,810	14,140	2,280	19.2%
Valley East	21,150	21,900	22,830	23,680	24,470	25,050	3,900	18.4%
Walden	7,670	8,320	9,030	9,650	10,200	10,610	2,940	38.3%
Rural (All)	15,800	16,260	16,600	16,950	17,300	17,550	1,750	11.1%
Total	166,300	170,600	175,700	180,500	185,000	188,300	22,000	13.2%

Source: City of Greater Sudbury. Growth Outlook to 2036. Draft, May 2013. Hemson Consulting Ltd.

Positive growth is forecasted for all communities, with Sudbury expected to witness the greatest amount of overall growth (3,510 to 8,400 persons, depending on the forecast scenario). The lowest amounts of growth are forecasted for Capreol and Onaping Falls, the City's two smallest communities. As a percentage of the existing population, Walden is forecasted to see the greatest proportional gains (21% to 38%, depending on the forecast scenario).

Only the Reference Forecast is shown in the following graph, which visually depicts anticipated growth in each community. Sudbury is clearly the largest community, followed by Valley East, Rural areas, Rayside-Balfour, and Nickel Centre. The more remote communities of Onaping Falls and Capreol are the smallest by population.



Source: City of Greater Sudbury. Growth Outlook to 2036. Draft, May 2013. Hemson Consulting Ltd.

Population by Age Group

The City's population increased by 3% between 2001 and 2011, but has seen notable changes in its age profile over this ten year span. In the past ten years, the City's 0 to 19 year old population declined by 11% (a net decrease of 4,440 persons), while the 55+ age group increase by 23% (a net increase of 8,960 persons). The decline of the youth population has likely impacted leisure programming and activities traditionally targeted to this age group.

Aligning with national aging trends, a "greying" of the City of Greater Sudbury's population is apparent. The City's median age increased from 38.9 years in 2001 to 42.3 years in 2011, which is greater than the Provincial median of 40.4 years. Due to the dominance of the baby boomer cohort, the City has a disproportionately large population of people between approximately 50 and 68 years old.


Looking to the future, as illustrated in the following table and chart, the baby boom cohort will enter their senior years, resulting in a nearly doubling of the 70+ age group by 2036. The other age groups will generally stabilize over the next twenty-five years, with some fluctuations in the intervening years.

Reference Forecast – Population by Age Cohort (2001-2036)

Age Cohort	2001	2006	2011	2021	2031	2036	Growth (2011-2036)	
Children (0-9)	18,990	16,940	16,410	16,350	17,400	16,410	0	0%
Youth (10-19)	21,850	21,650	19,990	17,490	17,360	18,380	-1,610	-8%
Young Adult (20-34)	33,540	30,030	32,770	37,230	34,310	33,450	680	2%
Mature Adult (35-54)	47,990	50,610	48,970	41,660	45,940	47,910	-1,060	-2%
Older Adult (55-69)	23,360	27,240	30,140	35,640	29,350	25,610	-4,530	-15%
Senior (70+)	15,870	17,330	18,050	23,380	31,480	35,040	16,990	94%
Total	161,600	163,800	166,300	171,800	175,900	176,800	10,500	6%

Note: Totals may not add due to rounding.

Sources: Statistics Canada, 2001-2006; adjusted for net under-coverage by Monteith Brown Planning Consultants.
City of Greater Sudbury. Growth Outlook to 2036. Draft, May 2013. Hemson Consulting Ltd.



Source: City of Greater Sudbury. Growth Outlook to 2036. Draft, May 2013. Hemson Consulting Ltd.

Age cohort projections have been prepared for each of the City of Greater Sudbury's communities (for the Reference Forecast only). The following observations have been noted:

Sudbury

- Had the lowest percentage of children and youth in 2011 (ages 0 to 19, 20%) and highest percentage of older adults and seniors in 2011 (ages 55+, 31%)
- Between 2011 and 2036, the child and youth population (ages 0 to 19) is forecasted to grow by 4%, the second highest growth rate
- Overall, this community is forecasted to have growth in most age groups and will not age as rapidly as most other communities

Valley East

- Had the highest percentage of children and youth in 2011 (ages 0 to 19, 26%) and lowest percentage of older adults and seniors in 2011 (ages 55+, 23%)
- Between 2011 and 2036, the child and youth population (ages 0 to 19) is forecasted to decline by 19%
- Between 2011 and 2036, the older adult and senior population (ages 55+) is forecasted to grow by 69%, the highest growth rate
- Overall, while this community currently exhibits one of the younger age profiles, it is forecasted to age at a more rapid pace than most other communities

Rayside-Balfour

- The demographic profile and forecast for this community is generally similar to that of the entire City

Nickel Centre

- Had the second highest percentage of children and youth in 2011 (ages 0 to 19, 25%) and second lowest percentage of older adults and seniors in 2011 (ages 55+, 24%)
- Between 2011 and 2036, the child and youth population (ages 0 to 19) is forecasted to decline by 17%
- Between 2011 and 2036, the older adult and senior population (ages 55+) is forecasted to grow by 62%
- Overall, while this community currently exhibits one of the younger age profiles, it is forecasted to age at a more rapid pace than most other communities

Walden

- Between 2011 and 2036, the child and youth population (ages 0 to 19) is forecasted to grow by 9%, the highest growth rate
- Between 2011 and 2036, the young and mature adult population (ages 20 to 54) is forecasted to grow by 29%, the highest growth rate
- In 2036, this community is forecasted to have the highest percentage of young and mature adults (ages 20-54, 50%), but the lowest percentage of older adults and seniors (ages 55+, 29%)
- Overall, this community is forecasted to have growth in most age groups and will not age as rapidly as most other communities – it is forecasted to have the lowest median age in 2036

Onaping Falls

- Had the second highest percentage of older adults and seniors in 2011 (ages 55+, 31%)
- The forecast for this community is generally similar to that of the entire City

Capreol

- The demographic profile and forecast for this community is generally similar to that of the entire City

Rural (All)

- Between 2011 and 2036, the child and youth population (ages 0 to 19) is forecasted to decline by 19%
- Between 2011 and 2036, the older adult and senior population (ages 55+) is forecasted to grow by 59%
- In 2036, the rural areas are forecasted to have the lowest percentages of children and youth (ages 0 to 19, 18%) and young and mature adults (ages 20-54, 42%), but the highest percentage of older adults and seniors (ages 55+, 40%)
- Overall, this community is forecasted to age at a more rapid pace than most other communities – it is forecasted to have the highest median age in 2036

Income

Studies have shown that income is an indicator of participation levels in recreation and leisure activities, with higher incomes generally being suggestive of higher levels of participation. According to the 2011 National Household Survey, the City of Greater Sudbury's median income for individuals (age 15 and over) and median household income were 8% and 6% higher than the Provincial medians, respectively. This suggests that recreational participation rates in the City of Greater Sudbury should generally be in line with provincial rates, but that affordability will remain a key objective. There will be a need to continue to actively engage residents of all income groups to ensure their recreation needs are being met. Many municipalities (including the City of Greater Sudbury) and organizations have established (or have access to) subsidy programs to assist those with financial barriers to accessing recreation and leisure opportunities.

Immigration

Participation in and accessibility of recreation opportunities is often impacted by immigration and diversity levels. Based on estimates from the 2011 National Household Survey, the City has a considerably lower percentage of immigrants (6%) than the Province (29%). 71% of the City of Greater Sudbury's immigrants arrived before 1980 and 70% of the immigration population is of European descent. This suggests a high level of homogeneity in the population and demands for traditional recreation opportunities, although this can be expected to change gradually over time as ethnic diversity increases.

Section 4. Public Engagement Program

Community input is critical to identify the issues, trends, and future priorities related to parks, open space, and leisure in the City of Greater Sudbury. In order to obtain this input, a number of internal and external engagement efforts were undertaken, including:

- online public survey (hard copies also available) to solicit information on participation and gaps in provision;
- a series of six public open houses to identify issues and receive input on key topics of interest;
- small group workshops with key City staff;
- interviews with individual members of City Council to solicit input areas of need and focus within the scope of the Master Plan; and
- presentations to the City's Community Services Committee to present project information and request approval of the final report.

Each consultation technique was structured to engage a different target audience and each had a unique purpose, whether to create awareness, gather information, identify issues, generate ideas, or gauge community support. A summary of the input received through the public engagement program is provided below; input from individual members of Council has not been summarized unless part of the public record.

4.1 Online Survey


An online survey was created and posted on the City's website in April 2014 for a period of approximately one month. The purpose of the survey was to identify leisure participation levels and barriers, as well as opinions on park and facility needs. The survey was publicized through a range of means, including posters, email correspondence, local media, etc. A link to the survey was also prominently displayed on the City's website. Hard copies were also made available at key municipal locations. Identical English and French versions of the survey were available.

The survey received a total of 491 responses (461 English and 30 French). While the response rate for the questionnaire is excellent, due to self-selected and non-random nature of the survey, it cannot be considered statistically significant, meaning that it may not be representative of the entire population. Furthermore, participants were able to cease participation at any time and to skip questions, so the number of responses to each question varies; percentages are calculated based on the number of responses to each question. Detailed data tables can be found in [Appendix A](#).

Participation

Q1. In the past 12 months, which of the following activities have you or anyone in your household participated in? By participation, we mean situations where you or a member of your household actively participate (which does not include attending an event or watching others), either at home or in public. (select all that may apply)


The leisure activities participated in by the majority of Greater Sudbury households are walking/hiking (90%), outdoor swimming (60%), cycling/biking (53%), and outdoor ice sports/skating (51%). Eight of the top ten responses are predominantly unorganized / self-scheduled activities.



n = 483

Q2. What is a reasonable length of time for you to travel for the leisure activities that your household does the most? (multiple responses permitted)

When asked what a reasonable length of travel would be for the leisure activities that households participate in the most, the most common response was 10 to 19 minutes (44%). Beyond this amount of time (20+ minutes), the number of responses generally decreases proportionately. Location of residence and activity type are likely to have an impact on the response to this question.




n = 477

Totals may not add due to rounding

Q3. Are you and members of your household able to participate in parks and leisure activities as often as you would like? (n=487)

Q4. Why are you and members of your household not able to participate in parks and leisure activities as often as you would like? (multiple responses permitted)



n = 286

Totals may not add due to rounding

55% of survey respondents indicated that their households were not able to participate in parks and leisure activities as often as desired. This subset was then asked for reasons why this was the case. The most common barrier identified was a lack of desired facilities or programs (33% of entire sample), followed by a lack of personal time (26% of entire sample). Lack of time is frequently the most common response in statistically significant surveys; the self-selected nature of this survey may have been a factor in the elevated response rate for lack of facilities/programs.

Program Activities & Gaps

Q5. *Are there any parks or leisure activities that you or members of your household would like to see offered in the City of Greater Sudbury that are not currently available?*

Q6. *What new or additional parks and leisure activities would you like to see offered? n = 239*

51% of respondents indicated that there are additional parks or leisure activities that they would like to see offered in Greater Sudbury; 22% said there were not and 28% were unsure. Many of the open-ended responses to this question focused on facility types rather than activities. Further, due to the large geographic size of the City, many responses referred to activities/facilities that are not available within the respondent's immediate community, despite being available elsewhere in the City.

The most common requests for additional parks and leisure activities were as follows:

- Trails (27)
- Bike paths (27)
- Bike lanes (22)
- Swimming / pool (21)
- Splash pads (12)
- Dog parks (9)
- Cricket (6)
- Green space (6)
- Indoor playground (6)
- Outdoor basketball courts (6)
- Water slide park (5)

Importance & Satisfaction

Q7. *In general, how important are the following items to your household? Please use a scale that ranges from "not at all important" to "very important".*


Q8. *Thinking about those facilities that currently exist in the City of Greater Sudbury, what is your level of satisfaction with the following? Please use a scale that ranges from "not at all satisfied" to "very satisfied".*

Respondents were asked to rate the level of importance and satisfaction with three broad facility types to evaluate levels of service. Typically, where importance exceeds satisfaction, the level of service is perceived to be inadequate, whereas where satisfaction exceeds importance, the level of service is perceived to be adequate or excessive.

In all three areas probed, respondents indicated a substantial gap between satisfaction and importance, indicating that current levels of service are inadequate. Self-selected surveys tend to attract respondents that have strong opinions and/or that may be dissatisfied with certain services, which is a factor that may contribute to the large gap between satisfaction and importance.

- 91% of respondents indicated that trails/pathways are important to their household, but only 45% indicated that they were satisfied with the trails/pathways available in Greater Sudbury.
- Similarly, 88% of respondents indicated that outdoor leisure facilities are important to their household, but only 50% indicated that they were satisfied with the outdoor leisure facilities available in Greater Sudbury.


- Lastly, 85% of respondents indicated that indoor leisure facilities are important to their household, but only 42% indicated that they were satisfied with the indoor leisure facilities available in Greater Sudbury.



n = 421-426

Totals do not add to 100% ("neither satisfied/important or dissatisfied/not important" and "don't know" not shown)

Q9. What is your level of satisfaction with the parks and leisure opportunities in the City of Greater Sudbury for the following age groups? Please use a scale that ranges from "not at all satisfied" to "very satisfied".



n = 358-391

Totals do not add to 100% ("neither satisfied or dissatisfied" not shown)


Similarly, respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction levels with parks and leisure opportunities available to various age groups within Greater Sudbury. There was a higher degree of non-response

("don't know") to these questions as responses often depended on the composition of each household. Overall, the highest levels of satisfaction were expressed for children's activities, while activities for teens and young adults received the lowest levels of satisfaction.

Facility Priorities

Q10. To what degree do you oppose or support spending additional public funds on the following facilities – either to improve existing facilities or build new ones? Please use a scale that ranges from "strongly oppose" to "strongly support".

Respondents were presented with 22 distinct types of parks and leisure facilities and asked to rate their willingness to support additional public spending to either improve existing facilities or build new ones. There was a high degree of support for most facility types, with 15 of 22 receiving majority support, the highest being for nature trails (86%), beaches (81%), playgrounds (79%), outdoor rinks (75%), and multi-use trails (75%) – all of these facilities are generally used in an unorganized, self-scheduled manner.




n = 385-400

Therapeutic / Leisure Pool Proposal

Q11. To what degree do you oppose or support the development of a therapeutic/leisure pool at the Lionel E. Lalonde Centre in Azilda? Please use a scale that ranges from "strongly oppose" to "strongly support".


As requested by City Council, questions specific to develop a therapeutic/leisure pool at the Lionel E. Lalonde Centre in Azilda were included in the online survey. 55% of respondents support this proposal, while 19% oppose it.



n = 404

Q12. If a therapeutic/leisure pool was developed at the Lionel E. Lalonde Centre in Azilda, how likely would you or members of your household be to use the facility on a regular basis (at least once per month)?

Reflecting the high degree of support for the therapeutic/leisure pool proposal, 30% of respondents felt that they would be somewhat, very, or extremely likely to use the facility on a regular basis. Given the facility's proposed market and programming, this is a favourable finding that supports the project's usage targets.



n = 407

Increasing Utilization

Q13. *What would encourage you or members of your household to make greater use of Greater Sudbury's indoor or outdoor Leisure Facilities? n=307*

Q14. *What would encourage you or members of your household to make greater use of Greater Sudbury's Parks and Trails? n=298*

Open-ended comments were received from approximately 62% of survey respondents. Primary responses related to the following (in order of most to least):


- providing activities, parks, and facilities that are close to one's home
- extending and connecting the system of trails and bike paths (and providing marked signage)
- improving the maintenance and cleanliness of parks, trails, and facilities
- greater promotion and advertisement of activities and assets (including online mapping of trails)
- lowering the costs of programs and facility rentals
- offering leisure programs at different times and/or extended facility hours
- upgrading leisure facilities
- providing safe bike lanes
- improving accessibility in general
- enforcement of the leash and poop & scoop by-laws

Statements

Q15. *Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements. Please use a scale that ranges from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree".*

Respondents were asked to identify their level of agreement with five scripted statements.

- 86% agree that "Investing in parks and leisure services should be a high priority for City Council."
- 59% agree that "Leisure activities in Greater Sudbury are generally affordable to your household."
- 52% agree that "The amount of time it takes your household to travel to leisure activities is reasonable."
- 51% agree that "The City should place a higher priority on the attraction of sports tournaments and competitions to Greater Sudbury."
- 48% agree that "There are sufficient parks and open spaces in your area to meet the needs of your household."



n = 391-393

Totals do not add to 100% ("neither agree or disagree" and "don't know" not shown)

Additional Comments

Q16. Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding parks and leisure services in the City of Greater Sudbury. n=193

Open-ended comments were received from 39% of survey respondents. Detailed comments are contained in [Appendix A](#).

Demographic Profile

The following summarizes the socio-demographic profile of those responding to the online survey:

Household Composition

- The average household size of respondents was 3.3, larger than the 2.4 persons per household reported in the 2011 Census
- 63% reported having one or more children/teens living within their household, larger than the approximately 40% that reported this in the 2011 Census

Age

- The average age of survey respondents was 41 years
- The following table illustrates the age composition of those living within responding households, compared against City-wide estimates; the online survey shows greater representation from residents below the age of 40, and lower representation from those age 55 and over

	Age Composition of Responding Households	Estimated City-wide Age Composition
Children (0-12 years)	21%	13%
Teens (13-18 years)	11%	7%
Young Adults (19-39 years)	34%	27%
Mature Adults (40-54 years)	22%	23%
Older Adults (55-69 years)	10%	18%
Seniors (70+)	2%	11%

Income

- 22% of respondents indicated an annual household income of less than \$60,000, 21% between \$60,000 and \$90,000, 23% between \$90,000 and \$120,000, and 34% above \$120,000

Residency

- 97% of respondents identified themselves as residents of the City of Greater Sudbury
- Data was not collected on community of residence due to a survey coding error

4.2 Public Open Houses

A series of six (6) public open houses were held in May 2014 to gather input pertaining to this Master Plan from residents and organizations. The open houses were advertised through local media, municipal websites, municipal facilities, and email correspondence to various stakeholders.

Specifically, the Parks, Open Space & Leisure Master Plan Review was introduced through the following public open houses:

- May 12, 2014 from 4pm to 7pm at Lionel E. Lalonde Centre, Azilda
- May 12, 2014 from 4pm to 7pm at Walden Citizen Service Centre/Library, Lively
- May 13, 2014 from 4pm to 7pm at Garson Citizen Service Centre/Library, Garson
- May 13, 2014 from 4pm to 7pm at Howard Armstrong Recreation Centre, Hanmer
- May 14, 2014 from 4pm to 7pm at Tom Davies Square, Sudbury
- May 14, 2014 from 4pm to 7pm at Dowling Civic Leisure Centre, Dowling

These open houses were structured as drop-in sessions where citizens could learn more about the scope and preliminary findings of the Draft Plan and provide comments on needs and strategies. Verbal and written input received through the public open houses has been considered as part of the Plan's development (see [Appendix B](#)).

Section 5. Leisure Facilities

As was the case in the previous Master Plan, the major challenges that continue to face the City are the influence of changing demographics, recreational activity patterns, and the sustainability of aging and outdated infrastructure. Further, a lack of desired facilities was identified as the most common barrier to participation through the online survey.

The infrastructure renewal and facility development needs of the Leisure Services Division over the next ten years far outstrip the resources allocated in the City's capital program, although the City has been making inroads where possible. Tough decisions as to how best to manage and adapt existing infrastructure to meet the needs of current and future populations in a financially-responsible manner must continue to be made.

5.1 Methodology

The current and future (to 2036) needs for parks and leisure facilities in the City of Greater Sudbury and its identified communities have been assessed using a blend of factors. In completing this task, the City's hierarchy of parks and leisure facilities have been assessed and gaps in geographic distribution and connectivity have been identified. Public and municipal input has also been taken into account, as have local participation and utilization factors. Specifically, the needs assessment considers the following inputs:

- quantitative provision targets based on industry standards and utilization levels; and
- geographic distribution.

Provision Targets

In order to derive and support meaningful action plans pertaining to leisure facilities, quantitative projections of current and future demand for facilities have been developed using "Greater-Sudbury-specific" facility provision targets. The purpose of the targets is to provide a general guideline for determining facility needs based upon population and/or participation thresholds. The 2004 provision targets were developed using a number of inputs, including input from the City's residents and stakeholders, existing levels of provision, usage levels, trends, existing standards in other municipalities, etc. Where applicable, the targets established in the 2004 Master Plan were reviewed and adjusted based on:

- the City's existing inventory (facilities owned, operated, and/or maintained by schools, private sector, etc. have been excluded from the inventory unless otherwise noted);
- industry guidelines (i.e., targets used by similar communities); and
- utilization levels and registration data, where available.

Participant-based provision targets (e.g., one soccer field per "x" participants) are generally used for leisure activities that are primarily registration-driven, while population-based targets (e.g., one indoor pool per "y" population) are applied to facilities that serve a broader cross-section of the community and/or are less structured in their use. The provision of some facilities (e.g., arts and cultural venues) is not driven by provision targets due to a wider variety of factors affecting provision and delivery.

Geographic Distribution

Although the focus of this Master Plan is the entire City of Greater Sudbury, the needs analysis requires that the population data/forecasts and inventories be identified on a community-specific basis. The 2004 Master Plan utilized 12 conceptual service areas that were loosely based on former municipal boundaries, with the former City of Sudbury being further divided into six areas. For this Master Plan Review, population and inventory data have been made available by seven distinct communities, each one representing a former municipality (plus a rural component that covers the entire municipality). The number of leisure amenities by geographic community has been examined to assess the proximity to residents and overall level of service.

Location, travel patterns, and historic service levels influence how local residents perceive the accessibility of recreation opportunities in the City of Greater Sudbury. Proximity is one of many factors that can increase one's physical activity. The online survey completed for this Master Plan found that a reasonable length of travel for common leisure activities was 10 to 19 minutes, although location of residence and activity type are likely to have an impact on the response to this question. 52% of respondents agreed and 25% disagreed that "The amount of time it takes your household to travel to leisure activities is reasonable." Typically, it is our experience that most individuals are willing to travel 10 to 30 minutes to access the activities that they participate in the most, with longer travel times tolerated for regular participation in competitive activities and access to higher-level facilities.

5.2 Inventory Comparison

The following table illustrates the provision levels of major indoor and outdoor leisure facilities at the time of the 2004 Master Plan and at present, with comparisons to the City-wide population figures of the day. Unless otherwise noted, this inventory does not include non-municipal facilities, such as schools, non-profit providers, or the private sector.

Municipal Leisure Facility Inventory, City-wide – 2004 and 2014

Facility Type	2004 Master Plan		2014 Master Plan		Comments / Notes
	Inventory	Population per Facility	Inventory	Population per Facility	
INDOOR FACILITIES					
Ice Pads	15	10,348	16	10,394	Second pad added to Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex
Indoor Pools (City only)	5	31,044	5	33,260	No change
Fitness Centres	5	31,044	6	27,717	Falconbridge Wellness Centre has since re-opened; McClelland Fitness Centre operated by not-for-profit group
Gymnasiums	7	22,176	7	23,757	No change
Community Centres & Community Halls	27	5,749	27	6,159	No change
Youth Centres	6	25,872	8	20,788	Youth centres now recognized at Ryan Heights Playground and Sudbury Action Centre for Youth
Seniors Centres/Clubs	n/a	n/a	22	2,185	Clubs not recorded in 2004 Plan

Facility Type	2004 Master Plan		2014 Master Plan		Comments / Notes
	Inventory	Population per Facility	Inventory	Population per Facility	
Indoor Turf Fields	1	155,230	0	--	Indoor field at Exhibition Centre now operated by private provider (no City involvement); optional sites being explored by private sector
OUTDOOR FACILITIES					
Playground Sites	159	976	179	929	Several new playgrounds realized through development; improved inventory tracking
Soccer & Football Fields (Lit = 2; incl. schools)	87	1,784	93	1,788	Several new fields developed; school fields vary annually
Ball Diamonds (Lit = 2)	70	2,218	73	2,278	School fields vary annually; excludes scrub/practice fields
Basketball Courts (half = 0.5)	27	5,749	30.5	5,452	Improved inventory tracking
Tennis Courts	56	2,772	59	2,819	Improved inventory tracking
Outdoor Rinks	53	2,929	56	2,970	Improved inventory tracking
Running Tracks (City only)	5	31,044	4	41,575	Removal of HARC track
Skate Parks	0	--	10	16,630	Several new skate parks
Splash Pads	2	77,615	8	20,788	Several new splash pads
BMX Parks	0	--	1	166,300	New BMX Park at Adanac Park
Off-leash Dog Parks	0	--	1	166,300	Recently opened first off-leash facility (Second Avenue) and working to establish another off-leash park in Rayside-Balfour area
Ski Hills	2	77,615	3	55,433	Adanac Ski Hill re-opened

* 2004 Plan counted non-City facilities as part of community hall inventory

2004 population = 155,230; 2014 population = 166,300

Inventory Source: City of Greater Sudbury, 2013

5.3 Arenas

Inventory & Background

The City of Greater Sudbury operates a total of sixteen (16) ice pads across fourteen (14) municipal arenas. Hockey, figure skating, and ringette are the dominant uses during the fall, winter, and spring; summer demand is lower, with activities such as indoor lacrosse and roller derby using the arena floors.

The following table illustrates the number of ice pads by communities, compared to their priority market (children and youth ages 5 to 19 years) for both 2014 and 2036. Currently, the most favourable ratios are found in Capreol (1:310) and Onaping Falls (1:670), while Sudbury has the poorest ratio (1:2,590).

Ice Pad Inventory, Compared to Priority Market (ages 5 to 19 years)

Community	Current Supply (Ice Pads)	Facilities	Current 2014 Per Capita Ratio (ages 5 to 19)	Projected 2036 Per Capita Ratio (ages 5 to 19)
Sudbury	6	Cambrian Arena, Carmichael Arena, Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex (2), McClelland Arena, Sudbury Arena	2,590	2,733
Capreol	2	Capreol Arena (2)	310	270
Nickel Centre	2	Toe Blake Memorial Arena, Garson Arena	1,210	955
Onaping Falls	1	IJ Coady Arena	730	670
Rayside-Balfour	2	Chelmsford Arena, Dr. Edgar Leclair Arena	1,175	1,070
Valley East	2	Centennial Arena, Raymond Plourde Arena	2,430	1,850
Walden	1	TM Davies Arena	1,590	1,630
Total	16		1,757	1,687

Note: In calculating per capita ratios, rural residents have been distributed to existing communities in proportion to population.

Two of the municipal arenas are twin pad facilities (Capreol Arena and Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex) while the rest consist of single pad venues that were constructed prior to the amalgamation of the City. The average age of the ice facilities in the City is 40 years, with the majority being constructed between 1950 and 1978. The exceptions to this are the Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex (1993 and 2011 expansion) and the recently refurbished Cambrian Arena (2010-2011). Substantial renovations were also made to McClelland Arena in 2008/09 following extensive fire and smoke damage. Repairs and upgrades to Chelmsford Arena have been authorized for 2014/15.

In 2007, the City completed a Multi-use Recreational Complex Feasibility Study that recommended the development of a facility containing two ice pads, gymnasium, outdoor soccer and/or football fields, indoor pool and/or library, and other supporting spaces. This complex would serve to simultaneously address latent demand and modernize the City's infrastructure. This project did not proceed.

Subsequent to the Feasibility Study, the City initiated an Arena Renewal Strategy in 2010 that looked systematically at arena usage, cost recovery, participation trends, and asset management requirements. This process also included extensive public and stakeholder input and identified strong support to maintain existing arenas through strategic investment.

In 2013, the City initiated a process to pursue the renovation or replacement of the Sudbury Community Arena (the City's OHL and event venue). Public-private partnership opportunities are being explored and further analysis and consultation will be undertaken. Due to its multi-stakeholder and multi-sectoral impact, this project is proceeding outside the scope of this Master Plan.

Analysis

While demand remains high for prime time ice, a review of data for the Arena Renewal Strategy found a downward trend in ice usage during the shoulder times (being those times immediately before and after prime times), with the exception of the Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex. Based on a provision target of one ice pad per 405 youth registrants (there were 6,139 youth registrants in 2012/13), the Arena Renewal Strategy supports a demand for 15.1 pads across the City. With a supply of 16 pads, this suggests a small surplus at present. Recent data suggests that registrations have declined

further; based on available demographic data, this trend is projected to continue, potentially creating additional capacity within the system.

As a result, there is insufficient support for expanding the supply of municipal arenas over the course of this master planning period. The long-term demand for arenas should be monitored and reassessed at the time of the next City-wide Master Plan or when significant changes to supply or demand factors occur.

Nevertheless, the online survey found interest in improving and/or expanding the level of service at local areas (67% support for additional spending, ranking sixth out of 22 facility types). Respondents to a 2013 survey undertaken for the City's Arena Renewal Strategy indicated a strong preference for maintaining existing facilities, most of which are single pad designs. Efforts are currently underway to increase usage at I.J. Coady Arena in Levack, which has the lowest usage rate in the City. The success of these initiatives will be evaluated prior to the 2014/15 season.

The City's Arena Renewal Strategy notes the many advantages of multi-pad arenas. As has been the case with the Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex, multi-pad arenas provide greater support to sport development and tourism and also benefit from operational efficiencies (the net operating deficit for a twin pad arena is similar to that of a single pad arena despite offering twice as much ice). The City's existing stock of single pad arenas assists in addressing distributional gaps resulting from the City's expansive territory, although it is accepted that this level of decentralization comes at a cost. In 2012, the City of Greater Sudbury's fourteen municipal arena facilities recovered approximately 51% of their direct capital and operating cost through revenues; their net impact on the tax levy was \$4.77 million (an average of \$341,000 per facility). Any future arena construction should give strong consideration to the benefits of multi-pad designs where supported by demand.

Many of the City's arenas were designed for a different era and lack amenities common in modern facilities, such as additional dressing rooms, accessible washrooms, warm viewing arenas, walking tracks, etc. Fortunately, the City has been able to make some improvements relative to accessibility; a new rink board system was installed at Garson Arena to enable access for sledge hockey and door openers, accessible viewing areas, and entrance ramps have been added to a number of arenas. There is a particularly strong need to expand the number of non-dedicated change rooms within existing arenas as a result of the significant increase in co-ed minor hockey teams. Recent arena development and expansion projects have sought to address this shortcoming and this – along with accessible washrooms – is expected to remain a priority consideration in future projects.

There has been significant investment in maintaining and repairing the existing facilities, but a substantial level of capital funding will be required to upgrade the current inventory of arenas. Similar to many other communities, the City of Greater Sudbury's capital needs far outweigh its funding abilities. It is anticipated that the Department will continue to seek grant opportunities to further expedite capital renewal of arenas and other leisure infrastructure.

Action Plans

1. Continue to implement the Arena Renewal Strategy, which found a current and long-term demand for 15 total indoor ice pads across the entire City (resulting in a surplus of one ice pad). This will require:
 - a continued focus on maintaining existing arenas in a safe and community responsive condition, with consideration to the City's recent building condition assessments;
 - monitoring of usage trends and community demands to assess the possibility of decommissioning one existing ice pad; and
 - continued progress on the eventual renovation or replacement of the Sudbury Community Arena.
2. The decision to decommission any arena should be accompanied by a community engagement process, capital lifecycle analysis, evaluation of alternate uses, and options for the continued delivery of leisure services within the affected community.

5.4 Indoor Pools

Inventory & Background

There are currently five municipal indoor aquatic facilities located throughout the City that offer a range of aquatic and leadership programs in addition to recreational swims. Municipal pools include: Dow Pool, Gatchell Pool, Howard Armstrong Recreation Centre (HARC), Nickel District Pool, and Onaping Falls Pool. The City's largest pool complex is located at HARC, which contains a 25-metre tank in addition to a hot tub. The Dow, Gatchell, and Nickel District Pools are all 25-metre tanks consisting of 4 to 6 lanes. The Onaping Falls Pool features a smaller free-form single tank.

The municipal supply is supplemented by post-secondary and not-for-profit pools that offer varying degrees of public access, including the YMCA of Sudbury (lap pool and therapeutic leisure pool), Laurentian University (50-metre, 8-lane pool with diving platforms), Health Sciences North (therapeutic pool), Finlandia Village (small pool), and several hotels.

The following table illustrates the municipal indoor pool supply by community. Currently, the City is providing one indoor pool per 33,260 people. Due to its larger population, Sudbury has three municipal indoor pools. Onaping Falls and Valley East each have one indoor pool, while Capreol, Nickel Centre, Rayside-Balfour, and Walden have none.

Indoor Pool Inventory

Community	Current Supply (Indoor Pools)	Facilities	Current 2014 Per Capita Ratio (all ages)	Projected 2036 Per Capita Ratio (all ages)
Sudbury	3	Gatchell Pool, Nickel District Pool, RG Dow Pool; note: major non-municipal pools include Laurentian University and YMCA of Sudbury	33,727	35,017
Capreol	0		n/a	n/a
Nickel Centre	0		n/a	n/a
Onaping Falls	1	Onaping CC	4,290	4,600
Rayside-Balfour	0		n/a	n/a
Valley East	1	Howard Armstrong Recreation Centre	23,370	25,500
Walden	0		n/a	n/a
Total	5		33,260	35,360

Note: In calculating per capita ratios, rural residents have been distributed to existing communities in proportion to population.

In February 2014, the City of Greater Sudbury completed a Therapeutic Pool Feasibility Study to assess options for adding a therapeutic pool to the Lionel E. Lalonde Centre in Rayside-Balfour. The development of a therapeutic pool in this community was identified as a strategic priority by City Council and this Study recommended the provision of a therapeutic/leisure pool to serve the aging population, infants/young children, persons with disabilities, and those recovering from injuries or other health conditions. City Council received this report and requested that feedback on the Study's findings be sought through the public engagement program for this Master Plan. The online survey for this Master Plan found that 55% of respondents support this proposal (19% are not in support) and 30% of respondents felt that they would be somewhat, very, or extremely likely to use the facility on a regular basis. Given the facility's proposed market and programming, this is a favourable finding that supports the project's usage targets. A final decision regarding this project is not likely to be made until after this Master Plan is complete.

Analysis

An understanding of current municipal pool utilization is helpful in evaluating current and long-term facility needs. Data from the Master Plan's online survey indicated that 49% of Greater Sudbury households contain one or more members that have participated in indoor swimming within the past twelve months. In 2012, the City's indoor pools accommodated 176,694 swim visits and there was very little change over figures from 2010. The following tables illustrate pool usage for the years 2010, 2011, and 2012.

Swim Visits by Facility, 2010-12

Facility	2010	2011	2012	Change (2010-12)	
Gatchell	41,827	39,685	35,549	-6,278	-15.0%
Onaping Falls	8,854	7,512	7,412	-1,442	-16.3%
R.G. Dow	31,893	34,385	31,616	-277	-0.9%
HARC	60,570	60,227	60,278	-292	-0.5%
Nickel District	33,776	37,986	41,839	8,063	23.9%
Total Visits	176,920	179,795	176,694	-226	-0.1%

Source: City of Greater Sudbury, 2013

Swim Visits by Type, 2010-12

Type	2010	2011	2012	Change (2010-12)	
Lessons	60,350	67,206	66,652	6,302	10.4%
AquaFit / Aquacices	23,273	23,021	23,470	197	0.8%
Recreational Swims / Swim Visits	66,861	66,316	63,359	-3,502	-5.2%
Rentals	26,436	23,252	23,213	-3,223	-12.2%
TOTAL	176,920	179,795	176,694	-226	-0.1%

Source: City of Greater Sudbury, 2013

As reported in the Therapeutic Pool Feasibility Study, the HARC and Nickel District pools are the most used, although capacity to expand programming exists at these and all sites. Comparatively, the Onaping Falls Pool has extremely low usage levels and has a much smaller tank. City-wide swimming lesson registration, which is a good indicator of swimming demand, increased by 8% between 2003 and 2012, but declined slightly between 2011 and 2012.

Between 2010 and 2012, the City of Greater Sudbury's five municipal indoor pools averaged 35,500 annual swims each; if the lower performing (but smaller) Onaping Falls Pool is removed from this calculation, the City's pools are average 42,500 annual swims each. This data suggests that the City's pools are operating at about 60% of their theoretical capacity. Based on this high level assessment, there would appear to be available capacity for additional usage within the City's current pool supply. Most City pools are currently operating at between 40 to 80% of their theoretical capacities, with the Nickel District and HARC pools operating closer to the upper end of this range.

In comparison to many smaller scale facilities, indoor pools are capital intensive and carry significant operating expenses. Municipal indoor aquatic centres are virtually assured of running operational deficits from year to year, even in the largest of markets. In 2013, the City of Greater Sudbury's five municipal indoor pools recovered approximately 33% of their direct capital and operating cost through revenues; their net impact on the tax levy was \$1.76 million (an average of \$352,000 per facility).

Requests were received through the public open houses for the development of a modern aquatic complex, most notably in the South End. However, capacities and costs must be taken into account when projecting current and future needs. The 2004 Master Plan identified a target of one indoor aquatic centre (including City, YMCA, and University pools) per 25,000 residents. Based on research and service levels in other communities, this provision target remains appropriate for projecting long-term needs in the City of Greater Sudbury. This provision target is applied in the following table, which illustrates that there is currently a small surplus of facilities and no long-term need to provide an additional aquatic facility within the City of Greater Sudbury.

Projection of City-wide Aquatic Facility Needs

	2011	2021	2031	2036
Projected Population	166,330	171,750	175,840	176,800
Provision Standard	1 indoor aquatic centre per 25,000 population			
Indoor Aquatic Centres Required	6.7	6.9	7.0	7.1
Existing Supply (City, YMCA, University)	7			
Surplus (Deficit)	0.3	0.1	0.0	(0.1)

Population Forecast (Reference Scenario): City of Greater Sudbury. Growth Outlook to 2036. Draft, May 2013.

Although there is a sufficient number of municipal pools at present, opportunities to develop a therapeutic/leisure pool in Rayside-Balfour are currently being sought. The business case for this proposal relies heavily on the fact that this is an underserved community and that the proposed design would accommodate several new high demand aquatic activities, all within a multi-use recreational complex. All of the City's existing municipal pools are rectangular lane pools with deep water – the City has enough fitness and competition pools for its current and long-term needs. Other than the YMCA of Sudbury facility, there are no public leisure pools, which are characterized by shallower water, irregular shapes, and waterplay elements such as slides and sprayers. The online survey completed for this Master Plan found greater support for a therapeutic/leisure pool (67%) compared to a lane pool for lap swimming (58%). Considerable support was also expressed for this proposal through the public open houses. In this light, the continued pursuit of a therapeutic/leisure pool can be supported.

However, there remains considerable capacity within the City's existing pools, most of which do not contain modern design elements and are becoming increasingly costly to operate and maintain due to their advanced age. Noting this, the Therapeutic Pool Feasibility Study suggested that the development of a therapeutic/leisure pool should trigger a review of other municipal pools, with the closure of an aging and/or under-performing pool being one possible outcome.

The City's three lowest performing pools are Onaping Falls, Gatchell, and Dow. The Onaping Falls Pool serves a more geographically isolated area and the support for maintaining facilities in these communities was highlighted through the engagement process for the Arena Renewal Strategy. The Gatchell and Dow pools, however, are located close together (approximately four-kilometres) and provide very similar programming; further, both pools are stand-alone facilities that do not benefit from the cost efficiencies associated with shared operations.

Given the need to look more deeply at this issue, these and other factors (e.g., operational efficiencies, capital requirements, and facility renewal/closure options) should be considered through a comprehensive review of the City's indoor pools; this process should include targeted public input. Options for increasing use, such as the introduction of semi-structured swim programs that promote free play, should also be examined. In the meantime, existing indoor pool facilities should be maintained as long as the pools are financially and operationally viable, with consideration given to the City's recently completed building condition assessments.

Action Plans

3. Implement the City's Therapeutic Pool Feasibility Study to realize the provision of a therapeutic/leisure pool at the Lionel E. Lalonde Centre in Rayside-Balfour.
4. Undertake a review of the City's indoor pools to identify opportunities for operational efficiencies, increasing utilization, and an evaluation of capital requirements and options for facility renewal/closure. The decision to close or re-purpose any facility should come after a one-year review period following the development of a new facility.

5.5 Fitness Centres

Inventory & Background

There are five municipal fitness centres³ within the City of Greater Sudbury, as well as the McClelland Fitness Centre which is operated by a not-for-profit organization under agreement with the City. The fitness centre at the Falconbridge Wellness Centre has re-opened since the 2004 Master Plan was developed.

In addition, there are four not-for-profit fitness and health clubs (YMCA of Sudbury, Laurentian University, Cambrian College, and College Boréal), as well as several private fitness operations. It is believed that most, if not all, of these facilities are operating at less than full capacity and can accommodate new members.

Municipal Fitness Centre Inventory

Community	Current Supply (Fitness Centres)	Facilities	Current 2014 Per Capita Ratio (all ages)	Projected 2036 Per Capita Ratio (all ages)
Sudbury	1	McClelland Community Centre & Arena*	101,180	105,050
Capreol	1	Capreol Millennium Resource Centre	3,750	3,800
Nickel Centre	1	Falconbridge Wellness Centre	12,120	13,250
Onaping Falls	1	Dowling Leisure Centre	4,290	4,600
Rayside-Balfour	1	Lionel E. Lalonde Centre	13,110	14,350
Valley East	1	Howard Armstrong Recreation Centre	23,370	25,500
Walden	0		n/a	n/a
Total	6		27,717	29,467

Note: In calculating per capita ratios, rural residents have been distributed to existing communities in proportion to population.

* operated by a not-for-profit organization under agreement with the City

The City recently undertook a review of fitness membership categories and fees. Council has approved an option to increase fitness centre fees to realize a higher operating cost recovery target, as well as the viability of instituting a fitness equipment replacement reserve fund, among other matters.

Analysis

While some fitness services may be similar to those offered by other providers, the City's focus is largely on providing affordable physical activity to its residents within facilities that offer fewer amenities than generally offered by the private sector. Providing affordable recreation opportunities that encourage greater levels of physical activity is a key objective for the City and its fitness centres contribute toward this goal.

National trends indicate that there is increasing demand for fitness programming, despite nation-wide overweight and obesity rates that remain alarmingly elevated. There is also increasing interest in a broad range of new, holistic, health-based, and specialized active living programs and activities (e.g., pilates, sport-specific training, athletic therapy, etc.). "Active living" programs and services that seek to integrate physical activities into one's daily routine are also an increasing focus of municipal recreation

³ "Fitness centres", within the scope of this Plan, are considered to be equipment-based training clubs that include amenities such as treadmills, free-weights, and other exercise machines.

departments, especially as the number of older adults increases. The City has a variety of spaces (e.g., fitness studios, gymnasiums, and multi-use rooms) that can accommodate these activities. Opportunities to enhance and/or increase active living programming within community facilities should be explored.

In terms of equipment-based fitness centres, the 2004 Master Plan did not recommend a provision target, noting that these facilities are best provided only if a gap in service exists that cannot be adequately filled by an alternate provider and if the opportunity presents itself. Existing fitness centres should be maintained as long as these facilities are financially and operationally viable. The online survey found modest support for improving and/or expanding the level of service at municipal fitness centres (59% support, ranking them thirteenth out of 22 facility types).

The City's fitness centres are reasonably well distributed, particularly given the existence of alternate providers in the former City of Sudbury. The City's current fitness centres existed pre-amalgamation and the decision was made at amalgamation to continue this level of service. There is one minor geographic gap; that being the lack of equipment-based fitness centres in Walden; requests were received at the public open house for such as facility to be attached to the local arena. This is a matter worth monitoring and assessing in more detail as this community grows.

Action Plans

5. Seek opportunities to expand the City's focus on fitness programs and active living through the maximization of space within community facilities (e.g., multi-purpose rooms, fitness centres, halls, libraries, schools, etc.).
6. Maintain existing fitness centres as long as these centres are financially and operationally viable.
7. Assess demand for a fitness centre in Walden, should a viable co-location and/or partnership opportunity arise.

5.6 Gymnasiums

Inventory & Background

There are seven municipally-owned and operated gymnasiums in the City of Greater Sudbury, as well as numerous local school gymnasiums that are used by the City and community organizations for leisure programming. Gymnasiums are a good fit with other recreation facilities (particularly fitness centres and indoor pools) and are able to accommodate a wide variety of activities ranging from active team sports (e.g., basketball, volleyball, pickleball, futsal, etc.) to banquets and day camps.

Municipal Gymnasium Inventory

Community	Current Supply (Gymnasiums)	Facilities	Current 2014 Per Capita Ratio (all ages)	Projected 2036 Per Capita Ratio (all ages)
Sudbury	1	Minnow Lake Place	101,180	105,050
Capreol	1	Capreol Millennium Resource Centre	3,750	3,800
Nickel Centre	1	Falconbridge CC	12,120	13,250
Onaping Falls	2	Dowling Leisure Centre, Onaping CC	2,145	2,300
Rayside-Balfour	1	Lionel E. Lalonde Centre	13,110	14,350
Valley East	0		n/a	n/a
Walden	1	Naughton CC	8,480	10,250
Total	7		23,757	25,257

Note: In calculating per capita ratios, rural residents have been distributed to existing communities in proportion to population.

Analysis

The City is currently providing one municipal gymnasium per 23,757 residents. The 2004 Master Plan did not recommend a provision target for municipal gymnasiums due to the considerable reliance on school facilities. Community Use of School initiatives and joint use agreements⁴ are in place to provide the City and not-for-profit groups with affordable access to school board facilities, including gymnasiums, auditoriums, classrooms, sports fields, etc. The versatility of gymnasiums enables these spaces to accommodate rising demand for non-structured activities and drop-in programs.

The distribution of municipal gymnasiums across the City is fair, although there are no municipal gymnasiums in Valley East and only one within the former City of Sudbury. Only 44% of online survey respondents supported the improvement and/or expansion of municipal gymnasiums in the City (ranking them 21 out of 22 facility types). However, given their flexibility to accommodate a wide range of interests, any future recreation facility development – particularly in under-served communities – should consider opportunities to include a gymnasium.

Action Plans

8. To facilitate continued community access to school facilities (e.g., gymnasiums, classrooms, sports fields, etc.), maintain joint use agreements with school boards.
9. Future indoor leisure facility capital projects should consider opportunities to include gymnasiums.

⁴ The City is currently working to revise the expired joint use agreement.

5.7 Community Centres & Halls

Inventory & Background

There are a total of 27 municipal community centres and community halls in the City of Greater Sudbury. The designs of these facilities vary widely; some are small stand-alone halls, some are larger multi-use facilities, and others are halls attached to community arenas.

Municipal Community Centre & Hall Inventory

Community	Current Supply (Halls)	Facilities	Current 2014 Per Capita Ratio (all ages)	Projected 2036 Per Capita Ratio (all ages)
Sudbury	8	Carmichael CC, LoEllen CC, Delki Dozzi, McClelland Community Centre, Minnow Lake Place, O'Connor CC, Twin Forks, CC, Westmount CC	12,648	13,131
Capreol	2	Capreol Arena, Capreol Millennium Resource Centre	1,875	1,900
Nickel Centre	2	Falconbridge CC, Garson Arena	6,060	6,625
Onaping Falls	2	Dowling Leisure Centre, Onaping CC	2,145	2,300
Rayside-Balfour	4	Chelmsford Arena, Dr. Edgar Leclair Arena, Whitewater Lake Park, Lionel E. Lalonde Centre	3,278	3,588
Valley East	3	Centennial Arena, Howard Armstrong Recreation Centre, Senator Rheal Belisle Cultural Centre	7,790	8,500
Walden	6	BW Moxam, Fielding Memorial Park, Kinsmen Hall, Naughton CC, TM Davies CC, Whitefish CC	1,413	1,708
Total	27		6,159	6,548

Note: In calculating per capita ratios, rural residents have been distributed to existing communities in proportion to population.

In addition to municipal facilities, there are a number of community halls owned and operated by local boards and volunteers. Some non-municipal halls receive annual operating grants from the City (e.g., Wahnapiatae, Skead, Penage Road, Beaver Lake, Carol Richard, Kukagami). Service clubs, places of worship, schools, and hotels also provide gathering spaces of various size and quality.

The City's halls and community centres offer space for several purposes including: meeting space for non-profit groups; recreational programming; private functions and events; long term leases for community groups; and community-centric locations for clinics and information sharing sessions. Several programs are being provided directly by the City out of community centres and halls, such as senior walking, moderate fitness program, yoga, cardio plus (aerobics/ body shaping), acrylic painting, zumba, etc. The cross-programming opportunities and versatility offered by community centres (which contain multiple recreation components, such as pools, fitness centres, gymnasiums, halls, etc.) help these facilities outperform most community halls.

In the past several years, the operation of the City's community halls has been addressed in various reports and by several committees. A 2013 report to City Council recommended a number of changes to community hall operations, such as items relating to user fees, marketing, maintenance, catering services, and coordination. It was also recommended that the City issue a Request for Proposals for individuals or organizations that might be interested in operating halls on a contract basis, selecting three halls as pilot sites (Capreol, Falconbridge, Onaping Falls).

Analysis

The large majority of the City's community centres and halls are aging facilities that will require significant capital upgrades over time, including barrier-free improvements. However, many are under-utilized and expensive to operate, providing reduced return on investment. The City is currently working to update its User Fee By-law to provide greater consistency and sustainability related to rental charges, including initiatives to increase use of local halls.

As shown in the following table, in 2012, approximately 75% of hall usage was offered without charge to non-profit groups. In the same year, nearly 30% of community halls averaged one booking per week or less. Conversely, only HARC (Valley East), the Kinsmen Centre (Walden), and the Dowling Leisure Centre (Onaping Falls) halls averaged four or more bookings per week in 2012. Although the number of bookings did not change substantially between 2010 and 2012, a longer-view suggests that overall bookings have increased since the 2004 Master Plan was developed.

Community Hall Bookings, 2010-12

	2010	2011	2012
Complimentary Bookings			
Community Groups	1,458	1,560	1,151
Leisure Programs	667	793	1,106
City Usage	152	112	115
Paid Bookings	905	730	772
Total Bookings	3,182	3,195	3,144

There is clearly ample capacity at most halls and centres to accommodate additional usage. Due to the dispersed nature of the City's population, the 2004 Master Plan did not recommend a target for halls or community centres. However, an examination of the geographic distribution of facilities suggests that all population centres have reasonable to above average access to local community halls. Halls were not identified as a high priority through the online survey. Based on these findings, no additional community centres or halls are required over the course of this Plan.

Despite low utilization, residents generally support the retention of local halls and community facilities. As capital maintenance requirements rise, tough choices will need to be made. Guided by sound asset management practices, the City should maintain and/or upgrade existing community centres and halls to the degree possible, with priority placed on high-use facilities. However, alternative options (e.g., closure, divestiture, re-purposing, etc.) may need to be explored for under-performing halls, in consultation with the affected community. In January 2014, City Council approved the recommendations of the Community Halls Working Group, which dealt with marketing strategies, capital investment, and amendments to the User Fee By-law to reflect current practice, as well as a new and simplified schedule of user fees.

Action Plans

10. Continue to seek opportunities to streamline hall operations, including contracting out the operation of community halls as a way to mitigate costs and directly engage local communities in hall management.
11. As opportunities arise, seek ways to improve the flexibility and multi-use nature of existing community halls to facilitate a wider range of activities and age groups, including activities that focus on the increasing number of older adults.
12. Guided by sound asset management practices, maintain and/or upgrade existing community centres and halls to the degree possible, with priority placed on high-use facilities. Alternative options may need to be explored for under-performing halls, in consultation with the affected community.

5.8 Dedicated Space for Youth & Seniors

Inventory & Background

There are eight youth centres and 22 senior centres/clubs in the City of Greater Sudbury, many of which are sponsored by the City and/or facilitated through annual grants with local organizations. The City also communicates and responds to issues surrounding children, youth, and seniors through Advisory Panels that advocate for quality of life improvements for these residents throughout the City. Several community partners are involved in the delivery of services and programs to child, youth, and seniors in the city of Greater Sudbury.

Youth Centre Inventory, Compared to Priority Market (ages 10 to 19 years)

Community	Current Supply (Halls)	Facilities	Current 2014 Per Capita Ratio (ages 10-19)	Projected 2036 Per Capita Ratio (ages 10-19)
Sudbury	2	Ryan Heights Playground, Sudbury Action Centre for Youth	5,560	5,715
Capreol	1	Capreol Millennium Resource Centre	450	360
Nickel Centre	0		n/a	n/a
Onaping Falls	2	Dowling Leisure Centre, Onaping CC	250	220
Rayside-Balfour	1	Rayside-Balfour Youth Centre	1,670	1,430
Valley East	1	Valley East Youth Centre	3,410	2,400
Walden	1	Kinsmen Hall	1,140	1,060
Total	8		2,499	2,298

Note: In calculating per capita ratios, rural residents have been distributed to existing communities in proportion to population.

Senior Centre / Club Inventory, Compared to Priority Market (ages 55+ years)

Community	Current Supply (Halls)	Facilities	Current 2014 Per Capita Ratio (ages 55+)	Projected 2036 Per Capita Ratio (ages 55+)
Sudbury	9	Centre de santé Communautaire du Grand Sudbury, Le Club Amical du Nouveau-Sudbury, Club Joie de Vivre, Friendly to Seniors™ Sudbury, One-Eleven Senior Citizens' Centre Inc., ParkSide Older Adults Centre, Sudbury South Seniors and Pensioners, VON Adult Day Centre, West End Seniors' Club	3,477	3,938
Capreol	2	Capreol Seniors Club 240, Skead Seniors Citizen Club	549	698
Nickel Centre	2	Coniston Seniors and Golden Age Club, Nickel Centre Seniors	1,454	2,415
Onaping Falls	1	Onaping Falls-Golden Age Club	1,317	1,587
Rayside-Balfour	3	Club 50 de Rayside-Balfour, Rayside-Balfour Seniors' Craft Shop, Club Accueil Âge d'Or - Azilda	1,192	1,670
Valley East	2	Club Accueil Age d'Or de la Vallée, Valley East Seniors Club	2,699	4,672
Walden	3	Naughton Seniors and Pensioners, Penage Road Seniors, Walden Senior Citizens and Pensioners Inc.	827	1,002
Total	22		2,185	2,755

Note: In calculating per capita ratios, rural residents have been distributed to existing communities in proportion to population.

Analysis

Dedicated space and services for both youth and seniors are vital to a healthy community. These spaces and service providers take several different forms across the City, from stand-alone centres to shared facilities and from City provided to community provided. Access, affordability, and responsive services are key principles that all of these spaces strive to provide. From both a customer service and operational perspective, these types of spaces should be integrated with other community facilities wherever possible.

Youth are traditionally a very challenging market for municipal recreation departments to serve due to the wide range of needs (e.g., recreational, social support, leisure hang-out, etc.), segmentation, peer pressure, changing “trendiness” of certain activities, competing interests, and lack of transportation options. Opportunities for organized sports for this age group are provided by community organizations, leaving municipal and non-profit agencies to cater more towards unstructured drop-in activities. There is a large portion of youth who do not play sports or are considered to be “at-risk” – it is this population that is not normally engaged in meaningful leisure activities, whether due to a lack of interest or a lack of opportunity (or both). Not all youth want to participate in organized activities and sports programs; therefore, youth centres should provide a place for youth to occupy their time in a constructive and positive social setting. The Master Plan’s online survey and open houses found considerable interest in expanded program opportunities for teens, including keeping youth centres open during the summer.

The number of youth in the City is expected to decline by 8% by 2036. This downward trend is forecasted to be most noticeable in Valley East, Nickel Centre, and rural areas, whereas Walden is

projected to see an increase. The City's youth centres are generally well distributed; however, there is currently no such opportunity in Nickel Centre (an area that has a declining youth population). The condition and aging infrastructure of existing youth centres are also concerns. Furthermore, many youth centres are not in accessible locations. Youth Centres should be located near schools, in parks or community centres, and on transit and active transportation routes.

The 2004 Master Plan did not recommend a provision target for youth centres, instead relying on needs to be identified on a case-by-case basis and in partnership with community organizations (where appropriate). The City should continue to facilitate opportunities and offer spaces that respond to the needs of youth.

Conversely, considerable population growth is anticipated in the 55+ age group. In the past ten years, this age group increased by 23% and a further 26% increase is forecasted by 2036, with much of this growth to occur in the near term due to the aging baby boomer population. While this trend will be prevalent across the City, the areas projected to see the greatest proportional increase in older adults are Valley East, Nickel Centre, and rural areas. All of the City's communities currently have access to one or more seniors' clubs.

Traditionally, seniors have tended to participate in less physically rigorous activities, such as card playing, crafts, trips, socialization, etc. Although these pursuits will remain an important aspect of seniors' services, the aging baby boomers are more fit and focussed than previous generations on maintaining an active lifestyle. This is expected to translate into increased participation in active recreation pursuits (albeit at a gentler pace), particularly those that are health and fitness related. In this way, the leisure demands of the new senior will closely mirror the needs of older adults, which include activities such as fitness and swimming. As such, if the City establishes new seniors' spaces or clubs, strong consideration should be given to co-locating centres/clubs with community centres, rather than creating new stand-alone facilities.

Now that the boomers are reaching their senior years, the amount of segmentation within the 55+ group is growing based not just on age, but also on ability, income, culture, etc. Some categories may include pre-retirement older adults, active older adults, passive older adults, and elders. This has substantial implications on seniors' facilities and programming. For example, most current senior centres are ill-equipped to meet the wide range of needs of those ranging in age from 55 to over 90+ years old, nor are program options available to all interests amongst this age range (e.g., mixture of daytime and evening programming). Opportunities to re-examine the image of municipal recreational services for seniors and the ability to attract the younger members of the boomer generation are explored further in Section 7 of this Master Plan.

Action Plans

13. As opportunities arise, retrofit existing leisure facilities to ensure that these facilities are age-friendly (e.g., welcoming for children/youth, older adults, and all ages in between). This may include relocating services to more accessible locations or the provision of lounge areas, dedicated spaces, storage, accessible washrooms, etc.
14. Should the City establish any new youth or seniors' spaces, strong consideration should be given to co-locating these spaces with community centres, rather than creating new stand-alone facilities.

15. Maintain and/or upgrade existing youth and seniors' facilities to the degree possible, with priority placed on high-use facilities. Alternative options may need to be explored for under-utilized and/or deteriorating facilities, in consultation with the affected community.

5.9 Indoor Turf Facilities

Inventory & Background

The City of Greater Sudbury does not currently provide any indoor facilities for turf sports (e.g., soccer, football, baseball, track and field training, etc.), but did recently develop its first outdoor artificial turf field at the James Jerome Sports Complex, which allows for extended outdoor season use.

The private sector, in partnership with the Sudbury Regional Soccer Association (SRSA), operates an Indoor Soccer Centre (formerly the Exhibition Centre) in the former City of Sudbury. This past season a new operator took over the Indoor Soccer Centre and installed fieldturf. Some indoor soccer activities also take place in local school and post-secondary gymnasiums.

Based on a broad target of one indoor turf field per 100,000 residents, a Feasibility Study prepared by the City of Greater Sudbury for a Multi-use Recreation Complex in 2007 identified demand for two indoor turf fields (200 by 100 feet) to meet the needs of a variety of field sports and indoor events. This Multi-use Recreation Complex was not realized and is not currently being pursued.

Recently, the development of 80,000 square foot air-supported dome for indoor sports on St. Charles College lands has been proposed by the SRSA, St. Charles College, and a private operator. The City does not have any direct involvement in this initiative. The current proposal for the St. Charles College dome would include four small fields for soccer and two for baseball, as well as a batting cage and a running track along the dome's perimeter. Initial construction plans have been delayed but may proceed in 2014.

Analysis

The popularity of soccer is expanding into all seasons, which requires artificial turf indoor facilities, the development of which is a widespread trend across Ontario. Indoor soccer appeals to a smaller market segment than the outdoor game, but has the potential to continue to grow in popularity, particularly with trends suggesting increased interest in adult soccer.

The manner in which indoor sports field facilities are designed, funded, and operated varies widely across the province. Indoor sports fields can be: covered by domes or permanent structures (converted or purpose-built); small (similar to an outdoor mini field) or large (similar to an outdoor major field); and funded/operated by the municipality, not-for-profit group, and/or private sector. The fields can be used for sports such as minor baseball, field hockey, football, lacrosse, rugby, and other events, although soccer is typically the predominant activity. The financial viability of an indoor soccer facility is heavily influenced by its size, type of construction, and operating model. Many municipalities that have chosen to forgo providing indoor field facilities, instead deciding to allow the private sector to fill this void.

The City does not have a historic service level for municipally-provided indoor soccer facilities and has many other high priority needs. So as not to compete with private sector operations, it is recommended that the City refrain from becoming a direct provider or operator of indoor soccer facilities. At Council's discretion, the City may continue to provide nominal support to local soccer clubs for access to non-municipal indoor facilities as it has in the past.

Action Plans

- | |
|---|
| <p>16. Municipal development, administration, and/or operation of an indoor sports/soccer facility is not recommended at this time.</p> |
|---|

5.10 Arts & Culture Facilities

In the City of Greater Sudbury, responsibility for arts and culture service delivery is the responsibility of the Greater Sudbury Development Corporation (GSDC) given its strong connection to tourism and economic development. The GSDC is currently developing a new Cultural Plan that builds upon the City's 2006 Arts & Culture Strategy. The new Cultural Plan is a collaborative effort with the public and key stakeholders that will put forth a renewed vision for growth and success in the City's arts and culture sector.

It is not the intent of this Master Plan to duplicate the efforts of the City's Cultural Plan, which will address most facility (e.g., museums, galleries, theatres, etc.), programming, and service delivery needs. Rather, arts and cultural facilities are discussed at a high level due to their relevance to parks and leisure services. In fact, the City's Leisure Services Division is responsible for event coordination and operational oversight of the Grace Hartman Amphitheatre in Bell Park, along with several other facilities and parks capable of accommodating a wide range of arts and cultural activities.

Of particular interest is the Grace Hartman Amphitheatre (GHA), which recently underwent a renovation and expansion. This facility provides a full and varied seasonal program of community and professional events to residents and visitors alike, with fixed seating for 561 people and grass seating for an additional 1,400. A new sound and lighting system, public washrooms, vendor service area, and public parking were part of the capital upgrades. In 2013, the facility was booked for 41 days, a 50% increase over the previous year.

A Business Plan was completed for the GHA in 2010, which included guiding principles for the operation of the amphitheatre, a market analysis, rationale for seating capacity, and recommended operational practices. Following the first year of operations in 2011, a Business Plan Review process was initiated to address feedback received and needs for future capital investments, as well as a mandate for the facility. In 2013, a formal review of the 2010 GHA Business Plan was completed and presented to City Council. This report reaffirmed that the amphitheatre should continue to give priority to smaller scale, local not-for-profit community groups. The Business Plan Review also recommended that additional hard seating and a roof be added to the facility to increase frequency of high production/large scale promoted events; the capital improvement cost is currently estimated to be approximately \$6 million.

City Council has identified the installation of a roof on the GHA as a priority project within the City's 2012-2014 Strategic Plan. Options for achieving this goal, along with providing extra hard seating were identified as part of the Business Plan Review and will be considered as part of the 2014 budget process.

Action Plans

17. Participate in the development and implementation of the City's Cultural Plan being developed by the Greater Sudbury Development Corporation.
18. Continue to implement the 2013 Grace Hartman Amphitheatre Business Plan Review, with priority given to enhancements that promote use by local not-for-profit community groups.

5.11 Playgrounds

Inventory & Background

The City of Greater Sudbury has approximately 179 playground locations across the entirety of the municipality, an average of one for every 92 children birth to age nine. Some of these sites are shared with local schools, although school playgrounds have generally been excluded from this count. Improvements to the City's asset management practices have led to improved tracking of playgrounds, although additional work remains.

Several new playgrounds have been realized in new subdivisions over the past few years as the City has engaged developers in the installation of playgrounds in lieu of full parkland dedication. Four of these municipal playgrounds are fully barrier-free: two in Sudbury (James Jerome Sports Complex and Ridgcrest Playground); and two in Valley East (Howard Armstrong Recreation Complex and Theresa Playground).

Municipal Playground Inventory, Compared to Priority Market (ages 0 to 9 years)

Community	Current Supply (Playgrounds)	Accessible Playgrounds	Current 2014 Per Capita Ratio (ages 0-9)	Projected 2036 Per Capita Ratio (ages 0-9)
Sudbury	83	2	112	113
Capreol	7	0	51	49
Nickel Centre	18	0	77	71
Onaping Falls	10	0	44	45
Rayside-Balfour	19	0	71	72
Valley East	25	2	110	100
Walden	17	0	51	64
Total	179	4	92	92

Note: In calculating per capita ratios, rural residents have been distributed to existing communities in proportion to population.

Several of the City's playgrounds support summer programs run by volunteer Neighbourhood Associations. In 2013, there were a total of 946 playground program registrations and 1,526 day camp registrations.

Analysis

The per capita supply of playgrounds in the City of Greater Sudbury is amongst the highest in Ontario. The City's numerous small settlement areas and dispersed geographic landscape are part of the reason for the considerable supply, as is the fact that the City's various communities have experienced incremental growth that has resulted in the municipality accepting small parkland dedications that are

suitable for playgrounds and not much else. Per capita playground ratios are currently highest in Onaping Falls, Capreol, and Walden.

Many of the City's playgrounds also contain outdated and outmoded play equipment, surface treatments, and pathways. It should be noted that the new built environment regulations of the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act* will apply to playgrounds installed or redeveloped in 2015 and beyond. To address these concerns, the City has increased its annual capital funding since the last Master Plan was completed in order to improve a number of existing sites. The online survey found considerable interest in improving and/or expanding the level of service at playgrounds (79% support, third out of 22 facility types).

As a result of these factors, there is considerable redundancy and overlap amongst the City's playgrounds (some of which have buildings in various states of repair), leading to higher operational and capital costs; the issue of surplus playgrounds requires special attention moving forward.

The 2004 Master Plan recommended a distribution-based provision target of one play structure within an 800-metre radius of every urban residential neighbourhood, without crossing a major arterial road or physical barrier. Mapping illustrating the 800-metre radii (Appendix C) was undertaken and there are currently no notable gaps in playground distribution within the urban portions of the City's settlement areas.

Conversely, several parks containing only playgrounds are located less than 400-metres apart, half of the recommended radius. The previous Master Plan recommended that consideration be given to declaring these sites surplus or redeveloped for alternate uses and established criteria for consideration. In 2010, the City adopted the Parkland Disposal Policy established by the Green Space Advisory Panel (GSAP). The policy contains the following criteria:

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

6. *Parkland should not be disposed of if the site has an identified risk management function or liability or it protects significant municipal assets (i.e. well head protection);*
7. *Parkland should not be disposed where there are significant opportunities to add or link to existing green space or further create a more balanced parkland system, and*
8. *Proposed site for disposal should have low or limited recreation potential, conservation potential, or attractiveness/sense of place.*

As a next step, it is recommended that those parks containing surplus playgrounds (e.g., those within 400 metres of another playground) and no other necessary leisure amenities be evaluated based on the aforementioned criteria established by the GSAP. Should any of these properties be declared surplus by Council, the City would then follow the protocols established in the Parkland Disposal Policy.

In terms of barrier-free playground design, in 2008, City Council passed a resolution that accessibility issues must be considered (minimum of one accessible component) when installing new creative play structures. Inclusive playgrounds help to promote and develop inclusive communities and are vitally important to children with various disabilities, to families of children with various disabilities, to caregivers with disabilities, and to the citizens of the City of Greater Sudbury. According to the 2011-2012 City of Greater Sudbury Accessibility Plan, there are between 24,000 and 26,000 residents with disabilities in the community, with approximately 1,000 of these being children under the age of 15.

Funding from the City's Accessibility Advisory Panel and senior government grants has enabled the development of four fully accessible barrier-free playground sites in recent years and the City is hoping to continue the equitable distribution of these facilities throughout Greater Sudbury. To improve geographic distribution, locations in Rayside-Balfour, Nickel Centre, and Walden should be considered for the installation of fully accessible barrier-free playgrounds.

Action Plans

19. In new or redeveloping urban residential areas, ensure that play structures are provided within an 800-metre radius of every residence without crossing a major arterial road or physical barrier. As per City policy, all new play structures must have a minimum of one play component that is fully accessible. Signage that identifies age-appropriate information should also be provided.
20. To improve geographic distribution, locations in Rayside-Balfour, Nickel Centre, and Walden should be considered for the installation of fully accessible barrier-free playgrounds.
21. Council may consider the disposition or re-purposing of surplus playground sites (e.g., those within 400 metres of another playground) within the context of its Parkland Disposal Policy and Green Space Advisory Panel recommendations. Equipment in good repair should be moved to other sites.
22. For municipal playground sites that are to remain in the active inventory, continue to place a high priority on the maintenance and replacement of play equipment, with consideration to accessibility regulations.

23. Fully integrate the City's inventory of playgrounds (and other leisure assets) within the Geographic Information System to improve analytical tools and future planning.

5.12 Soccer Fields

Inventory & Background

There are 59 soccer fields of varying sizes within municipal parks, six of which have lights. To supplement this supply, the City facilitates community access to 27 fields on school board property. Because lit fields can accommodate extended evening play, each is counted as a factor of two; lit artificial turf fields are counted as a factor of three due to their extended play opportunities. In total, the City has an effective supply of 93 soccer fields (unlit equivalents).

Municipal Soccer Field* Inventory, Compared to Priority Market (ages 5 to 19 years)

Community	Current Supply				Current 2014 Per Capita Ratio (ages 5-19)	Projected 2036 Per Capita Ratio (ages 5-19)
	Lit Fields**	Unlit Fields	School Fields	TOTAL (Unlit Equivalents)		
Sudbury	4*** (9)	20	21	50	311	328
Capreol	0	1	0	1	620	540
Nickel Centre	0	10	0	10	242	191
Onaping Falls	0	2	0	2	365	335
Rayside-Balfour	0	3	1	4	588	535
Valley East	2 (4)	12	4	20	243	185
Walden	0	5	1	6	265	272
Total	6 (13)	53	27	93	302	290

* several fields are also used for other field sports such as football

**each lit field is equivalent to two unlit fields due to extended play opportunities

*** includes one lit artificial turf, which is equivalent to 3 unlit fields

School fields include those permitted by the City through joint use agreements

Note: In calculating per capita ratios, rural residents have been distributed to existing communities in proportion to population.

Several new soccer fields have been developed in recent years (Howard Armstrong Recreation Centre, Adanac/Rotary Park, Lionel E. Lalonde Centre, etc.) and the City installed its first artificial turf field at the James Jerome Sports Complex.

Analysis

In the City of Greater Sudbury, there are nearly as many youth playing outdoor soccer as there are playing hockey. In many communities across the Province, outdoor soccer had overtaken hockey years ago. Despite soccer's enormous growth in the last two decades, enrolment in outdoor soccer within Ontario peaked in 2007 and has seen small declines each year since. While overall soccer registration in Ontario may have begun to stabilize, registration in adult soccer leagues increased 62% between 2002 and 2011. Currently, the ratio of youth to adult outdoor soccer players is approximately 4 to 1 across the Province (it is approximately 5 to 1 in the City of Greater Sudbury). Growth in adult soccer can be partially attributed to the aging of youth soccer participants from the 1990s, and continuing participation in soccer.

Annual registration data collected by the City suggests that local participation is generally following provincial trends. The participation rate for youth soccer in Sudbury is slightly higher than the provincial average (16% versus 13%). However, registration has declined slightly since the 2004 Master Plan was prepared – there are presently approximately 5,400 organized soccer players in the City of Greater Sudbury, compared to 6,000 in 2003. Much of this can be attributed to the declining size of the child and youth population. The following table illustrates soccer registration data from the past three seasons.

Soccer Participants (registered), City of Greater Sudbury, 2011-13

	2011	2012	2013
Youth Participants	4,628	4,365	4,506
Adult Participants	721	922	906
Total Participants	5,349	5,287	5,412

Source: City of Greater Sudbury, 2013

The 2004 Master Plan recommended a market-driven provision target of one soccer field (unlit equivalent) per 65 active participants. This target was established with consideration to general standards of play and field capacities. Linking the target directly to participation helps to provide a true indication of demand. With access to 93 soccer fields (unlit equivalents) at present and 5,412 registrants, the City is currently providing one soccer field per 58 players. A target of 1:65 indicates a demand for 83 fields at the present level of registration; however, this figure is understated as several fields are also used for other field sports such as football. Taking into account the additional field users, the current soccer field supply is likely very close to meeting all needs, indicating that there is neither a surplus nor a deficit.

By applying current participation rates against population forecasts, it is projected that there will be a long-term need to maintain the current supply of soccer fields (93 unlit equivalents) to the year 2036; should participation rates change, this figure may require adjustment. The declining number of children and youth are likely to lead to reduced participation over the next decade, before rebounding to near current levels by 2036. Additional uptake of the game amongst adults may help to offset these declines in the intervening years.

Although City-wide figures suggest that the soccer field supply is meeting current needs (and the online survey found only modest interest in soccer field investment), it is necessary to examine provision levels on a community-basis. Currently, field to player ratios are lowest in Walden and Rayside-Balfour. There would appear to be a sufficient supply of fields presently in Sudbury, Nickel Centre, and Valley East. Despite having few fields, there are currently no organized leagues in Capreol and Onaping Falls.

Registrants per Soccer Field* (2013), by Community

	Youth Registrants	Adult Registrants	Total Registrants	Fields (unlit equivalents)	Registrants per Field
Sudbury	1,805	690	2,495	50	50
Capreol	0	0	0	1	0
Nickel Centre	535	0	535	10	54
Onaping Falls	0	0	0	2	0
Rayside-Balfour	316	0	316	4	79
Valley East	1,250	216	1,466	20	73
Walden	600	0	600	6	100
Total	4,506	906	5,412	93	58

Source: City of Greater Sudbury, 2013

* Several fields are also used for other field sports such as football

Even after adjusting for use of soccer fields by other sports such as football (the majority of which occurs on fields in Sudbury), provision levels are acceptable in all communities with the exception of Walden and Rayside-Balfour. To improve distribution, the City may consider providing three additional fields (mini fields to serve a growing child population) in Walden, as well as one additional field (full field) in Rayside-Balfour. Lighting of additional fields should also be contemplated in order to better serve competitive and adult soccer, which tends to play later into the evening; there are presently only six lit fields across the entire City.

With the City having substantially increased the number of municipal fields in recent years, based on experiences in other communities, soccer associations are likely to be more concerned about field quality than field quantity. With multiple sports using some fields (e.g., soccer and football), usage patterns can create conflicts and deteriorated turf quality. While some concerns can be addressed through scheduling, the use of artificial turf can help to mitigate these conflicts.

Furthermore, the City has sufficient flat land at the Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex to develop three full size lit soccer fields – this project should proceed as originally recommended in the 2004 Master Plan. Development of fields at this location would help to address the need for lit fields and create a centralized tournament centre; there are presently only six parks across the entire City that contain three or more fields. It would further allow for organized soccer to be transitioned away from some marginal park sites that are embedded within neighbourhoods and are not designed to accommodate the parking and noise impacts associated with organized sports.

Action Plans

24. Develop a soccer complex with three full size lit fields at the Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex. Consideration should be given to developing one field as artificial turf, as well as a support building (dressing rooms, storage, concession, washrooms).
25. Provide three additional mini fields in Walden and one additional full field in Rayside-Balfour through park development/expansion or agreement.
26. Continue to upgrade existing soccer fields to meet local needs, including the identification of additional fields suitable for lighting installation. Preference should generally be given to fields in areas of need and park sites with multiple fields.

27. Maintain access to the parking lot at the former Barrydowne Arena in order to provide parking for the newly established mini fields at Adanac/Rotary Park.

5.13 Ball Diamonds

Inventory & Background

There are a total of 49 municipal ball diamonds in the City (including 24 lit diamonds and one school diamond under agreement). Like soccer fields, ball diamonds with lights can accommodate extended play and are considered to be equivalent to two diamonds each, raising the supply to 73 diamonds (unlit equivalents). The City also has several lower quality diamonds (typically identified by an old backstop and grass infield) that are unused and have been excluded from this inventory, despite being included in the 2004 Plan.

Municipal Ball Diamond Inventory

Community	Current Supply				Current 2014 Per Capita Ratio (all ages)	Projected 2036 Per Capita Ratio (all ages)
	Lit Fields*	Unlit Fields	School Fields	TOTAL (Unlit Equivalents)		
Sudbury	9 (18)	10	0	28	3,614	3,752
Capreol	2 (4)	1	0	5	750	760
Nickel Centre	4 (8)	3	0	11	1,102	1,205
Onaping Falls	1 (2)	2	0	4	1,073	1,150
Rayside-Balfour	2 (4)	2	0	6	2,185	2,392
Valley East	4 (8)	5	0	13	1,798	1,962
Walden	2 (4)	1	1	6	1,413	1,708
Total	24 (48)	24	1	73	2,278	2,422

* each lit diamond is equivalent to two unlit diamonds due to extended play opportunities

School diamonds include those permitted by the City through joint use agreements

Practice/scrub diamonds are excluded

Note: In calculating per capita ratios, rural residents have been distributed to existing communities in proportion to population.

Analysis

In the City of Greater Sudbury, while nearly the same number of residents play baseball as do soccer, the ratio of youth to adults is inverted, with four times as many adults playing the sport as youth. Provincially, baseball leagues (including softball, hardball, fastball, and slo-pitch) have generally seen a decline in participation since 1992 in Ontario, partly at the expense of soccer's growing popularity. Baseball Canada has taken significant steps in addressing this decline by introducing new programs and enhancing communication with its member organizations. Nationally, softball has seen a similar decline, however, it appears to be stabilizing as the sport is a popular option for adult recreational leagues and women are increasingly finding the game more attractive, especially on a competitive level.

Annual registration data collected by the City suggests that local baseball participation is generally following provincial trends. Locally, registration has declined slightly since the 2004 Master Plan was prepared – there are presently approximately 5,130 organized ball players in the City of Greater Sudbury, compared to 5,730 in 2003. Much of this can be attributed to the declining size of the child and youth population. The following table illustrates baseball registration data from the past three seasons.

Baseball Participants (registered), City of Greater Sudbury, 2011-13

	2011	2012	2013
Youth Participants	946	994	1,125
Adult Participants	4,320	4,336	4,008
Total Participants	5,266	5,330	5,133

Source: City of Greater Sudbury, 2013

The 2004 Master Plan recommended a market-driven provision target of one baseball diamond (unlit equivalent) per 80 active participants. This target was established with consideration to general standards of play and field capacities. Linking the target directly to participation helps to provide a true indication of demand. With access to 73 ball diamonds (unlit equivalents) at present and 5,133 registrants, the City is currently providing one baseball diamond per 70 players. A target of 1:80 indicates a demand for 64 diamonds at the present level of registration, suggesting a modest surplus. This is supported by the online survey, which found low levels of support for ball diamond improvements (they ranked 18 out of 22 facility types).

By applying current participation rates against population forecasts, it is projected that there will be a long-term need for approximately 66 diamonds (unlit equivalents) by 2036; should participation rates change, this figure may require adjustment. As a result, much of the current surplus is likely to be sustained over time, at least on a City-wide basis.

Although City-wide figures suggest a surplus of diamonds, it is necessary to examine provision levels on a community-basis.

Registrants per Ball Diamond (2013), by Community

	Youth Registrants	Adult Registrants	Total Registrants	Diamonds (unlit equivalents)	Registrants per Diamond
Sudbury	737	1896	2,633	28	94
Capreol	0	72	72	5	14
Nickel Centre	0	488	488	11	44
Onaping Falls	56	96	152	4	38
Rayside-Balfour	90	520	610	6	102
Valley East	242	492	734	13	56
Walden	0	444	444	6	74
Total	1,125	4,008	5,133	73	70

Source: City of Greater Sudbury, 2013

Currently, diamond to player ratios are lowest in Rayside-Balfour and Sudbury; there would appear to be a sufficient supply of fields presently in all other communities. To equalize distribution, approximately five additional diamonds (unlit equivalents) would be required in Sudbury as well as two in Rayside-Balfour. However, given the current surplus and downward registration trend, it is recommended that the City monitor needs over time and seek to accommodate any short-term peaks in demand through the use of school diamonds, scheduling practices, or improvements to existing diamonds. Barring substantial changes to participation rates, the development of new diamond is not anticipated during the timeframe of this Plan.

Similar to soccer, baseball associations are likely to be more concerned about quality of diamonds rather than quantity. This is a common problem in many municipalities as many diamonds were built years ago

and fencing, benches and lighting have deteriorated. Further, many diamonds were built at a time when youth baseball was more popular. Today, many diamonds are being expanded to accommodate adult users. The City should continue to evaluate the need for major capital upgrades to existing diamonds on an as-needed basis. For example, the City and Sudbury Minor Baseball Association have established a cost-sharing arrangement to install lights on the only unlit diamond at the Terry Fox Complex in Sudbury (an area that may be slightly underserved at present).

Lastly, given the current and future outlook for the sport, many municipalities are converting surplus ball diamonds to other field sport uses (e.g., soccer, football, etc.) or other amenities (e.g., off-leash dog parks, skateboard parks, etc.), where feasible. This continues to be an option for the City to consider in certain communities.

Action Plans

28. Demand for additional diamonds is not anticipated during the timeframe of this Plan. Nevertheless, the City should continue to monitor registration data, with particular focus on the Sudbury and Rayside-Balfour areas.
29. Upgrades may be made to selected diamonds with the assistance of local organizations, including the installation of lights at the Terry Fox Complex (Diamond #2). Preference should generally be given to fields in areas of need and park sites with multiple fields.
30. Lower quality practice or scrub diamonds should be evaluated and redeveloped for other uses, where appropriate.

5.14 Other Sports Fields

Inventory & Background

There are no dedicated football fields in the City; however, the artificial turf field at James Jerome Sports Complex and the natural turf field at Queen's Athletic Field are used predominantly for football and soccer. Secondary school fields are also heavily used for football.

Analysis

Sports other than soccer that are accommodated to varying degrees on City and school fields include football, field lacrosse, rugby, field hockey, cricket, and ultimate frisbee. Each of these are niche sports with low participation rates (and low support through the Master Plan's online survey, although there were some open-ended comments in support of a dedicated cricket pitch in the City), but there is evidence of some growing demand for these sports in communities across Ontario. The following table identifies registration data for several organized fields sports in the City.

Other Field Sport Participants (registered), City of Greater Sudbury, 2011-13

	2011	2012	2013
Football – Youth Participants*	800	578	754
Football – Adult Participants	90	90	90
Cricket Participants	20	20	15
Rugby Participants	30	0	0
Ultimate Frisbee Participants	140	50	60
Total Participants	1,080	738	919

* includes Joe MacDonald Youth Football League and School Teams

Source: City of Greater Sudbury, 2013

Football, field hockey, lacrosse, ultimate frisbee, and rugby are activities that can all utilize the same field, with some design and operational adjustments. For example, because of the turf damage that can be caused by football and rugby, conflicts with other sports may occur. The preferred solution is to redirect football and rugby usage to fields that are: (a) artificial; or (b) shared with other sports that are not as concerned with field conditions (e.g., rugby). The ability to accommodate a wide variety of sports is part of the reason for recommending the development of an artificial turf field at the Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex. All artificial turf fields should be designed to accommodate these various activities, which may assist in growing the sports at the youth level.

Conversely, a properly designed cricket field consists of a large circular or oval-shaped grassy ground. There are no fixed dimensions for the field but its diameter can be as large as 150 metres, which requires an oval piece of land approximately two hectares (five acres) in size. A cricket field is about twice the size of a rectangular sports field and two such fields situated side-by-side can be used for cricket if they have the proper slope. In Ontario, cricket is played primarily by adults, although many clubs have had success in building youth programs. At present, there are approximately 15 cricket players in the City of Greater Sudbury, not enough to substantiate the development of a dedicated pitch. Some interest was expressed through the online survey for cricket fields; however, additional engagement with this sporting community would be required to better understand current needs and long-term sport development plans.

Action Plans

31. Ensure that the artificial turf field recommended for the Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex is designed to accommodate a wide range of field sports, including football, field lacrosse, ultimate frisbee, etc.

5.15 Outdoor Basketball Courts**Inventory & Background**

The City maintains a total of 19 half and 21 full basketball courts in municipal parks for a total of 30.5 full court equivalents (each half court equals 0.5 courts). Additional hoops and courts are provided at schools for use outside of school hours. The City is considering basketball court provision in new neighbourhood parks, with a new court recently being installed in Sunrise Park (Sudbury).

Outdoor Basketball Court Inventory, Compared to Priority Market (ages 10 to 19 years)

Community	Current Supply			Current 2014 Per Capita Ratio (ages 10-19)	Projected 2036 Per Capita Ratio (ages 10-19)
	Half Courts	Full Courts	Full Court Equivalents		
Sudbury	3 (1.5)	9	10.5	1,059	1,089
Capreol	2 (1)	1	2	225	180
Nickel Centre	5 (2.5)	2	4.5	378	280
Onaping Falls	2 (1)	1	2	250	220
Rayside-Balfour	0	3	3	557	477
Valley East	3 (1.5)	2	4	974	686
Walden	4 (2)	3	5	228	212
Total	19 (9.5)	21	30.5	655	603

Note: In calculating per capita ratios, rural residents have been distributed to existing communities in proportion to population.

Analysis

Basketball is a popular sport amongst teens and outdoor courts provide opportunities for unstructured play, particularly as the activity is easily incorporated into neighbourhood-level parks, thus allowing easy access (by foot or bicycle). In fact, basketball ranks behind only soccer in terms of number of teens (ages 12-17 years) participating across Canada (ahead of hockey, football, tennis, golf, and baseball).

The degree to which the City's basketball courts are used is unknown; the same can be said for many other unstructured amenities. To help the City prioritize capital funding, it is recommended that an "observation project" be undertaken to document usage of unscheduled and casual use park amenities, such as tennis courts, basketball courts, bocce courts, playgrounds, etc. This observation project would require periodic visits to several parks at various times and days of the week. This information will allow for a better understanding of who is using which parks, which amenities, and when, thereby providing the City with justification for facility re-purposing, repair, and/or expansion.

Given that outdoor basketball courts appeal mostly to youth, the provision target should be correlated with the size of this age group rather than the population as a whole (where data exists). The 2004 Master Plan recommended a target of one basketball court per 750 youth ages 10 to 19 years. In the absence of any quantifiable usage data, this target remains appropriate at this time. On a City-wide basis, there is currently one full court equivalent for every 655 youth ages 10 to 19 years. Many municipalities aspire to provide one court between 500 and 750 youth, so the finding that the City is within this range is reassuring. The online survey found little support for improving and/or expanding the provision of outdoor basketball courts (45% support for a rank of 20 out of 22 facility types).

The latest age cohort population forecasts anticipate a decline of approximately 1,610 youth across the City by 2036 (a decrease of 8%). As a result, the provision ratio is forecasted to decline to one court per 603 teens even if the current supply remains static. Application of the provision target suggests a need for approximately 27 courts and present, declining to 25 courts by 2031.

However, outdoor courts are community-level facilities and accessibility is an important consideration. The distribution of outdoor basketball courts is relatively good across the City, particularly in the less populated communities. Current supply to population ratios are poorest in Sudbury and Valley East (1:1,059 and 1:974, respectively). In these communities in particular, new basketball court development may be considered within new residential subdivisions that do not have any municipal courts within 1-

kilometre. New facilities should be designed as half courts unless the goal is to create opportunities for outdoor ice skating on the same pad, in which case a full court may be considered.

Mapping illustrating the 1.0-kilometre radius has been developed to assist in confirm potential gaps and overlaps in basketball court distribution (see Appendix C). At 1.0 km, there are several gaps in basketball court distribution. A total of six notable gaps exist in the following areas: Onaping Falls (Onaping, Levack, or the urban portion of Dowling); Sudbury (Copper Cliff, Downtown, Minnow Lake, and South End); and Valley East (Val Caron). At 1.0 km, there are also some overlaps in basketball court distribution, including one in Rayside-Balfour (St. Onges/Jacques Cartier and Coté Park) and one in the former City of Sudbury (East End Playground and Ridgemount Playground).

The identification of proper sites for teen-focussed outdoor amenities such as basketball courts and skate parks can be challenging as there is a need to mitigate noise and deter inappropriate behaviours at these facilities. The following are some of the more substantial considerations:

- Space is very important in that the facility should be sufficiently sized to provide a large buffer area from neighbouring properties, as well as having enough space to construct the facility without displacing or crowding other users. Because basketball courts and skate parks tend to attract older children and teens, these facilities may not be appropriate directly adjacent to playgrounds or spray pads.
- Visibility is critical to protect the users, as well as allowing neighbours and police to monitor activity at the facilities at all hours. Security lighting is also critical to support visibility, but full lighting of the facility is not recommended so as not to encourage after-hours usage.
- Access to transportation, especially transit, allows users to travel to a location and will maximize the use of the facility. Parking may also be in place to support users who would travel by car to the facility; this is particularly important for skate parks. Access to washrooms may also be considered.

Distancing teen-focussed outdoor amenities in isolated locations is not the answer. Locations adjacent to community centres or within community parks provide many of these required elements, including access to other activities, and are generally preferred as potential sites for amenities such as basketball courts and skate parks.

Action Plans

- | | |
|-----------------------|--|
| <p>32.</p> <p>33.</p> | <p>Undertake an “observation project” to document usage and assist in prioritizing opportunities for the re-purposing, repair, and/or expansion of unscheduled and casual use park amenities, such as tennis courts, basketball courts, bocce courts, playgrounds, etc.</p> <p>New basketball court development may be considered within noted gap areas and new residential subdivisions that do not have any municipal courts within 1-kilometre. New facilities should be designed as half courts unless the goal is to create opportunities for outdoor ice skating on the same pad.</p> |
|-----------------------|--|

5.16 Outdoor Tennis Courts

Inventory & Background

There are 59 public tennis courts in the City of Greater Sudbury, 39 of which are lit for evening play. School courts may also be available in some areas. Although this implies an increase over the supply listed in the 2004 Master Plan, not all courts are netted as many are in disrepair or used for other uses (e.g., ball hockey, skate park, etc.). No municipal tennis courts have been developed in several years.

Outdoor Tennis Court Inventory

Community	Current Supply			Current 2014 Per Capita Ratio (all ages)	Projected 2036 Per Capita Ratio (all ages)
	Unlit Courts	Lit Courts	Total Courts*		
Sudbury	9	15	24	4,216	4,377
Capreol	0	4	4	938	950
Nickel Centre	0	7	7	1,731	1,893
Onaping Falls	7	0	7	613	657
Rayside-Balfour	0	3	3	4,370	4,783
Valley East	2	4	6	3,895	4,250
Walden	2	6	8	1,060	1,281
Total	20	39	59	2,819	2,997

* Not all tennis courts may have nets

Note: In calculating per capita ratios, rural residents have been distributed to existing communities in proportion to population.

Analysis

Tennis courts are inclusive facilities that accommodate most age groups and a variety of skill levels. Interest in tennis has varied considerably in the past, but a passionate base of players in some communities. Many municipalities across the province are dealing with a surplus of courts and new court development is generally only occurring within new residential areas.

While there is some evidence that baby boomers are creating a small boost in tennis participation after years of the sport being in decline, the fastest growing sport in Canada is actually pickleball, a lower intensity paddle sport that can be played on modified tennis courts (it requires a badminton-sized court with a net that is slightly lower than tennis height). Pickleball recently debuted at the Ontario Senior Games and is easy for beginners to learn, but can develop into a quick, fast-paced, competitive game for experienced players. Notable demand for pickleball was expressed at the public open houses and the City should consider converting selected tennis courts to accommodate this growing activity.

The 2004 Master Plan identified a provision target of one tennis court per 5,000 persons, which each of the City's communities are currently meeting. In fact, the City is currently supplying one tennis court for every 2,819 residents, nearly double the provision target. Some of this inefficiency is a result of the City's size and the need to provide courts on a community or neighbourhood basis, as well as the fact that many courts are in poor condition due to lack of use. Based on a 1.0 km service radius (see Appendix C), there are two modest gaps in tennis court distribution in Sudbury (New Sudbury/Barrydowne and the South End).

Nonetheless, there is currently a sizable surplus of tennis courts, particularly in Onaping Falls, Capreol, Walden, Nickel Centre, and to a lesser degree Sudbury. Based on a 1.0 km service radius, overlaps in tennis court distribution are noted between the following parks, all within the former City of Sudbury:

- James Jerome Sports Complex and Lockerby Playground
- O'Connor Playground and Sacre Couer Soccer Fields
- Quinn & Logan and Delki Dozzi

Despite a small number of gaps, no additional courts are required in any area of the City during the timeframe of this Plan. This is further supported by the online survey data that indicates low levels of support for investment (tennis courts ranked nineteenth out of 22 facility types).

Further, the backlog of deferred maintenance on City tennis courts is significant and growing even though the City undertakes court repairs (e.g., resurfacing, lighting, fencing, etc.) as funding allows. There is also a sense that many tennis courts are not well used. To determine actual usage of casual park amenities, an observation project of City parks is recommended (see outdoor basketball court section); the findings of this initiative would assist the City in identifying key sites for capital improvements and/or decommissioning.

Action Plans

34. No additional courts are required in any area of the City during the timeframe of this Plan. The City should convert under-utilized tennis pads in over-supplied areas to other alternative uses (e.g., pickleball) or remove the courts entirely to mitigate capital requirements.

5.17 Splash Pads & Beaches

Inventory & Background

The City has eight splash pads and seven supervised beaches. There are no municipal outdoor pools. Unsupervised beach areas also exist in a number of other park locations.

The following table identifies the provision of splash pads by community. The majority of these facilities have been built within the past ten years.

Splash Pad Inventory, Compared to Priority Market (ages 0 to 9 years)

Community	Current Supply (Splash Pads)	Locations	Current 2014 Per Capita Ratio (ages 0-9)	Projected 2036 Per Capita Ratio (ages 0-9)
Sudbury	5	Memorial Park, O'Connor, Ridgecrest, Westmount	1,854	1,884
Capreol	0		0	0
Nickel Centre	0		0	0
Onaping Falls	0		0	0
Rayside-Balfour	1	Coté Park	1,350	1,360
Valley East	1	Howard Armstrong Recreation Centre	2,750	2,490
Walden	1	Kinsmen Sports Complex	860	1,080
Total	8		2,051	2,051

Note: In calculating per capita ratios, rural residents have been distributed to existing communities in proportion to population.

Analysis

Splash pads are unsupervised outdoor aquatic facilities containing interactive water play features, such as spouts, jets, water walls, fountains, water guns/cannons, water buckets, etc. The size and number of features can vary from one facility to the next. Splash pads contain no standing or pooled water and typically use fresh or treated/recirculated water. With no admission fee, these facilities are particularly appealing to families with young children and are a key contributor to the City's goal of creating a healthy community.

The City has established several new splash pads in recent years and all have been well received by the community. Being community or even neighbourhood-level facilities, the distribution of splash pads is very important. 66% of online survey respondents supported the improvement and/or expansion of splash pads in the City (ranking them ninth out of 22 facility types).

Many municipalities have established targets of providing one splash pad within one to two kilometres of all urban residential areas to promote walkability. The City's 2004 Master Plan was supportive of additional splash pads but did not specify a provision measure. Continued expansion of the municipal splash pad inventory is recommended, with seven to eight new facilities being required in the next ten years. Presently, there are no such facilities in Nickel Centre, Onaping Falls, and Capreol. Based on a 1.5 km service radius, there are several localized gaps that exist in other communities, including Rayside-Balfour (Azilda), Valley East (Val Caron), and Sudbury (South End, Minnow Lake, and Bell Park); mapping is provided in Appendix C.

The City should continue to pursue plans with partners to install a signature splash pad at Bell Park to serve local residents, City-wide residents, and those visiting the City's premier park. Many of the City's splash pads are small and simple, and do not include designs that would fully engage a child's imagination. Greater variety in scale and design is recommended as new splash are developed in the City, particularly those at major community destinations (e.g., Bell Park).

Due to higher levels of use and appeal for young children/families, splash pads should be provided in community parks that have access to washrooms, change areas, and off-street parking; shade and seating is also desired. Within the park, siting of splash pads is important. These facilities should be located near parking but kept a safe distance away from streets. Splash pads work well when near playgrounds, but a proper distance should be maintained to restrict users from tracking sand (which can clog drains) into the splash pad.

Beaches provide a valuable recreational experience and a medium for swim lessons. The City's supervised beaches appear to be operating well, are generally well distributed, and are in proximity to concentrated populations. The online survey found considerable interest in improving and/or expanding the level of service at municipal beaches (81% support, second out of 22 facility types). The City should continue to maintain its supervised beaches to ensure there is an opportunity to participate in this form of summertime recreation. Additional public engagement may be required to determine possible areas for improvement to beach areas.

In late 2012, the Province of Ontario introduced new technical requirements under the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act* relative to beach access routes (among other items). These regulations apply to beach access routes constructed and redeveloped in 2016 and beyond. When redeveloping

existing or establishing new beach access routes, the City must have regard to these requirements, which identify prescribed widths, slopes, surfacing (firm and stable), etc.

Action Plans

35. Continue to expand the municipal splash pad inventory through application of a 1.5-kilometre service radius within urban residential areas. Based on the present distribution, seven to eight new splash pads would be required to meet this target, including sites within Garson, Onaping/Dowling, Capreol, Sudbury (South End, Minnow Lake, and Bell Park), and possibly Azilda and/or Val Caron. Splash pads should be provided in community parks that have access to washrooms, change areas, and off-street parking.
36. Continue to maintain municipally supervised beaches and to ensure that beach access routes meet or exceed the technical requirements of the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act*. Additional public engagement should be undertaken to determine possible areas for improvement to beach areas.

5.18 Off-Leash Dog Parks

Inventory & Background

The City recently developed its first leash-free dog park, which is located off Second Avenue in Sudbury. A committee has been established to further enhance the site. A by-law for regulating the use of the park has been approved and appropriate signage has been installed. The Azilda Community Action Network is fundraising toward establishing an off-leash dog park at North End Playground in the Rayside-Balfour area.

Analysis

With local by-laws regulating the use of leashes, dedicated off-leash areas provide pet owners with the opportunity to exercise and socialize dogs in a controlled area. Leash-free parks should not be viewed as being facilities strictly for pets, but also a venue for exercise and social interaction for residents with a common interest.

Off-leash parks have proven to be quite successful in many municipalities, with larger urban areas often having several such facilities. Often, there is little need for dog parks in rural areas since there are generally sufficient private open spaces available for dogs; it is in the urbanized area where properties are smaller that demand is more evident. Dog parks can also be polarizing in some communities; in Greater Sudbury, the online survey found low to moderate support (47%), but also moderate opposition (23%, the highest of all facility types).

The safety of other park users, setbacks from residential and environmentally sensitive areas, and the provision of amenities (e.g., parking, benches, waste containers, etc.) are important considerations in the design of leash-free parks. The City's Off-leash Committee should establish criteria for evaluating sites for future dog parks, with consideration of the following factors (at a minimum):

- existing park locations, uses, and intensity
- potential environmental impacts (environmentally sensitive features should be avoided)
- sufficient land base (ideally a minimum of two hectares)
- availability of on-site parking
- ample buffers from adjacent land uses (particularly schools and residential areas)
- accessibility via pathways and/or trails and roads

Selecting appropriate sites that are supported by residents is often the most significant challenge in establishing leash free parks. The City should develop further criteria that address concerns of local dog owners and other members of the community. Further, many municipalities require that their dog parks be managed by an affiliated organization in order to act as park stewards, which should be a requirement for any future parks in the City of Greater Sudbury. Considerations to fund development of dog parks through pet licensing fees or surcharges should be considered.

The City should look to engage local communities and organizations in the planning, creation, and operation of future off-leash dog parks, with priority given to the City's larger urban areas, including: Sudbury (south/southwest area); Rayside-Balfour; and Valley East. The City's Off-leash Committee is currently examining the feasibility of establishing an off-leash dog park in Rayside-Balfour (in a municipal park in place of an under-utilized scrub ball diamond).

Action Plans

- | |
|---|
| <p>37. Establish formal criteria for identifying and evaluating potential sites for future off-leash dog parks, with consideration to those identified in this Plan.</p> <p>38. Engage local communities and organizations in the planning, creation, and operation of future off-leash dog parks, with priority given to the City's larger urban areas, including: Sudbury (south/southwest area); Rayside-Balfour; and Valley East.</p> |
|---|

5.19 Outdoor Ice Rinks

Inventory & Background

The City of Greater Sudbury assists in the operation of approximately 56 outdoor winter ice rinks that are maintained and run by a dedicated corps of community volunteers. Not only are the rinks used for public skating and special events, the facilities are also scheduled for organized hockey, figure skating, and school activities. The large majority of these rinks are boarded facilities. The number of active rinks can vary slightly from year to year depending on volunteer commitment. Several rink buildings are also used to support summer playground programs.

Outdoor Rink Inventory

Community	Current Supply (Outdoor Rinks)	Current 2014 Per Capita Ratio (all ages)	Projected 2036 Per Capita Ratio (all ages)
Sudbury	27	3,747	3,891
Capreol	3	1,250	1,267
Nickel Centre	5	2,424	2,650
Onaping Falls	3	1,430	1,533
Rayside-Balfour	2	6,555	7,175
Valley East	7	3,339	3,643
Walden	9	942	1,139
Total	56	2,970	3,157

Note: In calculating per capita ratios, rural residents have been distributed to existing communities in proportion to population.

Over 50,000 documented visits are made annually to the City's outdoor rinks, with the Queen's Athletic Skating Oval in Sudbury being one of the most popular facilities. Excluded from this figure is the Bell Park Skating Path, which is the preeminent winter recreational destination in the City of Greater Sudbury.

Analysis

Outdoor rinks provide neighbourhood-level programs and open skating/shinny opportunities, and also help to foster community spirit through the reliance on local volunteers. However, these facilities tend to have a short season and are subject to the elements. Researchers⁵ indicate that Canada's outdoor skating season has shortened significantly in many regions of the country as a result of changing climate conditions, a trend that is likely to continue. Over time, this factor may contribute to the eventual decline in the number of outdoor rinks, a trend that is already being seen in many communities to the south.

The supply of 56 rinks translates into an average of one facility per 2,970 residents. Rinks are equitably distributed amongst the City's various communities with the exception of Rayside-Balfour, which has a significantly lower per capita supply compared to other areas within the City. The 2004 Master Plan did not establish a target for the provision of outdoor rinks as it was generally felt that the City had an adequate supply at the time. However, there are several compelling reasons – from declining usage to aging facilities (particularly rink buildings) to increasingly unpredictable weather – to suggest that there is an over-supply of these facilities in the City.

Based on a 1.0 km service radius (see mapping in Appendix C), the only notable gap in distribution is in Valley East (Val Caron). However, taking into account the desire to not cross an arterial road, there are three notable areas of overlap in outdoor rink distribution, all within the former City of Sudbury: Don Lita and Lebel Playgrounds; Cedar Park and Ridgecrest Playgrounds; Antwerp and Ryan Heights and O'Connor Playground.

While the City should continue to maintain existing outdoor rinks to the degree possible (75% of online survey respondents supported the improvement and/or expansion of outdoor rinks in the City, ranking them fourth out of 22 facility types), the guiding principles support placing priority on the highest-use facilities. Therefore, it is recommended that the City establish a policy to address the rationalization of

⁵ Damyanov, N. N., Matthews, H. D., & Mysak, L. A. (2012). Observed decreases in the Canadian outdoor skating season due to recent winter warming. *Environmental Research Letters*, 7(014028).

existing rinks and provision of new outdoor rinks. This review may explore alternative options (e.g., elimination of funding, re-purposing, closure, etc.) for under-utilized and/or deteriorating facilities, in consultation with the affected community.

The City currently provides operational support to the existing outdoor rink program by providing part-time wages (approximately 25-hours per week for eight to ten weeks) to assist volunteers in maintaining the sites. An annual grant allocation is also provided to the local Neighbourhood Association to support small projects. However, as the use of the City's indoor arenas declines (as has been the trend), investment in outdoor rinks needs to be rationalized.

The City has begun a process to review annual user statistics at each outdoor rink to better determine the proper level of future funding support. Given the low attendance witnessed at several rinks, the City's outdoor rink program should be reviewed to ensure that it is making the most effective use of available funding. One model to consider would be focusing investment on higher use sites while eliminating paid staff at other sites in lieu of volunteers; this is a model that is common amongst many municipalities.

Action Plans

- | |
|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 39. Establish a policy to address the rationalization of existing rinks and provision of new outdoor rinks, as well as to undertake a review of the outdoor rink program to ensure that it is making the most effective use of available funding. 40. Maintain existing outdoor rinks to the degree possible, with priority placed on high-use facilities. Alternative options may need to be explored for under-utilized and/or deteriorating facilities, in consultation with the affected community. |
|--|

5.20 Running Tracks

Inventory & Background

There are four outdoor recreational running tracks of varying surfaces within municipal parks:

- Centennial/Doug Mohns Park (Capreol)
- Queen's Athletic Field (Sudbury)
- LoEllen Park (Sudbury)
- Lionel E. Lalonde Centre (Rayside-Balfour)

In addition, many elementary and secondary schools provide recreational track facilities, as does Laurentian University.

Track and field competitions utilize the Laurentian Community Track, which is only one of two all-weather track surfaces in Northeastern Ontario. The Laurentian Community Track is operated under an agreement between the City and University; it was rebuilt in 2009 with the assistance of all four school boards and Laurentian University), in addition to Provincial and Federal funding partners. The agreement between the City and University has recently expired and is currently under review for renewal.

Analysis

The 2004 Master Plan set a provision target of one city-wide all-weather track (municipal or non-municipal). This is currently being met by the Laurentian Community Track. The City's municipal and school tracks provide access to students and residents at the local level and should continue to be maintained in a safe and usable condition.

Action Plans

41. Continue to maintain and support the Laurentian Community Track for local use and to ensure its viability for hosting regional and provincial-level track and field competitions.

5.21 Skate & BMX Parks

Inventory & Background

There are currently ten skate parks within the City of Greater Sudbury, with all of these being established since the 2004 Master Plan was completed. The City's largest permanent skate park is at 10,000 square foot facility located at Carmichael Arena in Sudbury.

Skateboard Park Inventory, Compared to Priority Market (ages 10 to 19 years)

Community	Current Supply (Skateboard Pads)	Locations	Current 2014 Per Capita Ratio (ages 10-19)	Projected 2036 Per Capita Ratio (ages 10-19)
Sudbury	2	Carmichael Arena, Delki Dozzi Park	5,560	5,715
Capreol	1	Capreol Millennium Resource Centre	450	360
Nickel Centre	1	Central Lane Park	1,700	1,260
Onaping Falls	2	Russell Beaudry, Dowling Leisure Centre	250	220
Rayside-Balfour	2	Coté Park, Rick McDonald Complex	835	715
Valley East	1	Lions Playground	3,410	2,400
Walden	1	TM Davies CC	1,140	1,060
Total	10		1,999	1,838

Note: In calculating per capita ratios, rural residents have been distributed to existing communities in proportion to population.

The City's first (and currently only) BMX park was developed at Adanac/Rotary Park in 2010 as a host site for the Ontario Summer Games. The facility continues to be used by the community.

Analysis

Skateboarding and BMX riding have evolved from fads into mainstream activities. In turn, skate and BMX parks are increasingly being viewed as positive venues that respond to the interests of many children, youth and – to a lesser extent – young adults. The ability for these sports to be unstructured, unscheduled, and of a relatively low cost also adds to their appeal (the online survey found modest support for additional investment in skate parks). In addition, the provision of these types of facilities can help discourage informal skating and biking that may take place in residential, commercial, or ecologically sensitive areas by offering a safe and purpose-built facility that is targeted directly towards the intended users.

The 2004 Master Plan recommended that the City establish a total of nine permanent skate park distributed across the City. Skate parks should be professionally designed to offer opportunities for both the novice and experienced user. The previous Master Plan suggested that four of the parks be modestly-sized (approximately 6,000 to 8,000 square feet) and the remainder be smaller (approximately 2,000 to 4,000 square feet). This strategy should not preclude the development of more skate parks should local community groups wish to provide funding or maintenance in order to make the development of new parks possible.

The approach to skate park development recommended in the previous Master Plan remains valid; that being to build a series of small and modestly sized skate parks around the City, with the Carmichael Arena skate park acting as a City-wide facility. This concept better serves individual communities, decreases overcrowding at any one park, and may also create increased opportunities for community fundraising and stewardship. Skate parks should be provided in every urban community due to the inability of children and youth to travel to other areas of the City to use them; however, communities with fewer than 500 youth (ages 10-19 years) would be a low priority for skate park development. Location criteria for teen-focussed facilities (including skate parks) have been identified under the outdoor basketball courts section of this Plan.

In determining skate park requirements, consideration should be given to the distribution of current opportunities in relation to the population. In urban areas, a blended target of one park per 3,000 youth (ages 10-19 years) and a 2-kilometre service radius is recommended. The mapping in Appendix C illustrates that there are no overlaps in current skate park distribution, but that several notable gaps exist.

Guided by the City's population forecasts and the distribution analysis, up to four additional skate parks are required in the former City of Sudbury (to supplement the two existing parks; gaps include the South End, New Sudbury, Downtown, and Copper Cliff) as well as one additional skate park in Valley East to improve geographic distribution. Interest was expressed through the public open houses for a new skate park in Lively. Skateboarders should be engaged in the design, creation, and operation of new facilities.

In terms of the BMX Park at Rotary/Adanac Park, efforts have been made through Leisure Services to establish an affiliated club that would assist with the required day-to-day maintenance, programming, and event-hosting for the facility. It appears the demand is for a less formal type of facility, similar to the City's existing skateboard parks. Considerations for pump parks and pump tracks – which require less maintenance and volunteer support – could be explored.

Action Plans

42. Develop up to four additional skate parks in Sudbury (gaps include the South End, New Sudbury, Downtown, and Copper Cliff) as well as one additional skate park in Valley East to improve geographic distribution. Skateboarders should be engaged in the design, creation, and operation of new facilities.
43. Explore options for bike pump parks/tracks as needs arise (instead of BMX parks that tend to require greater maintenance and volunteer support).

5.22 Ski Hills

Inventory & Background

The City currently operates three ski hills: Adanac (Sudbury); Lively (Walden); and Capreol. Both the Adanac and Lively Ski Hills were closed at the time of the last Master Plan due to various financial and operational challenges that have since been resolved. There are no longer any privately-run ski hills in the City (a private hill in Onaping Falls closed following the 2012/13 season).

The City has invested significant capital funds to improve its three ski hills in recent years and the online survey found moderate support for continued investment (64%, ranking them eleventh out of 22 facility types). The Adanac and Lively Ski Hills now have snow-making capacity (the Capreol ski hill does not), which has greatly improved operations and the customer experience, as have a new chalet, carpet lift, and ski rental building at the Adanac Ski Hill as part of its transition toward a four-season destination. The City is currently reviewing the Capreol Ski Hill operation to determine opportunities for additional winter use of the existing site (e.g., tobogganing) and has also introduced a single pass for all three ski hills, among other steps aimed at improving the user experience and increasing participation.

Analysis

There were over 16,600 visits to the City's three ski hills in the 2012/13 season, a slight reduction from previous years. Recent improvements to the Adanac Ski Hill in particular have been well received by the community as it is by far the busiest of the three operations, attracting an average of 151 visits per shift over the past three seasons (2011/12 to 2013/14). In 2013/14, the Adanac Ski Hill accounted for 80% of all municipal ski hill visits in the City of Greater Sudbury. By comparison, the Lively and Capreol ski hills – which are open about half as often as Adanac – averaged 57 visits/day and 11 visits/day over the past three seasons, respectively, despite their markedly lower lift fees. While total usage can vary year to year based on changing weather conditions, the average daily attendance figures from the past few years show only modest variation.

Active management of the City's ski hills is necessary given the challenges that poor weather conditions and other market factors can have on this industry. The City must continue to stay apprised of trends in the outdoor winter recreation and work to stay competitive in its offerings in order to retain existing and attract new users.

To this end, the City has budgeted capital funds over the next few years to address the replacement of lifts at the Adanac and Lively ski hills. In the longer-term, the City may also consider improvements to the Lively Ski Hill to make it more of a four-season destination, much like the vision for the Adanac Ski Hill.

Improvements to the Capreol Ski Hill may also be identified through its operational review, which is ongoing. The lack of snowmaking equipment at the Capreol Ski Hill (a significant capital investment), however, makes the feasibility of a tube park challenging. Given its low utilization levels, major capital investment at this location is not recommended without a proper business plan and strategy.

Action Plans

44. Ensure the sustainability of municipal ski hills through responsible asset management, customer-responsive programs and services, and four-season opportunities. Lifecycle analysis indicates that the replacement of lift equipment at the Adanac and Lively ski hills will be required in the near term.
45. Given the low utilization of the Capreol Ski Hill, its continued operation must be rationalized. A detailed operational review should be undertaken, including the exploration of alternate uses and consultation with stakeholders. Major capital investment at this location is not recommended without a proper business plan and strategy.

5.23 Other Leisure Facilities

Leisure is a general term that describes a very broad range of interests and activities and the City is certainly not the only provider of leisure services or facilities. Based on historical service delivery, budget limitations, competitive interference, or a myriad of other reasons, the City simply cannot involve itself in the provision of every type of facility. For example, in the City of Greater Sudbury, curling, indoor tennis, and gymnastics are sports that are generally accommodated through facilities operated by not-for-profit or private sector organizations.

The City of Greater Sudbury should remain open to discussion from new and emerging sport and leisure groups and evaluate capital proposals through a formal partnership framework, with consideration to the Master Plan's guiding principles and the City's financial capacity to participate in such projects. The partnership framework should include the various partners providing information which, at a minimum, should include (but not be limited) to:

- a comprehensive needs analysis and business plan
- the proponent's financial capacity
- a demonstration of the sustainability of the project
- detailed evidence of community benefits
- full risk analysis

Action Plans

46. Develop a formal partnership framework to evaluate municipal involvement in unsolicited proposals for specialized leisure facilities. At a minimum, this framework should require proponents to prepare comprehensive business plans (completed to the City's satisfaction) to enable the evaluation.

Section 6. Parkland & Trails

Parks provide the land base that supports outdoor leisure amenities and activities, while trails improve connectivity and promote recreational activity. A balanced and well maintained parks system and trails network connect people of all ages, interests, and abilities and are vital contributors to a healthy community. The continued provision and enhancement of parks and trails is a strong desire of the community.

This section contains an assessment of the City's system of active parkland and recreational trails and provides policy direction for the continued management of these valuable community resources. The intention is to support and supplement the work completed by the City's Green Space Advisory Panel, with a view toward informing the City's Official Plan Review (most notably Section 7.0 Parks and Open Space). Natural environment lands and linkages are beyond the scope of this Master Plan.

6.1 Parkland

Context

One key item identified through the 2004 Master Plan was the considerable number of small, undeveloped park sites within the City. Policies for evaluating surplus park sites were subsequently included in the City's Official Plan. In 2007, this issue, along with a desire to improve park equity and accessibility across the entire City, led the City to appoint a Green Space Advisory Panel (GSAP) in 2007. The primary role of the Panel was to make recommendations for parks and open space policy, create an evaluation system to assist in identifying priority park parcel acquisitions, and identify surplus park properties.

Although the GSAP has identified priorities for acquisition in its 2010 Final Report, the exercise of identifying surplus park properties has not yet been undertaken. To guide this future exercise, the Panel created a Parkland Disposal Policy that was adopted by Council in 2010. Specifically, the Parkland Disposal Policy outlines criteria that must be met before parkland can be considered surplus, requirements for public notice and input, and the use of funds from the sale of surplus parkland (which are divided equally between city-wide park needs and park needs within the ward the sale was made).

A new GSAP was appointed in 2011 to focus on implementation by identifying green space gaps and connectivity opportunities and providing input into the Official Plan Review, which is currently underway. This Panel delivered an interim report in late 2013.

Through the GSAP and Official Plan, the City of Greater Sudbury has made great strides in implementing the parks and open space recommendations contained in the 2004 Master Plan. The Master Plan's online survey found that 48% of respondents agreed and 34% disagreed with the statement that "There are sufficient parks and open spaces in your area to meet the needs of your household."

Parkland Classification

The definition of a park classification system encourages variety within the park system and provides direction for park development and function. The parks classification system recommended by the GSAP allows green space to be classified as one of the following types of parks:

- Neighbourhood Park: to meet the recreational needs of its immediate neighbourhood
- Community Park: to provide the space and supportive facilities needed for active recreation
- Regional Park: to be a focal point for the City as a whole
- Linear Park: to be a connector for people and/or wildlife
- Natural Park: to protect a natural area while meeting residents' needs for passive recreation
- Special Purpose Park (cultural/historical): to protect sites with historic, scientific, cultural, social, or spiritual importance; or to serve a special, specific purpose
- Ecological Reserve: to protect significant natural areas with ecological and/or geological importance, or that capture a characteristic natural feature of the City
- Facilities: while not an official category, the inventory in the 2013 GSAP Interim Report contained land upon which indoor facilities (e.g., community centres, arenas, etc.) are situated

Details of each park class can be found in the Panel's 2010 report, including purpose, intended use, facilities and features, size, and service area/standard. This classification system is well developed and logical and should be used for directing policy and acquisition in the City of Greater Sudbury. However, because of the different mechanisms through which parks and open space are acquired (as discussed later, active parkland is often transferred to the City through a dedication process prescribed through the *Planning Act*, whereas open space lands may be transferred through negotiation, donation, or protected through other means), the City may consider grouping the classifications under the following sub-headings:

- Active Parkland: Neighbourhood, Community, and Regional Parks
- Open Space: Linear, Natural, and Special Purpose Parks and Ecological Reserve

In this way, a provision target for active parkland can be clearly articulated and implemented through planning approvals. The provision of open space lands will vary depending on topography and may not be possible within all developments.

The balance of this Master Plan focuses on the active parkland component that is required to support most leisure activities; that is properties classified as Neighbourhood, Community, and Regional Parks. While these park types may contain open space elements or natural features, active parkland is acquired largely through parkland dedication. The other park classes relate more closely to the natural environment (which is beyond the scope of this Plan) or pedestrian movement (which may be secured by the City through means other than parkland dedication).

Action Plans

47. Consider the park classification system created by the Green Space Advisory Panel as part of the City's Official Plan Review; dividing the classification system into two groups: (1) Active Parkland (Neighbourhood, Community, and Regional Parks) to which the per capita provision target will apply; and (2) Open Space (Linear, Natural, and Special Purpose Parks and Ecological Reserve).

Park Beautification

Within the City's parkland inventory are 187 sites containing horticultural assets (e.g., 362 flower beds, 182 planters, etc.), all of which are maintained by municipal staff. These resources contribute to beautification efforts across the City and have a positive impact on civic pride, tourism, and economic investment. As such, there is merit in considering enhanced maintenance levels for high volume use areas such as community waterfront parkland and urban parks. Park-specific maintenance objectives should be established to guide long-term investments and upgrades.

Action Plans

48. Establish maintenance and capital objectives specific to various park types.

Parkland Inventory & Requirements

Two of the key elements of any parks system are equity and accessibility. To assess these factors, section 7.2.1(7) of the City's Official Plan states:

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

It is understood that further standards were adopted by Council as part of the parks classification system:

- Neighbourhood Parks should be within a 10 minute walk (800m) without crossing major barriers, with a minimum of 0.25 ha per 1000 residents.
- Community Parks should serve communities and settlement areas, be within a 20 minute walk (1600m) without crossing major barriers, with a minimum of 1.5 ha per 1000 residents.
- Regional Parks serve the entire city, with a minimum of 2.25 ha per 1000 residents.
- Linear and Natural Parks should be within a 10 minute walk (800m) without crossing major barriers. For the latter, larger sizes (>2 ha) are preferable where possible.

The GSAP has undertaken a very detailed assessment of park distribution and these findings are discussed in the next subsection. In terms of overall parkland supplies, from the Panel's reports and City's Official Plan, it would appear that the target of 4ha/1000 refers exclusively to Neighbourhood, Community, and Regional Parks (i.e., active parkland). Based on the work completed by the GSAP, there is good support for maintaining this target moving forward.

The City's active parkland inventory consists of 233 sites totalling 1,217 hectares, which translates into an average of 7.3 hectares per 1,000 residents. It should be noted that the source of this data is the GSAP; a parcel-specific examination has not been undertaken through this Master Plan process to verify these figures. The following table illustrates the distribution of active parkland by community (City lands only).

City of Greater Sudbury, "Active Parkland" Inventory by Community (2013), City lands only

Community	2011 Population	Parkland (hectares)			Total (ha)	ha/1000
		Neighbourhood	Community	Regional		
Sudbury	91,570	85	51	312	448	4.9
Capreol	3,390	3	6	0	9	2.6
Nickel Centre	10,970	9	42	0	51	4.6
Onaping Falls	3,880	5	14	0	19	4.8
Rayside-Balfour	11,860	20	9	10	39	3.3
Valley East	21,150	39	29	30	98	4.7
Walden	7,670	9	44	190	242	31.6
Rural (All)	15,800	220	29	63	311	19.7
TOTAL	166,300	389	223	605	1,217	7.3
City-wide (ha/1000)	--	2.3	1.3	3.6	7.3	--
Number of Sites		164	44	25	233	--

Population Source: City of Greater Sudbury. Growth Outlook to 2036. Draft, May 2013. Hemson Consulting Ltd.

Parkland Inventory Source: City of Greater Sudbury, Green Space Advisory Panel Interim Report (2013)

The City is presently supplying Neighbourhood Parks at a rate of 2.3 ha/1000, although its target is 0.25 ha/1000. The inventory is exceeding the target by a wide margin. To recognize how the City's parks system has historically been developed, an increase to the target should be considered through the Official Plan Review. Neighbourhood Park supplies can generally be attained through the 5% parkland amounts and may represent between 1.0 to 1.5 ha/1000, depending on the density of residential development. If the entire parkland dedication was taken to fulfill the Neighbourhood Park targets, the City would need to acquire Community Parks through alternative means.

The City is presently supplying Community Parks at a rate of 1.3 ha/1000, slightly under its target of 1.5 ha/1000. The assembly and acquisition of Community Park sites – the larger parks that contain multiple sports fields, spray pads, tennis courts, picnic areas, etc. – is likely to become increasingly difficult within a slow growth municipality. Should the Neighbourhood Park target be increased, consideration should be given to a small decrease to the Community Park target. Together, the Neighbourhood Park and Community Park targets should total a minimum of 2.25 ha/1000 as this is the land base required to accommodate most active leisure assets, such as sports fields, courts, and playgrounds.

The City is presently supplying Regional Parks at a rate of 3.6 ha/1000, well above its target of 2.25 ha/1000. Regional Parks are not provided in every community as the function is City-wide and these parks are often dependent upon natural features (e.g., beaches, etc.). This inventory is boosted by several very large parcels, including the Naughton Trail Centre (175ha), Moonlight Beach (104ha), and Adanac/Rotary Park (101ha). The opportunity to acquire large regional parks (generally 10ha or more) in the future may be more limited than opportunities for Neighbourhood or Community Parks (although expansions to existing Regional Parks may be an option); therefore, it is likely that the per capita supply

of Regional Parks will decline as the City's population grows. Adjustments to the Regional Park provision target may be considered to maintain the overall target of 4 hectares of active parkland per 1,000 residents.

Based on the foregoing, the following adjustments to the active parkland targets are recommended:

Active Parkland Targets

	Current Target	Current Level of Provision	Proposed Target
Neighbourhood Parks	0.25 ha/1000	2.3 ha/1000	1.0 ha/1000
Community Parks	1.5 ha/1000	1.3 ha/1000	1.25 ha/1000
Regional Parks	2.25 ha/1000	3.6 ha/1000	1.75 ha/1000
Total Active Parkland	4.0 ha/1000	7.3 ha/1000	4.0 ha/1000

In terms of overall active parkland supplies, Capreol (2.6 ha/1000) and Rayside-Balfour (3.3 ha/1000) are currently falling short of the target. There is also a notable shortfall of Community Park supplies in Sudbury (0.6 ha/1000) and Rayside-Balfour (0.8 ha/1000). The highest per capita supplies of active parkland are in Walden and Rural communities.

In total, the City of Greater Sudbury owns approximately 426 sites totalling 3,891 hectares of parks and green space based on data contained with the 2013 GSAP Interim Report. This supply translates into approximately 23.4 hectares of land for every 1,000 persons based on the 2011 Census (166,300 persons, including undercount). Supplementing this inventory are a number of public or semi-public lands provided by schools, places of worship, non-profit organizations, conservation authorities, provincial and national park agencies, etc.

Action Plans

49. Maintain an updated inventory and geographic database of municipal parks, open space, and landscaped/horticultural properties (including a standardized property name, classification, and listing of assets) and establish a protocol for updating the database.
50. Consider amending the park-specific provision targets for Neighbourhood, Community, and Regional Parks, while continuing to maintain an overall target of 4.0 hectares of active parkland per 1,000 residents.

Parkland Gaps

The GSAP has advanced the implementation of the 2004 Master Plan through more detailed analysis, including mapping illustrating the gaps for Neighbourhood Parks (800m service radius), Community Parks (1,600m service radius), Linear Parks (800m service radius), and Natural Parks (800m service radius). As it relates to the topic of this Master Plan, the service radii established for Neighbourhood and Community Parks are appropriate.

Although the City has secured several sites in recent years, gaps still remain. Specifically, the Panel's 2013 report indicates that the communities of Chelmsford, Downtown Sudbury, and Wahnapiatae are underserved. Furthermore, a total of sixty-nine gap areas were identified, most notably areas in Sudbury (Downtown, South End, West End/Copper Cliff, New Sudbury, and Donovan/Flour Mill). Although many

of these gaps relate to Linear and Natural Parks, 18 Neighbourhood Park and 14 Community Park gaps were identified.

Of note is that several school closures have recently occurred and more are imminent. For many decades, these sites have been open space anchors in their communities and there are public expectations to acquire them. The situation is compounded when the closures occur in areas already deficient in parkland but the City cannot necessarily afford to acquire all sites. A framework has been established in the GSAP Report to respond to these opportunities in a consistent manner, with priority sites being identified. In 2013, the Panel identified specific sites as immediate priorities for acquisition to address parkland gaps.

The City should use a variety of tools and mechanisms to address gaps in active parkland provision. The following options are identified in the GSAP reports and include (but may not be limited to):

- Bringing city owned green space opportunities into the parks inventory
- Agreement/transfer/purchase of crown land
- Acquisition through purchase by the City
- Acquisition through 5% parkland dedication
- Acquisition through land exchange
- Acquisition through donation
- Expropriation
- Lease, conservation or trail easement, or joint-use agreements
- Land use tools, and temporary tools
- Land trusts

Action Plans

- | |
|--|
| <p>51. The City should use a variety of tools and mechanisms to identify and address priority gaps in the active parkland inventory; these options are identified in the Green Space Advisory Panel reports.</p> |
|--|

Surplus Parkland

As discussed earlier, despite some geographic gaps in coverage, the City has an abundance of parks and open space parcels in some areas. These lands tend to be smaller undeveloped properties that are not serving any meaningful recreational or environmental function, but that are located in very close proximity to a developed park property. The Ontario Municipal Benchmarking Initiative (OMBI) indicates that the City of Greater Sudbury has the most maintained parkland compared to the other benchmarked municipalities.

The 2004 Master Plan identified a process to identify surplus park parcels and a parkland disposal policy was subsequently developed and embedded within the City's Official Plan (Section 7.2.1 [8]). In 2010, Council adopted a more comprehensive Parkland Disposal Policy as per the 2010 GSAP Report; this policy was passed as By-Law 2010-158. The Parkland Disposal Policy outlines criteria that must be met before parkland can be considered surplus, requirements for public notice and input, and the use of funds from the sale of surplus parkland (which are divided equally between city-wide park needs and park needs within the ward the sale was made). The Official Plan Review should ensure consistency in wording with this Parkland Disposal Policy.

To date, the GSAP has not identified potential surplus parkland parcels, although some properties have been brought in front of Council through other avenues and have since been declared surplus. As a next step, this Master Plan recommends that those parks containing surplus playgrounds (defined by this Master Plan as those within 400 metres of another playground; see Section 5) and no other necessary leisure amenities be evaluated based on the prioritization framework established by the GSAP, which includes consideration of alternative uses, among other criteria.

Action Plans

- | |
|--|
| <p>52. The City should continue to evaluate and implement its Parkland Disposal Policy, with reference to this Master Plan and the Green Space Advisory Panel reports.</p> |
|--|

Parkland Policy & Dedication

In the City of Greater Sudbury, decisions relating to the future planning, acquisition, and development, of parkland are guided by several provincial and municipal regulations, including the Ontario *Planning Act* and the City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan. The City of Greater Sudbury is presently undertaking a five-year review of its Official Plan.

The *Planning Act* establishes a framework for the dedication of parkland and possible alternatives to the dedication of land for parks and recreation purposes. Parkland policies contained in the Official Plan – approved pursuant to the *Planning Act* – enable municipalities to require parkland dedication and identify criteria by which this land is assessed, including factors to be considered when seeking cash-in-lieu of parkland. The *Planning Act* requires that land dedication to the City as park (or purchased by the Town using cash-in-lieu), must be used for park or other recreational purposes, which not only includes land acquisition, but also the erection or repair of buildings and the acquisition of machinery.

Like most communities, the City's primary method for the acquisition of active parkland is through dedication from residential development (and redevelopment), which the City takes at a rate of up to 5% of the land included in the plan (or cash-in-lieu). Municipalities may require up to 2% of the land area (or cash-in-lieu) for industrial and commercial developments, redevelopments, and subdivisions; the City's Official Plan also contains such a policy. The City's Official Plan also recognizes the important of public access to lakes and requires subdividers of shoreline property to convey at least 5% of the usable shoreline, in addition to the 5% parkland requirement.

The City has used a combination of these provisions to realize approximately 15 new playgrounds over the past decade. The specific arrangement requires the developer(s) to install the playgrounds (to the City's satisfaction) in return for a portion of the required parkland dedication that would then be used to establish additional building lots.

The *Planning Act* also includes an alternate requirement of one hectare per 300 dwelling units for residential applications, which tends to produce greater amounts of parkland than the 5% rate when the density exceeds 15 units per hectare (depending on persons per unit counts); the City's Official Plan contains such a policy. Realizing that the 1ha:300 units provision can act as a financial disincentive for high density residential development, some municipalities are examining reductions to this provision through a number of different means, such as a tiered approach based on height and density, caps on

parkland lot coverage, reductions/waivers in special policy areas, and reduced cash-in-lieu rates for higher density developments.

However, just because residential densities are rising does not mean that there is a lesser need for parkland. In fact it is just the opposite – higher density developments include less traditional space for recreation and gathering (e.g., backyards, etc.), thereby placing pressure on existing parkland supplies and creating an urgency to acquire additional parkland through alternate means. In effect, insufficient parkland dedication transfers costs away from developers/purchasers to the tax base and runs contrary to the “growth pays for growth” philosophy. As such, reductions to the alternate parkland requirement should be approached with caution and should only be considered for the highest density applications. Through its Official Plan Review, these and other strategies for providing parkland within areas of residential intensification should be explored.

When used in combination, these aforementioned tools should assist the City in maintaining its desired provision level of 4.0 ha/1000. To maximize the conveyance of active parkland, however, the City may consider including a policy stating that undevelopable open space lands (e.g., stormwater management ponds, woodlots, valley lands, floodplains, hazard lands, etc.) will not be accepted as part of the parkland dedication requirement (or that it will be accepted, but only at a dramatically reduced rate), although these may be assumed through voluntary dedication or easement.

The City may also consider adding a policy in its Official Plan to guide decisions of when to take land versus cash-in-lieu. Generally speaking, municipalities should consider taking cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication, or a combination of cash-in-lieu and parkland, where (as determined by the City):

- there is no land that is either usable or functional on the site for parkland or recreational purposes;
- the required land dedication fails to provide an area of suitable shape, size, or location for public parkland;
- the area being developed is already well served by existing park and recreational facilities;
- the taking of parkland from the site may reduce the number of dwelling units or the floor space of a development or redevelopment such that it renders the development or redevelopment unfeasible; and/or
- such contributions may be more effective in achieving local parkland targets and the objectives of the Parks, Open Space & Leisure Master Plan or other guiding documents.

Additionally, the City’s Official Plan does not establish a standard for the minimum park sizes, although this may be addressed through consideration of the proposed parkland classification system (Neighbourhood Parks are generally 0.2 hectares or greater). Although the City may take land or cash-in-lieu at its discretion, not establishing a minimum park size can lead to uncertainty for developers and proposals that are not in the community’s best interest. Furthermore, under-sized parks cannot adequately meet neighbourhood needs and do not generate maintenance efficiencies for the City. The City may wish to establish a minimum park size, with discretion in cases where there are notable gaps in parkland and/or where other options are preferred, such as in areas of higher densities where space is limited (e.g., downtown).

Provincial and local planning policy is placing a greater emphasis on the development of complete communities and more sustainable / higher densities through intensification and infill. As established neighbourhoods become more densely populated over time, there will be fewer private backyards,

which will create a greater reliance on public parks – both existing and new – for a wide range of uses. Parks in these areas are expected to be more intensely used and reflect their surrounding urban area, with a focus on providing a local gathering space for unstructured activities, including informal play and socialization. The provision of parkland in intensifying areas will become increasingly important for urban residents.

The proposed parkland hierarchy is a step in the right direction, but may not fully reflect the realities of development within future areas of intensification, such as smaller public squares, plaza/ pocket parks, and private amenity space. To respond to the emerging issue of parkland dedication and renewal in intensification areas, the City should consider options for a more urbanized form of parkland within the context of its Official Plan Review, as well as options for renewing and revitalizing existing parks intended to serve areas of residential intensification.

The City of Greater Sudbury Official Plan indicates that *“All lands conveyed as part of parkland dedication must be suitable for recreation purposes and acceptable to the City”* (Section 7.1.1[6c]). “Suitability” is not defined in the Official Plan, which is common practice in most municipal Official Plans. Whether through the Official Plan or alternate means, the City may consider the following locational criteria and characteristics for active parkland when deciding on suitability of proposed parkland dedications:

- a) Parkland conveyed to the City must be conveyed in a condition satisfactory to the City, free and clear of all encumbrances unless otherwise agreed to by the City, and meeting minimum standards in terms of drainage, grading, and site conditions.
- b) Parks must be highly visible with prominent public street frontage. Parks are encouraged to be located adjacent to compatible uses (such as schools) and should be in close proximity to the area to be served. Connections to other parks, open spaces, and destinations through a trail network should be strongly encouraged.
- c) Parks should be designed to accommodate a diverse range of passive and active recreational activities (in keeping with their intended function) and have flexibility to accommodate new uses or interests.
- d) Where appropriate, parks should incorporate best practice principles of sustainable design, including natural heritage enhancement, naturalized stormwater management features, use of native plant species, incorporation of environmental education features, use of low-maintenance furnishings and equipment, and consideration of energy efficient facilities.
- e) Where development is proposed adjacent to parks and open spaces, it should be sited and designed to minimize rearlotting and to maximize public access and visibility.
- f) Small, under-utilized and/or undeveloped parks that contain no discernible function to the immediate or broader community or natural environment may be considered for disposition.

Lastly, it should be noted that the GSAP has provided several recommendations for the City to consider as part of the Official Plan Review. The Panel anticipates that its findings related to the park classification system, surplus parkland disposal policy, inventories, mapping, priority rankings, and gap analysis will be appropriately integrated into the new Official Plan.

Action Plans

53. Seek to maximize *Planning Act* provisions in acquiring parkland (or cash-in-lieu) and establishing a linked open space system, with consideration to the findings of this Master Plan and Green Space Advisory Panel Reports.
54. Through the City's Official Plan Review, consider options for providing parkland within areas of residential intensification. This may include (but not be limited to) changes to the alternate parkland requirement (1 hectare per 300 units) for the highest density applications, new park types in urban areas, and options for renewing and revitalizing existing parks intended to serve areas of residential intensification.

Parkland & Facility Development and Design

The City of Greater Sudbury's parks are well maintained and representative of most northern communities. That being said, there is a difference between a "good" parks system and a "great" one. Many parks do not resonate with people – especially the burgeoning population of older adults – because of their "cookie-cutter" features and lack of supporting modern amenities. As a result, many of the City's parks are under-utilized.

Parks should be the very best spots in the community – a place where people connect and become engaged in healthy activities (social or physical). The City of Greater Sudbury's parks have potential to be more than they currently are – to be vibrant places and spaces where residents and tourists can enjoy meaningful experiences. Re-imagining a parks system takes time and resources, but making the City's parks more distinctive – through unique designs, more age-friendly amenities, experience-based amenities such as natural playgrounds, and more – will make a noticeable impact on the community's quality of life. The City should also continue to encourage the organized and non-programmed use of its parks and employ best practices in beautification, environmental management, and stewardship – all of which are highly valued by local residents.

In general, the City's population, like nearly all communities across Ontario and beyond, is becoming older and less mobile. Parks will remain prominent civic destinations and hubs, but many will require additional amenities to accommodate an evolving community. This may include the need for more washrooms, benches, shade structures, rain shelters, picnic pavilions, open space for pick-up sports, outdoor fitness equipment, community gardens, hard surface pathways, recycling bins, drinking fountains, signage, etc.

In addition, time-pressed individuals of all ages and families are looking for areas where they can enjoy parks at one's own convenience. As such, a greater emphasis should be placed on providing more informal space in new parks in order to promote unstructured activities. The design of active and passive parks should also incorporate elements that cater to individual physical activity and wellness, such as outdoor fitness stations and reading gardens. Incorporation of public art into public and private spaces is also encouraged.

Regarding more active use parks, wherever possible, the City should cluster the same type of playing fields together to increase a sense of form and function. Washrooms should generally be provided at

parks where major sporting facilities (e.g., soccer fields, ball diamonds) are located and along key destinations in the trails system.

The development of a Leisure Facilities Standards Manual is recommended to assist with many of these matters. This Manual would assist the City in identifying baseline design standards, accessibility requirements, signage requirements, and construction details that would lead to the creation of high quality park amenities, leisure facilities, and public spaces.

Action Plans

55. Develop a Leisure Facilities Standards Manual to identify facility design standards (e.g., signage, accessibility, support amenities, etc.) to guide the development and redevelopment of leisure facilities.
56. In designing parks, continue to:
 - incorporate spaces and amenities encouraging physical activity, wellness, and informal use opportunities;
 - consider the needs of a diverse and aging population through the provision of washrooms, seating, shade/shelter, drinking fountains, pathways, and picnic areas;
 - follow accessibility legislation and guidelines to accommodate persons with disabilities;
 - apply CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) principles;
 - promote designs that encourage sustainable maintenance practices;
 - incorporate a balance of native, drought-resistant, and colourful vegetative features;
 - utilize materials that are robust, durable, and mindful of future maintenance requirements;
 - seek innovative and engaging initiatives that encourage environmental stewardship (e.g., recycling bins);
 - encourage public art; and
 - encourage active transportation connections and a linked open space system.

6.2 Trails & Connectivity

Inventory & Background

The City works in partnership with the Rainbow Routes Association and local community groups in the development of trails across the City of Greater Sudbury. There are approximately 173 kilometres of municipal off-road nature and paved trails in Greater Sudbury available for walking, cycling, inline skating, and cross-country skiing (excluding motorized trails, volunteer maintained cross-country ski trails, and cycling lanes), an increase of 16 kilometres since the 2004 Master Plan was developed. The trail network continues to grow, with several proposed routes now identified through various planning documents, including the Transportation Plan for the ongoing Official Plan Review.

Through the work of the City's Sustainable Mobility Advisory Panel, Green Space Advisory Panel, Rainbow Routes Association, and other partners, the City has made great strides in recent years in expanding its trail network and improving connectivity through a focus on active transportation. For example, the City completed a Sustainable Mobility Plan in 2010, the implementation of which is a goal

of the City's Healthy Community Strategic Plan. The concept of "sustainable mobility" refers to the ability of individuals to move freely within their communities, and it generally refers to non-motorized modes of transportation such as walking and cycling, although the Plan also addresses public transit. Further, the City is currently evaluating its active transportation network through the Official Plan Review, with a focus on the following facility types:

- bike lanes and shoulder bikeways
- separated bike lanes and cycle tracks
- multi-use trails (off-road)
- sidewalks
- signed only bike routes

Also, a focus of the GSAP's recent work has been to secure sites that contribute to connectivity, including linear parks that link parks together. Eleven linear parks have been added, and an additional five have been expanded, through the work of the Panel. It is an objective of the Panel that *"The system of parks is meant to be a connected network, accessible to residents and wildlife of the Greater Sudbury region."*

Given the extensive work completed by these agencies, it is not the intent of this Master Plan to duplicate efforts, but rather to identify key priorities relative to off-road recreational connectivity, with is an essential attribute of an effective parks system. Recreational value is enhanced by trail linkages and connectivity between different leisure areas and park types. Active living is also encouraged and facilitated. A substantial number of comments supporting these concepts were received through the Master Plan's public open houses.

Analysis

Multi-use pathways are a cost-effective method to increase physical activity levels, of particular importance given the dangerous level of obesity observed across Canada. Not only do pathways support positive interaction between the community and the natural environment to facilitate recreation activities, pathways also provide links between destinations and in many cases, provide alternative commuting means if strategically linked to key employment areas.

The online survey found very high local interest in expanding the City's network of trails, pathways, and bike lanes: 91% indicated that trails and pathways were important to their household, but only 45% were satisfied with the City's current level of service in this area. In the open-ended comments, there were frequent mentions to the need for improved safety on trails and bike lanes, particularly those that are not separated from roadways. Connectivity of trails and the extension of the cycling and walking trails were also common requests heard at the public open houses.

Walking and hiking for leisure was cited through the online survey as the most popular leisure activity undertaken by Greater Sudbury residents (90% of all households). In addition, 53% of households participate in cycling/mountain biking, 43% in running/jogging, and 31% in cross-country skiing. Through the online survey, the extension of nature trails was identified as the highest priority for additional municipal spending within the leisure services capital budget (86% support), with paved multi-use trails receiving 75% support. The existence of trails is an important factor that is often considered when people chose to re-located to a new home.

As age increases, so too does the propensity to identify walking as a favourite recreation time activity. This bodes well for future demand in the City of Greater Sudbury given the anticipated growth of the older adult population. As a result, it is anticipated that this growing segment of the population will place greater pressures on the municipal trail network, reinforcing the need to encourage active transportation options and healthy lifestyles through the development of high quality pedestrian and cycling infrastructure.

The *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act* maintains that all persons of age and disabilities should have an equal opportunity to participate. As a result, municipalities are required to design trails that can be used by all abilities through universal design of pathways, incorporating design considerations, such as grade, surface material, width, and cross-slopes. While it may be unreasonable to ensure all trails are accessible, the development of accessible multi-use pathways can be focussed in locations where high levels of utilization are anticipated. In addition to universal design of pathways, experiences in other communities suggests that the development of supporting amenities (such as the provision of washrooms, rest areas, bicycle parking facilities, rack systems on transit buses, and wayfinding signage) may also encourage usage of pathways and active transportation choices by all residents.

The City cannot achieve a comprehensive multi-use trail system without partnerships with community organizations, local and provincial agencies, and landowners. The City's GSAP, Sustainable Mobility Advisory Panel, Connect the Creek Committee, and Rainbow Routes Association are just some of the groups that are working together to examine trail connectivity and safe pedestrian crossings for walkers and cyclists. Many gaps still exist within the trail system and work to address these gaps is ongoing.

Continued implementation of the City's Sustainable Mobility Plan should be a priority. In relation to recreational connectivity, the Sustainable Mobility Plan recommended that the City:

- give equitable consideration to walking, cycling, transit and motorized passenger vehicles in the Official Plan when developing transportation policy, new infrastructure and new development site plans;
- amend the Official Plan to include a bicycle route network and route classification system;
- invest in, provide incentives for and enter into public-private partnerships to install pedestrian and cycling infrastructure;
- consult with Rainbow Routes Association where pedestrian connections are required to encourage trail linkages to new and existing developments;
- ensure infrastructure to improve connectivity between destination points, such as footpaths, are included in new developments;
- work to improve the pedestrian connections in existing neighbourhoods and between existing destination points (including trails, sidewalks, walkways, crossings, etc.); and
- complete the Junction Creek Waterway Park as an Active Transportation Corridor in the City of Greater Sudbury by 2015.

In terms of Official Plan policy, it is noted that subsection 51(25)(b) of the *Planning Act* allows for the conveyance of land for pedestrian and bicycle pathways as a condition of plan of subdivision approval, at the municipality's discretion. While this provision does not affect parkland supplies (it is over and

above the prescribed parkland dedication), it is a useful tool for the acquisition of linear corridors and trails that support and link parks and natural features. Unless this policy is contained in a municipal Official Plan, it cannot be formally enacted; therefore, it is recommended that the City create an Official Plan policy to allow for the conveyance of land for pathways within new subdivisions.

Further, through the Official Plan Review, the importance of trails and active transportation (including on-road cycling opportunities; e.g., bike lanes and routes) should be embedded throughout and Schedule 5 (Trails) updated to reflect current long-term planning goals.

Action Plans

57. Continue to work with partners on the expansion of recreational trails, active transportation choices, and associated support infrastructure, as guided by the City of Greater Sudbury Sustainable Mobility Plan, Official Plan, and related initiatives.
58. In the Official Plan Review, the importance of trails and active transportation should be strengthened through the identification of a preferred network and implementation policies. A policy to allow for the conveyance of land for pathways within new subdivisions (as permitted by Section 51 of the Planning Act) should also be considered.

Section 7. Delivery of Services and Programs

Within the context of the City of Greater Sudbury Healthy Community Strategy, this section examines specific aspects of the City's leisure programming and service delivery systems, including a focus on opportunities for youth and older adults, access to recreation, partnerships, and more.

7.1 Healthy Community Challenges & Priorities

"A healthy community is a place that is constantly improving its physical and social environment and, using the resources of the community, enables its citizens to help each other carry out their daily tasks and develop their potential where health is a state of complete physical, mental, and social well being and not merely the absence of disease or infirmity."

- World Health Organization

At every stage of life, health is determined by complex interactions between social and economic factors, the physical environment and individual behaviour. These factors are referred to as social determinants of health, which combine to influence health status. In the context of this Parks, Open Space & Leisure Master Plan, healthy communities are those that tend to exhibit some of the following characteristics:

- affordable and accessible recreation opportunities for all
- safe active transportation / sustainable mobility routes
- protection of the natural environment
- strong volunteer networks and partnerships
- responsible use of resources to ensure long term sustainability

These and other concepts are identified in the City's Healthy Community Charter, which focuses on the following four pillars. Several challenges and priorities have been identified for each pillar.

Pillar 1: Human Health and Well-Being	
Challenges	The City of Greater Sudbury Parks, Open Space and Leisure Master Plan 2004 identifies personal, social, economic and environmental benefits of recreation. Factors impacting the challenge of Active Living / Healthy Lifestyles are; education, income levels, Northern Ontario climate, aging infrastructure and the need for amenities that reflect the changing and varying demographic trend of our community. • Health Status • Health and Safety
Priorities	A community that: • encourages individuals to take ownership of their health and well being • supports individual and family wellness and safety programs • assigns appropriate resources to build capacity and equitable access for all
Strategies	• Construction and physical improvements of trails, sidewalks and bicycle paths. • Increase utilization of sports and exercise facilities. • Creation of a pedestrian friendly city. • Corporate ownership models for a healthy workplace. • Build equity and ensure equitable access to sport, recreation and physical activities. • Increased access to primary health care and mental health services. • Explore methods of positively influencing the determinants of health. • Support local, provincial and national human health and well-being initiatives.

Pillar 2: Environmental Sustainability	
Challenges	Sudbury's mining legacy has had profound environmental impacts. Although improved mining processes have greatly reduced impacts of current activities, the influence of past activities remains evident on the landscape. • Impaired Ecosystems • Lake Water Quality
Priorities	A community that: • takes pride in its neighbourhoods • practices, protects, and preserves its natural assets for future generations • regulates and enforces further environmental protection initiatives
Strategies	• Protect the quality of our surface and ground water sources. • Improve the sewage and storm sewer infrastructure. • Support the energy projects currently underway. • Implement the sustainability strategy that was developed in the EarthCare Local Action Plan. • Update the Natural Assets Report. • Support local, provincial, and national environmental initiatives.
Pillar 3: Economic Vitality	
Challenges	Factors impacting the challenge of Economic Growth are; employment opportunities for young people, creation of meaningful job opportunities, support of a vibrant and creative arts and culture sector and addressing the need for facility renewal and replacement. • Out-migration • Unemployment • Arts and Culture • Infrastructure Deficit
Priorities	A community that: • supports and promotes what it has to offer • fosters local employment, skill development and investment in new business ventures • provides resources to encourage and promote existing and new business opportunities
Strategies	• Target strategic areas within the City of Greater Sudbury for beautification. • Continue to pursue the City of Greater Sudbury branding initiative to highlight assets. • Address the need for increased employment opportunities. • Encourage innovation and creativity. • Support local, provincial, and national economic growth initiatives.

Pillar 4: Civic Engagement/Social Capital	
Challenges	Factors impacting the challenge of civic engagement/social capital are the large geographic spread of citizens across our community, level of educational attainment, income levels and changing demographics of our community. • Homelessness • Family Poverty • Educational Attainment
Priorities	A community that: • celebrates and encourages individual and group contributions • adds economic, environmental and social value through collective and corporate social responsibility • is responsive and open to individual and neighbourhood diversity and supports safe communities
Strategies	• Empower the community to take ownership of their health and wellbeing. • Build community pride and belonging. • Increase awareness of poverty and strategies for poverty alleviation. • Reduce unnecessary competition between service providers. (silos) • Promote the city's role as a facilitator of change. • Celebrate achievements and recognize Healthy Community advocates. • Address the need of training opportunities for youth and the unskilled workforce. • Expand the role of the Community Action Networks. • Support public safety and security initiatives. • Support local, provincial, and national social capital initiatives.

Source: City of Greater Sudbury Healthy Community Initiative, 2011

Implementation of the City of Greater Sudbury's Healthy Community Strategy is shared amongst several City departments, agencies, and the community. An Advisory Panel exists to advance the objectives of the Strategy and to guide various initiatives that will improve the human health and sustainability of the City. Various awareness opportunities and education events have been implemented to celebrate and advance the City's success in enhancing the local quality of life. Some key initiatives within the context of this Master Plan include the implementation of the Sustainable Mobility Plan and continued work on a universal Affordable Access to Recreation Policy for opportunities based on social determinants of health.

Action Plans

- | |
|---|
| 59. Consider the findings of this Master Plan as part of the City's Healthy Community initiative. |
|---|

7.2 Municipal Role in Service Delivery

The City of Greater Sudbury will continue to play a lead role in supporting, coordinating, and managing the leisure system, including being the primary (but not only) provider of parks and leisure infrastructure. In keeping with the guiding principles of this Master Plan, the City will generally offer direct leisure programming when there are identified benefits to core markets and the community at large. The City may also be the preferred provider due to reasons of accessibility, affordability, safety, and/or mandate alignment. It is vital for the City to continue to evaluate the delivery of leisure services on a regular basis and to consider new approaches that may improve the efficiency and cost effectiveness of existing services.

Support to volunteers, community engagement, and capacity building will also continue to be key roles for the City in ensuring a well rounded and sustainable leisure delivery system. A complex network of municipal departments, agencies, institutions, private business, community organizations, volunteers, and residents play vital roles in the delivery of leisure services. Much like the adage “it takes a village to raise a child”, it takes a shared effort to provide accessible and affordable leisure services to the complete range of Greater Sudbury residents. The City’s community development approach emphasizes the need to build capacity and encourage service providers to focus on the things they do best – a “strengths-based” delivery system that meets the unique needs of the community.

Action Plans

- | |
|---|
| 60. Evaluate the delivery of leisure services on a regular basis, including consideration to new approaches that may improve service efficiency and cost effectiveness. |
|---|

7.3 Affordable Access to Recreation

Across Canada, there is well documented support for providing low-income residents with affordable access to leisure services. The benefits of this access are many and address a number of criteria for healthy communities. To this end, the City is currently developing an Affordable Access to Recreation policy as recommended in the 2004 Master Plan and as recently directed by Council.

Presently, the City provides financial assistance to children in need through a number of initiatives (e.g., Feel Free to Feel Fit). Financial assistance and/or affordable events are also available through a variety of organizations, such as the Sudbury Manitoulin Children’s Foundation / Children’s Aids Society, YMCA of Sudbury, Tim Horton’s, Canadian Tire Jumpstart, sports groups, and foundations, to name a few. Through the online survey completed for this Master Plan, 23% of local residents disagreed with the statement that “Leisure activities in Greater Sudbury are generally affordable to your household”, indicating that there are many households that find it difficult to afford program fees and equipment/travel costs. The City’s proposed Affordable Access to Recreation policy would seek to provide free and universal access to specific recreational opportunities to all citizens.

The City has been working on this initiative for a number of years. In 2011, the Healthy Communities Fund Partnership identified a need to improve access to physical activity and recreation in the City of Greater Sudbury. This led to the creation of the Greater Sudbury Physical Activity Working Group, an advocacy committee consisting of local organizations from the aboriginal, health, social services, and sport and recreation sectors. Late in 2012, the Working Group, with support from the Heart & Stroke Foundation SPARK Advocacy Grant and Healthy Communities Fund Partnership, evolved to establish the City of Greater Sudbury Physical Activity and Recreation Roundtable. The Roundtable’s vision is “Everyone has access to affordable recreation in their community in order to enjoy health and social benefits to improve their prospects for a better future” and is committed to advocating for the development of policies and programs that will allow universal access to physical activity and recreation opportunities in the City of Greater Sudbury.

User fees, lack of transportation, lack of informal and structured programs, and a lack of awareness are just some of the key barriers to participation in leisure and recreation activities. Reducing barriers to participation is a continual goal of leisure service providers everywhere. Coordination and communication within and between municipal departments and community agencies is paramount in

creating a supportive environment for inclusive and universal access. Sponsorships with private businesses have proven to be successful in offsetting program costs in many communities, such that the range of low- to no-cost activities (or financial assistance programs) can be expanded, particularly to target markets of children, teens, families, and older adults.

Action Plans

61. Formalize the Affordable Access to Recreation policy in order to bolster universal access to physical activity and recreation opportunities.
62. Build on the existing program offerings to maximize opportunities for free access to municipal facilities (for all age groups) where expenses would be neutral (e.g., drop-in programs, open gym, open houses at fitness facilities, public skating / swimming, etc.). In doing so, create pilot program opportunities at municipal facilities to evaluate public interest and to further evaluate the net budget impact. Explore funding opportunities to cover cost for staff wages, benefits, etc.
63. Create and maintain an updated list of agencies that fund and/or provide subsidies, in order to refer citizens that require financial assistance to participate in municipal recreational programs.
64. Build on the community mapping initiative (GIS and online) to identify leisure facilities and programs that are free to the community.
65. Develop a communication strategy and create a brand for affordable access that could be incorporated within the City's "Healthy Community" initiative.
66. Encourage all agencies and leisure organizations to be advocates by recognizing, celebrating, and advertising their support towards affordable access.

7.4 Program Delivery

Access to affordable and high quality leisure programs is an essential component of a healthy community. Programming focused on physical activity and general interest needs provides individuals, communities, and the broader City with a wide range of benefits. As stated earlier, the City employs a mixed program model consisting of directly delivered programs, partnerships with community providers, and indirect delivery through local groups.

Programs are developed in response to the varied needs of each community, often in partnership with others. For example, Neighbourhood Associations are also a primary provider of direct programming, which can vary from one area to the next depending on interests, resources, and volunteer commitment. Best Start Hubs are also provided in many community centres and schools, offering children and their families a place to meet and participate in activities; there are English Hubs, Francophone Hubs, and one Aboriginal Hub for the City's growing First Nations community.

A primary focus of the City's leisure programming is to provide affordable opportunities that emphasize basic skill development, physical activity, and social inclusion. The model also emphasizes integrated

programming that accommodates persons of all abilities and skill levels, to the degree possible (where user needs are beyond what the City can feasibly offer – e.g., therapeutic services – the City provides contact information on alternate service providers).

Some priority areas for direct programming offered by the City's Leisure Services Division include:

- aquatic programs and recreational swimming (drop-in)
- public skating/shinny (drop-in)/power skating
- fitness and active living programs for all ages
- summer camp programs for children and youth
- downhill skiing and snowboarding lessons

The City and its partners place particular focus on drop-in programming for youth and seniors (herein referred to as “older adults”). Services to these target markets are managed through partnerships with youth program providers and senior citizens clubs within a variety of public and non-profit facilities throughout the City. There is regular communication between the City and youth / older adult service providers and there is an annual grant municipal stream available to many of these groups.

In terms of youth programming, this demographic will continue to be a focus for the Leisure Service Division and its partners. In 2013, the City was awarded the Silver Youth Community Builder Award by Play Works; Greater Sudbury is one of 42 communities from across Ontario to be recognized as a “Youth Friendly Community”.

The benefits of positive youth activity and investing in leadership development are well known and supported. The challenges of engaging youth in meaningful activities are also well documented. For example, many youth begin to opt out from organized sports once they reach their teens and become more interested in drop-in opportunities, but interest can vary from year to year based on peer influences. Transportation and cost are also major barriers to participation. There are also challenges caused by segmentation within this group (e.g., tweens/youth teens/older teens; low achievers/high achievers; etc.). Master Plan recommendations related to partnership support, community engagement and marketing, and dedicated space for youth should be effective in allowing the City to continue to successfully serve this age group.

Given the considerable growth forecasted for the City of Greater Sudbury's older adult population, additional attention to the personal and social health and well-being of this age group will be required. The City defines older adults as residents who are age 55 or older, but the segmentation amongst this age group is considerable, from baby boomers to the elderly, all with varying interests, abilities, and resources. The newest generation of older adults are expected to remain active longer in life and to have greater financial resources at their disposal, both of which have substantial implications on the delivery of leisure services, such as growing interest in drop-in activities, fitness programs, and value-added services. At the same time, there will continue to be many older adults that are interested in more traditional activities (e.g., cards, teas, bingo, etc.). Furthermore, as older adults age, many will acquire disabilities (e.g., mobility, dementia, illnesses, etc.) that will need to be accommodated, with City staff and volunteers receiving proper training.

A lack of time is the number one barrier to participation for every age group, including older adults. Activities that are convenient, accessible, affordable, and relevant will be the most successful. Program gaps and preferences (including those that may better accommodate the aging baby boomer

population) should be regularly identified and assessed through a variety of means. Consideration may also be given to expanding evening and weekend programming options to meet the needs of older adults that work and/or volunteer during the week. Examine opportunities to.

Given the wide range of ages captured within “seniors” services, it is recommended that the City complete its re-branding to use the term “older adult” exclusively, which is a prevailing trend among many municipalities. The term “seniors” can act as a barrier to attracting baby boomers, many of which are now over the age of 55. To avoid confusion, program descriptions within the Leisure Guide should clearly identify the target market should certain activities be meant for specific age groups.

Lastly, there has been local interest in taking steps to make Greater Sudbury a more senior-friendly community. Terms such as youth-friendly and senior-friendly are giving way to “age-friendly”, which does not prioritize one group over another. In fact, the World Health Organization (WHO) has identified a series of essential features of age-friendly cities and this checklist is being used as the foundation for age-friendly strategies across Ontario and beyond⁶. Age-friendly communities design policies, services, and infrastructure to help people of all ages – particularly older adults – to be active in their community. To be effective, the age-friendly concept must be embraced from a broad community perspective, and must involve all City departments and community stakeholders. Not only would age-friendly status help to improve the accessibility and responsiveness of local services, but it would also be an excellent fit with the City’s Healthy Communities initiative. The provision of age-friendly services, programs, and facilities should continue to be a priority for the City and its partners.

Action Plans

67. Continue to undertake program planning in coordination with community partners and in response to local needs, with an emphasis on services that promote physical activity and social inclusion.
68. Utilize “older adult” (not “senior”) as the preferred term in all City publications regarding the 55+ age cohort, including (but not limited to) the Leisure Guide, communication and promotion materials, and signage. Encourage partners to adopt a similar practice.
69. Undertake an Older Adult Strategy and pursue “age-friendly” community status for the City of Greater Sudbury. This will require an action plan for ensuring that leisure policies, services, and infrastructure enable people of all ages – particularly older adults – to be active in the community.

7.5 User Fees & Cost Recovery

To offset a portion of the costs associated with its parks and leisure facilities and programs, the City charges rental rates and program fees that are periodically updated based on inflationary factors and/or operating cost recovery targets. The rates and fees also show sensitivity to what surrounding

⁶ More information on this initiative can be found through the World Health Organization’s “Global Age-Friendly Cities Project”, the Public Health Agency of Canada’s “Pan-Canadian Age-Friendly Communities Milestones”, and Ontario Seniors’ Secretariat’s “Age-Friendly Community Planning Guide”.

municipalities and service providers are charging and to what the market will bear. Rates may vary depending on the type of use/user, time of day, day of week, season, etc.

Like most municipalities, the City of Greater Sudbury subsidizes community services through funds from general taxation; the degree of subsidization varies by service. If fees and charges were based on the full costs of providing such services, then many would become unaffordable to most residents. As such, it is expected that some subsidization will continue to reflect the public benefits of leisure services.

Prior to the City's amalgamation in 2001, each former municipality in Greater Sudbury had different rates and fees. Since this time, fees for arenas, fitness centres, playfields, and ski hills (among others) have been assessed and harmonized across the City, with some variation based on level of amenity and location. In some cases, additional cost centre analysis and consultation is still required on the fee categories and policies for fee waiver/space donation.

The City has established operating cost recovery targets for many of its major facilities, an exercise that should be expanded to all areas of practice. A best practice employed by some municipalities is to also include an annual capital replacement charge within the cost recovery levels to more effectively address the capital maintenance costs associated with upgrades and major facility renewal. Given the status of the City's aging infrastructure, this approach has merit as it promotes sustainability and fiscal responsibility.

Recently, as part of the Arena Renewal Strategy, increases to arena rates were instituted to mitigate the potential impact on the tax levy brought about by the construction of the second ice pad at the Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex and the repairs to Cambrian Arena. Similarly, should the City close or dispose of any parks or leisure facilities, consideration should be given to reallocating the operating funds from these former assets to the capital renewal of retained assets within the same community.

Action Plans

70. Regularly assess rates and fees for leisure programs and facilities to ensure that they represent a fair and equitable balance between true costs and public benefits. Include annual capital requirements within cost recovery targets to provide a true indication of the balance between user fee contributions, taxation, and other funding sources.
71. Evaluate the City's policies on user fee waiver/space donation relative to leisure services.
72. Should the City close or dispose of any parks or leisure facilities, consideration should be given to reallocating the operating funds from these former assets to the capital renewal of retained assets within the same community.

7.6 Community Engagement, Marketing, and Customer Service

The City informs residents of leisure opportunities through traditional media (print, radio, and television), the municipal website, advertising as community facilities, and through local partners and community organizations. The City also conducts annual surveys with stakeholders and regularly engages the public on special projects. Those seeking information have many ways to receive it, but generating awareness in today's society requires the use of a very wide range of communication tools.

The success of the City's leisure services often depends on connecting with users through a variety of vehicles, providing new and proactive strategies for reaching users as well as tried and true mechanisms that are familiar and predictable to current users. Promotion should focus not only on activities, events, and services, but also the benefits of participation and healthy lifestyles.

It is recommended that the City revisit its Communication and Marketing Strategy to ensure that it is effective in engaging all members of the community (including vulnerable and marginalized populations) and that it explores options for the targeted use of social media, mobile apps, electronic signs, attracting new users, and non-conventional outreach opportunities. Additional customer intelligence may also be required to identify the most effective ways to engage various types of users. This may be achieved through upgrades to the City's recreation management software, which could create improvements in customer service, online registration, program tracking, and data analysis modules.

Action Plans

73. Review the Communication and Marketing Strategy to ensure that it is effective in creating awareness and engaging all members of the community. The Strategy should reflect the continued development of new technologies, including social media, and explore new means to reach younger demographics.
74. Upgrade the City's recreation management software to improve customer service, customer intelligence, trend tracking, and performance indicators.

7.7 Sport & Leisure-Based Tourism

Sport tourism accounts for approximately 4% of overall tourism spending in Canada. Locally, it has been estimated that Greater Sudbury's role as host to the 2010 Ontario Summer Games resulted in \$3 to \$4 million in economic spin-off for the community.

Greater Sudbury has several advantages that make it a desirable location for provincial and national sport tourism events and competitions, such as its hospitality and visitor amenities, volunteer base, and unique northern setting. However, there remains a desire to balance community interests with the broader corporate goal of attracting revenue and tournaments to the City. The Master Plan's online survey found that 51% agreed and 19% disagree with the statement that "The City should place a higher priority on the attraction of sports tournaments and competitions to Greater Sudbury."

In 2012, a Sport Tourism Action Plan for Greater Sudbury was created and a Sport Tourism Advisory Panel was formed. The mandate of the Advisory Panel is to "focus on the business of sport tourism and on maximizing the economic impacts of hosting sport-related events in Greater Sudbury." In addition, there are a number of coordinating bodies and advocates involved in the sport tourism industry in Greater Sudbury, such as SportLink (a local sport council that offers assistance in event attraction and hosting, among other roles), Volunteer Sudbury, and the Greater Sudbury Sports Hall of Fame.

Through the Advisory Panel and an internal working group, the City has begun to move forward on the creation of equitable and transparent policies and targeted strategies to achieve the goals outlined in the Sport Tourism Action Plan. Additional work remains (for example, the City lacks an Event Hosting Strategy and support guidelines) and consideration has been given to the need for additional staff

resources to liaise with provincial/national sport bodies, sports groups, and local partners. Opportunities to enhance park-based community events and initiatives (e.g., Communities in Bloom) that promote social cohesion, community pride, and increase awareness of local traditions and talents should also be explored. At a minimum, through a review of the City's special events policy, consideration should be given to establishing basic and enhanced levels of support for events (e.g., site preparation, promotion, etc.) that takes into account the ongoing costs of this service and overall maintenance funding levels, while ensuring that the primary responsibility for special events remains with community organizations.

Action Plans

- | |
|---|
| <p>75. Continue to foster relationships between the City, Sport Tourism Advisory Panel, SportLink, and other partners (e.g., hospitality sector, sports groups, volunteers, etc.) to strengthen sports tourism in Greater Sudbury.</p> <p>76. With sectoral partners, create an Event Hosting Strategy to define roles and responsibilities, funding guidelines, potential bids to pursue, etc.</p> <p>77. Give consideration to regional, provincial, and national design and hosting standards when upgrading, redeveloping, and developing indoor and outdoor sports facilities.</p> |
|---|

7.8 Staffing & Volunteer Management

The City of Greater Sudbury provides a variety of coordination, management, and community development services that result in a dynamic and sustainable leisure delivery system. The Leisure Services Division is committed to service excellence and strives to provide and enable programs and services that are meaningful, produce benefit to participants and the community, and are delivered effectively with a commitment to continuously improve the level of service. Through its partners and direct engagement, staff strive to be innovative, creative, and in touch with community needs and expectations. The use of cross-divisional work teams, inter-department communication, and collaboration with agencies on specific initiatives are the norm and are a best practice for other municipalities to emulate.

There are increasing workload pressures on many staff teams in the City due to rising resident expectations and the provision of a broader range of services. For example, a growing interest in community gardens has raised a discussion about the need for a coordinator to lend support to local food systems and the incorporation of food production into the parks system (which is expected to be a theme in the City's new Official Plan). Staffing levels and/or responsibilities for special events, park beautification, summer playground programs, trail maintenance, sport tourism, and arena halls are just a few others that have been raised as areas for further analysis. Furthermore, staff training and coverage are common areas of concern within many organizations, particularly as new customer service regulations (e.g., accessibility for persons with disabilities) are enacted.

While the overall staffing model for the Leisure Services Division generally appears to be effective, as time passes, there is a growing need to undertake a review of staffing gaps, responsibilities, efficiencies, and training requirements. A targeted review of staffing needs is recommended; further study will be required to establish the scope of this review.

Facility/parks management and direct core programming are the most visible of the Division's responsibilities; however, the City also provides essential supports to community partners. These supports are varied and include (but are not limited to) staff support (e.g., community development coordinators), funding support and insurance coverage for Community Action Networks and neighbourhood associations, grant assistance, volunteer training and recognition, and much more.

Volunteers are the backbone of the leisure system as they deliver minor sports programs and assist with other vital services such as the playground and outdoor ice rink programs, not to mention a wide range of other services. However, increasing regulation and administrative requirements are taxing many groups. Should volunteer involvement decline, residents will look to the City to assume many of these responsibilities, which is an outcome that should be avoided. There continues to be a growing need for volunteer assistance and management resources (e.g., recruitment, screening, training, recognition, etc.) from the City and its partners. Some options to be considered include the expansion of inter-generational volunteering opportunities (e.g., youth and seniors), as well as creating connections between mandatory high school community service requirements and City/community volunteer needs.

Action Plans

78. Undertake a scoped review of staffing gaps, responsibilities, efficiencies, and training requirements within the Leisure Services Division.
79. Identify opportunities to strengthen the City's role in supporting volunteerism within the leisure delivery system.

7.9 Partnerships

Partnerships play an important role in the provision of parks and leisure facilities and services within the City of Greater Sudbury. The City has established a wide range of excellent partnerships with organizations serving the youth, senior, sport, health, education, environmental, and service club sectors, to name a few. Community access to school agreements is one partnership example that leverages existing resources for public benefit. One particular partnership surrounding a notable capital project is the development of the Northern Water Sports Centre, which will become a shared facility for the Sudbury Canoe Club, Sudbury Rowing Club, and the Sudbury Dragon Boat Festival.

Economic pressures will continue to prompt the City to pursue partnerships as a means of containing capital and operating costs, sharing risks, increasing the speed with which new projects can be brought online, expanding the availability of capital, increasing revenues, enhancing facility maintenance, and improving the cost efficiency of service delivery. As a result, the City will be required to enhance and create relationships with outside interests to gain access to new funding opportunities, management expertise, and other resources that may be otherwise unavailable. Conversely, the City will inevitably be approached with partnership proposals that will arise from community groups, not-for-profit organizations, or the private sector.

The most successful partnerships are derived from common objectives (e.g., environmental conservation, community improvement, physical activity, trail development, etc.), maximizing the strengths of each party, and mitigating risks (e.g., costs, liability, etc.). There are a number of criteria

that must be considered prior to establishing a relationship and a partnership with a third party wishing to introduce a new level of service with municipal assistance.

Once it has been determined that the proposed partnership is consistent with the municipal mandate and philosophies, the City should consider the following factors, at a minimum:

- that there is a role for the City to play in the provision of the program or service;
- whether there is a quantifiable or justified need for the service in the community;
- that the service can be properly accommodated within the City's long-term capital and/or operating resources;
- whether the partner is sufficiently capable / qualified (e.g., financially, staffing, internal expertise, etc.) to be able to deliver the service over the long-term, and in compliance with legislated policies and municipal standards;
- that the level of risk (e.g., financial, liability, etc.) is acceptable and that there is a plan in place to manage the risk;
- whether the partner can provide the service on a sole source basis; and/or
- that there is full agreement of terms, conditions, standards, and responsibilities amongst all parties.

As identified in the City's Arena Renewal Strategy, the most important aspect of developing a successful public-private partnership is the identification of the risks, rewards, and responsibilities of the participating partners and crafting a relationship that produces mutual benefit. The planning process should also involve determining the City's objectives, constraints, and the necessary attributes of potential partners. Additional direction regarding public-private partnerships (including their benefits, risks, examples, etc.) can be found in the Arena Renewal Strategy; although the focus of this report is on community arena development/management, many principles are applicable to other leisure services.

Lastly, to adequately prepare to effectively manage partnership opportunities, it is recommended that the City adopt a Standardized Partnership Framework relative to leisure services. This recommendation was also in the 2004 Master Plan, but no substantial action has been taken to date. This framework would set out a decision-making process to ensure that new and existing relationships with outside groups provide maximum benefit to the municipality. Furthermore, a search, selection, and monitoring approach should be uniformly applied to relationships with all external entities. This framework would set out a defined process that is fair, equitable, and transparent and that outlines clearly the expectations and obligations of organizations – private sector entities, community groups, etc. – wishing to partner with the City. This framework should also include a mechanism through which unsolicited proposals can be objectively evaluated.

Action Plans

- | |
|---|
| <p>80. Where appropriate, consider partnerships with public, not-for-profit, and/or private organizations in financing, developing, operating, and/or maintaining parks and leisure facilities and services in an effort to improve cost efficiency and enhance community benefit.</p> <p>81. Seek corporate sponsorships to enhance the delivery of leisure programs and services.</p> <p>82. Develop a standardized partnership framework to guide decisions relating to new and existing relationships with outside groups in the delivery and provision of leisure services and facilities.</p> |
|---|

Section 8. Implementation

This Section summarizes the action plans put forth within this Master Plan, along with their suggested priority and timing. A framework for reviewing and updating the Plan is also identified.

8.1 Implementation Strategy

Throughout the body of this Master Plan, recommendations on potential “action plans” have been identified at the end of each subsection or topic area. This is not intended to be a definitive list, as additional capital repairs, operating expenditures, and other initiatives outside the scope of this Plan may be identified and prioritized on a case-specific basis. By approving this Plan, the City is not bound to implementing every action plan or providing facilities in the order, amount, or timing indicated; rather, this Plan provides guidance on community priorities and sets a general course for meeting the needs as they are presently defined. **It is expected that the City of Greater Sudbury will make decisions on individual projects and funding sources annually through the capital budget process.**

This implementation strategy provides guidance for ensuring that the most critical action plans are dealt with in a timely fashion, while the less critical (yet important) action plans are implemented over time. In addition, high level capital cost estimates for key action plans have been identified in collaboration with City staff to ensure that local cost factors and standards are properly reflected. Annual operating costs for programs, services, and facilities (existing or recommended under this Plan) are not included in this analysis. It is expected that an analysis of operating budget implications and partnership options would be undertaken prior to approving any capital project and that sufficient annual operating funds would be allocated to any approved project.

The timing of the projects proposed in this Master Plan recognizes the need for phased implementation as some action plans are based upon what is needed and not necessarily what is financially achievable by the City at the present time. As such, the timing proposed for some action plans may not align with the City’s funding capacities as time goes by. As part of the annual budget process, this Plan will be reviewed to identify areas where the availability of resources may affect the timing of implementation.

Determining priorities is an exercise that should be revisited each year prior to the City’s capital and operating budget development exercise. Readjusting resource allocations is critical in a climate where base funding is not increasing substantially and resources need to be maximized in order to garner the greatest gain to the community. In addition to funding availability, factors that might change priorities year to year may include:

- capital lifecycle and considerations of safety;
- legislation and mandated requirements;
- changes to service standards;
- public input and community interests;
- emerging trends and changes in participation rates;
- availability of alternate providers; and
- socio-demographic changes and growth forecasts.

The City has limited resources and cannot afford to do everything that the community desires; this is one of the primary reasons for undertaking a Master Plan in the first place. Although the City of Greater Sudbury may be challenged in providing the appropriate financial resources to meet the Master Plan's recommendations, the City has an obligation to make every reasonable effort to implement these strategies through a variety of appropriate and acceptable means. The full implementation of this Plan will require the pursuit of development charges, grants, alternative funding, and the establishment of various partnerships and collaborations with community organizations, schools, agencies, and other partners.

Action Plans

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 83. | Ensure that sufficient annual operating funds are allocated to approved capital projects. |
| 84. | Continue to seek alternative funding sources (e.g., fundraising, sponsorships, grants, etc.) to supplement existing resources and to enable full implementation of the Master Plan. |

Priority is often, but not always, synonymous with timing – the higher the priority, the sooner the recommendation should be implemented. Priority has been determined based on an assessment of need, as identified throughout the planning process (including public engagement, trend and demographic analysis, assessments of facilities, parks, programs, etc.). Within the tables that follow, the priority and timing of action plans are organized into the following categories:

Priority

- | | |
|-------------------------|--|
| <u>High Priority:</u> | Immediate attention is recommended during the timeframe recommended. |
| <u>Medium Priority:</u> | Attention is required when high priority actions have been initiated or completed, or when suitable partners have been identified for funding. |
| <u>Low Priority:</u> | Attention is required when high and medium priority actions have been initiated/completed. |

Timing

- | | |
|---------------------|-----------------|
| <u>Short-term:</u> | 2014 to 2018 |
| <u>Medium-term:</u> | 2019 to 2023 |
| <u>Ongoing:</u> | 2014 and beyond |

Note: In the following tables, the action plans are numbered according to the order in which they are presented in the body of the Master Plan. They are not listed in priority order.

Action Plans	Priority	Timing	
		2014-18	2019-23
Arenas (Section 5.3)			
1. Continue to implement the Arena Renewal Strategy, which found a current and long-term demand for 15 total indoor ice pads across the entire City (resulting in a surplus of one ice pad). This will require: - a continued focus on maintaining existing arenas in a safe and community responsive condition, with consideration to the City’s recent building condition assessments; - monitoring of usage trends and community demands to assess the possibility of decommissioning one existing ice pad; and - continued progress on the eventual renovation or replacement of the Sudbury Community Arena.	High	●	●
2. The decision to decommission any arena should be accompanied by a community engagement process, capital lifecycle analysis, evaluation of alternate uses, and options for the continued delivery of leisure services within the affected community.	High	●	●
Indoor Pools (Section 5.4)			
3. Implement the City’s Therapeutic Pool Feasibility Study to realize the provision of a therapeutic/leisure pool at the Lionel E. Lalonde Centre in Rayside-Balfour.	High	●	
4. Undertake a review of the City’s indoor pools to identify opportunities for operational efficiencies, increasing utilization, and an evaluation of capital requirements and options for facility renewal/closure. The decision to close or re-purpose any facility should come after a one-year review period following the development of a new facility.	High	●	
Fitness Centres (Section 5.5)			
5. Seek opportunities to expand the City’s focus on fitness programs and active living through the maximization of space within community facilities (e.g., multi-purpose rooms, fitness centres, halls, libraries, schools, etc.).	Medium	●	●
6. Maintain existing fitness centres as long as these centres are financially and operationally viable.	Medium	●	●
7. Assess demand for a fitness centre in Walden, should a viable co-location and/or partnership opportunity arise.	Medium		●

Action Plans	Priority	Timing	
		2014-18	2019-23
Gymnasiums (Section 5.6)			
8. To facilitate continued community access to school facilities (e.g., gymnasiums, classrooms, sports fields, etc.), maintain joint use agreements with school boards.	High	●	●
9. Future indoor leisure facility capital projects should consider opportunities to include gymnasiums.	Low	●	●
Community Centres & Halls (Section 5.7)			
10. Continue to seek opportunities to streamline hall operations, including contracting out the operation of community halls as a way to mitigate costs and directly engage local communities in hall management.	Medium	●	●
11. As opportunities arise, seek ways to improve the flexibility and multi-use nature of existing community halls to facilitate a wider range of activities and age groups, including activities that focus on the increasing number of older adults.	Medium	●	●
12. Guided by sound asset management practices, maintain and/or upgrade existing community centres and halls to the degree possible, with priority placed on high-use facilities. Alternative options may need to be explored for under-performing halls, in consultation with the affected community.	Medium	●	●
Dedicated Space for Youth & Seniors (Section 5.8)			
13. As opportunities arise, retrofit existing leisure facilities to ensure that these facilities are age-friendly (e.g., welcoming for children/youth, older adults, and all ages in between). This may include relocating services to more accessible locations or the provision of lounge areas, dedicated spaces, storage, accessible washrooms, etc.	High	●	●
14. Should the City establish any new youth or seniors' spaces, strong consideration should be given to co-locating these spaces with community centres, rather than creating new stand-alone facilities.	Medium	●	●
15. Maintain and/or upgrade existing youth and seniors' facilities to the degree possible, with priority placed on high-use facilities. Alternative options may need to be explored for under-utilized and/or deteriorating facilities, in consultation with the affected community.	High	●	●

Action Plans	Priority	Timing	
		2014-18	2019-23
Indoor Turf Facilities (Section 5.9)			
16. Municipal development, administration, and/or operation of an indoor sports/soccer facility is not recommended at this time.	Low	●	●
Arts & Culture Facilities (Section 5.10)			
17. Participate in the development and implementation of the City's Cultural Plan being developed by the Greater Sudbury Development Corporation.	Low	●	
18. Continue to implement the 2013 Grace Hartman Amphitheatre Business Plan Review, with priority given to enhancements that promote use by local not-for-profit community groups.	High	●	
Playgrounds (Section 5.11)			
19. In new or redeveloping urban residential areas, ensure that play structures are provided within an 800-metre radius of every residence without crossing a major arterial road or physical barrier. As per City policy, all new play structures must have a minimum of one play component that is fully accessible. Signage that identifies age-appropriate information should also be provided.	High	●	●
20. To improve geographic distribution, locations in Rayside-Balfour, Nickel Centre, and Walden should be considered for the installation of fully accessible barrier-free playgrounds.	High	●	●
21. Council may consider the disposition or re-purposing of surplus playground sites (e.g., those within 400 metres of another playground) within the context of its Parkland Disposal Policy and Green Space Advisory Panel recommendations. Equipment in good repair should be moved to other sites.	High	●	●
22. For municipal playground sites that are to remain in the active inventory, continue to place a high priority on the maintenance and replacement of play equipment, with consideration to accessibility regulations.	High	●	●
23. Fully integrate the City's inventory of playgrounds (and other leisure assets) within the Geographic Information System to improve analytical tools and future planning.	High	●	
Soccer Fields (Section 5.12)			
24. Develop a soccer complex with three full size lit fields at the Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex. Consideration should be given to developing one field as artificial turf, as well as a support building (dressing rooms, storage, concession, washrooms).	Medium	●	

Action Plans	Priority	Timing	
		2014-18	2019-23
25. Provide three additional mini fields in Walden and one additional full field in Rayside-Balfour through park development/expansion or agreement.	High		•
26. Continue to upgrade existing soccer fields to meet local needs, including the identification of additional fields suitable for lighting installation. Preference should generally be given to fields in areas of need and park sites with multiple fields.	Medium	•	•
27. Maintain access to the parking lot at the former Barrydowne Arena in order to provide parking for the newly established mini fields at Adanac/Rotary Park.	High	•	•
Ball Diamonds (Section 5.13)			
28. Demand for additional diamonds is not anticipated during the timeframe of this Plan. Nevertheless, the City should continue to monitor registration data, with particular focus on the Sudbury and Rayside-Balfour areas.	Low	•	•
29. Upgrades may be made to selected diamonds with the assistance of local organizations, including the installation of lights at the Terry Fox Complex (Diamond #2). Preference should generally be given to fields in areas of need and park sites with multiple fields.	High	•	•
30. Lower quality practice or scrub diamonds should be evaluated and redeveloped for other uses, where appropriate.	Medium	•	•
Other Sports Fields (Section 5.14)			
31. Ensure that the artificial turf field recommended for the Gerry McCrory Countryside Sports Complex is designed to accommodate a wide range of field sports, including football, field lacrosse, ultimate frisbee, etc.	Medium	•	
Outdoor Basketball Courts (Section 5.15)			
32. Undertake an “observation project” to document usage and assist in prioritizing opportunities for the re-purposing, repair, and/or expansion of unscheduled and casual use park amenities, such as tennis courts, basketball courts, bocce courts, playgrounds, etc.	High	•	
33. New basketball court development may be considered within noted gap areas and new residential subdivisions that do not have any municipal courts within 1-kilometre. New facilities should be designed as half courts unless the goal is to create opportunities for outdoor ice skating on the same pad.	Medium	•	•

Action Plans	Priority	Timing	
		2014-18	2019-23
Outdoor Tennis Courts (Section 5.16)			
34. No additional courts are required in any area of the City during the timeframe of this Plan. The City should convert under-utilized tennis pads in over-supplied areas to other alternative uses (e.g., pickleball) or remove the courts entirely to mitigate capital requirements.	Medium	●	●
Splash Pads & Beaches (Section 5.17)			
35. Continue to expand the municipal splash pad inventory through application of a 1.5-kilometre service radius within urban residential areas. Based on the present distribution, seven to eight new splash pads would be required to meet this target, including sites within Garson, Onaping/Dowling, Capreol, Sudbury (South End, Minnow Lake, and Bell Park), and possibly Azilda and/or Val Caron. Splash pads should be provided in community parks that have access to washrooms, change areas, and off-street parking.	Medium	●	●
36. Continue to maintain municipally supervised beaches and to ensure that beach access routes meet or exceed the technical requirements of the <i>Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act</i> . Additional public engagement should be undertaken to determine possible areas for improvement to beach areas.	High	●	●
Off-Leash Dog Parks (Section 5.18)			
37. Establish formal criteria for identifying and evaluating potential sites for future off-leash dog parks, with consideration to those identified in this Plan.	High	●	
38. Engage local communities and organizations in the planning, creation, and operation of future off-leash dog parks, with priority given to the City's larger urban areas, including: Sudbury (south/southwest area); Rayside-Balfour; and Valley East.	High	●	●
Outdoor Ice Rinks (Section 5.19)			
39. Establish a policy to address the rationalization of existing rinks and provision of new outdoor rinks, as well as to undertake a review of the outdoor rink program to ensure that it is making the most effective use of available funding.	High	●	
40. Maintain existing outdoor rinks to the degree possible, with priority placed on high-use facilities. Alternative options may need to be explored for under-utilized and/or deteriorating facilities, in consultation with the affected community.	High	●	●

Action Plans	Priority	Timing	
		2014-18	2019-23
Running Tracks (Section 5.20)			
41. Continue to maintain and support the Laurentian Community Track for local use and to ensure its viability for hosting regional and provincial-level track and field competitions.	Medium	●	●
Skate & BMX Parks (Section 5.21)			
42. Develop up to four additional skate parks in Sudbury (gaps include the South End, New Sudbury, Downtown, and Copper Cliff) as well as one additional skate park in Valley East to improve geographic distribution. Skateboarders should be engaged in the design, creation, and operation of new facilities.	Medium	●	●
43. Explore options for bike pump parks/tracks as needs arise (instead of BMX parks that tend to require greater maintenance and volunteer support).	Low	●	
Ski Hills (Section 5.22)			
44. Ensure the sustainability of municipal ski hills through responsible asset management, customer-responsive programs and services, and four-season opportunities. Lifecycle analysis indicates that the replacement of lift equipment at the Adanac and Lively ski hills will be required in the near term.	High	●	
45. Given the low utilization of the Capreol Ski Hill, its continued operation must be rationalized. A detailed operational review should be undertaken, including the exploration of alternate uses and consultation with stakeholders. Major capital investment at this location is not recommended without a proper business plan and strategy.	High	●	
Other Leisure Facilities (Section 5.23)			
46. Develop a formal partnership framework to evaluate municipal involvement in unsolicited proposals for specialized leisure facilities. At a minimum, this framework should require proponents to prepare comprehensive business plans (completed to the City's satisfaction) to enable the evaluation.	Medium	●	
Parkland Classification (Section 6.1)			
47. Consider the park classification system created by the Green Space Advisory Panel as part of the City's Official Plan Review; dividing the classification system into two groups: (1) Active Parkland (Neighbourhood, Community, and Regional Parks) to which the per capita provision target will apply; and (2) Open Space (Linear, Natural, and Special Purpose Parks and Ecological Reserve).	High	●	

Action Plans	Priority	Timing	
		2014-18	2019-23
Park Beautification (Section 6.1)			
48. Establish maintenance and capital objectives specific to various park types.	High	●	
Parkland Inventory & Requirements (Section 6.1)			
49. Maintain an updated inventory and geographic database of municipal parks, open space, and landscaped/horticultural properties (including a standardized property name, classification, and listing of assets) and establish a protocol for updating the database.	High	●	
50. Consider amending the park-specific provision targets for Neighbourhood, Community, and Regional Parks, while continuing to maintain an overall target of 4.0 hectares of active parkland per 1,000 residents.	High	●	
Parkland Gaps (Section 6.1)			
51. The City should use a variety of tools and mechanisms to identify and address priority gaps in the active parkland inventory; these options are identified in the Green Space Advisory Panel reports.	Medium	●	●
Surplus Parkland (Section 6.1)			
52. The City should continue to evaluate and implement its Parkland Disposal Policy, with reference to this Master Plan and the Green Space Advisory Panel reports.	High	●	●
Parkland Policy & Dedication (Section 6.1)			
53. Seek to maximize <i>Planning Act</i> provisions in acquiring parkland (or cash-in-lieu) and establishing a linked open space system, with consideration to the findings of this Master Plan and Green Space Advisory Panel Reports.	High	●	●
54. Through the City’s Official Plan Review, consider options for providing parkland within areas of residential intensification. This may include (but not be limited to) changes to the alternate parkland requirement (1 hectare per 300 units) for the highest density applications, new park types in urban areas, and options for renewing and revitalizing existing parks intended to serve areas of residential intensification.	Low	●	
Parkland & Facility Development and Design (Section 6.1)			
55. Develop a Leisure Facilities Standards Manual to identify facility design standards (e.g., signage, accessibility, support amenities, etc.) to guide the development and redevelopment of leisure facilities.	Medium	●	

Action Plans	Priority	Timing	
		2014-18	2019-23
56. In designing parks, continue to: • incorporate spaces and amenities encouraging physical activity, wellness, and informal use opportunities; • consider the needs of a diverse and aging population through the provision of washrooms, seating, shade/shelter, drinking fountains, pathways, and picnic areas; • follow accessibility legislation and guidelines to accommodate persons with disabilities; • apply CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) principles; • promote designs that encourage sustainable maintenance practices; • incorporate a balance of native, drought-resistant, and colourful vegetative features; • utilize materials that are robust, durable, and mindful of future maintenance requirements; • seek innovative and engaging initiatives that encourage environmental stewardship (e.g., recycling bins); • encourage public art; and • encourage active transportation connections and a linked open space system.	High	•	•
Trails & Connectivity (Section 6.2)			
57. Continue to work with partners on the expansion of recreational trails, active transportation choices, and associated support infrastructure, as guided by the City of Greater Sudbury Sustainable Mobility Plan, Official Plan, and related initiatives.	High	•	•
58. In the Official Plan Review, the importance of trails and active transportation should be strengthened through the identification of a preferred network and implementation policies. A policy to allow for the conveyance of land for pathways within new subdivisions (as permitted by Section 51 of the Planning Act) should also be considered.	High	•	
Healthy Community Challenges & Priorities (Section 7.1)			
59. Consider the findings of this Master Plan as part of the City's Healthy Community initiative.	High	•	•
Municipal Role in Service Delivery (Section 7.2)			
60. Evaluate the delivery of leisure services on a regular basis, including consideration to new approaches that may improve service efficiency and cost effectiveness.	Medium	•	•

Action Plans	Priority	Timing	
		2014-18	2019-23
Affordable Access to Recreation (Section 7.3)			
61. Formalize the Affordable Access to Recreation policy in order to bolster universal access to physical activity and recreation opportunities based on an ability-to-pay model.	High	●	
62. Build on the existing program offerings to maximize opportunities for free access to municipal facilities (for all age groups) where expenses would be neutral (e.g., drop-in programs, open gym, open houses at fitness facilities, public skating / swimming, etc.). In doing so, create pilot program opportunities at municipal facilities to evaluate public interest and to further evaluate the net budget impact. Explore funding opportunities to cover cost for staff wages, benefits, etc.	High	●	
63. Create and maintain an updated list of agencies that fund and/or provide subsidies, in order to refer citizens that require financial assistance to participate in municipal recreational programs.	Medium	●	
64. Build on the community mapping initiative (GIS and online) to identify leisure facilities and programs that are free to the community.	High	●	
65. Develop a communication strategy and create a brand for affordable access that could be incorporated within the City’s “Healthy Community” initiative.	Medium	●	
66. Encourage all agencies and leisure organizations to be advocates by recognizing, celebrating, and advertising their support towards affordable access.	Medium	●	
Program Delivery (Section 7.4)			
67. Continue to undertake program planning in coordination with community partners and in response to local needs, with an emphasis on services that promote physical activity and social inclusion.	High	●	●
68. Utilize “older adult” (not “senior”) as the preferred term in all City publications regarding the 55+ age cohort, including (but not limited to) the Leisure Guide, communication and promotion materials, and signage. Encourage partners to adopt a similar practice.	High	●	

Action Plans	Priority	Timing	
		2014-18	2019-23
69. Undertake an Older Adult Strategy and pursue “age-friendly” community status for the City of Greater Sudbury. This will require an action plan for ensuring that leisure policies, services, and infrastructure enable people of all ages – particularly older adults – to be active in the community.	High	•	
User Fees & Cost Recovery (Section 7.5)			
70. Regularly assess rates and fees for leisure programs and facilities to ensure that they represent a fair and equitable balance between true costs and public benefits. Include annual capital requirements within cost recovery targets to provide a true indication of the balance between user fee contributions, taxation, and other funding sources.	High	•	•
71. Evaluate the City’s policies on user fee waiver/space donation relative to leisure services.	Medium	•	
72. Should the City close or dispose of any parks or leisure facilities, consideration should be given to reallocating the operating funds from these former assets to the capital renewal of retained assets within the same community.	Low	•	•
Community Engagement, Marketing, and Customer Service (Section 7.6)			
73. Review the Communication and Marketing Strategy to ensure that it is effective in creating awareness and engaging all members of the community. The Strategy should reflect the continued development of new technologies, including social media, and explore new means to reach younger demographics.	High	•	
74. Upgrade the City’s recreation management software to improve customer service, customer intelligence, trend tracking, and performance indicators.	High		•
Sport & Leisure-Based Tourism (Section 7.7)			
75. Continue to foster relationships between the City, Sport Tourism Advisory Panel, SportLink, and other partners (e.g., hospitality sector, sports groups, volunteers, etc.) to strengthen sports tourism in Greater Sudbury.	Medium	•	•
76. With sectoral partners, create an Event Hosting Strategy to define roles and responsibilities, funding guidelines, potential bids to pursue, etc.	Medium	•	

Action Plans	Priority	Timing	
		2014-18	2019-23
77. Give consideration to regional, provincial, and national design and hosting standards when upgrading, redeveloping, and developing indoor and outdoor sports facilities.	Medium	•	•
Staffing & Volunteer Management (Section 7.8)			
78. Undertake a scoped review of staffing gaps, responsibilities, efficiencies, and training requirements within the Leisure Services Division.	High	•	
79. Identify opportunities to strengthen the City's role in supporting volunteerism within the leisure delivery system.	Medium	•	•
Partnerships (Section 7.9)			
80. Where appropriate, consider partnerships with public, not-for-profit, and/or private organizations in financing, developing, operating, and/or maintaining parks and leisure facilities and services in an effort to improve cost efficiency and enhance community benefit.	High	•	•
81. Seek corporate sponsorships to enhance the delivery of leisure programs and services.	High	•	•
82. Develop a standardized partnership framework to guide decisions relating to new and existing relationships with outside groups in the delivery and provision of leisure services and facilities.	Medium	•	
Implementation Strategy (Section 8.1)			
83. Ensure that sufficient annual operating funds are allocated to approved capital projects.	High	•	•
84. Continue to seek alternative funding sources (e.g., fundraising, sponsorships, grants, etc.) to supplement existing resources and to enable full implementation of the Master Plan.	High	•	•
Monitoring and Updating the Master Plan (Section 8.2)			
85. Implement a system for the regular implementation, monitoring, and review of the Master Plan.	High	•	•
86. Reconfirm the direction, priorities and accomplishments of the Master Plan in 2019. Undertake a complete review and update of the Master Plan in the year 2024.	High		•

8.2 Monitoring and Updating the Master Plan

The City of Greater Sudbury should regularly review and assess, and periodically revise the recommendations of the Parks, Open Space & Leisure Master Plan in order to ensure that they remain reflective of local conditions and responsive to the changing needs of the community. This will require monitoring of activity patterns, tracking user satisfaction levels, consistent dialogue with community organizations, annual reporting on implementation and short-term work plans, and undertaking a detailed ten-year update to the Plan. Through these mechanisms – or as a result of other internal or external factors – adjustment of resource allocations and priorities identified in this Plan may be required.

Reviewing the Plan requires a commitment from all staff involved in the delivery of parks and leisure services, Council, and the public. An appropriate time for this is prior to the annual budgeting process. The following steps may be used to conduct an annual review of the Master Plan:

- review of the past year (recommendations implemented, capital projects undertaken, success/failure of new and existing initiatives, changes in participation levels, issues arising from the public and community groups, etc.);
- identification of issues impacting the coming year (anticipated financial and operational constraints, political pressures, etc.);
- cursory review of the Plan for direction regarding its recommendations;
- preparation of a staff report to indicate prioritization of short term projects and determination of which projects should be implemented in the coming year based upon criteria established by staff (e.g., financial limitations, community input, partnership/funding potential, etc.);
- communication to staff and Council regarding the status of projects, criteria used to prioritize projects, and projects to be implemented in the coming year; and
- budget requests/revisions as necessary.

Action Plans

- | | |
|-----|---|
| 85. | Implement a system for the regular implementation, monitoring, and review of the Master Plan. |
| 86. | Reconfirm the direction, priorities and accomplishments of the Master Plan in 2019. Undertake a complete review and update of the Master Plan in the year 2024. |

Appendix A: Complete Online Survey Results

The detailed results of the online survey are contained on the following pages.

A. PARTICIPATION

1. In the past 12 months, which of the following activities have you or anyone in your household participated in? By participation, we mean situations where you or a member of your household actively participate (which does not include attending an event or watching others), either at home or in public. (select all that may apply)

	#	%		#
Walking or Hiking for Leisure	433	90%	Other	
Swimming (outdoor)	291	60%	Snowshoeing	11
Cycling or Mountain Biking	255	53%	Cricket	8
Ice Sports / Skating (outdoor)	248	51%	Ultimate Frisbee	6
Swimming (indoor)	239	49%	Dog park / dog walking	5
Use of Playground Equipment	229	47%	Roller skating	3
Water Sports (e.g. canoeing, kayaking, etc.)	227	47%	Rugby	3
Running or Jogging	207	43%	Disc golf	2
Aerobics, Fitness or Weight training	207	43%	Gardening	2
Ice Sports / Skating (indoor)	183	38%	Golf	2
Cross-country Skiing	149	31%	Gymnastics	2
Soccer	134	28%	Best Start Hubs	1
Downhill Skiing	134	28%	Bowling	1
Use of Spray Pads in Parks	134	28%	Camping	1
Gymnasium Sports	128	27%	Curling	1
Baseball or Softball	98	20%	Geocaching	1
Tennis	68	14%	Martial arts	1
Basketball (outdoor)	56	12%	Mountain climbing	1
Skateboarding	43	9%	Organized competitions	1
Organized Teen Programs (e.g. drop-in activities, youth club, etc.)	33	7%		
Football	29	6%	Skijoring	1
Organized Seniors Programs (e.g. luncheons, cards, special interest courses, etc.)	25	5%	Snowboarding	1
Other	56	12%		
Answered question	483		Squash	1
Skipped question	8		Target shooting	1

2. What is a reasonable length of time for you to travel for the leisure activities that your household does the most? (multiple responses permitted)

	#	% (responses)	% (sample)		#
0-4 minutes	58	9%	12%	Other	
5-9 minutes	87	14%	18%	Prefer closer to home	3
10-14 minutes	140	22%	29%	Depends	2
15-19 minutes	133	21%	28%		
20-24 minutes	71	11%	15%		
25-29 minutes	37	6%	8%		
30-34 minutes	38	6%	8%		
35-39 minutes	12	2%	3%		
40-44 minutes	14	2%	3%		
45 minutes or more	32	5%	7%		
Don't Know/Not Applicable	8	1%	2%		
Other	5	1%	1%		
Total Responses	635	100%			
Answered question	477				
Skipped question	14				

3. Are you and members of your household able to participate in parks and leisure activities as often as you would like?

	#	%
Yes	194	40%
No	268	55%
Don't Know	25	5%
Answered question	487	100%
Skipped question	4	

4. Why are you and members of your household not able to participate in parks and leisure activities as often as you would like? (multiple responses permitted)

	#	% (responses)	% (sample)
Lack of desired facilities or programs	163	26%	33%
Lack of personal time / Too busy	127	20%	26%
Program not offered at a convenient time	99	16%	20%
Lack of information / Unaware of opportunities	76	12%	16%
Lack of money or equipment	71	11%	15%
Lack of transportation / Facility too far away	71	11%	15%
Health problems / Disability / Age	11	2%	2%
Language / Cultural Barrier	9	1%	2%
Don't Know	2	0%	0%
Other	8	1%	2%
Total Responses	637	100%	
Answered question	286		
Skipped question	205		

Other	#
Safety concerns (biking)	4
Lack of activities in French	1
Poor facility management	1
Public swim/skate is cancelled	1
Weather	1

B. PROGRAM ACTIVITIES & GAPS

5. Are there any parks or leisure activities that you or members of your household would like to see offered in the City of Greater Sudbury that are not currently available?

	#	%
Yes	229	51%
No	98	22%
Don't Know	126	28%
Answered question	453	100%
Skipped question	38	

6. What new or additional parks and leisure activities would you like to see offered?

(two mentions or more)	#		#
Trails	27	Outdoor fitness areas	3
Bike paths	27	Outdoor rinks	3
Bike lanes	22	Playground	3
Swimming / pool	21	Recreation Centre	3
Splash pads	12	Salt water pool	3
Dog parks	9	Soccer fields	3
Cricket	6	Therapeutic pool	3
Green space	6	Artificial turf field	2
Indoor playground	6	Baseball	2
Outdoor basketball courts	6	Bocce courts	2
Water slide park	5	Community hall	2
Arenas	4	Concert hall	2
Kayak and bike rentals	4	Cross country trails	2
Organized outdoor activities	4	Dance	2
Outdoor gathering spaces	4	Daytime activities for children	2
Parks	4	Free programs	2
Rock climbing wall	4	Open spaces	2
Skate park	4	Rollerskating	2
Yoga	4	Sidewalks	2
Community gardens	3	Turf field	2
Multi-pad arena	3	Upgraded playgrounds	2
Multi-use recreational facility	3	Zumba	2

C. IMPORTANCE & SATISFACTION

7. In general, how important are the following items to your household? Please use a scale that ranges from "not at all important" to "very important".

Indoor Leisure Facilities such as arenas, pools, and halls

	#	%	
Very Important (5)	246	58%	85%
Important (4)	117	27%	
Neither Important or Not Important (3)	33	8%	
Not Important (2)	17	4%	7%
Not At All Important (1)	11	3%	
Don't Know	2	0%	
Answered question	426	100%	
Skipped question	65		
Average Rating	4.34		

Outdoor Leisure Facilities such as sports fields, courts, and playgrounds

	#	%	
Very Important (5)	262	62%	88%
Important (4)	109	26%	
Neither Important or Not Important (3)	35	8%	
Not Important (2)	7	2%	3%
Not At All Important (1)	7	2%	
Don't Know	1	0%	
Answered question	421	100%	
Skipped question	70		
Average Rating	4.46		

Trails and Pathways

	#	%	
Very Important (5)	317	75%	91%
Important (4)	69	16%	
Neither Important or Not Important (3)	23	5%	
Not Important (2)	6	1%	3%
Not At All Important (1)	6	1%	
Don't Know	3	1%	
Answered question	424	100%	
Skipped question	67		
Average Rating	4.63		

9. What is your level of satisfaction with the parks and leisure opportunities in the City of Greater Sudbury for the following age groups? Please use a scale that ranges from "not at all satisfied" to "very satisfied".

Children (0-12 years)

	#	%	
Very Satisfied (5)	31	8%	38%
Satisfied (4)	117	30%	
Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied (3)	70	18%	
Not Satisfied (2)	68	17%	25%
Not At All Satisfied (1)	30	8%	
Don't Know	75	19%	
Answered question	391	100%	
Skipped question	100		
Average Rating	3.16		

Young Adults (19-39 years)

	#	%	
Very Satisfied (5)	10	3%	28%
Satisfied (4)	100	26%	
Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied (3)	95	25%	
Not Satisfied (2)	104	27%	35%
Not At All Satisfied (1)	33	9%	
Don't Know	44	11%	
Answered question	386	100%	
Skipped question	105		
Average Rating	2.85		

Older Adults (55-69 years)

	#	%	
Very Satisfied (5)	17	5%	20%
Satisfied (4)	57	15%	
Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied (3)	62	17%	
Not Satisfied (2)	75	20%	26%
Not At All Satisfied (1)	21	6%	
Don't Know	142	38%	
Answered question	374	100%	
Skipped question	117		
Average Rating	2.89		

8. Thinking about those facilities that currently exist in the City of Greater Sudbury, what is your level of satisfaction with the following? Please use a scale that ranges from "not at all satisfied" to "very satisfied".

Indoor Leisure Facilities such as arenas, pools, and halls

	#	%	
Very Satisfied (5)	28	7%	42%
Satisfied (4)	153	36%	
Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied (3)	110	26%	
Not Satisfied (2)	98	23%	29%
Not At All Satisfied (1)	27	6%	
Don't Know	10	2%	
Answered question	426	100%	
Skipped question	65		
Average Rating	3.14		

Outdoor Leisure Facilities such as sports fields, courts, and playgrounds

	#	%	
Very Satisfied (5)	26	6%	50%
Satisfied (4)	187	44%	
Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied (3)	100	24%	
Not Satisfied (2)	83	20%	24%
Not At All Satisfied (1)	20	5%	
Don't Know	7	2%	
Answered question	423	100%	
Skipped question	68		
Average Rating	3.28		

Trails and Pathways

	#	%	
Very Satisfied (5)	43	10%	45%
Satisfied (4)	146	35%	
Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied (3)	99	23%	
Not Satisfied (2)	95	22%	31%
Not At All Satisfied (1)	35	8%	
Don't Know	5	1%	
Answered question	423	100%	
Skipped question	68		
Average Rating	3.16		

Teens (13-18 years)

	#	%	
Very Satisfied (5)	6	2%	17%
Satisfied (4)	60	16%	
Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied (3)	65	17%	
Not Satisfied (2)	93	24%	35%
Not At All Satisfied (1)	41	11%	
Don't Know	119	31%	
Answered question	384	100%	
Skipped question	107		
Average Rating	2.61		

Mature Adults (40-54 years)

	#	%	
Very Satisfied (5)	20	5%	29%
Satisfied (4)	94	24%	
Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied (3)	77	20%	
Not Satisfied (2)	77	20%	26%
Not At All Satisfied (1)	22	6%	
Don't Know	98	25%	
Answered question	388	100%	
Skipped question	103		
Average Rating	3.04		

Seniors (70+)

	#	%	
Very Satisfied (5)	16	4%	18%
Satisfied (4)	49	14%	
Neither Satisfied or Dissatisfied (3)	58	16%	
Not Satisfied (2)	53	15%	22%
Not At All Satisfied (1)	25	7%	
Don't Know	157	44%	
Answered question	358	100%	
Skipped question	133		
Average Rating	2.89		

SUMMARY	Satisfied (top 2)	Dissatisfied (top 2)	Rating
Children (0-12 years)	38%	25%	3.16
Teens (13-18 years)	17%	35%	2.61
Young Adults (19-39 years)	28%	35%	2.85
Mature Adults (40-54 years)	29%	26%	3.04
Older Adults (55-69 years)	20%	26%	2.89
Seniors (70+)	18%	22%	2.89

D. FACILITY PRIORITIES

10. To what degree do you oppose or support spending additional public funds on the following facilities – either to improve existing facilities or build new ones? Please use a scale that ranges from "strongly oppose" to "strongly support".

Arenas	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	137	34%	67%
Support (4)	131	33%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	74	19%	13%
Oppose (2)	28	7%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	23	6%	
Don't Know	7	2%	
Answered question	400	100%	
Skipped question	91		
Average Rating	3.84		

Basketball Courts (outdoor)	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	46	12%	45%
Support (4)	131	33%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	159	40%	10%
Oppose (2)	28	7%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	13	3%	
Don't Know	16	4%	
Answered question	393	100%	
Skipped question	98		
Average Rating	3.45		

Children's Splash Pads (outdoor)	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	105	27%	66%
Support (4)	154	39%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	90	23%	9%
Oppose (2)	24	6%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	10	3%	
Don't Know	12	3%	
Answered question	395	100%	
Skipped question	96		
Average Rating	3.84		

Fitness Centres	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	91	23%	59%
Support (4)	143	36%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	100	25%	14%
Oppose (2)	38	10%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	17	4%	
Don't Know	7	2%	
Answered question	396	100%	
Skipped question	95		
Average Rating	3.65		

Gymnasiums	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	45	12%	44%
Support (4)	125	32%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	155	40%	12%
Oppose (2)	35	9%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	13	3%	
Don't Know	14	4%	
Answered question	387	100%	
Skipped question	104		
Average Rating	3.41		

Baseball or Softball Diamonds	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	53	13%	46%
Support (4)	127	32%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	150	38%	12%
Oppose (2)	37	9%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	12	3%	
Don't Know	14	4%	
Answered question	393	100%	
Skipped question	98		
Average Rating	3.45		

Beaches	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	138	35%	81%
Support (4)	183	46%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	54	14%	4%
Oppose (2)	13	3%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	3	1%	
Don't Know	6	2%	
Answered question	397	100%	
Skipped question	94		
Average Rating	4.13		

Community Halls	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	52	13%	49%
Support (4)	141	36%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	141	36%	12%
Oppose (2)	35	9%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	14	4%	
Don't Know	12	3%	
Answered question	395	100%	
Skipped question	96		
Average Rating	3.48		

Football Fields	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	35	9%	37%
Support (4)	111	28%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	169	43%	16%
Oppose (2)	48	12%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	14	4%	
Don't Know	14	4%	
Answered question	391	100%	
Skipped question	100		
Average Rating	3.28		

Multi-use Trails (paved)	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	189	48%	75%
Support (4)	108	27%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	61	15%	8%
Oppose (2)	18	5%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	12	3%	
Don't Know	7	2%	
Answered question	395	100%	
Skipped question	96		
Average Rating	4.14		

Appendix A

Nature Trails (unpaved)	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	228	58%	86%
Support (4)	111	28%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	39	10%	2%
Oppose (2)	4	1%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	5	1%	
Don't Know	7	2%	
Answered question	394	100%	
Skipped question	97		
Average Rating	4.43		

Outdoor Rinks	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	124	32%	75%
Support (4)	170	43%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	77	20%	3%
Oppose (2)	9	2%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	4	1%	
Don't Know	7	2%	
Answered question	391	100%	
Skipped question	100		
Average Rating	4.04		

Seniors' Centres	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	88	23%	64%
Support (4)	160	41%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	95	25%	4%
Oppose (2)	8	2%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	9	2%	
Don't Know	27	7%	
Answered question	387	100%	
Skipped question	104		
Average Rating	3.86		

Ski Hills	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	104	27%	64%
Support (4)	145	37%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	93	24%	9%
Oppose (2)	22	6%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	14	4%	
Don't Know	14	4%	
Answered question	392	100%	
Skipped question	99		
Average Rating	3.80		

Swimming Pools for warm-water therapy and leisure	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	133	34%	67%
Support (4)	130	33%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	84	21%	9%
Oppose (2)	22	6%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	12	3%	
Don't Know	14	4%	
Answered question	395	100%	
Skipped question	96		
Average Rating	3.92		

Tennis Courts	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	58	15%	46%
Support (4)	122	31%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	158	40%	9%
Oppose (2)	25	6%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	11	3%	
Don't Know	21	5%	
Answered question	395	100%	
Skipped question	96		
Average Rating	3.51		

Other (two mentions or more)	#
Bike lanes / paths	6
Cricket	6
Community gardens	3
Activities for the outlying communities	2
Concert venue (enclosed)	2
Cross Country Ski Facilities	2
multi use fields	2
Multi-Use Recreational Facility	2

Off-Leash Dog Parks	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	90	23%	47%
Support (4)	93	24%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	104	27%	23%
Oppose (2)	48	12%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	43	11%	
Don't Know	13	3%	
Answered question	391	100%	
Skipped question	100		
Average Rating	3.37		

Playgrounds	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	147	37%	79%
Support (4)	164	42%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	58	15%	3%
Oppose (2)	9	2%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	3	1%	
Don't Know	12	3%	
Answered question	393	100%	
Skipped question	98		
Average Rating	4.16		

Skateboard Parks	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	58	15%	50%
Support (4)	137	35%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	128	33%	13%
Oppose (2)	34	9%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	16	4%	
Don't Know	16	4%	
Answered question	389	100%	
Skipped question	102		
Average Rating	3.50		

Soccer Fields	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	92	24%	60%
Support (4)	141	36%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	116	30%	7%
Oppose (2)	22	6%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	7	2%	
Don't Know	10	3%	
Answered question	388	100%	
Skipped question	103		
Average Rating	3.76		

Swimming Pools for lane swimming	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	111	28%	58%
Support (4)	119	30%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	106	27%	10%
Oppose (2)	30	8%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	10	3%	
Don't Know	18	5%	
Answered question	394	100%	
Skipped question	97		
Average Rating	3.77		

Youth Centres	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	118	31%	66%
Support (4)	138	36%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	92	24%	6%
Oppose (2)	15	4%	
Strongly Oppose (1)	7	2%	
Don't Know	15	4%	
Answered question	385	100%	
Skipped question	106		
Average Rating	3.93		

SUMMARY	Support (top 2)	Oppose (top 2)	Rating
Nature Trails (unpaved)	86%	2%	4.43
Beaches	81%	4%	4.13
Playgrounds	79%	3%	4.16
Outdoor Rinks	75%	3%	4.04
Multi-use Trails (paved)	75%	8%	4.14
Arenas	67%	13%	3.84
Swimming Pools for warm-water therapy/leisure	67%	9%	3.92
Children's Splash Pads (outdoor)	66%	9%	3.84
Youth Centres	66%	6%	3.93
Seniors' Centres	64%	4%	3.86
Ski Hills	64%	9%	3.80
Soccer Fields	60%	7%	3.76
Fitness Centres	59%	14%	3.65
Swimming Pools for lane swimming	58%	10%	3.77
Skateboard Parks	50%	13%	3.50
Community Halls	49%	12%	3.48
Off-Leash Dog Parks	47%	23%	3.37
Tennis Courts	46%	9%	3.51
Baseball or Softball Diamonds	46%	12%	3.45
Basketball Courts (outdoor)	45%	10%	3.45
Gymnasiums	44%	12%	3.41
Football Fields	37%	16%	3.28

E. THERAPEUTIC / LEISURE POOL PROPOSAL

11. To what degree do you oppose or support the development of a therapeutic/leisure pool at the Lionel E. Lalonde Centre in Azilda? Please use a scale that ranges from "strongly oppose" to "strongly support".

	#	%	
Strongly Support (5)	116	29%	55%
Support (4)	105	26%	
Neither Oppose nor Support (3)	101	25%	
Oppose (2)	39	10%	18%
Strongly Oppose (1)	35	9%	
Don't Know	8	2%	
Answered question	404	100%	
Skipped question	87		
Average Rating	3.58		

12. If a therapeutic/leisure pool was developed at the Lionel E. Lalonde Centre in Azilda, how likely would you or members of your household be to use the facility on a regular basis (at least once per month)?

	#	%	
Extremely Likely (5)	57	14%	21%
Very Likely (4)	27	7%	
Somewhat Likely (3)	36	9%	70%
Not Very Likely (2)	90	22%	
Not at all Likely (1)	194	48%	
Don't Know	3	1%	
Answered question	407	100%	
Skipped question	84		
Average Rating	2.17		

F. INCREASING UTILIZATION**13. What would encourage you or members of your household to make greater use of Greater Sudbury's indoor or outdoor Leisure Facilities?***Note: Responses have been paraphrased and summarized by topic.***Improved / better / more...****GENERAL**

Cost / affordable rates	48
Free use days	7
Lower cost for family memberships	4
Cheaper ice rates	4
Cheaper arena fees in the summer	3
Student offers	2
Prize give-aways	1

Promotion / awareness / communication	36
---------------------------------------	----

Accessibility	14
Transit service	7
Accessible by bus	4
Availability	4
Accessibility by bicycle	3
Free shuttles	1

Management of facilities	4
Well trained staff	3
Refreshments / food	3
Free personal trainer for 2 weeks	1
Website with accurate activity times	2
Online bookings	2
Website	1
Eliminate online ticket sales	1

Variety	5
Support active lifestyles / physical health	2
Diversity / creativity / imagination / fun	1

Improved / better / more...**FACILITIES**

Facilities / activities close to home	73
Upgraded facilities	31
Maintenance of facilities / cleaner	18
Facility distribution - more for outlying areas	9
Facilities in Sudbury / Centralized	6
Pool/facilities in South End	5
Pool in Azilda	4
Facilities in New Sudbury	4
Facilities in Lively	2
Facilities in Coniston	2
Facilities in Chelmsford	1
Facilities in Copper Cliff	1
Facilities in Rayside-Balfour	1
Keep Levack Arena	1
Facilities in Azilda (indoor pool/track/fitness)	1

Trails / walking paths / sidewalks	18
Bike lanes / Active Transportation	8
Cricket facility / programs	8
Multi-use facility	6
Equipment	4
Playgrounds	4
Indoor field turf surfaces	3
Beaches	2
Parking	2
Tennis Courts in New Sudbury	2
Change rooms	1
Community gardens	1
Designated family areas	1
Facilities for 14-65 year olds	1
Fitness centres (small neighborhood-based)	1
Heaters in arenas for specators	1
Indoor/outdoor basketball	1
Lighting	1
Outdoor rock climbing walls	1
Quad chair lift at Adanac	1
Roof over outdoor rink at Westmount Park	1
Safer fields	1
Ski hills	1
Softball diamond upgrades	1
Splash pads	1
Therapy Pool	1
Use of schools	1

Improved / better / more...**PROGRAMS**

Times / hours of operation	32
Public skate/public swim times	8
Times - evenings / after work	6
Family only times	4
Times - weekends	2
Times - mornings / before work	2
Female only times	1

Activities (general)	6
Community events	4
Activities for families	3
Activities for adults	3
Activities for young adults (leagues)	2
Activities for teens	2
Activities for young children (infants)	1
Activities for older adults	1
Activities where children and adults could participate together	1

Drop-in / unorganized activities	2
Summer activities for the neighbourhood	2
Outdoor activities within nature	2
Aqua exercise / swimming lessons	2
Competitive events	1
Less emphasis on competitive team sports	1
Creative activities	1
Cross-country skiing (more affordable)	1
Interesting events	1
Exercise classes	1
Include swimming in membership rates at RB Fitness	1
Indoor activities for our long winter	1

14. What would encourage you or members of your household to make greater use of Greater Sudbury's Parks and Trails?

Note: Responses have been paraphrased and summarized by topic.

Improved / better / more...**GENERAL**

Safety on trails / bike lanes	27
Promotion / awareness / communication	26
Online information and maps	14
Accessibility	18
Available 24/7	1
Free shuttles	3
Transit access to key park sites	1
Enforce leash laws / poop and scoop	15
Reduced loitering / security	6
Prohibit ATVs from using trails	2
Allow adult use of parks beyond 11pm	1
Variety	4
Less crowded parks	1
Support active lifestyles / physical health	1
Free / lower cost	3

Improved / better / more...**PARKS / TRAILS**

Connected trails / more trails	96
Parks / trails / activities close to home	48
Maintenance / cleaner	47
Signage / marked trails	21
Paved trails for persons w/ disabilities	11
Bike lanes	11
Longer trails	5
Dog-friendly amenities / spaces	8
Lighting	6
Parking	6
Seating / picnic areas	5
Playgrounds	4
Distribution - more for outlying areas	3
Greenspace protection	3
Lookouts / scenic vistas	3
Washrooms	3
Cricket facility	2
Drinking fountains / water stations	2
Ball diamond upgrades	1
Beaches	1
Beautification	1
Bike racks	1
Cross-country ski trails	1
Greater year round use	1
Outdoor fitness stations	1
Shade	1
Ski hills	1
Snow removal from primary trails	1
Use of park buildings	1

Improved / better / more...**PROGRAMS**

Events	6
Activities (general)	3
Activities for families	2
Activities for teens	1
Canteen services in parks	1
Equipment lending (snow-shoes, nordic poles)	1
Geocaching	1
Subsidized programs	1
Walking groups	1

G. STATEMENTS

15. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements. Use a scale that ranges from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree".

There are sufficient parks and open spaces in your area to meet the needs of your household.

	#	%	
Strongly Agree (5)	35	9%	48%
Agree (4)	154	39%	
Neither Agree or Disagree (3)	65	17%	
Disagree (2)	89	23%	34%
Strongly Disagree (1)	45	12%	
Don't Know	3	1%	
Answered question	391	100%	
Skipped question	100		
Average Rating	3.12		

The amount of time it takes your household to travel to leisure activities is reasonable.

	#	%	
Strongly Agree (5)	40	10%	52%
Agree (4)	164	42%	
Neither Agree or Disagree (3)	88	23%	
Disagree (2)	76	19%	25%
Strongly Disagree (1)	21	5%	
Don't Know	2	1%	
Answered question	391	100%	
Skipped question	100		
Average Rating	3.32		

Leisure activities in Greater Sudbury are generally affordable to your household.

	#	%	
Strongly Agree (5)	42	11%	59%
Agree (4)	188	48%	
Neither Agree or Disagree (3)	66	17%	
Disagree (2)	73	19%	23%
Strongly Disagree (1)	18	5%	
Don't Know	4	1%	
Answered question	391	100%	
Skipped question	100		
Average Rating	3.42		

The City should place a higher priority on the attraction of sports tournaments and

	#	%	
Strongly Agree (5)	109	28%	51%
Agree (4)	91	23%	
Neither Agree or Disagree (3)	110	28%	
Disagree (2)	50	13%	19%
Strongly Disagree (1)	24	6%	
Don't Know	8	2%	
Answered question	392	100%	
Skipped question	99		
Average Rating	3.55		

Investing in parks and leisure services should be a high priority for City Council.

	#	%	
Strongly Agree (5)	205	52%	86%
Agree (4)	133	34%	
Neither Agree or Disagree (3)	37	9%	
Disagree (2)	8	2%	4%
Strongly Disagree (1)	7	2%	
Don't Know	3	1%	
Answered question	393	100%	
Skipped question	98		
Average Rating	4.34		

H. DEMOGRAPHICS**16. How many people, including yourself, live in your household?**

	#	%
1	28	7%
2	102	26%
3	65	17%
4	124	32%
5	50	13%
6 or more	16	4%
Answered question	385	100%
Skipped question	106	
Total number of people	1,273	
Average household size	3.3	

17. Please indicate the total number of persons within your household that fall into the following age categories.

	#	%	Est. City-wide Pop.
Children (0-12 years)	268	21%	13%
Teens (13-18 years)	136	11%	7%
Young Adults (19-39 years)	423	34%	27%
Mature Adults (40-54 years)	271	22%	23%
Older Adults (55-69 years)	123	10%	18%
Seniors (70+)	29	2%	11%
Total	1,250	100%	100%
Answered question	381		
Skipped question	110		
Average household size	3.3		

18. In what year were you born?

	#	%
1939 or earlier (74 yrs or older)	2	1%
1940 to 1949 (64 to 73 yrs)	21	6%
1950 to 1959 (54 to 63 yrs)	38	11%
1960 to 1969 (44 to 53 yrs)	76	21%
1970 to 1989 (34 to 43 yrs)	105	29%
1980 or 1989 (24 to 33 yrs)	93	26%
1990 or later (16 to 23 yrs)	21	6%
Answered question	356	100%
Skipped question	135	
Average Year	1972	
Average Age	41	

19. In 2013, what was your household's total annual income before taxes?

	#	%
Under \$30,000	24	8%
Between \$30,000 and \$59,999	42	14%
Between \$60,000 and \$89,999	63	21%
Between \$90,000 and \$119,999	70	23%
\$120,000 or more	102	34%
Answered question	301	100%
Skipped question	190	

20. Are you a resident of the City of Greater Sudbury?

	#	%
Yes	382	97%
No	2	1%
Don't Know	8	2%
Answered question	392	100%
Skipped question	99	

21. Which of the following communities do you live closest to?

Data was not collected on community of residence due to a survey coding error.

I. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS**22. Please provide any additional comments you may have regarding parks and leisure services in the City of Greater Sudbury.**

Detailed comments are provided below. These are verbatim and have not been edited.

A 4 plex arena is needed as it would draw teams from all over province that would boost local economy.....plus sudbury arena is outdated!!!

A family centre with a pool in the Azilda area would be welcoming to new families. We are tired of travelling to Sudbury and valley for everything. It would give the community an opportunity to access another leisure activity without having to get into a vehicle and burn gas. Azilda has many families who could benefit. Many rentals in azilda and full bus access.

Access to parks and leisure services must be considered in terms of walking and biking distances from a household as having to rely on public transportation or a vehicle is a deterrent to use.

Advertise the upcoming activities such as hockey tourneys and baseball & softball tourneys.

Again, bike paths....we, the City of Greater Sudbury, should be pioneers in making our city bike-friendly....that, in itself, would get more people riding their bikes; less car traffic and pollution; healthier beings; more tourism, etc.

All the staff work hard and do the best they can with what they have, I suggest putting more money into it to promote a healthy community. Invest now so we won't have invest more in health care later...

Any activities offered need to be advertized for general interest and to encourage participation. I personally use Facebook and seek info about activities through there. Including both anglophone and francophone communities would be a must as well. Values that are strong to me are human and environmental health, mental health, and culture. Sustainable development is needed to support a healthy community.

Arena's are run-down and travel time to an arena is too long. Further, ice costs have ballooned to the point that putting my children in hockey or figure skating is not affordable.

Arenas have become elitist. Only those who can afford equipment can make use of them.

As a member of the Azilda Community Action Network I feel very informed regarding these issues. We need lights installed at the Rick Macdonald Park to discourage undesirable night time use. We need to invest in Whitewater Lake park to develop leisure trails on Lover's Rock. The Therapeutic pool is a wonderful idea and it should go forward. We need to construct a field house at the Azilda Outdoor Rink. Facilities like the Azilda Fitness center and the Campground at WWL Park should be maintained in public hands - they should not be privatized.

As a parent of two figure skaters, I find it unjust that the ice costs are so high and that summer ice fees are not just restricted to the summer months of July and August but that they start in April. If the City wants healthy active youth, then the activities that our youth want to participate in should be available to everyone and not just those whose families have higher incomes. Also, why are arenas in southern Ontario and other provinces so much more beautiful and modern than those here?

bathrooms are unkept most of the time, no toilet paper, allowing people to get away with graffiti and there could be better lighting and burned out lights should be changed sooner

Bell Park Amphitheatre should have an opaque sail like roof as per recommendations contained in the Bell Park Master Plan. This plan is a reference document and needs to be referred to by city planners! The question regarding maintaining existing facilities or building new facilities should be split in to two separate questions. Answer to maintain existing facility is not the same as agree to build new.

Bike lanes! Sharrows! Lights for cyclists! Connectivity! Bike friendly cities are the BEST!

Bike paths, walking and hiking paths are beneficial to the entire community and contribute to fewer cars on the road and improved health for all.

Biking trails should enable people to cycle to work and leisure without need to use bus carriers around traffic problems

Chelmsford needs to have some kind of facility. There is no where to go in the winter to exercise. Driving to Onaping and Dowling are not an option for us - especially because of the unusual hours. The travel to Sudbury makes it unappealing. The drive time makes it difficult to allocate time to use any facility. There are no outdoor trails here (that I know of). We are part of Sudbury so we should also have walking trails within our reach.

City should give consideration to a new swimming pool facility in the south end - eg. Countryside Arena to replace the aging infrastructure that it currently maintains. Dow Pool and Gatchell serve a basic requirement but in a city the size of Sudbury and particularly with the growth in the south end a newer facility is desirable. City should also plan to provide more services in the southend rather than focussing on New Sudbury

Coniston lost their very vibrant and busy community hall with amalgamation - and failed to live up to agreement made with N.C. council --- have never recovered level of activities that were once prevalent we had a fitness centre housed in hall used by seniors and youths alike, We had many community groups - cubs, brownies, TOPS, Lioness Club, seniors bridge etc etc -- HUGE LOSS!!!

Cricket is a growing sport in Sudbury and the North. The only thing holding cricket back is not having playing fields. Two soccer fields can easily be converted into a cricket field without modifying or changing the soccer field. If there was a cricket field in Sudbury cricket will take off and a lot of people will play the sport. Its a easy sport to learn and play and anyone can play cricket. Big Nickel Cricket Club is doing a great job in supporting cricket and getting cricket out in Sudbury. If we can get a proper Cricket field in Sudbury we can have a lot of Tournaments from cities around us which will generate more money for Sudbury and the community. It not only benefits us but the City of Sudbury as well.

Don't forget about adults and seniors who aren't necessarily interested in pools, arenas and parks. Often we're most interested in walking, hiking, biking and the trail systems.

enclosed concert venue for music and the arts

enforce off leash dog laws; pave trails

Focusing on health and fitness is important - aging population needs fitness and leisure options - a well-planned city will attract businesses and people - ie. desirable retirement community - keep lakes and rivers clean and healthy - continue regreening efforts and reduction of air and water pollution

For winter sports more arena's/ice pads are required. For summer activities longer hours. Most day camps/activities run during working hours. Extend them or offer ways to drop children of early. I would not care even if it cost more. similar to before/after school programs.

Get rid of the old boys club and make staff do what the constituency wants done. We want better cycling and pedestrian infrastructure in place, not excuses as to why it can't be done. Drag yourselves into the 21st century with the rest of the world.

Have facilities readily available for all to use and affordable and easy to get to makes for a healthier community for all, least travel on our roadways to get to these facilities

Having asked a parks employee about why city parks can't just be natural greenspace instead of lawn and manufactured play areas, he said for safety and because parents don't like it. Please consider a 'test park' where the natural greenery is left alone (i.e. forested). It costs far less and is far more fun. Listen to the lyrics of Bob Snider's 'Parkette' if you wish to understand this better.

Households in south end hand in highest property tax in Sudbury, but there are lack of shopping center, activity space here. That's unreasonable.
I am a little put back on the mention of this pool for Azilda, as when we had a meeting in Lively we were told that the city has enough pools and we wouldn't ever get a new one....
I am concerned that some of the facilities in the outlying communities may be closed, as they become older, and never replaced. Not everyone can travel into the city for activities, just as many in the city can't travel out of the city. All the communities need to have services and recreation areas.
I coach figure skating and travel all over Canada. Sudbury has, by far, the worst arenas and the most expensive ice. Summer ice rates are ridiculous, and since when is April a summer month, why are rates getting so expensive starting in April. No other area raises their rates in April, most don't, but if they do it is July and August. Everywhere I go they have multi pad facilities, just got back from Belleville and they have a beautiful facility....it is embarrassing. Nice that we have countryside (2 pads) however it is very poorly set up (likely because of the add on) Access from one rink to the other through the bathroom or another small room??? Wow.
I could not answer #6 adequately - it would not allow me to enter tennis courts, arena or track and field facility in New Sudbury. I kept getting an error message to enter a positive number! I would love to see one great facility in New Sudbury that would accommodate a number of leisure activities.
I definitely support council placing a high importance on parks and leisure in our community. Spending time enjoying nature is essential to our health and well being.
I feel that since we've become one city, the funds are spent mostly in the city and not the outlying areas. With Chelmsford being home to the OLG, at time when no other town in the City wanted the casino, we should have seen more of the shared profits given to the City spent in Chelmsford and Azilda, and it did not happen. Not just with the parks and leisure, but also the infrastructure, etc... In the millions received thus far, the City Counsellors/Mayor could EASILY justify building that therapeutic pool in Azilda as a start in sharing the profits from OLG. I am encouraged to hear that you are considering it. And since the gym in Azilda does not offer all the same amenities as the other city run gyms, if that could be reflected in the membership fees, that would be great also.
I find Sudburians in as a whole are ignorant to those that wish to lead an active lifestyle. There is a general culture of obesity, smoking and drinking. A lot needs to be done to support those that are leading active, healthy lives. When I'm in Ottawa, Toronto, London, Niagara, or Barrie on a nice day there are people of all ages out running, biking, and the parks are filled. Here I can run for an hour and never see another person out even walking and I'm in a high density area. Rainbow Routes is doing a great job to promote the trails and activities in the city.
I have been pushing for a roof over the rink at Westmount. I would really like if someone from the city would listen to our plan and help us with this project and move it forward with fundraising done by all. We need to properly maintain our facilities that we currently run/ painting of exterior of building, remove graffiti, make easy access for wheelchair and handicap people, more benches in the park for young families to sit, wifi etc.. Call me xxx-xxxx
I hope the out lying areas become part of this grand plan and not just within the city
I live in Capreol and we need to have our parks updated with better maintenance. We also need to expand our beach and have a playground in this area so families are able to spend the quality time together enjoying the outdoors. The City needs to work in all communities and not just upgrading in the City. Families cannot afford to travel to Sudbury so parks, beaches, trails arena etc should be upgraded with the addition of new parks. Families need more outdoor activities and by adding and upgrading this will happen.
I live in Dowling and many things I have to travel a good distance to enroll, I cannot access summer camps for my child because you do not offer bus service, bus service in my area is awful, since the city took over our area we have a lot less services and have to travel for everything
I love that we encourage so much outdoor activities in sudbury! I also love what Ward 11 is doing, adding additional and separate bike lanes which are paved and curbed to make commuting less dangerous....Number 6 was not working and I was unable to mention that I think an activity which should be encouraged and money should be put towards is indoor rock climbing and bouldering. the bouldering room at LU is so small! I also would love to see a Mountain Equipment Coop here in sudbury as we focus very much on recreation and I love that about our city, yet I need to travel to Barrie and Toronto for better equipment! There is enough interest in recreational activities that I know this store would be well received.
I love the idea of a pool in Azilda. There are so many other communities within the city that have one and Azilda residence (as well as others from around the area {ie. Chelmsford, Dowling, Valley} will greatly benefit from it.
I really think Sudbury should fix up Adanac ski hill to make it more appealing.
I think a Pool in the town of Azilda would be a great idea. I also believe that prices at the Lionel E. Lalonde are too expensive for what's there. More people might use it.
I think supporting both winter/summer recreation should top our list since we are a northern community. However, I personally would like activities that are affordable. Cost will always be a determining factor.
I think the programs should be more affordable for family's, if things were less expensive we could do more activities instead of having to choose
I think there is a lot going on in Sudbury and a lot of activities to choose from, but finding out about them is a challenge. Many groups/clubs have no info online. Be nice to have it all in one place.
I think there is a lot of opportunity for parks and leisure in this city...I think there is a strong and growing community who back these types of investments. There's needs to be a big public outside area (such as Bell Park) that can house multiple leisure activities at once.. Have greenery..volleyball basketball paved trails etc..it would be a beautiful thing to see people getting out and active in a beautiful space
I think we should take the time and make sure we can all afford for the young generation to be able to participate in activities year round.
I tried to answer one question about which activities I would like to see but it would not accept it, so three activities would be salt water pool for children and a better selection of activities for boys under 6yrs. I do take my family out of Sudbury to do activities, as the facilities are nice, clean and more affordable ie Espanola Rec Centre only costs \$5 to take a parents and 3 children swimming in a heated salt water pool.
I volunteer with Walden Minor Soccer. The City staff have been extremely helpful and supportive of our activities over the years - everyone from the maintenance guys in Walden to the City scheduling staff to the Citizen Service staff. WMSA uses CGS fields and facilities, including the loan of the sea container (and maintenance of it) at Kinsmen Sports Complex. I appreciate the partnership with the city to help us be successful.
I would definitely support the development of a central city multi-use sports facility.
I would like to see a city wide system of connected bike trails and paths. We need more sidewalks for pedestrians. City council and planners need to get away from planning for vehicle traffic only thinking. The city needs to reduce the amount of vehicle traffic by building more paths and lanes for bicycle and pedestrian traffic. More biking and the development of a carpooling plan.
I would like to see more areas within the city where sport and leisure activities can be "visibly" seen by the community to promote active living which will encourage all demographics to partake in. Multi purpose areas such tennis, basketball courts, trails, playgrounds in a central area I believe increase the active living population. For the most part our youth are left bored and uninformed of the current resources we have. Visibility is the key.
I would like to see more encouragement and funding being placed towards sports such as cricket. It is among the fastest growing sports in Canada, Sudbury can't fall behind. We must accommodate.

I would like to see more facilities in the south end. We have no splash pads, no pools, no C.G.S. fitness centre, no maintenance @ silver lake beach, no skate park, no BMX track, no sliding hills, no outdoor basketball court, no baseball fields, no dog park etc. etc. etc. we have a shiny new arena though; that we can't use..... but Mr. Craig still gets voted in every 4 years.....

I would like to see the Lily Creek walk extended to Regent to create a loop around York St with distance markers. People will walk it.

I would love to see additional cycling paths from outlying areas (Chelmsford/Azilda) as well as education to motorists about sharing the road. As a triathlete training in this city is dangerous and motorists are unaware that they need to share the road or they just don't care.

If Sudbury wants to attract a different class, or maybe bump up their "best place to live" ranking, investing in a new arena / 21st century entertainment complex (in the downtown core or somewhere close) is a good start. This will be a catalyst for other business ideas or other ideas for leisure spaces and re-greening type efforts. The architecture school is a great thing, but the core needs more and it may very well start with a sophisticated buildings or a clean environment (green space, leisure/safe space) for us to cohabitate.

if the city wants to promote healthy living, it needs to provide proper bike lanes on Paris St. (the artery to the main employers in town, hospital and university), and not like the pot hole bike lanes on bancroft/howey. get rid of the train tracks downtown, put in a light rail service from new sudbury to downtown and add bike, walking paths. it needs to be built before people can use it.

If we could get to the parks and leisure services without having to dodge 20 potholes on the way, we would probably use them more. I can barely drive down my street because of the potholes. And then I see the pothole patrol on the Kingsway on a Thursday afternoon before a long weekend? Unbelievable.

If you invest in the community in areas such as parks, paths, cycle lanes and recreation centres, it will attract more businesses and professionals to settle here. It will make our city more livable/appealing as well as healthier (more active) which will reduce some of the strain on healthcare.

It should have trail in our neighborhood. path joins Elizabeth street subdivision St-Jean Baptiste and Berthiaume and who joined to Place Bonaventure. Our children must take the high road to get around. argggghhh

It was 10 years ago I participated in courses aquasize, swimming, swimming pools Greater Sudbury, but I lost 1h - 1h30 just transportation to get there. The same is true for the slopes, there is nothing in our corner of the city. chelmsford lost everything when we amalgamate. More services. Now it is our turn to have services in our area. We could use the Customer has Azilda, Levack, Onaping (the pool is too small) Chelmsford, Blezard Valley, lively and even Whitefish. Give her a chance to develop our village.

involve community people ... community garden, more trails. keep separate spaces for young children and adolescents ... ie: park for young near skate park for teenagers ... young people are intimidated. The city of greater sudbury really needs a large sports complex with several ice arena, swimming pool, gym etc ... to attract tourism!

In a city the size of Sudbury, constantly closing arenas is hurting the youth participating in ice activities. Building a multi-use facility would be beneficial for all users and impact the volunteer base for organizations running tournaments etc. Having things all in one place makes it easier for guests coming into the city and puts less strain on volunteers to be in multiple places at once. We are a large city and have no where near the facilities that some smaller communities have. it's about time our city starts investing in our youth and provide them with a welcoming place to be active instead of shutting them down every chance they get. As your homes get older, they need a facelift, but sometimes they need to be torn down and rebuilt, bigger and better

In the Valley we need an outdoor pool for kids the water pads is not enough. This pool could be with 3 feet to 2 feet. Baseball dugout need covers, and the baseball diamonds need new sand its hard like rock in the Valley. And the baseball fields need to get many lights fixed in the Valley.

Instead of building a new therapeutic pool in Azilda which will only serve a very small percentage of the population the City should upgrade the pools are already in existence (Gatchell, Dow, Nickel District). If this therapeutic pool is primarily for rehab purposes how are those people who live within the core of the city (south end, new sudbury, minnow lake, east end etc) who need rehabilitation supposed to get out to Azilda. It would be a lot more convenient if these therapeutic aquatic programs were offered at a pool in a more central location (ie, Gatchell, Nickel District) that are more easily accessibly through bus routes. A "Therapy Pool" could just be added on to one of the existing pools in order to provide citizens with the ability to swim laps as well in cooler water.

Insufficient options in the core for people. All the activities listed in the leisure guide are all in the outskirts of the old city. Dishearting for those of us who want to participate, but can not because of the lack of transportation.

interesting, engaging teen activities ! question 6 did not allow text comment

Invest in parks.. not just playgrounds.

It appears to me that a small but vocal football and hockey oriented segment of the city have forced the focus of discussion onto arenas and over lit astro-turf fields. We have the second highest rate of obesity in Canada: arenas where people go to watch others being fit are expensive and not helping us to get fit. I see people driving to Bell park to walk the board walk (which Sudbury should be very proud of - the board walk that is). I believe there is a desire for more such gentle fitness opportunities. There is the potential for a number of really beautiful hill top walking trails - instead of allowing developers to level them off and add to our run-off problems. More bike lanes please. More creative ways to encourage fitness please i.e., community gardens, fitness circuit trails etc. Please no more arenas and plastic playing fields. Oh yeah, an adults only swimming pool would help us avoid the nasty chlorine/ammonia mx that occurs when children pee in pools (that's the chemical that stings your eyes, not the chlorine alone). Thanks for listening.

It will be highly appreciated if City helps Big Nickel Cricket Club to develop hard ball cricket culture in Sudbury by developing a cricket field. This will encourage the sport and teams across Ontario to come and play cricket in Sudbury. This will not only popularize the sport but also bring business and new entertainment to the city.

It would be great to see a multi use facility be put near or at the Lasalle Secondary School property. It once hosted an outdoor rink and should once again. Also, updating the tennis courts and possible putting in a soccer only field would be great.

It would be nice to have a aquatic facility or even a curling rink in Azilda.

It would serve the community of Coniston if there was a Community Center here, it would be great for the young and the elderly. Not all people can get to the City to partake in the activities offered in other areas.

I strongly support the plan for parks, open space and recreation as well as therapeutic and recreational swimming offered at Lionel E. Lalonde Centre. Ease that we could enjoy.

Keep arenas and community halls in better shape - be more open to hall rentals, no reason to build new arenas - just do proper maintenance on a regular basis.

Keep up the good work! The City needs to make a much stronger commitment to non-motorized transportation options (ie. commuter bike paths).

Keep up the good work. Do some innovative things that will improve quality of life for all residents. Sudbury has a bad reputation for that, nationally, and after a long winter like this, don't you think residents could use a boost/break? Make some tweaks to the "system" and think out of the box....hire more young people (change agents) and keep asking residents for their opinions in ways that make it easy for them to give them.

Keeping our families active at a reasonable cost.

Large multi-purpose facility (ex. 4 ice rinks, etc) -easier to host largest tournaments.

the cost of parks and leisure center could be reduced with the use of voluntary. Or arenas, swimming, we must find new alternative guarder for our park and our arenas, in good condition. it is to find someone who's not afraid to ask for help or find the necessary resources
Leisure and sport are so important to a healthy and civilized society. This should always remain a priority. We strongly feel it is of the utmost importance to prioritize making sport and leisure accessible in lower-income neighbourhoods.
Lively needs a childrens playground in the Sugar bush area. There are so many kids all at the right age for this. On Haloween we had almost 200kids. A park woudl get so much use and there appears to be lots of land within walking distance.
Look into public/private partnership. Wake up and quit wasting money. Why are the lights on baseball fields when no one uses them. Build more concrete skateboard parks. Get out of the Stone Age. More transparency of the costs of program.
Lots of baseball facilities need up grading. Almost all arenas need up grading or need to build new ones.
Love the Elgin greenway design. Shovels need to hit the ground. Christmas decor should be taken down after Christmas.
Lower ice fees in the summer! Why are we charged for summer ice starting in April? Who does that? Summer is July and August..not April and May!
maintain what we have - upgrade neighbourhood equipment - make better publicity of what is available (ie: leisure guide does not have maps of trails etc only mentions them...) and who is in charge so one can call someone for information. Rentals for bike trails, skating, cross country skiing, snowshoeing (do we even have use of outdoor trails in the winter? see more information is needed in publicizing what we have or what groups are around who do these things - work together)
More and safer bike lanes to get TO activities.
More bike lanes and racks, improved sidewalks- maintenance in winter!
More bike trails through nature and to sites in our beautiful city. More bike/pedestrian lanes on city streets for safety and less carbon footprint.
more dog friendly; more accessible for all community members (affordable and physically accessible for individuals with disabilities); more trash bins; 11pm ban is a little crazy; solar powered lighting on trails
more enforcement of speeding on trails wih snow machines & four wheelers etc
More off-leash dog spaces should be provided.
More signs to slow down Reduce speed near parks More police presence
more trails both maintain and unmaintained the city has some beautiful land but its hard to get to it and essay to get lost
Must be sustainable and not impede on environment or climate change in any way.
My Sudbury would include partnering with the mining industry to create underground climate controled systems that would tie in tourism venues such as science north with adanac ski hill as well as the downtown area. These Tunnels would offer world class facilities and lead people to a mountain top multi-functional sporting centre that would host world class events as well as feature our mining heritage. The outing mountainous terrain could offer a bigger better ski hill as well as cross country ski trails, junction creek night lit skating paths and summertime mountain biking and hiking trails to mention a few activities. I've put some of these ideas into a visual presentation if anyone is interested in persuing any of these ideas further...
Need more multipurpose facilities. With large/deep pools and arenas.
need safer and more cycling trails. Cycling trails should automatically be considered everytime there are road improvements made.Our rinks should be included in a multipurpose sport facility; swimming, gym etc.....(like what we see in Barry)
need to make more bike paths before I get hit
New Sudbury is a terribly under serviced area of the city. We need our own Lily Creek and there are a number of ideal locations for such a project. I'm dismayed with the level of small thinking and lack of vision
No matter how tiny, every community we visit in Northern and Southern Ontario, have nicer and more ice pads than we do. their ice rates (the fee to rent /hour) are also way way cheaper. Sudbury is ripping our hockey and skating clubs off and making these sports inaccessible to all.
Off leash walking of dogs on actual bush trails without a ticket would be great plus.
Offering programs and facilities to assist people to improve their level of physical fitness is critical to the long range health of The Sudbury community. Need to encourage people to get physically active.
Onaping Falls needs more programs and facilities for leisure activities such as a Splash Pad, skate park.
only spend on what we can afford without tax increase we cannot afford what we have and you want to spend o more facilities we will not be able to maintain. I pay to go to goodlife let private enterprise provide the facilities and ensure we make money on our facilities, also build a new library in Sudbury why everything is electronic give your head a shake and stop trying to please specialty groups I was at the valley libraries looking for a book the librarian could not find and told me I would have to order the book to lazy talking with a friend to held I found the book on my own. there is no accountability with city employee,
Opening spaces also should consider the pathways to these spaces. Think beyond the field or park to the ways people can get there the paths the trails the inviting access and ease for families to commune in the space great parks with out door steps are not so great. Create a yellow brick road and encourage citizens to engage let things evolve a garden, a chess table a fire pit or a yoga area it's the people who drive the spaces use best.
Our arena facilities do not compare to those in other cities thus it is not attractive for events to be located here. We are much behind other cites of the north and elsewhere.
Overall as a family we are quite pleased and in love in leisure activities. Bike paths would be an improvement.
Park spaces need to prioritize ecological integrity, including connectivity between green spaces, maintaining adequate size to maintain genetic variability, and protecting habitat for species at risk. Obtaining additional green space should be a priority for the city. As wetlands are ecologically important sites and offer ecological services and water retention, they should not be developed to provide infrastructure for other park initiatives. Finally, additional efforts need to be made to encourage dog owners to remove dog waste.
parks and leisure services is a good basis for a good community. With growing obesity rates this is one way to encourage our youth to live a healthy lifestyle.
Please a piece of land that we can turn into a cricket field so that the big nickel cricket club can host some tournaments and bring money and resources into the Sudbury economy. Also a new multiplex arena teamed up with the university at Laurentian would be amazing although anywhere in the main city area would do.
Please do not mess up Bell Park by over building. Public flower gardens are a nice idea. Consider a community orchard. Keep Centennial Park open.
Please get a cricket stadium for sudbury people
pool in azilda
Publish a Leisure Guide that people will want to read and update your system so that people can easily register without going through 311. The process can be very frustrating.
Question #6 gave me an error code. Please more services in Valley East, the sports complex there is great, but there should be more like it for the whole area.
Rayside-Balfour has a population of 15,000 persons and we have no pool. This is not acceptable and we will take advantage for sure. We must go to Hanmer, Copper Cliff and Sudbury to make swimming lessons for children. I hope we will soon see a new pool in the center Lionel Lalonde. Thank you.

Recently my family and I have had to stop cross-country skiing because the rates became too high (nearing \$60 for one afternoon) at local clubs. I know it's a highly personalized thing and you can't please everyone, but if there were city run trails and rentals at cheaper (or evens subsidized rates) it would make us very happy.

residents living in the out skirts of greater Sudbury like levack, onaping, dowing, cartier etc should have to travel great distance for their children to play hockey etc. try fixing up and investing in the arena in levack, and other stuff for young adults, teens etc can do . why should us in these outlying areas have to travel all the time because our council wants to make the other areas like the valley Chelmsford etc like arenas , they want to put money into places other than levack etc try investing in your outlying areas, we pay HIGH taxes in onaping and we don't have any of the services that other areas have but you collect our taxes and keep raising them every year especially us who live in onaping that don't have a grocery store, gas station etc. tryinvesting our tax dollard into stuff for our children and teens out in these outlying areas can have something to do rather than just roam the streets of onaping/levack and get into trouble. we are all a part of the greater Sudbury but we don't get the attention like chemmie, azilda, the valley, etc. want our taxes but don't want to do anything to help us out in these areas.

Roads should be priority before all other, the city should charge the major damage contributors ex. Estrada,Vale and Day for required repairs/resurfacing rather than the tax payer

Should not pay for outside consultants should have local people on volunteer committees to assist. These people know more than any high priced consultant would ever know. Go where the knowledge is. We have many organizations in the district that can both plan and maybe assist is estimating costs with the staff at city hall. City should look at a centralized location for a large sports complex.

Some monies should be spent on updating/improving community playgrounds and parks for middle-aged kids. Opportunities other than climbers and swings such as basketball courts doubling as road hockey surfaces would be appreciated in the neighbourhood parks.

Some parks need updating. The ditch at Autumnwood toto lot was to be completed and covered in 1984. It still remains open , and banks are eroding , limiting future use and are unsafe .A very large subdivision is now near by and use is being heavily made of this site. Need more level areas for soccer and baseball . Eroded bank sides make it a dangerous place to run. More dog pooh/grabage containers needed. City workers are killing trees with grass machines because they are girdling park and killing them.workers rarely clean tot lot of broken glass or debris since i have to do after they leave .

Some playgrounds are very old and can use a complete makeover. Ryan Height playground is an example of that. To encourage more adults watching their kids, it would be nice to include picnic areas and a trimmed and clean trail leading the the school.

Sudbury needs to start adding bike lanes on big streets, at least downtown. Their are more biker and no support for them in the city's road infrastructure.

Sudbury should be doing WAY more to serve as a tourist hub when it comes to tournaments, and sport in general. We have the infrastructure in place; however, when it all comes together, there are things done that just don't make sense. Best example, low fencing at James Jerome around the fields. Why not spend just a little bit more and put high fencing in that prevents the ball from getting lost in a creek? Same goes for bleachers and fan support - it's TERRIBLE! City staff who are present are ALWAYS miserable as well.....this is supposed to be a place where a community comes together!!!

Summer camps should not have increased 100 dollars per child. There should be a sliding scale per child

Summer field booking should happen MUCH sooner! We need to get our registration under-way but we don't even know if we'll have a field or what day it might be.

Please ensure quality programs and services and also provide a good diversity in programs and services in French.

Thank you for the addition of the splash pads in the new sudbury area. We are looking forward to accessing them this summer. i highly recommend a sidewalk on falconbridge highway from garson to new sudbury.

Thanks for your interest.

The adult activities are too often in the outlying communities. Specifically indoor winter activities

The bathrooms and change rooms in arenas are disgusting. Not cleaned properly, very unsanitary and embarrassing when hosting guests from out of town for tournaments. Need updating.

The beach at whitewater lake is no longer a beach. It's become a place for seagulls to crap everywhere and there's no sand for the kids to play. It would also be nice to have swings. Not enough picnic tables either. Having a pool in Azilda would be great for my family. We have two kids and they love to swim. We find it hard to go to town for lessons or free swim

The beautiful arena complexes we see in every other city we go to for skating competitions make us ashamed of our arena facilities here. Look at the Burlington Arena - 4 ice pad complex - 1 dedicated to be a figure skating arena (no boards), Hamilton arena - dedicated to figure skating, Belleville - Quinte Arena - 4 ice pads, meeting rooms, gym and full pool area with lane swimming, John Rhodes Area in the Sault - Arena with dual entrance and a pool with activity centre, Thornhill Arena - Library, Pool, Arena. Why have all these arenas throughout Sudbury that are run down, make a large 4 pad arena with a pool community centre. The cost of summer ice being so high (and since when is April a summer month...most other places do not have summer rates, but if they do it is July/August).

The CGS really needs to step up in terms of biking infrastructure and walking infrastructure in the city and also parks should have community gardens that are managed by the city or outsourced to an organization to do so.

The city does a great job maintaining and responding to parks needs. Onus needs to be on citizens to maintain cleanliness of the parks (i.e. pick up your dog poop and don't put your garbage on the ground where the garbage used to be). Love the idea of supporting a healthy/active lifestyle but get the junk food and vending machine out of these leisure facilities, it's unnecessary and does not create a healthy environment.

The City does not do a good job of running leisure programs and facilities. Offering incentives for private companies to establish facilities and maybe even subsidizing those in need would be a far better use of public funds. Do a better job of policing snowmobile and ATV users who leave public property and trespass on private property.

The City needs to invest more in paved trails for cycling and walking. Passive exercise, such as walking, is an excellent and cheap way (i.e. do not have to pay/maintain a stand alone building) for everyone to exercise. Paved trails that access retail areas, schools and other points of destination (rather than just a pretty nature walk) would promote this type of exercise.

The city needs to look at more non-traditional sports such as cricket to engage newcomers.

The City of Greater Sudbury is seriously lacking vision on it's facility and leisure planning. For a city this size compared to others provincially and nationally, we lack integrated multi-use facilities. We spend far too much on supporting inadequate arenas, pools and other single-use facilities in disparate locations around the city, as opposed to looking at a true community centre. It is impossible to attract large sporting events like hockey, figure skating, swim meets, etc with a patchwork of smaller venues and aging facilities.

The City should give the Community Action Networks more funds to add to what already exists. No one knows their community better then the residents. There are no lack of ideas but lack of funds.

The city should look at the Quebec City model. Bike and walking trails that connect to parks, sports fields and all parts of that city

The cost of ice and the location of available ice and time does not seem to meet the needs of potential participants of these activities thereby making it difficult to encourage participation in skating activities both figure skating and hockey.

The fields for question 6 would not accept text answers, so I'll add here: My son wants "Pokemon Club", and I want more activities where children and adults can participate together. I don't like sitting and watching my kid play sports, I'd like us to be active together.

The main beach should be more clean. A shower should be there. There should be an out door kiddie pool in the city. In summer when the beach is closed it would be nice.

The outskirts must be connected with the downtown with dedicated multi purpose trails and paths for pedestrians and cyclists.

The park in Garson, between Imperial Drive and Metcalfe, really needs updating. The equipment is very old and there are A LOT of children in the area considering the streets it is close to and the town housing complex that it is right beside. The large field area could be use for something such as basketball court, tennis court, football field or splash pad.

The paved bike trail on Ramsay Lake Rd is awesome! If only it were in a forested area instead if the side of a road. A nice paved path through the forest would be nice for bikers/rollerbladers/longboarders. Look to Rotary Park for guidance. Best park in the city! More beautiful parks like Rotary instead of half assed 'trails' that take 10 min to complete and run along busy roadways. We want nature, not traffic.

The priority for the next council should be the construction of a Multi-Use Recreational Facility and not a new arena in the downtown core. Funds should be allocated to benefit the community as a whole, not a select few. In addition, privatization of the facility should be considered to allow for cost savings by not employing City employees.

The resources for children 10-16 years of age have become horrible. Chelmsford and Azilda have less and less for children to do and youth are getting into more trouble. Centres that offer physical fitness classes, anything other than hanging around would be beneficial.

The soccer fields are overgrown during the summer. Outdoor tennis courts (like the one at Lasalle Secondary) are poorly maintained.

their needs to be more leisure activities and filed in the garson area and the parks building need to be overhauled to be L.E.D. certified to be more energy efficient and the filed lights and lots of building should be taken down and rebuilt. The parks and lesiue activities need to be top priority on the cites mines like the sports complex.

there are many parks in Sudbury and area. but many not well kept..or well manned..again no dogs allowed or supposed to be on leashes...how can a conservation area allow unruly dogs or dogs period..?.or a beach where people walk bare feet..walk on sand that has animal urine on it...or beach water that has dog hair in it..?.disgusting..!

there should be a huge marketing campaign done on outdoor activities that already exist before creating more. People are just not aware of what exists. The leisure guide is boring and has no visual content. Why do you think people pick up the SNAP...for the pictures. turn the leisure guide into an information marketing magazine that comes with its own website and facebook page.

There should be diving offered in Sudbury

There should be indoor park for small children where they can run around. I have small relatives whom I like to take out often but in winter it is sometimes too cold to stay outside and they can't run around and burn up energy in stores and libraries. The parks are wonderful in the summer.

There's nothing to do around Chelmsford for people of the age between 15-25 and then we wonder why there are crimes and what not we need a place that we can actually go meet new people and just have fun

this could reduces helth issues for all age groups by increasing activity aoptions

This survey asked about public funds to support these but did not ask if we are satisfied with the extra user fees.

This survey likely should have been better advertised to allow for better participation from the residents of this city. The more people that you hear from the better for the City on a whole and for the council helping to manage it. Being a city employee in the field of leisure services I feel that we do a fair job of servicing existing members but do a extremely poor job of advertising and marketing to the other 80% of society who is nonactive not ot mention unfit. On an aside I find it a conflict having a split of resources and services having the Greater Sudbury Libraries offer fitness classes-ie Yoga. Regards.

Trails are full of dog messes so hard to walk one, branches stick out and hit you in the face, no lighting.

Trails are neglected in Greater Sudbury. Too many chiefs, not enough indians.

A therapeutic pool would be ideal. I believe in lionel center was packed. Beside the manor st-gabriel my opinion has chelmsford would have been ideal.

very hard to have kids and get to activities in sudbury, times are infrequent and finding tiems online is not easy, so facilities have littel parking(gatchell) others too busy(valcaron) parents are often captive with no options while kids enjoy, or vice versa. Parks are often vacant, with no activities or organisers. its very sad. azilda has 3 nice baseball diamonds empty all day until the beer leagues show up, but they have lost most of their parking, the road way is now a no parking and the area is often booked for functions.

Water stations! Easy way to increase usership of the trail systems already in place.

We are avid cyclists. All 4 of us cycle to work in the snow free months. 2 of us cycle all winter. Improve cycling infrastructure, and off road cycle tracks we strongly support. Sudbury has phenomenal XC skiing facilities. Most of these are small clubs run by volunteers. Timmins, North Bay and the SSM have much larger facilities. We would support the City helping these club volunteers expand their facilities and begin to attract outside tourists to these venues. We support neighbourhood trails. Trails where we can walk the dog, walk to Tim Hortons, the library, grocery store, etc. Development plans should include more walking trails that provide "short cuts" and "off road" options to move around our neighbourhoods. The city has done a great job with Bell Park and should be commended. It is a jewel within the city.

We are involved in a number of activities provided by the city and have usually been satisfied. This year we have had some issues with ice time (our daughter plays in the Sudbury Girls Hockey League), we have been bumped out of ice times for various tournaments, and for "competitive" leagues(teams). When an ice time is booked and paid for it should be honoured.

We do not need a theraputic pool in Azilda. The city does not make good use of existing pools and this Council is not likely to close one.

We don't care to drive 20-30 min. to go public swimming.

We have 3 competitive swim teams in Sudbury which attract hundreds of families from the region for swim meets that are held monthly. If we had a modern sports facility that included a competitive swimming pool along with arenas, our city could hold more hockey tournaments/swim meets which would bring in hundreds of thousands of dollars annually.

We have a lot of facilities in CGS that need an investment to bring them up to a reasonable standard and keep them attractive to use. People WANT healthy things to do - we need to make the investment and remember that hockey isn't #1 for everyone. Some of us want art to be better considered in leisure activities.

We have a lot of youth in the New Sudbury Area who do not have the means or who cannot afford to travel to access tennis courts/sports facilities. I would like to see tennis courts opened in the New Sudbury Area and greater attention to youth needs throughout the city, not just the downtown area.

We have one of the most beautiful cities anywhere - it is embarrassing that we don't have more multi-use trails in the huge forest areas we have. Please do not waste money on another pool - we have plenty of pools - take that money and build more outdoor hiking/mountain biking trails

We have some of the highest ice fee times around and they are going up again. This is making sports like hockey and figure skating too hard for middle income families to afford let alone low income. There needs to be something done to make our ice facilities run more cost effective and accessible to all people. Hockey and figure skating for kids is becoming rich people sports. Middle income families don't qualify for the programs out there that help pay for these sports but when you have kids there is no money to afford these programs.

We have to drive to Laurentian to get decent bike paths.

we need more public spaces. no more parking lots!

we need to get more stuff in this city that we can do for funetc swimming any time of the year , a great ski hill and more events !!!! that is low in cost to keep kids of the street and in drugs

We need to support a network of bike paths. We need to ensure what we have is retained and improved to achieve a healthy community. Do not invest in roads. It is a bottomless pit

We need to take better care of our fields. We need to hire people or find consultants to guide us in finding better ways of maintaining our baseball fields. Also, there are kids that are not being given the opportunity to play baseball at a young age (4-12) because the fields are not adequate and adult leagues are overtaking youth sports. This can no longer happen. With the rate of obesity and non activity in the city of greater Sudbury (have a look at Stats Canada, we are top 5 in many negative health categories). We have to help our kids stay and be active!

We only have one official dog park and lots of people don't like it...we should have more and one that are safe carefree where people and their dogs respect each other..but don't judge...we should also have areas at the beach for our dogs too...Toronto the big city is more dog friendly then us..

We require a multi use arena to support all types of sports - hockey, soccer, skating, indoor sports such as volleyball. I would like more information on how to use gym time in order to play indoor volleyball

We travel with our children to many communities across Ontario - their multi-use facilities are far superior to what we have in Sudbury and the cost for user groups is ever increasing here which is going to drive some members of the community away from sport

When new planning for subdivisions the following issues must be taken more seriously: shoreline access, park allotments, green-space, pedestrian pathways (cycling and walking), sidewalks, and lane-ways. There are many opportunities for all to adopt an active lifestyle here; however it seems that to do so one must have a car. Alternate methods of transportation must be addressed when road upgrades and subdivisions are planned. Example Lane-ways are one place where communities meet. Without lane-ways the backyard neighbors might as well live on the other side of the planet. Where have our lane-ways gone?

While I am unlikely to cycle, I believe that the provision of through cycling routes would decrease vehicular use for commuting and pleasure.

Would like to see a Splash Park in Copper Cliff. Other communities such as Lively have one. Would give the people of Copper Cliff something to do in their park.

Would love to see this kind of investment. <http://www.greengym.ca/> <http://skateparkrats.com/2012/04/09/minnow-lake-skatepark-sudbury/> instead of infrastructure aimed solely at small children

Would really like to see more available in the Lively area. Having to always drive to activities is frustrating.

Would there be an opportunity to have a community of practice or online forum between the neighborhood playground and volunteers.

Appendix B: Record of Public Input

The following is a record of public input received from the six open houses held to gather feedback on the Draft Parks, Open Space & Leisure Master Plan Review in May 2014. Comments have been summarized into the following categories and listed according to the session they were gathered at; multiple mentions are noted in parentheses.

- A. Indoor Leisure Facilities
- B. Outdoor Leisure Facilities
- C. Trails & Bike Lanes
- D. Parkland
- E. Service Delivery & Programs
- F. Out-Of-Scope Items

A. Indoor Leisure Facilities

Azilda Open House

- Support therapy / leisure pool in Azilda (10); consider saltwater (2); the Lions Club had fundraised for a pool in the past
- Better maintenance of facilities (e.g., netting on basketball hoops in gymnasium)
- Need opportunities for indoor walking, possibly at the Lionel E. Lalonde Centre
- Don't close the Dr. Edgar Leclair Arena

Lively Open House

- Would like an indoor pool (therapy/lane/leisure) in the South End; a modern swimming complex that includes walking track or training in a cost-effective way; pool like in Espanola (5)
- Fitness centre; attach to arena (4)
- Keep youth centre open in the summer (2)
- Dedicated youth centre (not shared)
- Add a gymnasium to Youth Centre
- Add video cameras to Youth Centre
- Add air conditioning to Youth Centre
- Centrally-located multi-sport / interest facility for teens with theatre and AV equipment
- Indoor abilities centre where people can walk
- Cement floor in Kinsmen Hall for floor hockey, skateboarding
- Roller derby area

Hanmer Open House

- Consider converting pools to saltwater
- Don't support multi-plex arenas; keep existing facilities
- Declining need for arenas
- Consider an indoor playground

Garson Open House

- No comments

Sudbury Open House

- Add a pool and gymnastics facility to Gerry McCrory Countryside Arena
- Support therapy / leisure pool in Azilda
- Provide a large facility downtown that provides facilities for activities such as sports, museum, theatre, art gallery (replace Bell Museum), gymnasium, etc.
- Facilities should be multi-use, not stand-alone (e.g., pools, soccer fields)

Dowling Open House

- Teen centre open all summer (3)
- Support therapy / leisure pool in Azilda (2)
- New fitness equipment at the Dowling Leisure Centre (2)
- New indoor pool in Onaping (2)
- More advertising and usage of the I.J. Coady Arena (2)
- Replace the Onaping pool at the Dowling Leisure Centre
- Open the arena in the summer; cheaper out of season rates
- Keep I.J. Coady Arena open
- Multi-use facility with an indoor pool and reduced rates for senior/youth
- Build multi-use facilities in strategic locations
- Provide gym facilities in Levack-Onaping
- Early morning fitness centre in Dowling; maybe 6:30am or 7am
- Keep Dowling Leisure Centre open during summer for gym use and workout programs
- Reroof the Onaping Community Centre or build a new place
- Parking lot at Onaping Community Centre in dire need of repair
- New facilities must be run efficiently and cost effectively
- Bigger room for teen centre

B. Outdoor Leisure FacilitiesAzilda Open House

- Interested in pickleball
- Playground at Birch Street Park needs updating
- More off-leash dog parks

Lively Open House

- New skateboard park; multi-use pad for basketball, tennis, skateboard (4)
- Don't move the playground to the Lively Ski Hill – keep them in the centre of Lively where parents can supervise them; maintain a central location, perhaps behind the Library (2)
- Ski rentals and snack shop opened at ski hill (2)
- Move skateboard park to Lively Ski Hill
- There is interest in starting a Walden Minor Baseball League, but most fields are fully booked
- Ensure that playground equipment meets safety standards (e.g., Meatbird and Simon Lake Parks)
- Need an off-leash dog park (video monitored)
- Add bandstand (not wood) for seniors to open space behind Library
- Basketball and volleyball courts
- Tennis or outdoor activity area on Main Street (more than soccer)
- Use tennis courts for ball hockey, etc.
- Meatbird Park beach bout lines are getting smaller and no kids allowed with inflatables

Hanmer Open House

- Declining need for ski hills
- More community gardens
- Upgrade the bleachers at ball diamonds; add dugouts; more shade
- Splash pool (not pad) in downtown Lively

Garson Open House

- More pickleball courts (2); already have 25 people playing the sport at the YMCA
- Some residents using Penman Park for golf practice; dangerous (house has been hit); no golfing signs should be posted
- Foul balls from Blezard Valley Kinsmen ball diamond (Martin Road) are going into common park areas and private property; additional netting has not been effective; this is a safety issue that needs to be addressed – can it be removed from use?

Sudbury Open House

- We need to keep our seniors active; we would love to see pickleball courts in Sudbury (3)
- Provide more facilities for teens – skateboard park is getting a lot of use
- More sports fields
- School board fields are not well maintained or managed
- Support proposed dog park in Azilda; should be supervised by staff or volunteers
- Would like to see more free dog bags around the City to encourage clean-up

Dowling Open House

- Add lights to ball diamonds in Dowling (2)
- Improve the ball diamond at the Onaping Community Centre
- Off-leash dog park in Dowling
- Maintain the tennis courts in Levack
- Approach Onaping Ski Hill for purchase or rental
- Nordic Ski Hill should not have been abandoned
- Provide a Splash Pad in Onaping
- Work with the Onaping Falls Recreation Committee to ensure success of their Splash Pad Initiative
- Need a skate park in Dowling
- New playground for Levack and Onaping
- Plumbing for Levack outdoor rink, so water no longer needs to be trucked in

C. Trails & Bike Lanes

Azilda Open House

- More bicycle paths and trails are needed (3)
- Connect Azilda and Chelmsford through trails
- Develop a paved walkway throughout all of Azilda
- Add bike lane along Montee Principale, Bonin Street, and Montee Rouleau
- Complete work on Voyageur Cross Country Ski Trail – transforming it into a hiking trail

Lively Open House

- More accessible biking and walking trails (4)
- Greater inter-connectivity of trails; e.g., Copper Cliff to Gatchell to Hillcrest to Trans Canada Trail; Field Park to Hillcrest; Kantola to Black Lake Road to Lively; Melwyn Avenue to Laura Street playground (4)
- More bike lanes

Hanmer Open House

- Develop, maintain, and promote trails (great exercise for seniors)
- More bike trails
- Add trails to Langdon Park (and portable washroom)
- Develop a bike/rollerblade path around the soccer fields at HARC

Garson Open House

- No comments

Sudbury Open House

- Close off some downtown roads every Sunday so people could walk, bike, rollerblade, great family fun (2)
- More bicycle paths and trails are needed
- Very good ideas on this online research ex. hiking trails, walking trails, casual fun

Dowling Open House

- Bike path from Onaping 144 to Dowling
 - More fun in the wilderness
-

D. Parkland

Azilda Open House

- Improve access and maintenance at Lovers Rock

Lively Open House

- Keep parks the way they are – quiet and clean
- Improvements need to Simon Lake Park (pick up trash, add lighting, remove trees, water quality, add outdoor rink)

Hanmer Open House

- New park at Lions Club in Hanmer

Garson Open House

- No comments

Sudbury Open House

- Improve parking and access at Bell Park; don't need more trees

Dowling Open House

- More parks in Dowling
- Retaining wall next to railway tracks in downtown Levack in need of repair

E. Service Delivery & ProgramsAzilda Open House

- Seniors programs are segmented, not inclusive

Lively Open House

- Tennis court programs
- Utilize Library Kin Room for playgroup program
- More corporate involvement / investment
- Better promotion of Youth Centre

Hanmer Open House

- Free, family-oriented, outdoor activities are in demand (e.g., walking, cross-country skiing, swimming, fitness, playgrounds, etc.)
- More no to low-cost activities and memberships
- Offer times for free access to the walking track at HARC
- Better maintenance of trails is needed; this requires more staff resources and empowering volunteers

Garson Open House

- No comments

Sudbury Open House

- Improve communication and organization of sports field bookings

Dowling Open House

- More older adult fitness classes
- More programs to accommodate kids and encourage healthy, active lifestyles and relationships in Onaping Falls
- More programs during the daytime and aligned with student schedules (not just evening)
- More emphasis on youth programs in Onaping Falls
- Bring back outdoor learn-to-swim and playground programs at Windy Lake Provincial Park
- Provide free rentals to non-profit organizations for free events
- More afterschool clubs like craft and sports; self-esteem club, texting club
- Open the Play'n'Chat at Onaping Community Centre one evening a week; have volunteer-run storytime
- Teen dance in Dowling
- Offer workout programs during weekends (Zumba, aerobics, etc.)

F. Out-of-Scope ItemsAzilda Open House

- Improved tourism mapping (showing former township boundaries)

Lively Open House

- Walden Food Bank must be moved to a central location and be wheelchair accessible
- More sidewalks (Black Lake Road)

Hanmer Open House

- Post notices for meetings on the doors at HARC, not the message boards

Garson Open House

- No comments

Sudbury Open House

- Improve bus service (2)
 - Bus access to the conservation trails in the summer
 - Use express busses for Capreol/Onaping, etc.

Dowling Open House

- Ice cream truck (2)
- Dowling's library closes early on youth centre nights however it should be promoted for youth to use
- Better transportation for Onaping Falls
- Zoo in Dowling
- I would like the US Centre to be opened in the summer; add computers in the US Centre
- More class/school trips
- More reliable public transportation, especially to provide teens with the ability to get to and from employment
- Open Dowling library later on youth centre nights
- Sit in restaurant in Dowling

Appendix C: Neighbourhood-Level Outdoor Leisure Amenity Mapping

Mapping of neighbourhood level outdoor leisure amenities is contained on the following pages.