### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

Item 13, Report No. 10, of the Finance, Administration and Audit Committee, which was adopted, as amended, by the Council of the City of Vaughan on June 23, 2015, as follows:

## By approving the following:

That recommendation 1. of the Finance, Administration and Audit Committee report, dated June 15, 2015, be amended by adding:

"and that the planning process for the North Maple Regional Park be separate and distinct from the Block 27 Secondary Plan process";

That the two soccer fields in the North Maple Regional Park continue to be designed in the interim;

That the recommendation contained in Communication C11 from the Commissioner of Planning, dated June 19, 2015, be approved, as amended, as follows:

- 1. That funding up to \$200,000 for the completion of a detailed Park Master Plan and for additional scope of work related to planning and transportation studies underway to properly position the property concurrent with development of the New Communities Secondary Plan be allocated within the approved Capital Project 5961-2-03; and
- 2. That staff conduct additional due diligence and report back for Council's consideration in September 2015 on the future strategic use of PPP lands along the Keele Street frontage to assist with funding and advancement of future phases of park development and on the appropriate criteria for undertaking an Request for Expressions of Interest (RFEOI) procurement process to provide information on potential market interest and the potential magnitude of financial benefit to the City;

Regional Councillor Di Biase declared an interest in this matter as his children own property in Block 27, which was given to them by their maternal grandfather, and was not present when the matter was under consideration.

13

### NORTH MAPLE REGIONAL PARK DUE DILIGENCE AND LONG-TERM STRATEGY WARD 1

The Finance, Administration and Audit Committee recommends:

- 1) That recommendation 1. in the following report of the Commissioner of Planning and the Director of Parks Development, dated June 15, 2015, be approved, subject to amending recommendation 1. to read as follows:
  - 1. That the information, recommended next steps and action plan provided in the report of the Commissioner of Planning and the Director of Parks Development, dated June 15, 2015, and summarized in Attachment 5, be approved as the go-forward plan for implementation of North Maple Regional Park, except that further alternative uses and financing arrangements, other than the sale, for the time being, of the lands fronting on Keele Street, be explored with public, private-for-profit, or not-for-profit entities;
- 2) That consideration of recommendation 2. in the report of the Commissioner of Planning and the Director of Parks Development, dated June 15, 2015, be deferred to the June 23, 2015, Council meeting; and

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015**

### Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 – Page 2

3) That the presentation by the Director of Parks Development and the Director of Development Finance & Investments, and C5, presentation material titled: "North Maple Regional Park Due Diligence and Long-Term Strategy", be received.

### **Recommendation**

The Commissioner of Planning and the Director of Parks Development, in consultation with the Commissioner of Finance & City Treasurer, the Director of Development Finance & Investments and the Senior Manager of Real Estate recommend:

- 1. That the information, recommended next steps and action plan provided in this report and summarized in Attachment 5 be endorsed as the go-forward plan for implementation of North Maple Regional Park; and
- 2. That funding up to \$200,000 for the completion of a detailed Park Master Plan and for additional scope of work related to planning and transportation studies underway to properly position the property concurrent with the development of the New Communities Secondary Plan be allocated within the approved Capital Project 5961-2-03.

### **Contribution to Sustainability**

Developing a long-term strategy to guide the planning and development of North Maple Regional Park (NMRP) demonstrates a coordinated and sustainable approach that is consistent with the priorities previously set by Council in Green Directions Vaughan, specifically:

- Objective 2.2 To develop Vaughan as a City with maximum green space and an urban form that supports our expected population growth.
- Objective 2.3 To create a City with sustainable built form.
- Objective 3.1 To develop and sustain a network of sidewalks, paths and trails that supports all modes of non-vehicular transportation.
- Objective 4.1 To foster a City with strong social cohesion, an engaging arts scene, and a clear sense of its culture and heritage.

## Economic Impact

Capital development of NMRP is currently estimated to cost in excess of \$35M for the ultimate build-out of the park. Funding for capital development, based on a conventional approach using Development Charge (DC) funding, is not affordable in the short-term and would require the project to be phased over many years, possibly spanning 15 years or more. This report builds on the findings of the Financial Advisory Review presented in September 2014, which was completed to review the potential for Public-Private-Partnerships (PPP's) to assist with funding and earlier advancement of park development. *The result of the consultant's work identified limited opportunities associated with PPP's, and in particular, no precedent examples of infrastructure PPP's for park projects.* 

The consultant's report recommended that an alternative approach be considered involving the sale of a portion of parkland identified for PPP opportunities. A value-added sale of land (sale after designations for highest and best use are in place) is estimated to generate funding consistent with the consultant's findings, as outlined in this report. The funding derived from a competitive process after the property is properly positioned with appropriate designations could be sufficient to assist the City in being able to accelerate development of the entire NMRP faster

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

### Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 – Page 3

and in a manner that will financially allow park development DC funding to be directed towards other priority park projects such as the development of parkland in the Vaughan Metropolitan Centre (VMC) as well as the continued development of much needed District Parks and Neighbourhood Parks.

This report also identifies the need to undertake a Park Master Plan to establish a detailed park plan to guide the future development of the NMRP and provide a framework for decision making within the context of the overall park vision. It is also proposed that the scope of work for the Block 27 Secondary Plan and associated studies including the New Communities transportation study be expanded to support further detailed planning and review of land development options related to the PPP lands identified along the Keele Street frontage. Costs associated with these studies are estimated to be in the range of \$175,000 to \$200,000, which can be funded within existing approved Capital Project 5961-2-03 Maple Valley Plan Design.

Development of NMRP will also have an economic impact in terms of operating and maintenance (O&M). Details on the timing and impact of O&M costs will be determined by the scope of work and timing of capital park development and in-service year(s). This report identifies and recommends that a holistic and sustainable approach be considered for NMRP in terms of environmental, financial and social sustainability, in keeping with the Park Vision. Further review of O&M costs is recommended to be undertaken as part of the Park Master Plan process.

The economic impact of the Phase 1 development work has been accounted for in the 2015 budget within the approved Capital Budget.

### **Communications Plan**

Consultation with the community was essential to establishing the vision for NMRP. Continued community consultation including discussion with user groups and stakeholders will continue to occur at various stages of implementation of the NMRP development. This report proposes the completion of a detailed Park Master Plan to guide decision making for park implementation in accordance with the Park Vision. A detailed communication plan will be developed as part of this project which could include establishing a NMRP Advisory Committee comprised of City Staff, 2 Members of Council and key stakeholders to guide the completion of the master plan process.

Consistent with the Regional level status of this park, Staff recommend that a communications and marketing strategy be considered to generate City-wide awareness and interest in the NMRP. In addition, elements of the park will be integrated with communications for the New Communities Secondary Plan process currently underway should Council endorse incorporating NMRP into this project.

#### Purpose

The purpose of this report is to provide Committee and Council with further information related to the Financial Advisory Review conducted by the Grant Thornton consultant team in 2014 and to identify and seek Council endorsement of a long-term strategy and coordinated approach to guide the detailed planning and development of NMRP in accordance with the Park Vision.

#### **Background - Analysis and Options**

#### Synopsis:

This report provides a framework for the implementation of NMRP and proposes a coordinated approach to managing the various planning and development processes to ensure alignment with the Park Vision Plan. In particular, this framework includes:

## EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

## Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 - Page 4

- 1. Park Vision A Balanced Approach
  - A balanced approach to park development consistent with the established NMRP Park Vision Plan.
  - Linkages identified between the NMRP Park Vision and the strategic goals of the City's Active Together Master Plan (ATMP).
  - <u>Recommended next steps</u>: that the current balanced approach of the NMRP Park Vision continue to be used as a foundation to guide Phase 1 work and park planning, design, development, and programming AND that alternative approaches to funding and partnership opportunities be explored as implementation of the NMRP plan begins and future development plans emerge.
- 2. Financial Due Diligence
  - A summary of the Financial Advisory Review completed by Grant Thornton in September 2014.
  - Supplementary information to the Financial Advisory Review, exploring three approaches to park development, namely: Option 1: Conventional Approach to Park Development
    - Option 2: Recreation Partnership
    - Option 3: Strategic Positioning and Potential Value-Added Sale of Lands
  - <u>Recommended next step</u>: that staff further explore opportunities associated with the value-added sale or strategic positioning of a portion of the PPP lands identified along the Keele Street frontage in the context of the Secondary Planning process currently underway for Block 27, for the purposes of creating opportunities and generating potential for sufficient funding to advance development of NMRP.
- 3. Planning Context
  - Identification of the planning context in which the development of the NMRP exists, including discussion of the Vaughan Official Plan 2010, the Provincial and Regional Context, the Block 27 Secondary Plan, and the North Vaughan New Communities Transportation Master Plan.
  - <u>Recommended next step:</u> that the PPP lands along the Keele Street frontage of NMRP be added to the Block 27 Secondary Planning Process and that scope of work and funding allocation for this project and supporting studies be amended for this purpose.
- *4.* Case Study Scenario Downsview Park
  - Downsview Park provided as a case study wherein a portion of property is positioned and subsequently sold or leased for private development in order to support the advancement of park development and to fund park operations and maintenance, similar to the recommendation of the Financial Advisory Review.
  - The sale of land for development and decisions regarding partnership opportunities to support park development are governed by the Downsview Park Master Plan to ensure consistency and transparency.
  - Recommended next steps: that a detailed Park Master Plan be prepared to generate a design framework and implementation strategy to guide the future development of and to inform the Block 27 Secondary Plan process and articulation of options for the strategic development and potential sale of a portion of parkland along the Keele Street frontage AND that the concept of a fully sustainable funding model for park design, capital development and operations be included for further review as part of the scope of work of the Parks Master Plan in effort to reduce the long-term financial implications associated with on-going park operations and maintenance.

## EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

## Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 – Page 5

- 5. Parks Development Context
  - NMRP Phase 1 implementation is currently in progress.
    - <u>Recommended next step:</u> that Phase 1 design and implementation plans continue to be advanced in an effort to open the park for public use as quickly as possible and that a comprehensive communications plan be prepared to generate awareness and City-wide interest of NMRP.
- 6. Recommended Next Steps and Action Plan
  - Summary of Next Steps and Action Plan proposed to guide development of NMRP.

## 1.0 Park Vision – A Balanced Approach

NMRP is envisioned to become a signature park for Vaughan residents and visitors. The park property totals approximately 81 hectares (200 acres) and is uniquely situated at the southern extent of the Oak Ridges Moraine (ORM), adjacent to the significant Core Natural Heritage Feature of the East Don River watershed. The physical character of the property includes a combination of developable tableland areas and beautiful rugged areas of natural regeneration with undulating topography that is typical of the ORM landscape.

The NMRP Vision was developed with the support of the community over a number of years. In 2013, a revised NMRP Vision was established with community input and received by Council to guide future park development (Attachment 1). The NMRP Vision identifies the community's desire for a **balanced approach** to park design and development; an approach that includes park facilities for both active and passive uses and for all levels of ability, ages and interests and that is sensitive to the natural environment of the park.

Accordingly, the NMRP Vision proposes a balance of active and passive park facilities through the establishment of 5 planned zones:

Park Zone	% of Total Park Area
Sports Facility Area	25%
Active Area and Play Zone	18%
Picnic Area	12%
Woodland Gardens and Naturalization	30%
Lands for potential PPP	15%

The balanced approach to park planning and development aligns with the strategic goals and objectives of the Active Together Master Plan (ATMP), the City's strategic plan for Parks, Recreation and Libraries. The purpose of the ATMP with respect to parkland is to identify current needs and facility provision strategies that are consistent with the City's commitment to providing safe, accessible, and community-responsive parks and facilities that appeal to a wide range of interests and abilities. In particular, the 2013 update of the ATMP specifically identifies, as an emerging theme, City-wide community interest in finding the proper balance between providing spaces for structured sports activities and spaces for less formal, self-scheduled activities (e.g. picnic areas, trails, off-leash areas, etc.).

The ATMP also identifies a sense of urgency expressed by the community associated with defining infrastructure requirements to meet the growth pressures of intensifying development and emerging new communities. The ATMP identifies and recommends that comprehensive community planning shall ensure that sufficient land is set aside for parks and open spaces,

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

## Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 - Page 6

adequate funding is allocated, and partnership opportunities explored so that the delivery of programs and services to the community can be made in a timely fashion. Of critical importance is the aspect of funding and the City's ability to support the development of all identified and necessary facilities. Should City funding not be sufficient to meet identified needs, as is the case with NMRP, the delivery of projects to the community will be delayed unless alternative sources of funding are identified and explored.

Strategies identified by the ATMP to assist with implementation and financial considerations include:

- Encourage partnerships and sponsorships in the provision and delivery of facilities and services;
- Consider alternative funding and cost-sharing approaches to achieve capital and operating cost recovery levels; and,
- Conducting feasibility studies, business plans, site assessments and/or public engagement prior to developing or expanding major projects to ensure alignment with community needs, partnership opportunities and financial capabilities.

### **Recommended Next Steps:**

That the current balanced approach of the NMRP Vision continue to be used as a foundation to guide Phase 1 work and future park planning, design, development and programming.

That alternative approaches for funding and partnership opportunities be explored as implementation of the NMRP plan begins and as future development plans emerge.

## 2.0 Financial Advisory Review

In September 2014, Committee and Council received a presentation and written report from the Grant Thornton consulting team regarding the Financial Advisory Review for NMRP. The purpose of the review was to identify and evaluate opportunities for mitigating the significant costs associated with the development and operation of the park since conventional funding sources (DC's and tax levy) will not be sufficient in the short-term. Following discussion, Staff were directed to further review the options and considerations identified by the consultant and report back in Q2 2015.

The scope of work for the financial review included:

- Overview of PPP service delivery models;
- Commentary on the financial advantages/disadvantages of not pursuing PPP for the NMRP project;
- Recommendations on other potential funding sources related to PPP's;
- Provision of relevant examples/benchmarks of other PPP arrangements;
- Recommended service delivery models appropriate for the NMRP project; and
- Review of risk assessment, funding source implications, revenue generation opportunities, operating and maintenance considerations, for the various options being proposed.

The results of the consultant's review concluded there is limited potential for PPP opportunities to assist with a project of the size and scope of NMRP. In fact, Grant Thornton concluded that

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

# Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 - Page 7

infrastructure related PPP park projects are without precedent and that there does not appear to be an existing supplier market for projects of this size and scope. Other potential delivery models, including construction by the City and operation by a non-profit organization or construction/operation through a recreation facility partnership, may provide some opportunity; however, these delivery models may also be challenging to establish because of the relatively limited revenues associated with the programming of park facilities. The Grant Thornton study concluded that *the most significant financial opportunity for NMRP may exist with the potential value-added sale of a portion of the PPP lands* identified along the Keele Street frontage, once appropriate land use designations and infrastructure approvals are in place.

The report indicated that subject to a further detailed valuation exercise, the sale of PPP lands could have the potential to secure sufficient funding to significantly, if not fully, fund the cost of park development works. However, it would be necessary to fund annual operating, maintenance and lifecycle replacement costs through other means such as property taxes.

Through the community consultation process and visioning exercise for NMRP, the community supported the exploration of PPP opportunities provided that the net public benefits of the park are protected or enhanced. Some key comments from the community include:

- Proposed development should be complementary with the park and consider creative and innovative solutions including environmentally-friendly designs;
- Consideration should be given to sell potentially surplus lands to assist with funding park development while retaining a significant exposure gateway and frontage for the park;
- Big box development and commercial uses would not be an ideal fit, unless it can be demonstrated that value can be offered to the community.

Following Committee and Council discussion on this item in September 2014, Staff reviewed the recommendations made by Grant Thornton and provide the following response and additional information:

## **Option 1. Conventional Approach to Park Development**

The 2013 DC Background Study assumes that NMRP will be constructed in phases, with the final phase anticipated at the time to be completed in 2019. However, this construction timeline would only be achievable if the City incurred a deficit in the Parks Development DC Reserve. According to the 2013 DC Background Study, approximately \$18M of the \$35M funding required to develop NMRP will be collected "in-period". This means that the bulk of funding required for capital development will not be available until the 2022 to 2031 time period.

Therefore, if the City was to undertake a conventional method of park development, where no debt is incurred and the DC Reserve remains in a positive balance, it is likely that the *full development of NMRP could not be completed in the short term, but would need to be phased over a longer period of time* (i.e. up to 2031) and would be subject to competing priorities such as the development of parkland in the VMC and other intensification areas. The advantage of using the conventional method is that the City would progressively develop the park as funding becomes available, no parkland would be lost and the City would retain full ownership of the facilities and all associated user fee revenues.

## EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

## Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 - Page 8

Option 1.	Conventional Approach to Parkland Development
Revenue Potential:	Limited to user fees related to programming
Park Development Timing:	Phased Approach over 15+ years
Considerations:	<ul> <li>Advantages: <ul> <li>The City retains full ownership over all of the park lands</li> <li>Retention of all user fee revenues</li> <li>Control over design, budget, and quality</li> <li>Retained control and maximized park frontage on Keele Street</li> <li>Least conflict with ORM Conservation Plan</li> <li>O&amp;M costs are phased with marginal increase in property tax levy over time</li> </ul> </li> <li>Disadvantages: <ul> <li>Long-term park implementation scenario (over 15 years)</li> <li>Limits development of other parks within the City due to limited funding sources</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Summary:	This option is considered a viable option; however, funding the capital development of NMRP would compete with other park development priorities and full build-out of the park would take many years to deliver (i.e. up to 2031)

## **Option 2. Recreation Partnership**

A recreational partnership is a partnership between a public entity and a private entity to provide recreational services such as a hockey arena or soccer facilities. These types of arrangements are often limited to operating and maintenance agreements and usually do not include the capital development of a facility.

The driving factor for the financial feasibility of these types of partnerships is based on the demand for the types of services being provided as well as the competitiveness of the user fees within the market. Although a supply and demand analysis was not performed by Grant Thornton, they concluded that these facilities are typically challenged to generate enough revenue to offset their own capital and operating costs and as such it seems unlikely that a partnership of this nature would generate enough funds to facilitate the construction of the remainder of the park.

Although these types of partnerships may not generate enough revenue to fund the construction of the park, they must not be entirely overlooked. They may be a viable option for service delivery so long as consideration is given to the facilities that are to be contemplated as a part of the park plan. Grant Thorton pointed out that the cost of adding a facility that is not contemplated in the plan for the park would most likely result in a net overall increase in cost to the City and that the addition of facilities that are already being contemplated in the plan would result in a net savings in costs. As such, the intent would be to further explore the viability of a recreational partnership after a master plan and long term strategy for the park has been

## EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

## Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 – Page 9

*completed.* This will help to inform any decisions on the types of services that the City will be looking to deliver in the park. From a funding perspective, this option generally does not differ greatly from the Conventional Approach to Park Development. The PPP for the recreation facility may help to partially or fully offset the capital and/or operating and maintenance costs of the facility itself; however, the park development would still likely require a phased funding approach over the next 10 to 15 years.

An alternative approach could be that the City partners with a non-profit partner to activate, operate and manage a portion and/or facility within the park and in doing so, they may become stewards of the park. A non-profit partner with access to other government sponsored funds, independent fund-raising opportunities and volunteer networks could also contribute towards activating, expanding, and promoting the park within the wider community. In general, any capital funding route would not limit the City in seeking non-profit partners in the form of cultural or environmental organizations. Examples include Evergreen, a national non-profit organization dedicated to restoring nature in urban environments, which currently operates the Don Valley Brick Works, an open space within the City of Toronto.

Option 2.	Recreation Partnership
Revenue Potential:	Unlikely to significantly contribute to capital funding of the entire park, but may reduce O&M costs and provide future revenue
Park Development Timing:	Varies – Phased approach over 10 to 15 years depending on type and terms of partnership
Considerations:	<ul> <li>Advantages:</li> <li>May reduce to a limited extent the amount of DCs required to fund NMRP</li> <li>May decrease O&amp;M costs and could have access to additional revenue streams</li> <li>Opportunity to develop a City-wide and potentially intercity destination</li> <li>Unlocks potential for integrated recreational destination associated with future mobility hub</li> <li>The City's portion of O&amp;M costs could be phased with marginal increase in tax levy over time</li> <li>Disadvantages:</li> <li>Risks associated with short and long-term partnership commitments (i.e. economic and management commitments)</li> <li>Portion of NMRP total area will be lost to the construction of PPP related facilities</li> <li>Reduced park frontage to Keele Street and reduction in total parkland provision</li> </ul>
Summary:	This option was not considered advisable as a strategy to develop the entire park as per the recommendations of the Financial Advisory Review, however partial partnerships with non- for-profit partners may enrich the park programming while providing a platform to access funds and grants that otherwise would not be available to the City alone.

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

## Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 - Page 10

### Option 3. Strategic Positioning and Potential Value-Added Sale of a portion of Lands

One of the key recommendations in the Grant Thornton report was the potential value-added sale of a portion of the identified PPP lands as a strategy to generate capital funding to develop the park. The consultant's recommendation was based on the potential for Low-Density Residential development. The example cited by the consultant identified development of 91 houses with a gross area of 14.7 hectares (36 acres) and net area of 10.3 hectares (25 acres), estimated to provide sufficient funds to expedite the development of the NMRP.

To further explore this option, Staff undertook a valuation study relating to three potential development scenarios on a portion of the NMRP. The study provides estimates of current market value for each of the development scenarios. The values attributed to each of the separate development scenarios assume that the various land uses are permitted and have the required Official Plan and zoning designations and infrastructure approvals in place and that there are no hurdles to beginning construction.

The property must be properly positioned by the City to create this opportunity and designation of land requires a statutory Planning Act process. The NMRP property is currently designated as Parkland in Section 13 of the Vaughan Official Plan 2010 (VOP 2010). It is envisioned that the land use designation and related changes to VOP 2010, triggered by this option (Value Added Sale of Lands), could be incorporated to the Block 27 Secondary Plan study and public consultation to achieve the greatest amount of certainty and control over end uses in the least amount of time.

Option 3.	Strategic Positioning and Value-Added Sale of Lands
Revenue Potential:	Revenue from the sale of lands could facilitate most, if not all, the funding required to complete the entire NMRP plan, thus minimizing the need for DC's and10% tax levy funding
Park Development Timing:	Full park development within 3-5 years
Considerations:	Advantages:
	Synergy with current Block 27 Secondary Plan process
	<ul> <li>Minimizes amount of parkland to be sold by maximizing land value potential</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Opportunity to maximize public street frontage, views and access into the park</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Increases potential to activate the park with greatest amount of City control to achieve a complementary and integrated development</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Allows Parkland DC funding to be directed towards other priority projects</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Potential taxation savings of \$3.5 million (non-DC portion of \$35M estimated development costs)</li> </ul>
	Accelerates advancement of park development works

## EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

# Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 - Page 11

	<ul> <li>Disadvantages:</li> <li>Loss of strategic land holding that could be repurposed in the future for other purposes (e.g. institution, government accommodation, etc.)</li> <li>The process of a transparent sale of lands may require some additional staff capacity or external resources (e.g. Fairness Commissioner) to ensure transparency and to manage any potential public criticism related to competitive disposition process.</li> <li>Potential negative public perception of City's parkland being rezoned and earmarked for sale</li> <li>Reduced park frontage to Keele Street</li> <li>Reduction in total parkland provision per capita of active parkland at a city-wide level</li> </ul>
Summary:	Due to the opportunities associated with integrating the development of NMRP into the planning context of the current Block 27 Secondary Plan process and the potential for significant returns on land value, this option is recommended to be given serious consideration in the context of a parks master planning exercise.

Given the need to consider City-wide parkland service levels, consideration must be given to the potential sale of parkland when the City is currently experiencing a deficit in this service category. Service level for active parkland is often measured in hectares per population. The City's current service level for parks is identified in the ATMP as being 1.87Ha/1000 population, with a target service level of 2.2Ha/1000 population. Although the sale of some of the NMRP lands may result in a slight decrease in service level using this formula, there may be an increase in other park service level measures. For instance, the DC Background Study measures park development service level using a dollars/capita formula. Therefore, while parkland service level (land/capita) may slightly decrease, the parks development (dollars/capita) may increase as the non-DC funds generated from a sale of land are redirected to improvements of the rest of the park, which is a concept known as "quality vs. quantity". The quality vs. quantity concept means that for a park that is envisioned for many active uses, it may be equally advantageous to have higher quality facilities at an earlier point in time, rather than simply a larger quantity of unimproved parkland (or parkland that is improved at a much later time).

Funding for the entire City park network is intrinsically interconnected and a holistic approach must be taken when considering funding options. For example, if parkland is sold at NMRP, the quantity of parkland within the City is reduced overall; however, the strategic sale of parkland could provide the funding required to build the remainder of the park and it would also unlock DC's earmarked for NMRP, which could potentially be used to improve the quality of parks being offered in other areas of the City. Further exploration of the opportunities and constraints associated with this proposed option is required.

Municipally owned parkland and open spaces are non-renewable resources, which are important to communities. Once lost to another use, parkland and open space is difficult to recover. The ATMP and Green Directions Vaughan reports recommend the preservation of municipal parks and open space as a City goal; however, the Planning Act recognizes that in certain instances, a municipality may conclude that a change in parkland use may be necessary to advance public purposes.

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

### Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 – Page 12

When a proposal for such a change in parkland and open space is made, Council is required to make a careful evaluation of the proposed change and the impacts expected from that change. Council should also be aware of and ensure compliance with the legal requirements applicable to the proposed change of use.

If the lands in question are declared surplus and sold, not only would the City receive proceeds from the disposition, it would also receive revenues annually due to the change to the taxable status (if applicable) once the lands are rezoned and the VOP 2010 is amended for the approved development. Also, when future owners apply for development, additional revenues (i.e. development charges, cash-in-lieu of parkland, application and processing fees, etc.) would be collected for the betterment of the City.

In addition, NMRP is strategically located near a future GO station, the future Block 27 community and the Keele Maple employment park. While the consultant's report did not examine the option of maintaining lands within the park for strategic economic development or employment purposes, holding a portion of lands for strategic purposes is a further option that could be considered. Evaluation of this other land use option and variances of this option (e.g. long-term lease of a portion of lands) would involve conducting further due diligence and obtaining infrastructure and planning approvals to ensure future land uses can be achieved on the site.

### **Recommended Next Steps:**

That Staff further explore opportunities associated with the value-added sale or strategic positioning of the PPP lands identified along the Keele Street frontage in the context of the Secondary Planning process currently underway for Block 27, for the purposes of creating opportunities and generating potential for sufficient funding to advance development of NMRP.

#### 3.0 Planning Context

## Vaughan Official Plan 2010

The VOP 2010 provides clear and specific policies regarding the hierarchy of parks and open spaces and the integration of these public spaces throughout the City to support a balanced distribution of parks and recreation opportunities for Vaughan residents and visitors. The following specific VOP 2010 policies are noted within the context of planning for NMRP:

7.3.1.1.To implement the parkland objectives and targets of the Active Together Master Plan, as amended from time to time, by satisfying the per-capita targets for parkland are met and that existing and planned parkland facilities are sufficient to meet the needs of projected residential populations.

7.3.2.3 That all parks shall be located and oriented to be:

- a. In a central location in the community to be served in order to act as a focal point for the community;
- b. Uninterrupted by major physical barriers, such as rail lines, arterial and collector streets, and other physical barriers that restrict access;
- c. Accessible by transit, bicycle, on foot and by car;
- d. Highly visible with prominent public street frontage (50% of the park perimeter) to enhance passive surveillance;
- e. Connected to other parks, open spaces and natural features to create an interconnected network of parks and open spaces.

## EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

## Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 - Page 13

7.3.2.4 To design parks and open spaces to:

- a. Accommodate a diverse range of both passive and active recreational activities, and have flexibility to accommodate new uses or interests;
- b. Cater to a broad range of users by providing space and facilities that support a range of activities;
- c. Encourage healthy living through the provision of a variety of recreational facilities, ranging from sports fields to outdoor fitness areas and playgrounds;
- d. To reflect the diverse cultures in Vaughan by providing for unique activities and facilities that reflect the needs of various cultural and ethnic groups.
- 7.3.2.7 Where buildings or structures that support the planned function of parks and open spaces are proposed within parks and open spaces, they should be sited and designed to:
  - a. Be a positive, attractive, sensitive and integrated element;
  - b. Enhance, protect and restore existing vegetation and natural heritage features;
  - c. Incorporate public amenities, including public art, and enhance the user experience of these areas;
  - d. Enhance open space linkages, public access, visibility and effective use of the park or open space.
- 7.3.2.8 Where development is proposed adjacent to parks and open spaces it shall:
  - a. Be sited and designed to minimize rear lotting and adequately limit the impact of shadows on the park or open space;
  - b. Be oriented to maximize public access and views to such spaces, where appropriate;
  - c. Present a primary and interactive façade to the park or open space;
  - d. Provide for casual overlook thereby increasing the passive surveillance and safety of the park or open space.

## Provincial and Regional Context

NMRP is located east of Keele Street, between Teston Road to the south and Kirby Road to the north. The park is located within the ORM Conservation Plan Settlement Area Boundary, with the eastern portion of the site flanked by a Natural Heritage Network Core Feature (forested area). The park is bounded to the north by an existing low-density residential neighbourhood and to the south by the decommissioned Keele Valley Landfill, which is currently maintained by the City of Toronto. A location map and regional context map is appended as Attachment 2.

The VOP 2010 identifies the Natural Heritage Network as an interconnected system of natural features and the functions they perform. It identifies unbuilt areas within the network as Core Features or Enhancement Areas, consistent with the Watershed Plans for the Don and Humber Rivers developed by the Toronto and Region Conservation Authority (TRCA), and also includes lands identified by the Provincial Greenbelt and Oak Ridges Moraine (ORM) with specific policies provided for these areas consistent with Provincial Plans and York Region policies. As such, the NMRP falls primarily under the regulatory requirements of the ORM Conservation Plan, specifically within the Settlement Area land designation boundary and forms part of the Don River Watershed. The purpose of Settlement Area is to focus and contain urban growth through the application of multiple principles identified in Section 18 of the ORM Conservation Plan. As identified in Section 18, all uses permitted by the applicable official plan are permitted, subject to the compliance to provisions of other Subsections identified in the ORM Conservation Plan.

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

## Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 - Page 14

The following specific VOP 2010 policies related to the Natural Heritage Network are noted within the context of planning for NMRP:

- 1.2.3.1. To protect and enhance the Natural Heritage Network as an interconnected system of natural features and the functions they perform,
  - a. restricting development or site alteration in accordance with the policies of this Plan within the components of the Natural Heritage Network.
  - b. seeking opportunities to expand and better link the Natural Heritage Network;
  - c. seeking the dedication of Core Features and their associated minimum vegetation protection zones through the development approval process to an appropriate public agency at no public expense; and
  - d. securing new natural and open space linkages for improved connectivity of the Natural Heritage Network through the development approvals process, conservation easements, donations or purchases.

## Block 27 Secondary Plan

In January 2015, the Policy Planning Department launched the Secondary Plan process for Block 27 located west of Keele Street, directly across from NMRP. The secondary plan process will establish a framework that will contain policies and mapping that will identify within the VOP 2010 more detailed direction on land use, natural heritage, community design and transportation. This framework will provide direction for the new community in Block 27 and lands associated with NMRP. The purpose of the Block 27 process is to develop a Secondary Plan for the Block 27 New Community Area in order to guide the Block's growth and development to the year 2031, for incorporation into Volume 2 of the VOP 2010. Due to the significance of NMRP and its proximity to Block 27, the park will play an important role in the planning process for the new community and will provide an important community amenity. It also provides significant opportunities related to the potential sale of a portion of the PPP lands for development purposes. Through this process, the City can assess the potential opportunities arising from a re-designation from "Park" to "Residential" or "Commercial Mixed Use" through a comprehensive Secondary Plan study that involves the input of local residents, the development community and interested stakeholders.

The goal of the study is to prepare a Secondary Plan, which will result in a complete community with a mix of uses and densities that meet the minimum requirements set out in the Growth Plan and York Region Official Plan and that prioritizes people, sustainability and livability with highquality urban design.

Part of the Scope of work being undertaken for Block 27 includes examination for the potential of a GO Station/Mobility Hub along the existing north-south rail line, along the easterly part of the Block, across from the proposed NMRP. It is expected that the station would be within walking distance of the park.

The study will be conducted in four phases and is projected for completion by November 2016, with Council adoption of the Secondary Plan. Phase 1 of the Plan is the Background Study & Reporting Stage (January to May 2015), Phase 2: Plan Development and Process (January to October 2015) Phase 3: Preparation and Refinement of the Draft Secondary Plan (November 2015 to March 2016), and Phase 4: The Approvals Process (up to November 2016). The study is currently at the end of Phase 1. This provides a timely opportunity to integrate the Master Plan for the park with Secondary Plan process for the adjacent Block 27 area.

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015**

### Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 – Page 15

### North Vaughan New Communities Transportation Master Plan

In April 2015, Council endorsed Staff's recommendation that HDR Corporation be retained to provide the necessary transportation planning, engineering and project management services to complete the North Vaughan and New Communities Transportation Master Plan (NVNCTMP). The NVNCTMP will define policies, programs and infrastructure required to meet the City's mobility needs in the North Vaughan Area and provide a context for transportation decisions. The objective of this plan is to look at both internal and external factors that contribute to achieving sustainable transportation for residents and businesses while ensuring recommendations of the plan address needs ranging from immediate to future growth.

The Primary Study Area for NVNCTMP is approximately 6,575 hectares, bound by King-Vaughan Road to the north, Highway 27 to the west, Teston Road to the south and Bathurst Street to the east. Working alongside with consultants for Block 27 and Block 41 Secondary Plans, the NVNCTMP will address the Secondary Plan requirements for these blocks, considering the development of the internal transportation networks in these blocks and their connectivity to the external transportation networks. As part of the broader transportation strategy, NVNCTMP will also look at infrastructure needs in support of the establishment of a potential GO station (in Block 27) in accordance with the policies of the Metrolinx "Mobility Hub Guidelines".

### **Recommended Next Steps:**

That the PPP lands along the Keele Street frontage of NMRP be added to the Block 27 Secondary Planning process and that scope of work and funding allocation for this project and supporting studies be amended for this purpose.

## 4.0 Case Study Scenario - Downsview Park

Downsview Park provides a case study wherein land is sold for private development in order to support the advancement of park development, similar to what is contemplated to advance the development of NMRP, although at a much larger scale.

## Location

Downsview Park is a 231 hectares (572 acres) site, located within the North York District of the City of Toronto. It is roughly bordered by Sheppard Avenue to the north, Allen Road to the east, Wilson Avenue to the south, and Keele Street to the west.

#### **Historical Context**

In 1929, the de Havilland Aircraft Company Ltd. (now part of Bombardier Inc.) established a manufacturing facility, a hangar, and a runway at the site that is now Downsview Park. In 1947, the Royal Canadian Air Force acquired the surrounding properties and established an air base at this location. In 1969, the name of the air base was changed to Canadian Forces Base (CFB) Toronto (Downsview).

In 1994, the Federal government announced the closing of CFB Toronto (Downsview) for the purpose of establishing a large urban park on the property. CFB Toronto (Downsview) was closed in 1996 and Parc Downsview Park Inc., a subsidiary of the Canada Lands Company Ltd. – a federal Crown corporation charged with acquiring and developing surplus lands owned by the federal government – was established in 1999 by the Federal government to guide the strategic direction of Downsview Park. In 2003, Parc Downsview Park Inc. became a federal Crown corporation, gaining full ownership of the property by 2006. In 2012, the federal government amalgamated Parc Downsview Park Inc. with the Canada Lands Company Ltd.

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

### Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 - Page 16

#### Initial Development of Downsview Park

The initial development of Downsview Park was slow moving. This is likely the result of the Federal government's requirement that Downsview Park would be self-financing. In addition, Parc Downsview Park Inc. did not gain full ownership of the property and borrowing authority until 2006, which also likely contributed to this delay.

Downsview Park was eventually opened for public use in 2012. The park includes large open spaces for passive recreation uses. Approximately 70,000 trees have been planted, as well as other soft landscaping features. Other passive features include but are not limited to the Circuit Path, the Festival Terrance, seating and a boardwalk around a storm-water lake, and a cleared meadow overlooking the lake.

The park also maintains many of the previously existing buildings, re-purposed on the property for more active recreation uses. This includes the Downsview Park Sports Centre, consisting of a range of multi-purpose sports facilities, both repurposed and new. The Hangar, owned and operated by Downsview Park, is a 485,000 square-foot facility re-purposed to include four indoor soccer fields, three outdoor soccer fields (one domed for winter use), two indoor beach volleyball courts, and an indoor ball hockey court. The Hangar also includes The Grill restaurant. In addition to The Hangar, Downsview Park Sports Centre also comprises facilities for the HoopDome, Volley Ball Canada, the National Squash Academy, the Athletic Training Professionals, True North Climbing, Four One Six Skatepark, GrandPrix Kartways, and the Premier Elite Athletes Collegiate. Leasing arrangements with these organizations and others provide funds to operate and maintain the park. New facilities such as Maple Leaf Sports and Entertainment's Toronto FC Academy and Training Facility and Buckingham Sport's Chesswood Arena, are designed, built, operated and maintained by private companies, with a long-term leasing arrangement with Canada Lands Company Ltd. for the use of the land.

A range of programming and events take place throughout the year in both the outdoor and indoor features of the park, which also provide an additional source of funding for the operations and maintenance of the park.

#### **Downsview Park Master Plan**

Downsview Park is still very much in its development stage. As noted, the park consists mainly of large open fields and a significant amount of potential still exits for the development of the park. In order to realize that potential, Downsview Park is developing five neighborhoods in accordance with the overall Park Master Plan to fund the park development and long-term operations and maintenance. The five planned neighbourhood developments include Stanley Greene, William Baker, Sheppard, Chesswood, and Allen. A copy of the Park Master Plan for Downsview Park is appended as Attachment 3.

Stanley Greene 25.5 hectares (63 acres), is the first neighbourhood to be developed and will include 1356 residential units that will range in housing type. This neighbourhood will include parks within the neighbourhood as well as connections to Downsview Park proper. The servicing for this neighbourhood is almost complete.

William Baker 25.1 hectares (62 acres), Sheppard 28.3 hectares (70 acres), and Allen 16.2 hectares (40 acres), will also consist primarily of residential uses (approximately 5900 residential units in total), but will also maintain some non-residential uses. Chesswood 18.6 hectares (46 acres) will only maintain non-residential uses and will look to develop a Downsview Aerospace Hub, anchored by the establishment of the Downsview Park Aerospace Campus for Centennial College.

### **EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015**

## Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 - Page 17

#### **Downsview Park Financial Strategy**

As previously noted, it is a requirement that Downsview Park is self-financing. This includes the development, operations, and maintenance of the park. Based on information contained in Canada Lands Company Limited Corporate Plan Summary (2014-2015 to 2018-2019), several revenue sources exist for these purposes.

Over this five year time period, revenue from real estate sales is projected to equate to \$188.4M. This is based on the low risk sale of the five neighbourhoods identified above for mixed use (mainly residential) development. Other revenue sources over this same time period include rental revenue (\$34.3M), sports and facility revenue (\$17.4M), program and event revenue (\$5.9M), and attractions, food, and beverage revenue (\$2.7M). Total revenue for the five year time period is projected at \$248.7 M, which exceeds projected expenses of \$219.8 M by \$28.9M.

#### **Recommended Next Steps:**

That a detailed Park Master Plan be prepared to generate a design framework and implementation strategy to guide the future development of and to inform the Block 27 Secondary Plan process and articulation of options for the strategic development and potential sale of a portion of parkland along the Keele Street frontage.

That the concept of a fully sustainable funding model for park design, capital development and operations be included for further review as part of the scope of work of the Parks Master Plan in effort to reduce the long-term financial implications associated with ongoing park operations and maintenance.

#### 5.0 Parks Development Context

In September 2015, Council endorsed moving forward with Phase 1 park development, with the goal of meeting the community's desire to open NMRP as quickly as possible for public use. In April 2015, capital funding for Phase 1 was approved. The scope of work for Phase 1 development includes:

- Double artificial turf field complex with lighting
- Washroom/changeroom building (in partnership with the Vaughan Soccer Club)
- Temporary driveway and parking
- Trail development
- Signage, site furnishings and landscape planting

To date, Staff have been preparing Phase 1 park development plans and have met with project stakeholders including Vaughan Cares and the Vaughan Soccer Club to discuss their interest and involvement in the project. Staff will continue to meet with stakeholders as the project develops.

A concept plan of the proposed Phase 1 work area is appended as Attachment 4. The location of the proposed double artificial turf field complex is consistent with the NMRP Vision, which proposed the development of active sports facilities along the northern park area. The location will also allow the development of permanent facilities at this area of the park, which will not conflict with future park planning or development options moving forward.

The high-level schedule for Phase 1 development is included in the following section to outline anticipated timing of planning, procurement and construction, with the goal of having Phase 1 works completed and opened for use as quickly as possible.

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

## Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 - Page 18

### **Recommended Next Steps:**

That Phase 1 design and implementation plans continue to be advanced in effort to open the park for public use as quickly as possible and that a comprehensive communications plan be prepared to generate awareness and City-wide interest of NMRP.

### 1.0 Next Steps and Action Plan

Development of NMRP presents a great opportunity to establish a signature park for the City of Vaughan. The park has physical and ecological qualities that make it unique, attractive and programmable. In order to ensure that the NMRP Vision is realized, it is important to coordinate all processes of park planning and development that are running in parallel.

### **Recommended Next Steps**

- 1. That the current **balanced approach** of the NMRP Park Vision continue to be used as a foundation to guide Phase 1 work and park planning, design, development and programming.
  - Balanced approach aligns with community input and ATMP objectives
  - The Vision is being followed for Phase 1 park development
- 2. That *alternative approaches* for funding *and partnership opportunities* be explored as implementation of the NMRP plan begins and as future development plans emerge.
  - Partnership opportunities are currently being explored with the Vaughan Soccer Club and with Vaughan Cares
  - Additional partnership/sponsorship/alternative funding opportunities will be explored as the project moves forward within the context of the Park Vision and Master Plan
- 3. That Staff further explore opportunities associated with the *value-added sale or strategic positioning* of a portion of the PPP lands identified along the Keele Street frontage in the context of the current Secondary Planning process currently underway for Block 27, for the purposes of creating opportunities and generating potential for sufficient funding to advance development of NMRP.
  - Options and detail regarding opportunities and constraints will be explored through the proposed Park Master Plan process
  - Pending approval could be initiated in Q3 2015
- 4. That the *PPP lands* along the Keele Street frontage of NMRP be *added to the Block* 27 *Secondary Planning process* and that scope of work and funding allocation for this project and supporting studies be amended for this purpose.
  - Planning and transportation studies are currently underway or in the process of starting
  - Pending approval could be initiated Q3 2015
- 5. That a *detailed Park Master Plan* be prepared to generate a design framework and implementation strategy to guide the future development of and to inform the Block 27 Secondary Plan process and articulation of options for the strategic development and potential sale of a portion of parkland along the Keele Street frontage.
  - Master Plan important to detailing more precise location of park facilities, parking, driveways, future development areas
  - Pending approval could be initiated Q3 2015

## EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

## Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 - Page 19

- 6. That the concept of *a fully sustainable funding model for park design, capital development and operations* be included for further review as part of the scope of work of the Parks Master Plan in effort to reduce the long-term financial implications associated with on-going park operations and maintenance.
  - O&M costs associated with ultimate build-out of the park have the potential to be significant
  - Opportunities exist for the creative use of sustainable features in the park (i.e. use of solar power, storm water collection and re-use) to reduce long-term costs
  - Partnership opportunities and revenue generating opportunities can be explored to reduce O&M costs or provide revenue to off-set costs
- 7. That **Phase 1 design and implementation** plans continue to be advanced in effort to open the park for public use as quickly as possible and that a comprehensive **communications plan** be prepared to generate awareness and interest of NMRP.
  - Phase 1 concept design and discussion with stakeholders is already in progress
  - Developing a communications plan could be initiated Q3 2015

## Action Plan

A coordinated approach to the delivery and implementation of NMRP related projects is important to ensure alignment with the Park Vision. The following major tasks/actions, including identified Council decision points/status reports, have been identified with a summary schedule provided in Attachment 5.

- Phase 1 Preliminary Design, Stakeholder Engagement, and RFP for Phase 1 Detailed Design (Q4 2014 to Q3 2015)
- Block 27 Secondary Planning Process (Q1 2015 to Q4 2016)
- Transport Master Plan Process (Q1 2015 to Q2 2017)
   \*Q3 2015 COUNCIL REPORT: Status Update and Phase 1 RFP Award
- RFP for Park Master Plan (Q3 2015 to Q4 2015)

\*Q4 2015 COUNCIL REPORT: Park Master Plan RFP Award

- Phase 1 Stakeholder/Community Engagement and Detailed Design (Q3 2015 to Q3 2016)
- Phase 1 Construction Procurement (Q2 2016 to Q3 2016)
   \*Q3 2016 COUNCIL REPORT: Status Update and Construction Contract Award
- Park Master Plan Process (Q4 2015 to Q4 2016)
- Phase 1 Ground-Breaking and Construction (Q3 2016 to Q3 2017)
  - \*Q4 2016 COUNCIL REPORT: Status Update, Approval of Park Master Plan, and completion of Block 27 Secondary Plan
- Sale of Parkland Options Report Process (Q1 2017 to Q3 2017)
   \*Q2 2017 COUNCIL REPORT: Status Update, completion of Transportation Master Plan
- Phase 1 Ribbon-Cutting and Park open for Public Use (Q3 2017)
   \*Q3 2017 COUNCIL REPORT: Status Update, Recommendation and Approval for Parkland Sale
- Phase 2 Design and Stakeholder Engagement (Q2 2017 to Q1 2018)
   \*Q1 2018 COUNCIL REPORT: Status Update and Approval of Phase 2 construction
- Phase 2 Construction RFP, Bid and Award process (Q1 2018 onwards)

### EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

## Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 – Page 20

## Relationship to Vaughan Vision 2020 / Strategic Plan

This report is consistent with the priorities previously set by Council in the Vaughan Vision 2020/Strategic Plan and the necessary resources have been allocated and approved. Conducting a review of alternative funding and service delivery models for the development and operation of NMRP supports the City's commitment to enhancing natural and built environments through efficient use of resources, managing corporate assets through continuous assessment of infrastructure requirements, pursues excellence in service delivery and supports the goal of enhancing community health, safety and wellness through design and program opportunities. Taking steps to achieving the NMRP plan demonstrates Council's commitment to providing service excellence to citizens.

### **Regional Implications**

Implementation of the NMRP plan will require York Region involvement and approval related to Block 27 Secondary Plan process location of the proposed driveway entrance along Keele Street, as well as input and approvals associated with size servicing.

### Conclusion

This report has underscored the importance of continuing to implement the balanced approach to park development as outlined in the NMRP Park Vision and in accordance with the strategic goals and objectives of the City's ATMP.

Supplementary information relating to the Financial Advisory Review Completed by Grant Thornton in September 2014 has been provided and various financial approaches to the advancement of NMRP have been provided. Further exploration of Option 3: Strategic Positioning and Potential Value-Added Sale of Lands is recommended, based on the case study example of Downsview Park wherein land is sold to advance the development and operations of the park.

This report has also recommends the completion of a Park Master Plan for NMRP and the adoption of the Recommended Next Steps and Action Plan in order ensure a coordinated approach to guide the detailed planning and development of NMRP.

#### **Attachments**

- 1. North Maple Regional Park Vision Plan, January 2013
- 2. Regional Context Map
- 3. Case Study Scenario: Downsview Park Master Plan
- 4. North Maple Regional Park Phase 1 Work Plan
- 5. North Maple Regional Park Related Initiatives Process Chart

#### Report prepared by:

Jamie Bronsema, Director of Parks Development, Ext. 8858 Lloyd Noronha, Director of Development Finance & Investments, Ext. 8271 Roy McQuillin, Acting Director of Policy Planning, Ext. 8211 Gerardo Paez Alonso, VMC Project Manager, Parks Development, Ext. 8195 Michael Habib, Sr. Planner, Parks Development, Ext. 8092 Brianne Clace, Senior Analyst, Development Finance & Investments, Ext. 8284 Paul Salerno, Senior Manager of Real Estate, Ext. 8473 Adam Payler, AMCTO Municipal Management Intern, Ext. 3621

## EXTRACT FROM COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES OF JUNE 23, 2015

### Item 13, Finance Report No. 10 - Page 21

(A copy of the attachments referred to in the foregoing have been forwarded to each Member of Council and a copy thereof is also on file in the office of the City Clerk.)

Regional Councillor Di Biase declared an interest in the foregoing matter as his children have inherited property in Block 27, which forms part of the subject lands, and was not present when the matter was under consideration.