

Scenic Acres Position Paper – Scenic Acres Park

1. Executive Summary

Scenic Acres does not believe the best interests of Calgary are served locating a regional school centrally within a mature community, encroaching significantly on established residential area and testing the limits of existing road infrastructure. There was a planned public school for the site in the early 1980's to service local residents and it would have been welcomed at that time. However, over the last 30 years, this neighbourhood park has become a cherished asset entrenched within the Community as an actively used facility, fully optimized for organized regional sports programs and a variety of local recreational activities. Both the City and Scenic Acres residents have and continue to invest financially in its maintenance and betterment. There are also more logical sites available for a regional school that have access to major road infrastructure and minimize infringement on residential development. There are sites available in new communities where a regional school could far better integrate into the fabric of evolving dynamics in those areas.

We have worked as a Community not just to oppose development in this park but to collaboratively engage with elected officials and associated administrations to find a suitable alternative in order to avoid or minimize delays. Based on our discussions with Alberta Infrastructure and a commitment by City Planning to accelerate changes associated with land selection if that were to occur, the extent of the delay period is in question and would need to be determined. While the activity to re-address and properly plan may result in some construction delay, its length is immaterial relative to the larger and longer term decision to invest in a regional facility placed both optimally and permanently at an appropriate site that best serves its users as well as preserves the open space uses already optimized at Scenic Acres Park for the benefit of communities in Calgary's northwest.

The citizens of Calgary residing in Scenic Acres, as represented by the Scenic Acres Community Association (SACA), elected MLA (Sandra Jansen) and elected Ward 1 Councillor (Ward Sutherland) do not believe the "best interests of the citizens of Calgary" are served locating a regional school centrally within a mature community, encroaching significantly on established residential area and testing the limits of existing road infrastructure.

Facts

The Conseil Scolaire FrancoSud ("FrancoSud" or "CSFS") is a relatively new school board, established by a merger of two Francophone boards in 2013, that wishes to locate a regional Francophone school for 400 students on an existing park within the Scenic Acres community, at 220 Scenic Acres Drive NW.

The proposed site was created in 1983 as an "MSR" (joint municipal and school) site having a "PE" (public park, school and recreation) designation. This site was redistricted in 2008 as "S-SPR" (school, park and community reserve).

In 2005, following a request from the Calgary Board of Education (CBE), the joint owner of the park site with the City of Calgary, the Province of Alberta approved the transfer of the site to the City of Calgary for \$1.00. The approval of the Province was required as the CBE had declared the site as "surplus" to the school board's needs. The subsequent mandatory statutory transfer to the sole ownership of the City never occurred. As the transfer did not occur, the mandatory change in designation from an MSR site to an "MR" (municipal) site also did not occur.

In March 2013, without further consultation, the CBE and the City of Calgary used the 2005 approval to support the joint transfer of the ownership of the park site to the City and the FrancoSud's predecessor school boards.

The City of Calgary approved parks planning documents recognize the site as a "manicured park" (1994) and as "major open space" (2002).

The City of Calgary and the three Calgary school boards (the CBE, the Calgary Separate School Board (CSSB) and the FrancoSud) jointly manage reserve sites through two "joint use" agreements (JUAs) and a Joint Use Co-Ordinating Committee (JUCC), with the overriding principle being the management of such lands in the "best interests of the citizens of Calgary". Such reserve lands are held "on behalf of the citizens of Calgary subject to the legislative control and authority of the Government ... of Alberta". The use of reserve lands are to be prioritized with neighbourhood needs being given the highest priority; community needs a second tier; and with regional needs being given the third level of consideration.

What Would Satisfy The Community?

- The school construction project in SA Park should be halted and alternative sites considered using objective criteria, including:
 - The prioritization provisions of the Calgary Municipal Development Plan (2009; section 2.3.5) and the JUAs (i.e. prioritization – neighbourhood first; community second; regional third).
 - Objective planning criteria
 - Proximity to roadways
 - Existing site use
 - Site context
 - Available parking and site access
 - Opportunities for facility sharing with existing site users (existing schools, community facilities, etc.)
 - Application of the principles for site selection found in the JUAs, including
 - Consideration of the overall "benefit of the citizens of Calgary"
 - Following good planning principles and practices
 - "optimizing" a substantial component of the future parks and recreation needs in conjunction with school facility needs
 - Determine a "strategy for the over-all requirements of educational and recreational facilities, on a city-wide basis, preparatory to the detailed planning of any single area"
 - Review the historic planning documents for the park site, to gain insight on past planning considerations and reports affecting the site, including the following:
 - Urban Parks Master Plan (1994)
 - Open Space Plan (2002)
 - East Scenic Acres ASP (1990; unapproved)
 - 1981/1983 outline plan for the subdivision (City file 81-Y-265/9NW; Calgary Planning Commission - 1981 Aug 20 and 1983 Aug 3)
- FrancoSud's need for a school in northwest Calgary should be met on a timely basis at a site best suited for a regional elementary school. The best interests of FrancoSud parents and students, and the citizens of Calgary may be jointly met by a regional needs-focused site selection.
- The regional school should not be located on any site with similar characteristics to SA Park and community consultation lacking in the case of Scenic Acres should take place for any new site, with associated full transparency and disclosure.

Important Dates

- August 22, 1983 - Park site created by subdivision and placed in name of City of Calgary and CBE
- 2000 – Creation of two Francophone school boards in southern Alberta
- December 19, 2005 – Ministerial consent provided to CBE to approve the transfer of 9 "surplus" sites to the City of Calgary for \$1 / site; Scenic Acres Park was included in this list
- 2011 – Province of Alberta announce school modernization projects; \$500 million towards 50 new schools and another 70 modernization projections; total investments of over \$2.0 billion
- November 2011 – Report to Calgary City Council recommending a new JUA with two Francophone school boards; accompanying report states that 4 existing "vacant school sites" to be made "MSR" to be available for construction of new schools when funding is available (sites not identified)
- 2012 – Petition for and approval of local improvement tax on all residents for community funds to maintain and enhance community assets, including Scenic Acres Park
- February 24, 2012 – New JUA signed between two Francophone school boards and the City of Calgary; no reference is made to specific vacant or surplus sites within the agreement; agreement contemplates first priority for sites would be sites "surplus" to CBE or CSSB
- March 15, 2013 – Scenic Acres Park site transferred by City of Calgary and CBE to City of Calgary and two Francophone school boards
- August 30, 2013 – Merger of two Francophone school boards to create FrancoSud
- February 10, 2014 – Province of Alberta and FrancoSud announce new Francophone school in Scenic Acres
- March, 2014 – "Save Our Park Committee" (SOPC) ad hoc committee of concerned residents established with Scenic Acres Community Association (SACA) endorsement and active leadership
- April 26 & 27, 2014 – SOPC hosts Open House to gauge Community response to proposal
- May 21, 2014 – Open House Scenic Acres Community meeting hosted by MLA Sandra Jansen to discuss FrancoSud proposal
- May 30, 2014 – SACA formal motion to have representation on and liaise with the SOPC
- June 30, 2014 – JUCC reviews RKP Consulting summary of 9 "potential sites", with most of these sites being the subject of the 2005 ministerial consent
- July 2, 2014 – Closed meeting involving FrancoSud, City of Calgary, JUCC, Alberta Infrastructure, SACA Board and SOP Committee leaders
- August 28, 2014 – Closed meeting with same parties

2. Red Flags Creating Questions and Concerns

- What does it mean when a site is declared as "surplus" to a school board's needs? The *Municipal Government Act* (section 672) suggests that, following Provincial consent, such lands revert to municipal use.
- The new FrancoSud-City of Calgary JUA implies that "surplus" sites sit awaiting "repurposing" to once again become a school use site. This view seems contrary to the MGA.
- With respect to the potential school site evaluation at JUCC in June 2014, why was the review limited to 9 "surplused" sites? What if these sites were not properly managed by the City, pursuant to the MGA? The impression is that the JUCC and FrancoSud undertook cursory consideration of other potential sites with the overriding issue being delay to the potential construction commencement.
- The JUCC stated they would objectively re-assess potential school sites. Based on their own admission, they did not perform this assessment thoroughly.
- Review of the Municipal Government Act (MGA), Joint Use Agreement (JUA), Calgary Municipal Plan (2009) and Calgary Parks "Open Space" policy (2002) highlight that the City of Calgary too has not been compliant with many of its own requirements. There is no approved Area Structure Plan (ASP) as a baseline and therefore no "Community Needs Assessment" completed and no defined school envelope for Scenic Acres Park*. The draft Calgary ASP for "East Scenic Acres" from 1990 stated the Park would not be a regional school location.
- The City and its Parks branch have invested in SA Park since 2005 as if it had been correctly re-classified as Municipal Reserve (MR). It is assumed, based on the June, 2014 JUCC review that a similar failure to reclassify may be repeated for all the other 8 sites included in the 2005 ministerial approval.
- There has been no consultation through the years with the Scenic Acres Community Association (SACA) or any other community association regarding "surplus" lands.

* Multiple efforts have been made by SA over a period of six months to discover if a school envelope ever existed. On August 28th, SA was advised an envelope was in existence in 1983.

3. Background

(a) Save Our Park Initiative (SOP)

The Save Our Park (SOP) initiative was formed in response to widespread community opposition to the surprise announcement of a regional school being constructed in the Community's fully developed recreational facility. The Honourable Sandra Jansen has advocated preservation of Scenic Acres (SA) Park and requested a halt of the proposed development until the viability of alternate sites is properly examined. Councillor Ward Sutherland has pushed for a solution and offered to ensure that the permitting process will meet CSFS' timeline. He has strongly supported residential engagement in the planning process.

(b) Scenic Acres Community Association (SACA) Representing the Community

SACA advocates that the school construction project in SA Park should be halted and the optimal site determined. This substantial project is apparently driven by perceived construction timelines; not an objective site review. FrancoSud's (CSFS) need for a school in Northwest Calgary should be met on a timely basis at a site best suited for a regional elementary school. The best interests of FrancoSud parents and students, and the citizens of Calgary are optimized by regional needs-focused site selection. The regional school should not be located on any site with similar characteristics to SA Park and community consultation lacking in our case must also take place with full transparency.

Scenic Acres Park is fully developed and heavily used year round for organized sports and recreational activities both by Scenic Acres residents and the public at large. A Scenic Acres community petition resulted in a 2012 City special tax bylaw for a levy of \$60 per household to finance enhanced green space care; SA Park is a key community green space centrally located within the community. Local elementary school needs are satisfied through Scenic Acres School and Monsignor E. L. Doyle; neither operates at capacity.

CBE had an option to build an elementary school at this location but opted for an alternate site within Scenic Acres. The land was declared surplus and transferred to the City of Calgary in December 2005 by Ministry order; CSFS was given joint title to SA Park by the City in 2013; the community was not advised. In February 2014 then Premier Alison Redford announced that a Francophone regional elementary school would be constructed in Scenic Acres. The planned school will accommodate 400 students; we understand seven or eight reside in Scenic Acres.

4. Business Planning

The established procedures of the Joint Use Agreement (JUA) are being misapplied and/or not being fully considered in context of this land situation. Scenic Acres believes there is no precedent set by engaging communities in school planning – it only challenges the Boards to sharpen existing capital planning methods and to apply the JUA correctly and holistically, considering school, stakeholder and demographic dynamics in the context of full land optimization. Robust capital plans and as a matter of fact, all business plans should leverage the ideas and views of all stakeholders at the frontend of the process in order to augment decision making and streamline execution. In this context, the JUA framework and governance remains unchanged.

Both intra and inter community changes over time may impact the need for a property to be used for its original intended purpose. Scenic Acres residents who have lived in the community for decades are not only aware of school site designations but also are aware of changing dynamics and needs of a mature community. A refreshed, regular review procedure including community input makes good business sense – any organization with real estate holdings regularly assesses their portfolio and must decide whether to invest, divest, swap, etc. based on changing dynamics. For any government authority to retain and not appropriately manage or develop its holdings without a definitive plan Retaining is a disservice to the citizens of that community. The Scenic Acres Park site should have been designated a park reserve years ago and especially in context of the decision by the CBE to declare the lands as 'surplus' as approved by the Province in 2005.

5. Selection Process

This has not been a transparent process. Eight potential alternate sites apart from SA Park were re-assessed by the City's Joint Use Coordinating Committee (JUCC) in June 2014. We are advised that some sites have characteristics that would satisfy regional school requirements and regional criteria were only added to the assessment process subsequent to the expressed concerns of Scenic Acres. CSFS has confirmed that its principal rationale for not considering alternate sites is the potential delays in the school's completion. Notwithstanding our request for a pause to allow for a thorough review process, considerable effort has gone into development plans for construction on SA Park and less effort given to finding the appropriate location for the regional Francophone school.

It should also be noted that the CBE provided no additional sites for this re-assessment process while the CCSD provided two additional sites. Notwithstanding that this regional school is to service the Northwest quadrant of the City, the two school boards have limited CSFS access from many other sites that could better service their regional requirements. Despite the provisions within the two JUAs, there is no integrated planning and cooperation among the three school boards. There is no consideration of community demographics or regional requirements. One analogy to use in this situation could be taken from the relative underperformance of sports leagues where established teams provide only their less valued players for draft selection by an expansion team.

Below are the summary selection criteria as presented by the City Planning department. You will note there are six criteria that are technical/operational nature. The timeline criterion stands – with it not being planning criteria at all. The JUCC and City of Calgary planning staff refused to prioritize these nine sites based on the above criteria or on any other criteria.

ANALYSIS CRITERIA

These 9 sites were then reviewed against the following criteria and representatives of FrancoSud visited each site.

CRITERIA	METHOD OF MEASUREMENT
Site must be available to enable the school to open in September 2016	Can site be available for construction by no later than January 2015
Location relative to FrancoSud student catchment area.	Locate on map of catchment area of existing Terre de Juenes Ecole
Ability of School Building Envelope to accommodate a 400 student school including topographical conditions	Size and topography will accommodate a school footprint similar to school facility currently proposed for 220 Scenic Acres Drive NW
Impact of elimination of or adjustment to recreational facilities currently located on the JUS.	List of impacted facilities. Was facility only considered temporary. Number of bookings of any facilities eliminated. Comment on ease/cost of replacement of eliminated facilities.
Status of roads adjacent to School Building Envelope including number/ length of road frontage adjacent to School Building Envelope.	Status of adjacent roads. Number of road frontages. Length of road frontages
Road categories and distance from regional transportation facility e.g. Country Hills Blvd, Nose Hill Drive etc. to School Building Envelope	Distance from regional road to SBE Standard of roads used.
Land uses adjacent to and across the road from the School Building Envelope	List of number and type of adjacent uses

6. Site Re-Assessment Not Thorough

The JUCC did not perform a full re-assessment.

The following further considerations regarding site selection have been brought to the Community's attention:

1. Detailed evaluation of the site infrastructure services or site conditions for most or all alternate sites have not occurred and therefore could not determine if alternate sites could be made available for a January 2015 construction start.
2. Location of alternate sites within the Francophone School District (FSD) student catchment area.
3. Impediments to the efficient utilization of the School Building Envelope must be considered and identified on alternate sites. For example, the presence of a natural low that collects water. Such considerations require site testing and more detailed engineering work.
4. Access / frontage to roadways.
5. Proximity to transit. Studies would be required to determine what routes school buses would be able to use to both arrive at, and depart the sites, which in both cases would likely involve travelling further distances than noted within the Community.

6. Context – Proximity of additional playing fields; proximity of single dwellings and other residential.

Community Elaboration On Assessment:

1. The right selection involves locations readily accessible to major road infrastructure providing access/egress required for vehicular traffic with minimal intrusion into established residential areas. Scenic Acres family dwellings would have full and closer-than-normal frontage to the school directly across Scenic Acres Drive.
2. The logical prioritization involves properties within growth areas where school demand is most acute and where the demographic and character of the communities are still evolving.
3. The right assessment includes site selection based on recreational asset usage intensity, promoting optimization of the site. Scenic Acres Park is well known to be highly used and recreational functionality would be compromised.
4. The JUA provides options to acquire land to meet requirements and these options were not pursued by the JUCC. Considering CSFS' regional requirements in the Northwest would be new and impact growing and mature communities alike, logic would suggest a broader spectrum of options should have been considered.

7. Municipal Government Act (MGA)

On December 19 2005, the CBE transferred ownership of SA Park to the City with approval given by then Minister of Infrastructure, Lyle Oberg as per MGA Section 672(1) through a formal directive. The land would therefore have been designated municipal reserve and that action should have triggered no further consideration of a school development (MGA 672 (2), JUA Section 4.6.2). A Municipal Reserve is defined as reserve land for park purposes (Open Space Policy page 96). The City's significant investment in a new sprinkler system subsequent to this transfer with no identified school envelope in consideration demonstrates their investment in the entire Park facility. At the very least, the land title exchange should have triggered action to define a site plan with Community input. While the MGA suggests that City Council could transfer an MR site to a school board under 673(1), this is a simplistic view that ignores the history of the site and the very strict requirements associated with a site being 'surplused'. The actions taken to transfer title in 2013 were not, we submit, within the authority of the City or the CBE.

8. Scenic Acres Area Structure Plan (ASP) Excerpt

There was no formally approved ASP for this 'East' Scenic Acres to use as a baseline. There is a draft plan from 1990 which is outdated and does not reflect the final executed community plan. At the very least, an Area Redevelopment Plan (ARP) could be conducted with the baseline draft ASP as reference. The draft identified 'Scenic Acres' as 'East Scenic Acres' because Tuscany was considered 'West Scenic Acres' (which did get an approved ASP) and therefore, in that context, school requirements considered the larger residential catchment. East Scenic Acres was also scaled back

from a threshold population of 16,000 to 9,500 by upscaling lot sizes. As of 2014, the SA population is under 8,600 and has been trending down.

3.3 Open Space

The configuration of the open space system is conceptual only and may have to be varied at the outline plan stage. However, the following should be provided for:

3.3.1 School Sites and Public Areas

Unless otherwise required by the school boards the location and approximate size of school sites shall be as follows:

(a) Two joint use sites shall be provided, one of roughly 9.7 hectares (28 acres) in the north-central portion of the area, and a 4 hectare (10 acre) site near the southern edge of the community. The larger site will eventually contain a public elementary school, separate elementary school and junior high schools and a possible location for the community hall. The smaller southern site will provide for a public elementary school and playgrounds.

...

8.1 Schools

Three school sites have been provided for in the East Scenic Acres Area Structure Plan. These will be located on the joint use sites as shown on Map 2. The timing of construction of these schools has yet to be determined by the Public and Separate School Boards.

East Scenic Acres has been designated as a busing area for all public school students. The school boards will determine the schools pupils will attend.

8.2 Community and Recreational Facilities

Provision has been made for a wide range of recreational activities in this community. Facilities for active recreation, such as soccer fields, baseball diamonds and playgrounds, will be located on the two joint use sites (tennis courts are already located on the southern joint use site)..."

The two elementary schools and community hall were ultimately constructed in the north-central portion of Scenic Acres. Junior high community requirements were met with schools outside Scenic Acres. Sufficient in-community demand for a third neighbourhood elementary never arose and the southern site was transferred to the City in 2005. This draft ASP is not reflective of the Scenic Acres community life cycle which is currently in a mature state and even if considered, demonstrates that the SA Park site is not designated or appropriate for a regional school. The East Scenic Area Plan was not completed as a result of transportation concerns that were left unaddressed. Significant transportation concerns have been raised as a result of the impact of this regional school development. Scenic Acres thoroughfare traffic intensity has increased over the last five years as a result of the opening of Scenic Acres Link to Stoney Trail, an unplanned interchange from the original Scenic Acres Community plan. This road structure originally included a bus trap and was planned for eventual closure.

School footprint size requirements for public and separate elementary schools are 10 acres and 9.5 acres respectively; regional schools require a larger land allotment. The land title for Lot 19MSR (SA Park) states it is 9.86 acres. With regard to the site, the

proposed school will take up 20% of the total park. However, it will take a significantly higher proportion when considering useable land since SA Park property lines include urban forest, sloped and berm terrain that is unusable. With basketball courts, tennis courts, playground facilities, and a baseball diamond, the open space is significantly compromised for soccer programs and other uses. There is currently 340 hours booked for soccer programs each year in addition to other activities leveraging the open space.

9. Joint Use Agreement (JUA)

(a) Priority Usage

Section 4.7.1 of the 1985 JUA (and MGA Section 2.3.5) outlines use needs for Reserve Lands in priority as firstly; Neighbourhood (elementary school and parks), secondly; Community (junior high school, community park) and thirdly; Regional (high schools). A regional school such as the proposed Francophone school would be classified as third priority for SA Park under these guidelines. As a first priority of use, a fully developed and utilized park already exists at SA Park.

(b) Optimal and Collaborative Planning

Section 3 outlines that planning should be optimized with the JUA (Section 3.1.1 point 1), that good planning principles and practices be used (Section 3.2.1). In Section 4.8 the JUA states all parties will work jointly together for education and recreational facilities in terms of strategy for education requirements. Yet in practice this collaborative effort and governance structure is not practiced. There is little information on how City planners make available locations to the school boards, prioritize sites, use technical criteria in evaluating sites and use other demographic standards; the impression is that the school boards develop their own plans. This fact is particularly acute with the FrancoSud Board, recently formed and relatively puny, who do not have the competencies or resources to make similar site selection determinations. To provide some context to review period time intervals, Section 4.9 directs development responsibility for SR lands to occur within a five year timeframe. In the SA Park situation, the timeframe of dormancy is approximately 30 years. Of course, given that the site was "surplused" in 2005, the lands should now be MR and subject to development by the City of Calgary only.

(c) Open Space Plan Policy 2002

Excerpts from City Park's "Open Space Policy" provide specific directives that were not followed in the context of Scenic Acres and the Park. These delinquencies can be summarized into four key points:

1. An area development plan and community needs assessment should have been completed
2. Public consultation should have been part of the process
3. Consideration of demographic profile should have been part of the analysis
4. There are land review requirements with intervals of 5, 10, 15 years throughout the policy – not 30 years.

The specific sections are highlighted in an appendix at the end of this report.

10. Conclusion

There are 'red flags' that suggest that forging ahead with regional school construction in SA Park solely on the basis of a perceived timeline without further analysis amplifies an already poor decision and would not only create permanent damage to an optimized open space asset but could have cascading effects on other similar projects in Calgary and the Province.

- There are legislative arguments suggesting that the title transfer was not handled correctly;
- There are concerns that the MGA, JUA and Open Space Policy are not being optimized or even that there is compliance.
- There is not a strong foundation of governance, procedure or integrated business practice associated with the policy and decision making.

Overall, there has been no transparency with regards to this project which is contrary to the mandate of all levels of government. Scenic Acres has also had to conduct significant research and effort to develop an understanding of the sequence of events associated with the school decision. Ongoing discussions over the last six months have not been consultative; they have been edicts advising Scenic Acres what will happen. The fact that no one governing body is able to take accountability for this school project should highlight an area of concern and demonstrates the need for review of existing procedures and collaborative efforts.

Finally, Scenic Acres is a stakeholder in this decision; not just the FrancoSud constituents. Scenic Acres needs to be able to have input into this process constructively and not be continually shut out as we have experienced over the last six months. Proactive early community involvement needs to be the minimum standard for any major established community decision.

We respectfully demand that this project be halted and a thorough review be conducted regarding the integrity of the original decision concurrent with an in-depth analysis of the most appropriate site to accommodate the needs of regional school.

Appendix 1 – MGA link<http://www.qp.alberta.ca/documents/acts/m26.pdf>

Appendix 2 – JUA link

<http://www.theridgeonline.ca/citydocs/otherCitiesSurplusSites/City%20of%20Calgary%20JUI.pdf>

Appendix 3 – Open Space Policy Excerpts

Community Needs Assessment (Page 11)

*An area redevelopment plan (ARP) sets comprehensive land use policies for an area within the inner city or established communities and provides for its orderly redevelopment. It is a process that involves extensive public participation. The specific needs for open space of an area within the inner city or established suburbs, as determined by an ARP, should be based on the policies set forth in the Calgary Open Space Plan. **If an ARP has not been revisited in five years or if an area within the inner city or an established community has no ARP, the community needs assessment process (below) and the policies of this plan will be used to ensure that the community's open space needs are met.***

12. Open space shall be planned, developed, and managed in a manner that is fiscally sustainable.

a. In allocating limited funds for open space development and redevelopment within the inner city and established suburbs, the following priorities will be considered:

Restoration (lifecycle or a redesign to meet current needs) should be considered the highest priority since it involves protecting or improving an existing asset (whether constructed or natural);

Acquisition and Development should be the second priority since it involves the creation of a new asset.

The emphasis in open space capital prioritization should be on protecting existing assets before creating new ones.

It is envisioned that the process will be used to develop the program, and hence the facilities and amenities, on all

local, regional and city-wide open space. As outlined in the Parks Business Plan, the process will include:

• **public consultation to assess local needs:**

- *accurate data on current usage and trends;*
- *business analysis of different alternatives;*
- *consistency with our vision, objectives and principles;*
- *access for target groups; and*
- *partnering to leverage funds.*

Further work is required to determine how the guidelines would differ or respond according to the nature of the project. The following seven tasks are a starting point for this work:

1. **Consider the current and anticipated demographic profile.**

2. **Consult with the public.** *Public expectations and demand form part of the basis for the selection of facilities and services at the initial program development stage.*

Open Space Land Use Policies, Established Suburbs (page 25, 26)

1. **All park development/redevelopment within the established suburbs should meet neighbourhood and community park objectives** to provide effective, safe and sustainable open space environments.
2. The City should life cycle/renovate existing neighbourhood and community parks within established suburbs on a priority and opportunity basis, using a community needs assessment process.
3. **When life-cycle work at a recreational facility is needed, any redevelopment should trigger the community needs assessment process** (See Community Needs Assessment page 11). When the facility under review for life cycle is part of a larger park site (e.g., an arena with surrounding sports fields), the entire site should be reviewed as part of the process.

Strategies

1. **Review recreation/parks inventory, housing mix, market information, socio-economic status and the life-cycle stage of the community prior to the planning of any development or redevelopment related to the open space areas and recreational facilities.**
 2. ARPs should determine the community-specific need for open space within the established suburbs on the basis of the policies set forth in this plan. If an ARP has not been revisited in five years or an ARP does not exist for a community, the community needs assessment process (See Community Needs Assessment page 11) will be used to determine the community's open space needs.
-