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Executive Summary

The City of Hamilton is growing and the population is projected to increase to 660,000 by 2031. While the City has made efforts to grow within the current Urban Boundary to meet targets for intensification, a future urban boundary expansion growth area is required to accommodate future growth.

The Elfrida Growth Area Study is intended to develop a future urban vision for these lands should they be required to accommodate growth to the year 2041. The precise boundaries for growth will be confirmed through the Study.

Critical to the approach for Elfrida Growth Area Study is collaboration with stakeholders, landowners, development industry, team members, and the public. An approach to engagement was established through a Public Participation Plan that established the structure for consultation with the community and stakeholders over the course of the Study within the framework of the City of Hamilton’s Public Engagement Charter available at:


Study Area: 1,256 hectares
The Public Consultation Goals established for the Study are as follows:

• To build awareness and understanding of the purpose of the Elfrida Growth Area Study and the provincial goals for intensification;

• To effectively engage all stakeholders in the process of developing the Secondary Plan;

• To generate broad-based support from the community and stakeholders for the Elfrida Growth Area Study;

• To design consultation forums that are conducive to meaningful conversations focused on providing the planning, design and development framework for a compact, transit oriented urban community that effectively uses servicing infrastructure, is well integrated with surrounding agricultural lands and is a model of excellence of a healthy well-built complete community;

• To encourage resident and stakeholder participation and input and to ensure that contributions can be made through a variety of face-to-face and on-line forums; and,

• To evaluate and consider input received, including incorporation into revised/final zoning regulations, as appropriate.

Consultation Events

To date, three consultation events have occurred during the Elfrida Growth Area Study.

#1 Visioning and Design Workshop

The first consultation event was held in June of 2017 and consisted of a number of different sessions to establish a vision and guiding principles for the study area and to develop alternative development options based on three different development programs.

#2 Conceptual Development Options

The second consultation event was in December of 2017 and involved the presentation of the conceptual development options for input for the team to consider when evaluating the options to identify the preferred components that will shape a preferred plan.

#3 Preferred Community Structure Ideas

The third consultation event took place in June 2018 and included a presentation of the process used to evaluate the three conceptual development options and the results of the evaluation, followed by an overview of the draft preferred community structure ideas plan for public and stakeholder comments.

This report is a summary of “What We Heard” from the three public consultation events, as well as the Community Focus Group meetings that occurred prior to the public events.
SECTION 1
WHAT WE HEARD

Community Meeting #1

VISIONING & DESIGN WORKSHOP

June 2017
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A Community Focus Group was assembled to provide guidance, input and feedback to the project team throughout the consultation process and represents a wide range of interests.

The Community Focus Group has 11 members:

John Voortman  
Countrywide Recycling

Mel Switzer  
President of Hamilton Federation of Agriculture

Henry Swierenga  
Ontario Federation of Agriculture

Brianne Comley  
Hamilton-Halton Homebuilders Association

Judy Sykora  
Landowner

Nicholas von Bredow  
Realtor’s Association of Hamilton-Burlington

Don McLean  
Environment Hamilton

Steve Spicer  
Summit Park Developer and Landowner

Drew Spolstra  
Ontario Federation of Agriculture

Mary Nardini  
School Board Trustee

Roy Shuker  
Ontario Federation of Agriculture

The first Community Focus Group Meeting took place on June 13, 2017.

Following introductions of all those in attendance, a presentation provided an overview of the purpose and scope of the study and the purpose and role of the Community Focus Group.

The presentation was followed by questions for a round table discussion with the group.

What are the key opportunities for growth in the Elfrida Planning Area?

What are the key challenges for growth?

What’s most important from your perspective with respect to:

- Design of new communities and neighbourhoods
- Transportation: transit, vehicles, pedestrians, cycling
- Natural features and open spaces
- Heritage and culture
- Servicing
The following questions were asked before the round table discussion:

**Do we know why the Province appealed the matter? I thought it had something to do with the airport.**

Partially. There is a multi-phase hearing associated with the Airport Employment Growth District (AEGD). This is why the land budget work is important because it helps to answer a number of these questions.

**Are other lands being looked at for an urban area expansion?**

No.

**The new Growth Plan has new greenfield density targets. Does that factor into this study?**

We will evaluate it.

**Will a report be prepared that documents input received?**

Each workshop is followed with a “What We Heard” report that contains an event summary and results.

**Is the flyer available electronically, for posting on Facebook?**

It will be circulated after tonight (June 13, 2017).

**Is there a time line for development occurring?**

For the lands to become urban, approximately five years. Three years for draft plan approval, followed by servicing approvals. A phasing plan will also be prepared as part of this study that identifies timing, including provision of infrastructure (and future servicing studies). Agencies will be contacted as part of the study to identify school locations.

**What is the time line for this process? How does this study work alongside other necessary policy studies? What project is completed first?**

We should put a time line together of the ongoing concurrent processes. This process is to establish growth through to 2031, as informed by GRIDS (2006). Current Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) is looking at accommodating growth to 2041, alongside other new Provincial policies with respect to community development, the natural environment, and other matters of Provincial interest.

**Is this a process where others thinking growth should occur elsewhere can consider that decision?**

There are many landowners elsewhere in the City who would prefer to have that growth. GRIDS (2006) identified this location as the preferred location. Elfrida is Council’s direction. The end result of this study would require an Official Plan Amendment, which would be appealable. The original policy adoption in 2009 was also subject to appeal (remains under appeal). The Province has indicated to the City that the urban area expansion was not the problem, but how it was stated in the Official Plan.

**Do these points indicate a development model that looks like Downtown Hamilton?**

Mixed use, compact communities do envision a more integrated form. There are many models and structures that could take form.

**How much employment will be included in Elfrida?**

Part of MCR includes an Employment Lands Review, which will determine if there is any need for additional “production employment” type lands. Consider if there is a role for Elfrida in population-related employment (service sector jobs including offices - though Downtown Hamilton is the preferred location for major offices, community nodes can accommodate additional office space as well).

**When you undertake the new MCR, will you be focusing on Elfrida or might other land areas come into play?**

It depends on the land budget. Intensification estimates and potential, greenfield land requirements will drive that question. Clarification of GRIDS (2006), GRIDS 2, and MCR will be provided at the workshop. We are studying this area.
Round Table Discussion

What are the key opportunities for growth in the Elfrida Planning Area?

New GO Station and light rail transit (LRT). Opportunities for connections to those new lines (especially to new southeast end node). Financing is a challenge.

Transit connections across South Mountain, to airport.

Other nearby neighbourhoods are filling up with housing, having more urban areas can help keep more people in this neighbourhood (aging). Plus new people.

Biking opportunities.

Upper Centennial Parkway is not at capacity, and could be a direct link to the GO Station.

Exciting to build a whole new community from scratch.

We could use more small commercial to mitigate the impact on the residential tax base.

Expanded tax base.

This growth (190,000 more to 2041) will give this City the opportunity to grow into its own. Development Charges alone would be over $1 billion, based on a quick calculation.

Placing growth in one area allows for infrastructure investments to be concentrated in one place.

Zoning to support this more intense development can be accommodated.

Opportunity to implement stormwater management solutions. Increased paving sends more water to an already full Lake Ontario.

Opportunity to create a transit-centred community.

As part of GRIDS 2, all City-wide master plans are being updated to accommodate growth to 2041. There are opportunities to bring changes to those studies.

What are the key challenges for growth in the Elfrida Planning Area?

Need to focus on getting people to their jobs.

Lincoln M. Alexander Parkway is already horrendous in the mornings, also Trinity Church Road is filling up. How can we link these people to Toronto?

Have to balance the loss of productive agricultural lands to urban development. What sort of buffer is provided? Are there any examples of a good coexistence between urban uses and farming?

Conflicts with houses being built near me: noise, smell, working the farm at night.

20,000 people moved to Binbrook with no way to move them in and out.

Don’t want to tear up roads to put in sewer lines again (if going to Binbrook).

We are gridlocked getting in and out of the area today. City hasn’t gotten the existing roads right, and Ministry of Transportation created reduced capacity on the QEW.

Can’t put a road through existing development. Local area is okay, but downstream is stop-and-go. Getting downtown is a nightmare, stoplights at every corner.

Development should not take away from initiatives elsewhere.

Getting through these areas with big agricultural equipment is currently very difficult.

The hydro corridor should be avoided.

Look into trespassing on privately owned lands.

Had a lot of flooding in Hamilton this year, climate instability is contributing to this.

Planning for expansion when facing a $3.5 billion infrastructure deficit. Best Development Charges only cover 75% of construction cost.

A lot of viable land within the Study Area that should not be developed on (north side of Golf Club Road).
**What's most important from your perspective?**

### Design of New Communities

Developing as densely as possible leaves more land untouched for agricultural, natural heritage, and transportation purposes. Central Park, Stoney Creek is an example worth investigating.

Choice and affordability is important.

Looking at 110 people/jobs per hectare in Elfrida.

More mid-rise apartments, fewer detached dwellings.

I think people need space, living on top of each other creates all kinds of social problems.

Should attract more light industrial to the area.

Should have more mixed housing, including apartments.

Need to have community stores.

Use as little of the agricultural lands as possible.

Big houses take up too much of a footprint.

Prefer low density. Everyone has two cars, garage is an extended portion of the house.

Understand that row houses are affordable, but there needs to be character associated with the building.

Difficult to find housing for older persons. Some developments have incorporated age-friendly elements (e.g. at-grade entrances).

### Natural Features and Open Spaces

Various species-at-risk are in the area (Bobolink, bats).

As a farmer, I want lots of space.

The main watercourses will need to be looked at.

If not for the Fairgrounds, there would be no green space in Binbrook.

Needs lots of open space to support agriculture.

Taking natural heritage out of the study area will change opportunities for housing.

Lower Stoney Creek used to be fruit lands, it’s now all cleared for housing. Agricultural land is being destroyed.

### Heritage and Culture

Building as high a density as possible, leaves more land untouched (for agricultural, natural heritage, and transportation purposes).

### Servicing

Catholic School Board is building two-storey schools to use less land. All of the last six schools built were multi-storey (but not yet campus-style collocated).

### Transportation

Don't want the area to sprawl out of control.

Can't get fire trucks down the streets in Binbrook.

Wider sidewalks, ability to walk to stores and amenities (less cookie cutter).
City Project Team Meeting #1

Wednesday, June 21, 2017

The first City Project Team Meeting for the Elfrida Growth Area Study took place on June 21, 2017 at the Valley Park Recreation Centre and Arena from 1:00-3:00 p.m.

The session included a presentation on background information collected for the area and the Subwatershed Study.

The presentation was followed by a question and answer period.

In small groups, attendees provided input on the draft vision statement and design principles to guide development for various explorations.

Round Table Discussion

What is most important with respect to design, transportation, natural features and open space, heritage and culture, servicing?

Design

Need an integrated approach for the entire area, different form and function from other community developments due to Provincial policy and new requirements.

Complete communities, compact built form, active transportation.

Elfrida was `identified` for density in past reports, so may not be required to meet new targets.

Need City team to provide direction on density.

Require a full range of housing options. Need to plan for a denser community, explore unique forms of housing (not so many townhouses). Create character areas, streets and retail destinations.

Healthy communities, trail system, live/work, walkability.

Design with flexibility and fiscal responsibility in mind.

Look to older neighbourhoods for innovation.

Identify an identity for this area, place-making.

Transportation

City is working on a Transportation Master Plan and will include cycling, transit, trails etc.

Leverage the existing work in Elfrida.

Consider potential intersection improvements. Take a look at the larger area and access to the QEW, downtown, and other areas.

Extend existing active transportation facilities.

Require a long-term transit plan. Extend existing transit routes, and address issues of cost.

Implement complete streets guidelines, consider all modes of transportation.

Comprehensive development guide was recently passed. 20 metre right-of-way for local roads is a requirement. Each component should end with a financial analysis, to identify pockets of cost that are needed for specific projects - future planning from a cost impact, implications, fiscally responsible, viable plan moving forward.

Require cost sharing agreements in the public sector. The City is putting off projects due to costs. Other costs will be required for sustainability, complete streets, and transit.

Transportation Master Plan currently underway, align with the report: complete streets, policy direction on road users, rapid transit corridor.
Cultural Heritage

Stage 1 of the archaeological assessment is underway, fieldwork is to be undertaken. Cultural Heritage for the site should be reviewed and inventoried. Retain cultural heritage buildings.

Agriculture

Require an assessment of existing area to determine compatibility along the fringe. Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) for allotment gardens and small urban farms.

Have some production facilities (livestock farms), update the Minimum Distance Separation (MDS).

Address water related issues: sharing stormwater management ponds, spraying fields.

Refer to the Subwatershed Study for information, need to understand phasing.

Include agriculture buffers as part of the phasing strategy.

Servicing

City report recommended a new pumping station in Elfrida.

Wastewater – sanitary truck being expanded, convey additional flows to City system.

Environmental Assessment (EA) for pressure district 7, looking into new pumping station; City study is underway.

Infrastructure for 2031 in City reports, ensure capacity to 2041.

Rear lanes, more on-street parking, eyes on the street, utilities in the rear lane, better for transit.

Cost effective infrastructure, block servicing, developers working together – developers agreements (policy).

Subwatershed

The Subwatershed Study would typically occur in advance but is occurring parallel.

5 headwater areas, and two watersheds.

2 spillways due to flat topography. North area may need grading to deal with sheet flow flooding.

Phase 1 - Characterization
Phase 2 - Land use plan
Phase 3 - Implementation

Natural Heritage System

Vegetation communities, bird surveys, fish habitat, restoration areas – landscape modifications over the years.

Balance distribution of open spaces and privately owned publicly-accessible spaces (POPS). Need for recreation centre was identified in City Indoor Study. Need a community park that serves 20,000 residents.

Natural features need to be protected and enhanced, maintain ecological function.

Stormwater Management (SWM) and Low Impact Development (LID)

Keep water in the same watershed, create a water balance, existing online ponds.

SWM is very important – consider climate change mitigation, water balance, groundwater tables, and infiltration.

What are the existing standards for SWM? Can we explore SWM approaches?

The end-of-pipe method is the easiest but not encouraged, moving towards LID.

Commercial

Primary trade area around the study area, currently double the amount of commercial for the area.

Significant floor space is not required but neighbourhood retail is encouraged.

Office generates more jobs, employment lands near airport.
Day 1: Public Workshop #1 - Visioning

Wednesday, June 21, 2017

The first Public Workshop sessions for the Elfrida Growth Area Study took place on June 21, 2017 at the Valley Park Recreation Centre and Arena from 4:00-6:00 p.m. and 6:30-8:30. The afternoon and evening sessions were identical.

The sessions included a presentation on background information collected for the area and the Subwatershed Study.

Round table discussions took place to answer questions as well as discuss the givens and key directions from the inventory and analysis.

Round table discussions to seek input on the fundamental design principles.

The first Public Workshop session resulted in the development of a Vision Statement, Guiding Principles and a list of important Community Characteristics.

Vision Statement

“The Elfrida Growth Area is envisioned to become a complete, transit-supportive, mixed-use community that is compact, well-connected and both environmentally and economically sustainable, through a long-term strategy that respects the neighbouring land uses.”
Guiding Principles

- Develop in an environmentally appropriate manner that protects and restores the natural environment.

- Encourage the responsible use of resources to ensure long-term sustainability, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and reduce demands on energy, water, and waste systems.

- Manage growth over time that is logical, efficient, and cost effective.

- Ensure a diverse community with a mix and range of land uses to ensure a proper balance of residential, employment, community facilities, and services.

- Develop a well-designed and connected community of residential neighbourhoods that provide for a range of housing types and choices.

- Ensure an efficient transportation network that includes mobility options, is transit supportive, includes active transportation, walking and cycling, and accommodates vehicles.

- Provide an interconnected system of streets and pedestrian supportive streetscapes.

- Provide for a connected and integrated parks, open spaces, and trails system.

- Utilize green infrastructure to make use of the absorbing and filtering abilities of plants, trees, and soil to protect water quality, reduce runoff volumes, and recharge groundwater supplies.

Community Characteristics

- Green space
  - Open space network

- Protection of aquifer
  - Clean well water

- Retirement Community

- Housing options
  - Choice of housing

- Transit supportive
  - Accessible
  - Accessible to main arterials

- Friendly
  - Age friendly

- Harmony
  - Pedestrian friendly

- Live in comfort

- Multi-use

- Diverse

- Inclusive

- Multi-use

- Diverse

- Inclusive

- Multi-use

- Diverse

- Inclusive

- Multi-use

- Diverse

- Inclusive

- Multi-use

- Diverse

- Inclusive

- Multi-use

- Diverse

- Inclusive

- Multi-use

- Diverse

- Inclusive

- Multi-use

- Diverse

- Inclusive

- Multi-use

- Diverse

- Inclusive

- Multi-use

- Diverse

- Inclusive

- Multi-use

- Diverse

- Inclusive

- Multi-use

- Diverse

- Inclusive

- Multi-use

- Diverse

- Inclusive

- Multi-use

- Diverse

- Inclusive

- Multi-use

- Diverse

- Inclusive

- Multi-use

- Diverse

- Inclusive

- Multi-use
Day 2: **Public Workshop #1 - Design ‘Explorations’**

**Thursday, June 22, 2017**

The second set of Public Workshop sessions for the Elfrida Growth Area Study took place on June 22, 2017 at the Valley Park Recreation Centre and Arena from 3:00-5:00 p.m. and 6:00-8:00 p.m. This “Design Day” included two sessions followed by an Open House from 8:00-9:00 p.m.

Participants were organized into three groups and worked with a designer from the Project Team to explore options for the Elfrida planning area. Each group had a unique development program to guide the discussion. Groups addressed land use, the natural heritage system and an approach to stormwater management.

The concepts developed at the two workshop sessions were posted at the Open House for review.

The second set of Public Workshop sessions resulted in the development of six options for the Elfrida Growth Area.
### Development Programs

Each of the development options were structured around three different development programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Heritage System</th>
<th>PODS OF DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>CENTRAL NODE</th>
<th>NODES AND CORRIDORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development Program 1</td>
<td>Enhance all</td>
<td>Do not consider</td>
<td>Moderate enhancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Program 2</td>
<td>Retain/enhance</td>
<td>Retain some</td>
<td>Retain some</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Program 3</td>
<td>Retain/enhance</td>
<td>Do not retain</td>
<td>Retain some</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Structure</th>
<th>PODS OF DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>CENTRAL NODE</th>
<th>NODES AND CORRIDORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Development Program 1   | Disjointed, pods of development | Moderately connected, focus on existing road network | Permeable and connected, identify 'corridors' and 'centres'
| Development Program 2   |       |              |                      |
| Development Program 3   |       |              |                      |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Details</th>
<th>PODS OF DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>CENTRAL NODE</th>
<th>NODES AND CORRIDORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>Centralized system of parks, large neighbourhood parks</td>
<td>Very large community park, smaller neighbourhood parks</td>
<td>Variety of parks, linked to NHS/SWM and within neighbourhood centres (small)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>No major commercial, neighbourhood focus</td>
<td>Focus on major node, some neighbourhood commercial</td>
<td>Mix of small and large scale retail, focused in centres and corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Connected to park system, standard school size</td>
<td>School campus associated with central park</td>
<td>Centralized in neighbourhoods, urban scale school sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Distribution</td>
<td>Integrated and even distribution of low, medium, and high density housing in neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Major mixed use centre at Upper Centennial Parkway and Rymal Road, high density housing focused in centre</td>
<td>Medium and high density housing distributed in centres and corridors, medium and low residential in neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (office/population serving)</td>
<td>Employment related to primary road access</td>
<td>No employment, only major retail and schools</td>
<td>Employment campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Management (SWM)</td>
<td>Focus on low impact development (LID), minimize SWM ponds</td>
<td>All SWM ponds - traditional</td>
<td>Combination of LID and SWM ponds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Development Options

Afternoon Session

Development Program 1 – Pods of Development

- Retention and enhancement of natural heritage features and hedgerows
- Limited road crossings of natural heritage system (NHS)
- Neighbourhood parks located adjacent to NHS
- Active transportation incorporated into the NHS through trail network
- Utilized existing arterial road system
- Addition of a mid-block collector running east-west between the hydro corridor and Golf Club Road
- Pods of development due to retention of NHS and limited road crossings of the NHS
- Community areas are defined by 800m radius (measured from centre to edge) or 10 minute walking distance. Each community consists of 4 or 5 neighbourhood pods defined by 400m radius (measured from centre to edge) or 5 minute walking distance
- All neighbourhood pods include a mix and diversity of low/medium/high density housing
- Two secondary schools and a community centre
- Elementary schools located adjacent to neighbourhood parks and provided for in each neighbourhood pod
- Retention of existing estate residential
- Stormwater management provided through low impact development (LID - bioswales, hedgerows, natural drainage features)
Development Program 2 - Central Node

- Retention of only core natural heritage features
- Road network is focused on the existing road pattern and structure, utilizing existing connections and linkages
- Grid system of roads all connecting to mid-block collectors and arterials
- Mid-block collector running east-west between the hydro corridor and Golf Club Road, and a north-south mid-block collector connecting Mud Street to Golf Club Road
- Neighbourhoods defined by 400m radius (measured from centre to edge) or 5 minute walking distance, each with a central focus
- Low and medium density residential in the neighbourhoods
- Large commercial core centrally located with commercial retail uses and high density housing
- Large central park campus with a community centre and two secondary schools
- Traditional stormwater management ponds located as gateway features and neighbourhood amenities
Development Options

Afternoon Session

- Enhancement and retention of some of the natural heritage system (NHS) and hedgerows
- System of enhanced hedgerows utilized for low impact development (LID), active transportation, and cultural landscape
- Transit-oriented development (high density residential) within a commercial node at Rymal and Upper Centennial
- Grid system of roads with a mid-block collector running east-west between the hydro corridor and Golf Club Road
- Neighbourhood centres or nodes located within a 400m or 5 minute walking distance of residences
- Medium density residential located in centres with neighbourhoods of low density residential
- Employment campus located south of hydro corridor and in the west portion of the community, adjacent to existing employment uses to the west of Trinity Church Road
- Institutional uses utilized as landmarks along an enhanced open space system parallel to the hydro corridor
- View and connection to open space system at road termini
Evening Session

Development Program 1 – Pods of Development

- Retention and enhancement of all natural heritage features and hedgerows
- Limited road crossings of natural heritage system (NHS)
- Utilization of existing road network and connections
- Mid-block collectors running east west and north-south
- Neighbourhood commercial centres along mid-block collector and adjacent to existing commercial at Rymal Road
- Existing employment lands retained
- Pockets of high density residential located along Upper Centennial and mid-block collectors
- Pods of low and medium density residential neighbourhoods defined by the NHS
- Schools adjacent to neighbourhood parks and medium to high density residential areas
- Stormwater managed through LID, hedgerows, and natural systems
Development Options

Evening Session

Development Program 2 – Central Node

- Retention and enhancement of natural heritage system (NHS)
- Parkway boulevard along an enhanced open space network south of the hydro corridor
- Grid pattern road network, local roads terminating at Parkway boulevard
- Utilization of existing road network and connections
- Open space associated with natural features, expansion of natural features
- Large central park and institutional campus
- Neighbourhood commercial centrally located within medium density residential areas
- Low density neighbourhoods on the periphery of the medium density/commercial centres
- Mixed use commercial centre extending along Rymal Road to the east, combination of commercial retail, mixed use, and higher density residential
- Existing employment lands retained
- Traditional stormwater management ponds
Development Program 3 - Nodes and Corridors

- Enhancement and retention of some of the natural heritage system (NHS) and hedgerows
- System of enhanced hedgerows utilized for low impact development (LID), active transportation
- Utilization of existing road network and connections
- Community structured around nodes and corridors
- Mid-block collectors running east-west and north-south
- Three mixed use nodes located along the mid-block collectors or corridors
- Mixed use nodes located within an 800m or 10 minute walking distance of residences
- Nodes include mixed use, commercial, retail, and high density residential; incorporate components of the NHS
- Community parks associated with secondary schools
- Neighbourhoods defined by 400m radius (measured from centre to edge) or 5 minute walking distance, each with a central focus
- Medium density residential located along corridors (collector roads) and on the periphery of the mixed use nodes as a transition to the lower density residential
- Elementary schools adjacent to neighbourhood parks and located within each neighbourhood
- Combination of bioswales, hedgerows and stormwater management ponds
- Organic farm
Community Focus Group Meeting #1 Minutes

Hamilton Elfrida Growth Area Study

Community Focus Group Meeting #1
Fortintos
June 13, 2017
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

The Community Focus Group Meeting #1 was held on June 13, 2017. The following were in attendance:

- John Voortman, Countrywide Recycling (asked by Chamber of Commerce to attend)
- Mel Switzer, farmer, President of Hamilton Wentworth Federation of Agriculture
- Henry Swierenga, Ontario Federation of Agriculture
- Brianne Comley, Hamilton-Halton Homebuilders Association (alternate)
- Judy Sykora, landowner (grew up here)
- Kathy Della-Nebbia, Realtor’s Association of Hamilton-Burlington
- Don McLean, Environment Hamilton (Linda Lukasik as an alternate)
- Steve Spicer, Summit Park developer, landowner (as well as other landowners who organized the OP Review)
- Drew Spolstra, Chair of the Agricultural Rural Affairs Committee, lease land within study area, local farmer
- Mary Nardini, HWCDSB, School Board Trustee
- Roy Shuker, Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee, local farmer
- Observers: Linda Lukasek (Environment Hamilton); Elaine Vyn (landowner) Carmen Chiaravaicz (landowner)
- City: Christine Newbold, Alissa Mahood, Kirsten McCauley, Elyse Menray
- WSP: Joe Nethery
- TPP: Donna Hinde

Suzanne Mammel was absent.

Following introductions of all those in attendance, a presentation provided an overview of the purpose and scope of the study, the purpose and role of the Community Focus Group and tabled two questions for a round table discussion with the group (see attached).

The following is a summary of the questions asked before the round table discussion:

1. Do we know why Province appealed the matter? I thought it had something to do with the airport
   Partially. There is a multi-phase hearing associated with the AEGD. This is why the land budget work is important because it helps to answer a number of these questions. Part of the work needed

2. Are other lands being looked at for an urban area expansion?
   No. We are only looking at Elfrida at this time.

3. New Growth Plan has new greenfield density targets. Does it factor into this study?
   Yes, we will evaluate the new targets as part of this project.

4. Will a report be prepared that documents input received?
   Each workshop is followed with a “What we heard” report that contains an event summary and results (including documentation prepared). This information will be made available online.

5. Is the flyer available electronically, for posting on Facebook?
   It will be circulated after tonight.
6. **Is there a timeline for development occurring?**
(Developer in the room) says “five years: three years for draft plan approval, followed by servicing approvals.”
A phasing plan will also be prepared as part of this study that identified timing, including provision of infrastructure (and future servicing studies).
Agencies will be contacted as part of study to identify school locations.

7. **What is the timeline for this process? How does this study work alongside those other necessary policy studies? What project is completed first?**
We should put a timeline together of the ongoing concurrent processes. This will be available at the Public Information Centre on June 21 and 22, 2017.
This process is to establish growth through to 2031, as informed by GRIDS (2006). Current MCR is looking at accommodating growth to 2041, alongside other new Provincial policies with respect to community development, the natural environment, and other matters of Provincial interest.

8. **Is this a process where others thinking growth should occur elsewhere can consider that decisions? There are many landowners elsewhere in City who would prefer to have that growth.**
GRIDS (2006) identified this location as the preferred location for future growth. Elfrida is Council’s direction. The end result of this study would require an Official Plan Amendment, which would be appealable. The original policy adoption in 2009 was also subject to appeal (remains under appeal).
We will be sure to include a couple of slides that clarify this subject at workshop.
Province has indicated to City is that the urban area expansion was not the problem, but how it was stated in plan.

9. **Do these points indicate a development model that looks like a Downtown Hamilton?**
Mixed use, compact communities do environ a more integrated form. There are many models and structures that look could take.

10. **How much employment will be included in Elfrida?**
Part of MCR includes an Employment Lands Review, which will determine if there is any need for additional “production employment”-type lands. Current thinking is there is a role for Elfrida in population-related employment (service sector jobs including offices—though Downtown Hamilton is the preferred location for major offices. Community nodes can accommodate additional office as well.)

11. **Question- Has the Province changed its expectations?**
The Province has updated their density forecasts through the update Growth Plan to plan to 2041. They have the same expectation about building complete communities that are compact and dense.

**Comment:** To clarify about development charges the various provincial limitations plus city exemptions mean that DCs cover much less than 75 percent of even just the initial costs of new growth.

12. **When you undertake the new MCR, will you be focussing on Elfrida or might other land areas come into play?**
It depends on the land budget: intensification estimates and potential, greenfield land requirements will drive that question. Clarification of GRIDS (2006), GRIDS 2, and MCR will be provided at the workshop. We are studying this area.
Round Table Discussion

Question #1
What are the biggest opportunities and challenges for change in the Elfrida Study Area?

Key Opportunities

- New GO Station and LRT, opportunities for connections to those new lines (especially to new southeast end node). Money is a challenge.
- Transit connections across South Mountain, to airport.
- Other nearby neighbourhoods are filling up with housing, having more urban areas can help keep more people in this neighbourhood (aging). Plus new people.
- Biking opportunities.
- Upper Centennial Parkway is not at capacity, and could be a direct link to the GO Station.
- Exciting to build a whole new community from scratch.
- We could use smaller commercial to mitigate the impact on the residential tax base.
- Expanded tax base
- This growth (190,000 more to 2041) will give this City the opportunity to grow into its own. Development charges alone would be over $1 billion, based on a quick calculation.
- Placing growth in one area allows for infrastructure investments to be concentrated in one place.
- Zoning to support this more intense development can be accommodated.
- Increased paving of surface sends more water to a full Lake Ontario.
- Opportunity to create a transit-centred community.

Key Challenges

- Transportation. Getting to a corner store is fine, but getting to people’s jobs.
- Half of these people are going to go to Toronto. Linc is already horrendous in the mornings, so Trinity Church Road is filling up. How can we link these people to Toronto?
- Getting infrastructure into the area.
- Have to balance the loss of productive agricultural lands (and food production) to urban development. What sort of buffer is provided between new community and continued agricultural production? (I have no examples of a good coexistence between urban and farming. Lands becoming urban are no longer being improved for farming.)
- I’ve had conflicts with houses being built near me: noise, smell, working the farm at night.
- 20,000 people moved into Binbrook and there is no new way to move them in and out.
- Don’t want to tear up roads again to put in sewer lines again (if going to Binbrook).
- We are gridlocked getting in and out of the area today. It cannot happen on the existing roads today. City hasn’t gotten it right today, and MTO created reduced capacity on the QEW.
  - As part of GRIDS 2, all City-wide master plans are being updated to accommodate growth to 2041. There are opportunities to bring changes to those studies.
- Can’t put a road through existing development. Local area is okay, but downstream from here is stop-and-go. To get to Downtown Hamilton is a nightmare, stoplights at every corner.
- Development can’t take away from other initiatives elsewhere.
- Getting through these areas with big agricultural equipment is a nightmare today.
- The hydro corridor should be avoided.
- Trespassing on privately owned lands needs to be looked at.
- Had a lot of flooding in Hamilton this year, climate instability is contributing to this.
- Planning for expansion when facing a $3.5 billion infrastructure deficit, without having resolved that situation in current Hamilton. Best Development Charges only cover 75% of construction cost.
- There is a lot of incredibly viable land within the Study Area that should not be developed as houses. (Group showed a line on north side of Golf Club Road, roughly mid-block between the road and the hydro corridor, as those lands in question.)
Question #2
What’s most important from your perspective?

Design of New Communities
- As high a density as we can get, leaves more land untouched (for agricultural, natural heritage, and transportation purposes). Central Park Stoney Creek identified as an example worth investigating. What do people think about Aldershot?
- Choice and affordability.
- Given how density is now being measured, looking at probably 110 p+j/net ha in Elfrida. More midrise apartments, fewer detached dwellings. (Downtown Hamilton is 190 p+j/net ha.)
- I think people need space, living on top of each other creates all kinds of social problems.
- Should attract more light industrial
- Should be more mixed housing, including apartments.
- Community stores.
- Use as little of the agricultural lands as possible.
- See lots of row houses all over, and then a large detached dwelling in between. The big houses take up too much of a footprint.
- Prefer low density. Everyone has two cars, garage is an extended portion of the house.
- Understand that row houses are affordable, but there needs to be character associated with the building.
- Difficult to find housing for older persons. Some developments around have incorporated age-friendly elements (e.g. at-grade entrances).

Transportation
- Don’t want area to sprawl out of control
- Names of roads
- Can’t get fire trucks down the streets in Binbrook
- Have to go back to the transportation issue
- Need places for cars in the community
- Wider sidewalks, ability to walk to stores and amenities (less cookie cutter).

Natural Features and Open Spaces
- Usual species at risk will be found, coming here increasingly (Bobolink, bats)
- As a farmer, I want lots of space
- The main watercourses will need to be looked at.
- If not for the Fairgrounds, there would be no green space in Binbrook.
- Needs lots of open space to support agriculture.
- Taking natural heritage out of the study area will change opportunities for housing.
- Lower Stoney Creek used to be fruit lands now all cleared for housing. Agricultural land is being destroyed.

Heritage and Culture
- As high a density as we can get, leaves more land untouched (for agricultural, natural heritage, and transportation purposes).

Servicing
- As high a density as we can get, leaves more land untouched (for agricultural, natural heritage, and transportation purposes).
- Catholic School Board is going two-storey to use less land. All of last six schools built were multi-storey (but not yet campus-style collocated).

Next Steps
- Visioning and Design Workshop at the Valley Park Recreation Centre and Arena, June 21 and 22, 2017
- Community Focus Group Meeting, fall 2017
- Members are encouraged to distribute flyers to others who would be interested in attending the June 21 and June 22 meetings
WHAT WE HEARD
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Community Meeting #2

Community Meeting #2 took place on Wednesday, December 6, 2017 at the Valley Park Recreation Centre and Arena (970 Paramount Drive, Stoney Creek).

The Community Meeting had two identical sessions:

Session 1 took place from 4:00-6:00 p.m. and Session 2 took place from 6:30-8:30 p.m.

The meeting included:

- A presentation on three conceptual development options being considered for the Growth Area.
- Small table group discussions followed the presentation where attendees provided input on each one of the development options.
- Attendees wrote comments directly onto Note-taking Templates for each concept with regards to:
  1. Natural Heritage System
  2. Roads
  3. Mixed Use/Commercial
  4. Institutional and Parks
  5. Residential
- Following the Community Meeting additional comments were submitted to the design team online.

Participants attended Community Meeting #2

Comments were emailed in after Community Meeting #2
Concepts and Comments

Concept 1: Development Pods

Legend
- Secondary Plan boundary
- Residential
- Commercial
- Employment
- Elementary School
- Secondary School
- Place of Worship
- Community Centre
- Neighbourhood Park
- Natural Heritage System
- Roads
- Utility Corridor
- Neighbourhood (400m radius)

Concept 1

Natural Heritage System

*I don’t like it*

Natural Heritage System is based on Sub-watershed Study characterization which is only Phase 1

Needs to be tested

Overly designated, too specific

Roads

*I don’t like it*

20 metre right of ways

Consider alternate right of way standards

Roads don’t create a network
Residential

*I don’t like it*

Need more differentiation of land uses, concentrate density

Should still have higher density along major transit routes

Other Comments

Map shows a small section of natural heritage system along the west of First Road East (between Highland Road and Mud Street), this doesn’t currently exist

Natural heritage pocket (west side of Regional Road 56) should be on a final plan

Best plan to lessen transportation burden to give time to improve system
Concept 2: Central Node

Legend
- Community Centre
- Community Park
- Neighbourhood Park
- Natural Heritage System
- Stormwater Management Pond
- Roads
- Utility Corridor
- Neighbourhood (400m radius)

Concept 2

Natural Heritage System

It's okay
Preserve agriculture lands as much as possible

I don't like it
Natural Heritage System based on Sub-watershed Study characterization report
Needs to be tested
This impacts areas for development

Rocks

I love it
Arterial roads as shown look okay
Prefer network connectivity

It's okay
It's okay

I don't like it
20 metre right of ways on local roads
Consider alternative standards
I don't like it
Mixed Use/Commercial

**I love it**
Consider Concept 3 (spread out, not concentrated in one place)

**I don’t like it**
Commercial not to be centralized
Too centralized, may be too much traffic in one area
Too much concentration of commercial and higher densities on upper Centennial and 53 Highway
Explore other options for business park on Swayze Road
We don’t like it
Separate commercial areas for each area, decrease traffic on Centennial
Too congested in one area

Institutional & Parks

**I love it**
This size community warrants a large park facility in addition to normal neighbourhood parks. There may still be a need for a community park

**It’s okay**
It’s okay

Residential

**I love it**
High rise locations look right. Even with high rise and medium density, the low rise will be small singles and or towns to meet 80 people per hectare

**It’s okay**
It’s okay

Other Comments

Since studies will be refined overtime, even after adoption of the Secondary Plan, it is imperative that the Secondary Plan policies allow for refinement of all features, roads, densities etc. without requiring further amendment to the Plan

High density residences will cause massive increase in transportation problems, need good transit network to overcome problems and reduce automotive traffic

Phasing of development should begin from the Mud Street / Upper Centennial quadrant of the study area, going south towards Highland Road

Need transit links to GO Transit

First Road East, south of Mud Street, should be removed

Like the curving road at the top of the study area

Just nuts, too much commercial

Combo of the central node and the sub-nodes

Commercial/mixed use area is too big

Community complexes are good (park, schools and community centres located together)
Concept 3: Nodes and Corridors

Legend
- Secondary Plan boundary
- Low Rise Residential
- Mid-Rise Residential
- High Rise Residential
- Commercial / Mixed Use
- Employment
- Elementary School
- Secondary School
- Place of Worship
- Community Centre
- Community Park
- Neighbourhood Park
- Natural Heritage System
- Organic Farm
- Stormwater Management Pond
- Roads
- Utility Corridor
- Neighbourhood (400m radius)

Concept 3

Natural Heritage System

I love it

Good connectivity
Like the organic farm
I love it, the plan brings higher densities and commercial closer to the neighbourhoods
I love it
Environmental protection is key
Impact on agriculture must be considered

It's okay

It’s okay

I don’t like it

Natural Heritage System is based on current Sub-watershed Study which is only in characterization phase
Needs to be tested
Too enhanced
Stick to significant features to be protected
Roads

*I love it*

East/west arterial is good but the location needs to be reviewed

Like east-west collector south of Rymal Road

I love it

Increase public transit

Walkable community is important, bike paths and links to light rail transit and GO Transit

Walkability is vital for health and community

*It's okay*

It’s okay

*I don’t like it*

Consider alternative right of way standards

Need more collector road connectivity

Mixed-Use/Commercial

*I love it*

Several nodes are preferable, locations should be reviewed

More pedestrian friendly with local centres

Brings higher densities and commercial closer to neighbourhoods, good plan

Like the multiple commercial nodes

Will encourage pedestrians and cycling and reduce vehicular traffic

Amount of ‘brick and mortar’ commercial into the future will not be as great due to online shopping, consider when determining amount of commercial space in buildings

I love it

To create a community where citizens can work and play and stay

Schools, parks and events bring community together

Commercial areas that are within walking distance, less cars

*It’s okay*

It’s okay

*I don’t like it*

Smaller commercial at Highland Road/First Road East already on Upper Centennial Parkway

Institutional & Parks

*I love it*

Organic farm could only be a temporary use because once it is part of the urban area, it will ultimately be developed

I love it

Preserve natural areas, enhance areas of play to enhance health and well-being

*It’s okay*

School locations should be reviewed

It’s okay

Residential

*I love it*

Good mix of density

I love it

Low rise buildings and higher density

Will there be affordable/subsidized housing also?

Suggest mixture for all incomes

*It’s okay*

It’s okay
I don’t like it

High density block on Fletcher Road. Relocate to major transit way

Other Comments

Prefer the road pattern in Concept 2

Better suited for phasing

175 Swazie Road will require road connection for safe access

Worried about odors from the organic farm, else it’s my favourite

Prefer not to get rid of the streams

Tie in the development of phasing with servicing

Must consider Binbrook traffic

This might be the most walkable to destinations

Trails and natural areas are important

Commercial/mixed-use area needs to be big enough to attract residents from Heritage Green

Might need significant road capacity

Transit to Eastgate Square
Online Comments

Natural Heritage System

The floodplain should not form part of the Natural Heritage System, it should be shown separately. Floodplains may be adjusted through study and/or engineering solutions when there are no environmental implications.

The stream that is associated with the floodplain crosses through farm fields and in part is plowed through with no other natural features and little or no mature vegetation along it.

Buffers along the stream as part of the Natural Heritage System may be appropriate but expanding it along a floodplain as is proposed in Option 3 when there are no other natural features along the stream is not appropriate.

The HDF (Headwater Drainage Feature) designation of the southern drainage feature as "mitigation" type is not significant and can be removed and as such should be removed from Conceptual Development Option 1.

Roads

There is no more room on the QEW for more vehicles, the High Occupancy Lanes are not working for us either. Need the lane opened up to all vehicles again before the city is completely gridlocked.

None of the three growth scenarios for Elfrida show the road (Kingsborough Drive) that is part of the approved draft plan of The Crossings and intended to cross the hydro corridor to lands on the other side which are a part of Elfrida.

Residential

Submission to create a new mixed use community at Twenty Road West, centred along the Garth Street extension spine (opening up valuable employment lands).

Recognize the need for the City to include Elfrida as part of its overall growth management study; the City should not be doing so to the exclusion of other potential areas for growth.
# Note-taking Templates

## Concept 1: Development Pods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept 1</th>
<th>I love it</th>
<th>It's okay</th>
<th>I don't like it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Heritage System</td>
<td><img src="natural-heritage.png" alt="Icon" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td><img src="road.png" alt="Icon" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use / Commercial</td>
<td><img src="mixed-use.png" alt="Icon" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional &amp; Parks</td>
<td><img src="institutional.png" alt="Icon" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td><img src="residential.png" alt="Icon" /></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other comments:

- [ ]
- [ ]
- [ ]
Concept 2: Central Node

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept 2</th>
<th>I love it</th>
<th>It's okay</th>
<th>I don't like it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Heritage System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use / Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional &amp; Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other comments:
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________________________
Concept 3: Nodes and Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept 3</th>
<th>I love it</th>
<th>It's okay</th>
<th>I don't like it</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Heritage System</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use / Commercial</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional &amp; Parks</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other comments:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
The Community Focus Group Meeting #2 was held on November 13, 2017. The following were in attendance:

- John Voortman, Countrywide Recycling (asked by Chamber of Commerce to attend)
- Mel Switzer, farmer, President of Hamilton Wentworth Federation of Agriculture
- Henry Swierenga, Ontario Federation of Agriculture
- Judy Sykora, landowner (grew up here)
- Nicolas von Bredon, Realtor’s Association of Hamilton-Burlington
- Don McLean, Environment Hamilton (Linda Lukasik as an alternate)
- Steve Spicer, Summit Park developer, landowner (as well as other landowners who organized the OP Review)
- Drew Spoelstra, Chair of the Agricultural Rural Affairs Committee, lease land within study area, local farmer
- Roy Shuker, Agriculture and Rural Affairs Committee, local farmer
- Al Frisna, landowner
- Dave Pitblado, landowner
- City: Christine Newbold, Alissa Mahood, Christine Strupat
- WSP: Joe Nethery
- TPP: Donna Hinde

Following introductions of all those in attendance, a presentation provided an overview of the purpose and scope of the study and the purpose and role of the Community Focus Group. A presentation was used to describe the three development options being considered for the Elfrida Growth Study Area. The following is a summary of the discussion.

**Raised during Option 1: Development Pods**
- Hasn’t been any discussion tonight with respect to preservation of long-term agricultural lands
- Phasing is something we need to hear about more. Where development starts will impact our long-term preservation.
- Can’t squeeze in so many people. This will create many social issues.
- Seems an assumption is built in that the whole 1256 hectares will go through a development process.
- Can commercial and institutional development integrate into existing community
- What proportion of each concept is within X of higher order transit (per Metrolinx Big Move update)?
- Looks like an end run around the OMB process to predetermine an outcome on Elfrida.
### Option 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT I LIKE</th>
<th>WHAT I DON'T LIKE</th>
<th>GENERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Development applications are running up against species at risk issues.  We've lost several species completely in recent years. Setting aside more space is a better thing for species.</td>
<td>• Fragments land parcels</td>
<td>• Probably the most car dependent concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More space helps with climate change resiliency.</td>
<td>• This extent of PSW has not been ground-truthed. We’re aware of errors after years of monitoring this work.</td>
<td>• Most proactive with regards to Natural Heritage protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How can lands farmed for 100+ years be flagged as NHS?</td>
<td>• Can Effrida rely on adjacent commercial areas? Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Will this be a rural landscape? It doesn’t look like we are planning for that. Are hedgerows worthy of protection?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Arterials along 56 should intersect. Should aim to consolidate stop lights.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Option 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT I LIKE</th>
<th>WHAT I DON'T LIKE</th>
<th>GENERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Most liked from a development perspective.</td>
<td>• Least liked from an environmental perspective.</td>
<td>• ***What flood mapping is being used in this area?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Will be most efficient from a servicing perspective. (Quite a pro-development outcome.)</td>
<td>• Not real walkability along Upper Centennial (major highway). Do you pull density off Upper Centennial to encourage the walkability internally?</td>
<td>• (Some fixation on “commercial” meaning traditional single storey formats. Look at the label?) “Town centre”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Most accurately reflects what is “truly” Natural Heritage.</td>
<td>• May be issues with shadowing on existing residential.</td>
<td>• Should connect community node to a large central park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Node makes sense at this location</td>
<td>• Much of that “Square” central node is a swamp all year.</td>
<td>• ***What are the planned widenings for Rymal and Upper Centennial in current plans?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seem to support transit support.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The truck route up for review. Do we have the ability to look at this area differently.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Option 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT I LIKE</th>
<th>WHAT I DON'T LIKE</th>
<th>GENERAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Like how the elements of the community are more spread out, everyone can access.</td>
<td>• SE-most green is a farmhouse (cultural feature?).</td>
<td>• Antagonism toward farming and organic is not what others hear in the public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Farming and gardening could occur as part of a park.</td>
<td>• Why do we have circular arterial roads? Where is this major road taking people? Shouldn’t it connect the grid? Hamilton’s history on this is that a grid works better.</td>
<td>• Would you hybridize this plan within a grid/road system? Could probably keep more NHS that way, too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Makes a lot of sense as a phasing solution. A complete community per block.</td>
<td>• If someone wants an organic farm, they should start it themselves—City shouldn’t be in this business.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Options to enhance in the presentation

- Make it clear we are not picking 1, 2, or 3. These are not the final options. “We are choosing the best elements of 1, 2, and 3 to form a recommended concept.”
- Include the population numbers up front and early.
- How will people move through this? Hearing so much conversation about how people are going to get in and out of here.
- Will get questions about agricultural land: phasing (pieces)

### Next Steps

- Attend Community Information Meeting on December 6, 2017
- Final Community Liaison Committee will be in the spring of 2018
SECTION 3
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Community Meeting #3

Community Meeting #3 took place on Tuesday, June 12, 2018 at the Valley Park Recreation Centre and Arena (970 Paramount Drive, Stoney Creek).

Community Meeting #3 included:

- A presentation on the evaluation of the three conceptual development options and a presentation of the preferred community structure ideas.
- Small table group discussions followed the presentation where attendees provided input on the preferred community structure ideas.
- Attendees wrote comments directly onto a Note-taking Template of the Preferred Community Structure Ideas Plan with regards to:
  1. Greenlands System and Parks
  2. Road Network
  3. Mixed Use Centres
  4. Transit Corridor
  5. Institutional
  6. Residential

50 Participants attended Community Meeting #3
Preferred Community Structure Ideas Plan

Participants at the third Community Meeting were presented the Preferred Community Structure Ideas Plan and recorded their comments onto the following template during table group discussions.

The Natural Heritage System mapping is not final and is subject to the final recommendations of the Subwatershed Study.
**Greenlands System and Parks**

*Love it*

Love the linear park system along the hydro corridor

*Love it*

It's OK

It's okay

**Road Network**

*Love it*

Should have four lanes on Highway 56 all the way to Binbrook

*It's Okay*

The main roads are fine. Waiting to see what the proposed local road network will look like

Need off-road bike lanes too

Will there be enough roads/lanes to accommodate increased traffic congestion on Rymal Road and Upper Centennial?

Rymal Road needs to be widened to four lanes

*Don't Like It*

Don't like it

**Mixed Use Centres**

*Love it*

Retirement and nursing homes should be located at mixed use centres

The higher the better. More details

Love it

*It's OK*

It's okay

**Transit Corridor**

*Love it*

Transit corridors are appropriate and necessary nowadays

Buses, light rail, and rapid transit is the way to go

*It's OK*

It's okay

**Institutional**

*Love it*

Retirement and nursing homes are needed

Merge the school boards

Need locations for places of worship

*It's OK*

It's okay

**Residential**

*Love it*

Shows a good mix of housing types and is well layed out

Love it

*It's OK*

Will the density increase in transit supportive areas?

Too many homes for such a small space
THANK YOU!

COMMENT SHEET
Elfrida Growth Area Study
Tuesday, June 12, 2018 Community Meeting

Thank you for attending tonight’s Community Meeting. Your input is important. Please provide any comments you may have about the Elfrida Growth Area Study. Comment sheets may be dropped off in the box provided or sent by mail or email to the contact below by Wednesday, July 4th, 2018.

Melanie Pham, Planner
City of Hamilton
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6685
Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor
Hamilton, ON, L8P 4Y5

If you are not on the mailing list to receive notices of future meetings for this project and you would like to be added, please provide your contact information below:

Name: ___________________________ Email: ___________________________
Mailing Address: ___________________________ Postal Code: ____________

The Personal Information submitted on this form is collected under the authority of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c.P.13, and will be used for the purpose of carrying out the above studies. Questions about the collection of this personal information should be directed to the Manager of Community Planning and GIS at 71 Main Street West, 5th Floor, Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5, 905-546-2424 ext. 1279. Information will be collected in accordance with the Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. With the exception of personal information, all comments submitted regarding these studies will become part of the public record.

COMMENTS:

__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________
__________________________________________

(More space on reverse for additional comments)
THANK YOU!
Community Focus Group Meeting #3 Minutes

Hamilton Elfrida Growth Area Study

Community Focus Group Meeting #3
Fortino’s Community Room
May 30, 2018
6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

The Community Focus Group Meeting #3 was held on May 30, 2018. The following were in attendance:

- Henry Swierenga, Ontario Federation of Agriculture
- Judy Sykora, landowner (grew up here)
- Nicolas von Bredon, Realtor’s Association of Hamilton-Burlington
- Don McLean, Environment Hamilton (Linda Lukasik as an alternate)
- Steve Spicer, Summit Park developer, landowner (as well as other landowners who organized the OP Review)
- Councillor Brenda Johnson
- City: Christine Newbold, Alissa Mahood, Melanie Pham
- WSP: Chris Tyrrel
- WSP: Randall Roth
- TPP: Donna Hinde
- TPP: Ron Palmer

Following introductions of all those in attendance, a presentation provided an overview of the purpose and scope of the study and the purpose and role of the Community Focus Group, the results of the evaluation of the three options and the preferred community structure considered for the Elfrida Growth Study Area. The following is a summary of the discussion.

**Will the entire land area be required to accommodate growth if density goes up?**

- the area exceeds growth to 2041 – the team confirm phasing
- will have to be reviewed within context of GRIDS 1
- plan the entire area, phase it – ensure that 2041 51 and 61 can be appropriately planned and connected

**What happens if some portion of the land may become part of greenbelt?**

- nothing we do will constrain the province

**How have we connected with indigenous communities**

- we have been in contact, have not had a face to face meeting
Why is transportation included in the evaluation of urban design too?

- transportation in urban design is about land use structure discussion – linked to how a transportation system is planned

Infrastructure and maintenance crisis – what are we doing that will avoid that happening?

- planning with the best and up to date modern infrastructure – green infrastructure, state of the art technologies and techniques
- maintenance is about how much money to allocate to infrastructure – we don’t know this today.
- municipal fiscal impact – long term operation and maintenance cost of infrastructure – life cycle costs
- right size infrastructure, so we have capacity of subsequent phasing

Why can’t we use LID in option 1 and 2 – principle can be applied to all

- natural heritage system is biggest in option 1 – more options for drainage

Interface of agricultural land – are we talking buffers?

- Yes

How do we define urban agriculture?

- not a soy bean field in middle of subdivision, it’s small scale agriculture

More intensive development – more infrastructure and more maintenance - Doesn’t this contradict with what province says?

- big pipes are required and there are cost implications
- consideration for us to think about

How far are we on the transportation studies?

- Upper Redhill Parkway has it been considered in the analysis- aware of all the projects, traffic modelling has not been completed yet – traffic modelling will tell us about how much roads

Prospect of adding 80k people, 8k jobs, some activity will be here, much of employment will be elsewhere – how will people move?

- we are emaking sure that transit comes on day 1 – this is about transit
- GRIDS 1 showed higher order transportation to connect with sub regional nodes so we can get to employment areas, etc
- get people out of cars
- higher lever – city wide master plan always in contact with neihowrhouing municipalieis
Display Panels
The City of Hamilton is growing and the population is projected to increase to 680,000 by 2031. While the City has planned for a substantial amount of growth within it's current urban boundary, an urban boundary expansion is required to accommodate future population growth.

**PREFERRED LOCATION FOR NEW GROWTH**

In reviewing opportunities for where growth could occur, the Elfrida area was identified through the City’s comprehensive Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (GRIDS) process in 2006, as the preferred location to accommodate new growth to 2031 and beyond.

The Elfrida Growth Area Study is a unique opportunity to develop a complete urban community that:

- achieves transit supportive development with multi-modal connections to existing urban areas
- efficiently uses existing and new servicing infrastructure
- integrates well with the adjacent urban and rural lands
- provides a mix of land uses and community facilities
- protects important natural environmental features

The following studies will be undertaken as part of this project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Management Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-watershed Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and Wastewater Servicing Master Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Impact Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design Guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Heritage Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Lands Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Investment Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phasing/Staging/Implementation Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Secondary Plan and its supporting studies are only some of the pieces of the puzzle. Other plans, directions and initiatives work together to create a thriving community.

**CURRENT INITIATIVES UNDERWAY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initiative</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Contact Person</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hamilton.ca/">www.hamilton.ca/</a> grids</td>
<td>Heather Travis</td>
<td>905-546-2424 ext. 4168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Forest Strategy</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hamilton.ca/urbanforeststrategy">www.hamilton.ca/urbanforeststrategy</a></td>
<td>Catherine Plosz</td>
<td>905-546-2424 ext. 1231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial and Mixed Use Zoning</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hamilton.ca/cmu">www.hamilton.ca/cmu</a></td>
<td>Timothy Lee</td>
<td>905-546-2424 ext. 1249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Oriented Corridor Zoning</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hamilton.ca/lrtzoning">www.hamilton.ca/lrtzoning</a></td>
<td>Madeleine Giroux</td>
<td>905-546-2424 ext. 2664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-wide Transportation Master Plan update</td>
<td><a href="http://www.hamilton.ca/tmp">www.hamilton.ca/tmp</a></td>
<td>Steve Molloy</td>
<td>905-546-2424 ext. 2975</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coming Soon! City-wide Residential Zoning
# Technical Area Evaluation By Area Reasoning and Recommendations

## Lack of Broader Mix of Land Uses

Lacks a broader mix of land uses (i.e., commercial/retail) within accessible walking distance. Has significant natural heritage, parks, open space and likely trail opportunities.

## Limited North-South/Neighbourhood Connections

Limited north-south/neighbourhood connections does not support the establishment of a connected community. Also negatively impacts transit opportunities.

## Conserves All Core Features

Conserves all core features, all headwater drainage features, all restore/enhancement areas - most extensive & connected natural heritage system.

## Potential for High Level of Retention of Existing Cultural Heritage Resources

Potential for a high level of retention of existing cultural heritage resources.

## Greatest Number of Natural Heritage Crossings Mitigate with Trenchless Technology

Greatest number of natural heritage crossings - mitigate with trenchless technology. Most natural system for stormwater management.

## Opportunities for Phasing to Minimize Impacts on Existing Farm Operations

Opportunities for phasing to minimize impacts on existing farm operations in the short and mid-term.

## Lower Development Yields Result in Less Revenues for the City

Lower development yields will result in less revenues for the City.

## Meets Medium/High-Density Opportunities

Meets medium/high-density opportunities, but in a dispersed manner. Difficult to service with public transit, disconnected and density not focused on corridors.
## Technical Area Evaluation by Area Reasoning and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Area</th>
<th>Evaluation by Area</th>
<th>Reasoning and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility</strong></td>
<td>Improved road connectivity, and more parkland. Not very ‘walkable’; the single central node may encourage a reliance on cars. Does not provide for a complete community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connectivity</strong></td>
<td>First and last mile connectivity would be a challenge as trips would be centred on the central commercial node.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conservation</strong></td>
<td>Conserves only core features, resulting in a discontinuous natural heritage system, limits long-term viability (movement of wildlife/seeds/plant materials).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural Heritage</strong></td>
<td>Proposes increased commercial development in the current location of three identified cultural heritage resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Flow</strong></td>
<td>Would likely require the highest fire flow, and largest diameter watermains and sewers due to central high density node. Difficult to phase cost-effectively.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phasing</strong></td>
<td>Opportunities for phasing to minimize impacts on existing farm operations in the short and mid-term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Financial</strong></td>
<td>Assuming market demand is sufficient to capture the proposed supply, Option 2 would likely result in the greatest fiscal impact to the City.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public &amp; Regional</strong></td>
<td>A single major node results in a less connected community and limited active transportation opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Technical Area Evaluation - Concept 3 - Nodes and Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Area</th>
<th>Evaluation by Area</th>
<th>Reasoning and Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Economic Development</td>
<td>Provides the greatest diversity of land use/residential built form/housing densities. Accommodates neighbourhood-serving commercial and employment opportunities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>Linear green space provides trail opportunities to complement active transportation. Better options for transit and phasing, with 3 primary nodes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>Conserves core features of the Subwatershed Study as well as some headwater drainage features. Connectivity and consideration for natural corridors is accommodated.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>Potential to retain portions of existing cultural heritage resources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Requires the most additional connections to the existing trunk sewer. Best able to incorporate traditional and new stormwater management techniques.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Opportunities for phasing to minimize impacts on existing farm operations in the short and mid-term.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Assuming market demand is sufficient to capture the proposed supply. Option 3 would likely result in the second greatest fiscal impact to the City.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>Best connectivity, diverse range of densities and nodal locations along corridors to encourage active transportation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Elfrida Community is envisioned to become a complete, healthy, transit-supportive, mixed-use community that is compact, well-connected and both environmentally and economically sustainable, through a long-term strategy that respects the neighbouring land uses.

Principles

1. Develop in an environmentally appropriate manner that protects and restores the natural environment.

2. Encourage the responsible use of resources to ensure long-term sustainability, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and reduce demands on energy, water, and waste systems.

3. Manage growth over time to ensure that it is logical, efficient, and cost effective.

4. Ensure a diverse community with a mix and range of land uses to ensure a proper balance of residential uses, employment opportunities, and community facilities and services.

5. Develop a well-designed and connected community of residential neighbourhoods that provide for a range of housing types and choices, including affordable housing.

6. Ensure an efficient transportation network that includes mobility options, is transit supportive, includes active transportation, walking and cycling, and accommodates vehicles.

7. Provide an interconnected system of streets and pedestrian supportive streetscapes.

8. Provide for a connected and integrated system of parks, open spaces, and multi-use trails.

9. Utilize green infrastructure to make use of the absorbing and filtering abilities of plants, trees, and soil to protect water quality, reduce runoff volumes, and recharge groundwater supplies.
What is the required minimum density?
New greenfield areas must achieve a minimum density of 80 persons and jobs per hectare.

How density is calculated...
Density is the ratio of residents and jobs to a land area - the measure of how many people live and work in an area.

Density = persons + jobs per hectare
Density can vary and is calculated as an average across the entire area.

Natural heritage features, electricity transmission lines (e.g. Hydro corridor), railways, freeways, employment areas (industrial), and cemeteries are excluded from the overall calculation in a designated greenfield area.

What it looks like...

RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD AREA

MIXED USE REGIONAL CORRIDOR/NODE

COMMUNITY STRUCTURE PLAN - NODES AND CORRIDORS

Employment Areas excluded
Natural Heritage Features excluded

Source: The Planning Partnership and the City of Markham
ELFRIDA
GROWTH AREA STUDY

PREFERRED COMMUNITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS

- Major Greenlands System
- Major Road Network
- Parks and Open Space
- Mixed Use Centres
- Mixed Use Transit Corridors
- Community Centres
- Secondary Schools
- Elementary Schools
- Residential

- Retail and office
- Mid-rise
- Public space
- Mix and diversity

Mixed use centres

The Natural Heritage System mapping is not final and is subject to the final recommendations of the Subwatershed Study.

Appendix "C" to Report PED18182
Page 61 of 158
ELFRIDA
GROWTH AREA STUDY
PREFERRED COMMUNITY STRUCTURE ELEMENTS

- Major Greenlands System
- Major Road Network
- Parks and Open Space
- Mixed Use Centres
- Mixed Use Transit Corridors
- Community Centres
- Secondary Schools
- Elementary Schools
- Residential

- Mix of housing types
- Mix and variety
- Townhouse
- Single detached

- Natural environment + trails
- Natural heritage
- Bicycle paths
- Community gardens

The Natural Heritage System mapping is not final and is subject to the final recommendations of the Subwatershed Study.
WHERE WE ARE IN THE PROCESS

We are currently beginning Phase 3 - Recommended Option, to develop the preferred land use scenario and Secondary Plan for Elfrida.

ADDITIONAL STUDIES

Concurrent and additional studies are required to inform the future Secondary Plan, some of which are already underway. These include:

- Municipal Comprehensive Review
- Land Needs Assessment
- Subwatershed Study
- Water and Wastewater Servicing Master Plan
- Transportation Master Plan
- Agricultural Impact Assessment
- Urban Design Guidelines
- Financial Investment Strategy
- Phasing Study

These plans will contribute to further informing the Elfrida Growth Area Study, and assist in the final phase of this study to develop a preferred land use scenario and Secondary Plan.

PHASE 1 - PROJECT LAUNCH

Community Focus Group (CFG) Mtg 1
June 13 2017

Visioning and Design Workshop
(#1) June 21-22 2017

PHASE 2 - LAND USE OPTIONS

CFG Mtg 2
Nov. 13 2017

Public Workshop (#2) Review
land use scenarios
Dec. 7 2017

PHASE 3A - COMMUNITY STRUCTURE IDEAS

CFG Mtg 3a
Mar. 30 2018

Public Workshop (#3a) Review
Community Structure Ideas - June 12 2018

PHASE 3B - RECOMMENDED OPTION

CFG Mtg 3b

Public Workshop (#3b) Review
preferred land use scenario
Please fill in a comment sheet before you leave, or take one with you to fill in later. We would appreciate receiving your comments by **WEDNESDAY JULY 4, 2018**.

**THANK YOU**

for attending this Public Information Centre. Your participation in this process is important and will contribute to the Elfrida Growth Area Study.

**WE WANT TO HEAR FROM YOU – OTHER WAYS TO GET INVOLVED**

**SIGN UP FOR E-MAIL OR MAIL UPDATES**
Elfrida@hamilton.ca

**VISIT WEBSITE**
www.hamilton.ca/elfrida

**COMMENT SHEETS**
Fill out and leave with team or e-mail/mail to staff listed below

**CONTACT STAFF**
Call, e-mail or meet with staff to discuss.

*If you would like a copy of the information presented tonight, it will be available on the website at www.hamilton.ca/elfrida*
ELFRIDA GROWTH AREA STUDY

PREFERRED COMMUNITY STRUCTURE IDEAS PLAN

COMMENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenlands System and Parks</th>
<th>Road Network</th>
<th>Mixed Use Centres</th>
<th>Transit Corridor</th>
<th>Institutional</th>
<th>Residential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOVE IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT'S OK</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DON'T LIKE IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Natural Heritage System mapping is not final and is subject to the final recommendations of the Subwatershed Study.
Community Meeting #1
Visioning & Design Workshop
Elfrida Growth Area Study

Community Focus Group Meeting #1
June 13, 2017
6:00 pm

Purpose of the Study

- The Elfrida Area has been identified as the preferred location to accommodate new growth to 2031 and beyond
- This area was selected through the City’s comprehensive Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (GRiDS) process.
Identification of the Study Area


- Planning process that identified Nodes and Corridors Structure for growth and development for the City of Hamilton
- Associated Infrastructure Requirements
- Economic Development Strategy
- Financial Implications for growth options
- Identified Elfrida lands to accommodate growth to 2031

Chronology

Rural Hamilton Official Plan
- Elfrida Study Area – Special Policy Area
  - Outlined the process and studies to be carried out to include the lands in the urban boundary
  - Province removed the Special Policy Area
  - Province’s decision appealed by City and Landowners

Urban Hamilton Official Plan
- General set of policies for an urban boundary expansion
  - Reference to Elfrida as a future growth area
  - Province removed the reference to Elfrida
  - Province’s decision appealed by City and Landowners
Chronology

- No resolution to appeals at this time

- City preparing an updated Municipal Comprehensive Review and Land Budget Analysis to determine the exact amount of land required to accommodate growth to 2041

- Ontario Municipal Board hearing dates have not been scheduled

Background

- Although the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) and Rural Hamilton Official Plan (RHOP) relating to the Elfrida lands are under appeal, urban boundary expansion policies are in effect (in the UHOP)

- Urban boundary expansion policies in the UHOP:
  - Provide guidance and direction for studies required to bring Elfrida into the urban boundary and assign appropriate land uses (Municipal Comprehensive Review, background studies, public consultation, secondary plan)
Background Studies

- **Municipal Comprehensive Review**
  - GRIDS 2
  - Population and employment forecasts (2041)
  - Land Budget Analysis (supply and demand for residential, commercial & employment land up to 2041)

- **Subwatershed Study**
  - Stormwater, infrastructure, natural heritage system impacts

- **Secondary Plan**
  - Detailed policy and land use direction for future growth

Scope of the Study

- Secondary Plan
- Water / Wastewater Servicing Master Plan
- Agricultural Impact Assessment
- Archaeological Assessment
- Natural Heritage Review
- Transportation Management
- Plating / Spraying / Application
- Urban Design Guidelines
- Financial Investment Strategy
- Commercial Lands Review
- Cultural Heritage Assessment
**Timeline: Secondary Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>Phase 2</th>
<th>Phase 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Background Research &amp; Analysis</td>
<td>Land Use Scenarios</td>
<td>Preferred Land Use Scenario &amp; Secondary Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Community Working Group 1**: Visioning & Design Workshop 1 June 21 & 22, 2017
- **Community Working Group 2**: Public Workshop 2 Review land use scenarios
- **Community Working Group 3**: Public Workshop 3 Review preferred land use scenario

- Pop-Up Consultation Events
- Small Group Meetings
- Online Engagement / Project Website

**Community Focus Group: Purpose**

- **Assist in the identification of current and potential opportunities, issues and constraints** relative to land use, transportation, servicing, natural heritage and other aspects of the project.
- **Share knowledge** of the area.
- **Review** the project team’s work in progress and provide input to the study team at key milestones throughout the study.
- **Provide feedback** that reflects the needs and interests of the local community and/or their represented interest group.
- **Assist with communicating the study’s progress** to the larger community.
- **Attend public information centres** where possible.
- **Not a decision making body**.
Community Focus Group: Role and Responsibilities

- Familiarize themselves with the study area and material on the Elfrida Growth Area Study website

- Come prepared to meetings by reviewing materials provided

- Participate equally in the meetings providing feedback to the information shared by City staff and the Consulting Team

- Share information with members of your community and/or stakeholder group

- Attend each of the three Community Focus Group meetings (or provide regrets in advance of the meeting)

- Act respectfully towards other Community Focus Group members, City staff, the Consulting Team and Councillors

Visioning and Design Workshop

Wednesday, June 21, 2017
4:00 to 6:00 pm OR 6:30 to 8:30 pm

- Background, givens, key directions and design principles

- Presentation by the team, followed by table group discussions: what’s important, what are the foundational principles for optional concepts?

PRODUCT:
Vision and Guiding Principles
Visioning and Design Workshop

Thursday, June 22, 2017
3:00 to 5:00 pm OR 6:00 to 8:00 pm

Design Day

• Preregistration for participation in the development of options for the Elfrida planning area

• Join one of three groups to work with a designer from the project team to explore community options for the Elfrida planning area

PRODUCT:
Three options for Elfrida

Visioning and Design Workshop:
Development Program for Three Options

Each option will explore variables in:

- The natural heritage system

- Urban structure
  • road system
  • park system
  • location of neighbourhoods and centres
  • distribution of density

- Approach to stormwater
The Basis of the Secondary Plan

- Potential to use existing infrastructure and to complete the existing communities
- Use existing and planned transportation networks
- Inter-connected and multi-modal transportation network
- Emphasis on transit and pedestrian connections to encourage active and alternative transportation choices

The Basis of the Secondary Plan

- Meet the provincial targets for population growth and intensification
- Designed as a compact urban community
- A model of excellence in urban development
The Basis of the Secondary Plan

- environmentally sound policies that promote **sustainable development**
- conserve the **natural and cultural heritage**
- protect **source water** and encourage **low impact development**
- conformity with **agricultural policies** and support for continued **agriculture** if desired

Round table discussion

What are the **key opportunities for growth** in the Elfrida Planning Area?

What are the **key challenges for growth**?
Round table discussion
What’s most important from your perspective with respect to:

1. Design of new communities and neighbourhoods
2. Transportation: transit, vehicles, pedestrians, cycling
3. Natural features and open spaces
4. Heritage and culture
5. Servicing

Next Steps

Attend the Visioning and Design Workshop
June 21 and 22, 2017

Attend the Community Focus Group meeting
Fall of 2017 – date and location to be confirmed
**PURPOSE OF THIS STUDY**

- Develop future land uses and an urban vision for the Elfrida Study Area
- Includes supportive Master Plan studies to service the growth

**ABOUT ELFRIDA**

- Existing uses within the Study Area
  - Agricultural uses
  - Rural residential
  - Commercial developments along major routes
  - Employment uses (including a small industrial park along Swayze Road)
Wards 9 and 11, compared to Hamilton overall (based on 2011 census):

- Slightly lower proportion of seniors (65+)
- Fewer single parent families
- Lower unemployment rate
- Higher household incomes
- Fewer commutes by active transportation

WORK COMPLETED TO DATE

- **Vision 2020**: 1992 visioning exercise that created a number of sustainability indicators
- **GRIDS**: 2006 Council-approved Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (GRIDS)
- **RHOP UHOP**: Vision, goals, objectives, and policies to guide growth and development across Hamilton
- **Our Future Hamilton**: 2015 visioning study engaged 54,000 community members on their vision for the future of Hamilton
- **2016-2025 Strategic Plan**: Aims to create a healthy, safe, prosperous and sustainable community
1. There are a number of municipal studies underway to review growth management in Hamilton.

2. Study team is tasked with developing an urban vision for the full Study Area.

3. This study is part of the City’s integrated approach to evaluating big and pressing questions related to growth.

4. The results of these other studies will inform the recommendations and outcomes of this study (and vice versa).

5. The policies of the 2017 Growth Plan mean that Elfrida will develop in a form and function differently and uniquely from any other new community in Ontario.
INPUTS TO THE STUDY

- **GRIDS 2**
  - Population and employment forecasts (2041)

- **Municipal Comprehensive Review**
  - Land Budget Analysis
    - (supply and demand for residential, commercial & employment land up to 2041)

- **Subwatershed Study**
  - Stormwater, infrastructure, natural heritage, system impacts

ELERIDA STUDY OVERVIEW

- Subwatershed Study
- Natural Heritage Review
- Cultural Heritage Assessment
- Water / Wastewater Servicing Master Plan
- Agricultural Impact Assessment
- Archaeological Assessment
- Transportation Master Plan
- Commercial Lands Review
- Financial Investment Strategy
- Urban Design Guidelines
- Phasing / Staging / Implementation
- A Future Secondary Plan
The Elfrida Growth Area Study is being undertaken in accordance with the joint Master Plan process identified through the Planning Act and the Environmental Assessment Act.

The City is also undertaking two Master Plans as components of the Elfrida Growth Area Study:

1. Transportation Master Plan
2. Water and Wastewater (W&WW) Servicing Master Plan

**STUDY OVERVIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 1</th>
<th>• Identify the Problems and Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2</td>
<td>• Develop and Evaluate Alternative Solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 3</td>
<td>• Develop and Evaluate Alternative Design Concepts for Preferred Solution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 4</td>
<td>• Prepare an Environmental Study Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 5</td>
<td>• Project Implementation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WHAT IS A SECONDARY PLAN?**

- An additional level of Official Plan policy
- Detail land use, infrastructure, design policies for specific geographic areas
- Provide for consistency of development within a new community
STUDY TIMELINE

February – Early Fall 2017  
Phase 1  
Background Research & Analysis  
Community Focus Group Mtg 1  
June 13  
Visioning & Design Workshop (#1)  
June 21 & 22  
Pop-Up Consultation Events  
Small Group Meetings  
Online Engagement / Project Website  
We are here

Early Fall 2017 to Early 2018  
Phase 2  
Land Use Scenarios  
Community Focus Group Mtg 2  
Public Workshop (#2)  
Review land use scenarios

Early 2018 to Summer 2018  
Phase 3  
Preferred Land Use Scenario & Secondary Plan  
Community Focus Group Mtg 3  
Public Workshop (#3)  
Review preferred land use scenario

Transportation  
Cultural Heritage  
Agriculture  
Water and Wastewater  
Subwatershed Study  
Commercial Lands Review
TRANSPORTATION

POLICY

Provides direction on rapid transit initiatives and improving existing transit in the City

Hamilton Transportation Master Plan

Outlines overall vision of an integrated and balanced transportation network in Hamilton

"Rapid Ready" Report

Provides direction on active transportation initiatives in the City

Shifting Gears: Cycling Master Plan

10-Year Local Transit Strategy

Step Forward: Pedestrian Mobility Plan

Hamilton Recreational Trails Master Plan
EXISTING TRANSIT NETWORK

PROPOSED TRANSIT NETWORK
### KEY DIRECTIONS

1. Foster a connected and accessible on-road and off-road pedestrian path network, which promotes a culture of walking
2. Build an extensive on-road and off-road cycling network which can connect cyclists for utilitarian, commuting and recreational uses
3. Create an expanded transit network that can support ridership demand until the implementation of rapid transit through the proposed LRT / BRT routes (25-year horizon)
4. Design a complete street network that would be supportive of all modes of travel as well as supporting vehicle and goods movement (including agricultural equipment) demands

---

### CULTURAL HERITAGE

[Map of CULTURAL HERITAGE area]
STUDY OVERVIEW

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment
- Will identify areas of Indigenous and historical potential
- Will map all areas requiring further Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment

Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment
- Will identify cultural heritage resources
- Will provide general mitigation recommendations to assess and, where possible, avoid negative impacts

FINDINGS TO DATE

Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment
- Over 200 registered archaeological sites within a 1 km radius of the Study Area
- Sites demonstrate a long history of Indigenous occupation and Euro-Canadian settlement

Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment
- Agricultural land use and settlement within and adjacent to the Study Area began in the early nineteenth century
- The City of Hamilton's Heritage Register lists 24 cultural heritage resources within or adjacent to the Study Area
1. Conservation and protection of identified cultural heritage resources should be upheld through appropriate planning and design measures as identified in applicable legislation.

2. Conservation and protection of cultural heritage landscapes should occur through implementing development and site alteration activities that protect, maintain, and enhance those areas.

3. Non-designated, and non-registered cultural heritage properties shall be appropriately identified, evaluated, and conserved through applicable legislation.

4. Protect, conserve, and mitigate archaeological sites and areas of archaeological potential through applicable legislation; avoid harmful disruption or disturbance of known archaeological sites or areas of archaeological potential.

5. Include Indigenous consultation as part of work program.

---

**AGRICULTURE**
Agricultural related considerations that will require management and coordination include:

- **Compatibility** – plan future land uses utilizing a phased method to minimize the potential for issues of compatibility, particularly with respect to Minimum Distance Separation, nuisance, water and agricultural chemical use
- **Parcel Fragmentation** – development should consider avoiding fragmenting parcels which could obstruct access to fields and cause excessive heavy and slow moving farm equipment to travel using urban streets
- **Goods Movement** – consider options to support movement of vehicles shipping agricultural goods to markets

**PRINCIPLES**
PRINCIPLES

Farms and farmers are protected under the Farming and Food Production Protection Act (FFPPA, 1998):

• Farmers are protected from nuisance complaints made by neighbours, provided they are following normal farm practices
• No municipal by-law applies to restrict a normal farm practice carried on as part of an agricultural operation

KEY DIRECTIONS

1. Agricultural lands where the use would likely remain agricultural will be identified, evaluated, and considered throughout the planning and design process
2. Any adverse impacts on agricultural operations and on the agri-food network from expanding settlement areas would be avoided or, if avoidance is not possible, minimized and mitigated as determined through an agricultural impact assessment
3. Integrating and mitigation of public feedback (questions/concerns) of future effects during transition from agricultural setting to a more urban setting with inclusion of urban agriculture
WATER AND WASTEWATER SERVICING MASTER PLAN

WATER DISTRIBUTION

Watermains Pressure Districts

- 150 mm 23
- 250 mm 25
- 300 mm 6
- 400 mm 6
- 450 mm 7

City of Hamilton

Existing Water Distribution System
WATER & WASTEWATER MASTER PLAN

- Preferred alternative to service the Southeast Mountain:
  - An expansion to the existing HD007 pumping station
  - Includes a new water tank to provide storage, security and operational flexibility

WASTEWATER COLLECTION

- There is no wastewater infrastructure currently servicing the Ellida Study Area as it is outside the urban boundary
- The Upper Centennial Parkway Sanitary Trunk Sewer is currently under construction and will be extended through the Ellida Study Area from Green Mountain Road to Golf Club Road
- The trunk sewer is 1,800 mm in diameter and was designed to connect to proposed and existing sanitary infrastructure
1. Consider ease of connecting any future water and wastewater infrastructure to the City’s existing water and wastewater infrastructure
2. Maintain or enhance drinking water quality
3. Provide efficient wastewater collection with a focus on the protection of property and the environment
The Elfrida Subwatershed Study is one of several component studies which will be undertaken in support of the Elfrida Growth Area Study process.

- The purpose of the Subwatershed Study is to develop a plan that allows sustainable development, while ensuring maximum benefits to the natural and human environments on a watershed basis.
SUBWATERSHED STUDY

NEXT STEPS

- Preferred land use strategy to be developed (Winter 2018)

SWS Phase 2
- Evaluation of potential impacts of land uses on the Natural Heritage System
- Development and evaluation of preferred subwatershed management strategies
- Selection of preferred subwatershed management strategy
- Present preferred strategy

SWS Phase 3
- Implementation

Traditional Stormwater Management (SWM) Techniques
- Treat rainwater as a liability and waste that needs to be flushed away from urban areas
- Provide water quantity and quality control only
- Depend on end-of-pipe treatment only
- Tend to use pipes and hard structures to convey stormwater runoff rates
- Engineering-based
- Not easy to link to watershed goals, objectives, and targets

Low Impact Development (LID) Techniques
- Treat rainwater as a resource to be protected and managed
- Provide water balance control and landscape functionality in addition to water quantity and quality control
- Stormwater quantity, quality, and water balance are treated from source to receiving waters (e.g., river, lake, pond)
- Tend to use natural / urban landscapes, including soils, pipes, and trees
- Watershed-based, and can be easily linked to overall goals and targets, and adaptive watershed management
KEY DIRECTIONS

1. Identify and explore land use design options that enhance or are compatible with the Natural Heritage System
2. Identify and integrate compatible recreation opportunities that connect the community to the Natural Heritage System
3. Consider enhancement opportunities and opportunities to integrate non-core features into the design (e.g. hedgerows)

COMMERCIAL LANDS REVIEW
Currently, the Primary Trade Area has nearly 2.3 times the amount of shopping centre-type space per capita compared to the City of Hamilton average.

There is room for considerable population growth within the Primary Trade Area (which encompasses the Elfrida Study Area, and beyond) – in the range of 35,100 persons – without a requirement for additional provision of retail-commercial lands.

This does not restrict local, neighbourhood commercial uses.
Each of the three different development options will explore variables in:

- The natural heritage system
- Urban structure
  - road system
  - park system
  - location of neighbourhoods and centres
  - distribution of density
- Approach to stormwater management

Please pre-register if interested.
DISCUSSION QUESTION #1

What is most important from your perspective with respect to:

1. Design of new communities and neighbourhoods
2. Transportation: transit, vehicles, pedestrians, cycling
3. Natural features and open spaces
4. Heritage and culture
5. Servicing

DISCUSSION QUESTION #2

A Vision Statement for the Elfrida Growth Area describes a preferred future condition - the aspiration for the character and form of new development in the Elfrida Growth Area.

Brainstorm with others at your table
Write a list of words or phrases you think should be captured in a Vision Statement

From the list, choose your top three words or phrases
Write one word/phrase on one sheet of paper
Elfrida Growth Area Study

Visioning and Design Workshop 1
June 22, 2017

https://www.hamilton.ca/elfrida

VISIONING AND DESIGN WORKSHOP

Day 2: June 22, 2017 – DESIGN DAY

Each of the three different development options will explore variables in:

The natural heritage system

Urban structure
  • road system
  • park system
  • location of neighbourhoods and centres
  • distribution of density

Approach to stormwater management
KEY DIRECTIONS- transportation

1. Foster a connected and accessible on-road and off-road pedestrian path network which promotes a culture of walking
2. Build an extensive on-road and off-road cycling network which can connect cyclists for utilitarian, commuting and recreational uses
3. Create an expanded transit network that can support ridership demand until the implementation of rapid transit through the proposed LRT / BRT routes (25-year horizon)
4. Design a complete street network that would be supportive of all modes of travel as well as supporting vehicle and goods movement (including agricultural equipment) demands

KEY DIRECTIONS- cultural heritage

1. Conservation and protection of identified cultural heritage resources should be upheld through appropriate planning and design measures as identified in applicable legislation
2. Conservation and protection of cultural heritage landscapes should occur through implementing development and site alteration activities that protect, maintain, and enhance those areas
3. Non-designated, and non-registered cultural heritage properties shall be appropriately identified, evaluated, and conserved through applicable legislation
4. Protect, conserve, and mitigate archaeological sites and areas of archaeological potential through applicable legislation; avoid harmful disruption or disturbance of known archaeological sites or areas of archaeological potential
5. Include Indigenous consultation as part of work program
KEY DIRECTIONS - agriculture

1. Agricultural lands where the use would likely remain agricultural will be identified, evaluated, and considered throughout the planning and design process.

2. Any adverse impacts on agricultural operations and on the agri-food network from expanding settlement areas would be avoided or, if avoidance is not possible, minimized and mitigated as determined through an agricultural impact assessment.

3. Integrating and mitigation of public feedback (questions/concerns) of future effects during transition from agricultural setting to a more urban setting with inclusion of urban agriculture.

KEY DIRECTIONS - subwatershed

1. Identify and explore land use design options that enhance or are compatible with the Natural Heritage System.

2. Identify and integrate compatible recreation opportunities that connect the community to the Natural Heritage System.

3. Consider enhancement opportunities and opportunities to integrate non-core features into the design (e.g. hedgerows).
1. Currently, the Primary Trade Area has nearly 2.3 times the amount of shopping centre-type space per capita compared to the City of Hamilton average.

2. There is room for considerable population growth within the Primary Trade Area (which encompasses the Elfrida Study Area, and beyond) – in the range of 35,100 persons – without a requirement for additional provision of retail-commercial lands.

3. This does not restrict local, neighbourhood commercial uses.

---

**KEY DIRECTIONS - commercial**

What words or phrases should be captured in a Vision Statement for Elfrida Growth Area?

- Safety
- Transit supportive
- Housing options
- Green space
- Connected
- Transit supportive

---
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DRAFT DESIGN PRINCIPLES

1. Develop in an environmentally appropriate manner that protects and restores the natural environment

2. Encourage the responsible use of resources to ensure long-term sustainability, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and reduce demands on energy, water, and waste systems

3. Manage growth over time that is logical, efficient, and cost effective

4. Plan for a diverse community with a mix and range of land uses to ensure a balance of residential, employment, community facilities, and services

5. Develop a well-designed and connected community of residential neighbourhoods that provide for a range of housing types and choices

6. Ensure an efficient transportation network that includes mobility options, is transit supportive, includes active transportation – walking and cycling - and accommodates vehicles

7. Provide an interconnected system of streets and pedestrian appealing streetscapes

8. Provide for a connected and integrated parks, open spaces, and trails system

9. Use green infrastructure to make use of the absorbing and filtering abilities of plants, trees, and soil to protect water quality, reduce runoff volumes, and recharge groundwater supplies
Complete Communities

Places such as mixed-use neighbourhoods or other areas within cities, towns, and settlement areas that offer and support opportunities for people of all ages and abilities to conveniently access most of the necessities for daily living, including an appropriate mix of jobs, local stores, and services, a full range of housing, transportation options and public service facilities.

Complete communities are age-friendly and may take different shapes and forms appropriate to their contexts.

Compact Built Form

A land use pattern that encourages the efficient use of land, walkable neighbourhoods, mixed land uses … all within one neighbourhood, proximity to transit and reduced need for infrastructure.

Compact built form can include detached and semi-detached houses on small lots, as well as townhouses and walk-up apartments, multi-storey commercial developments, and apartments or offices above retail.

Walkable neighbourhoods can be characterized by roads laid out in a well-connected network, destinations that are easily accessible by transit and active transportation, sidewalks with minimal interruptions for vehicle access, and a pedestrian-friendly environment along roads to encourage active transportation.
BUILT ENVIRONMENT

Daily activities and amenities within 400 metres (5 minute walk) of residences to support walking, cycling, and local transit within the community.

MIX OF USES

mix and diversity

MIX OF HOUSING TYPES

mix of housing types
CONNECTED AND PERMEABLE STREETS

200m radius

PEDESTRIAN FRIENDLY AND WALKABLE STREETS

pedestrian supportive
THE SECONDARY PLAN WILL...

- Seize the potential to **use existing infrastructure** and to **integrate into the existing communities**
- Utilize existing and planned **transportation networks**
- Feature an **inter-connected and multi-modal transportation network**
- Place an emphasis on **transit and pedestrian connections** to encourage **active and alternative transportation choices**
THE SECONDARY PLAN WILL...

- Include environmentally sound policies that promote **sustainable development**
- Conserve the **natural and cultural heritage**
- Protect **source water** and encourage **low impact development** techniques
- Consider **agricultural policies** and how to provide **support for continued agriculture**

---

THE SECONDARY PLAN WILL...

- Contribute to the City implementing its provincial targets for **population growth and intensification**
- Be designed as a **compact urban community**
- Be a model of **excellence in urban development**
Community Meeting #2
Conceptual Development Options
Elfrida Growth Area Study

Public Information Centre #2
December 6, 2017
6:00 - 8:30 pm

Purpose of the Study

- The Elfrida Area has been identified as the preferred location to accommodate new growth to 2031 and beyond.
- This area was selected through the City’s comprehensive Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (GRIDS) process.
Identification of the Study Area


- Planning process that identified Nodes and Corridors Structure for growth and development for the City of Hamilton
- Associated Infrastructure Requirements
- Economic Development Strategy
- Financial Implications for growth concepts
- Identified Elfrida lands to accommodate growth to 2031

Chronology

Rural Hamilton Official Plan
Elfrida Study Area – Special Policy Area
- Outlined the process and studies to be carried out to include the lands in the urban boundary
- Province removed the Special Policy Area
- Province’s decision appealed by City and Landowners

Urban Hamilton Official Plan
General set of policies for an urban boundary expansion
- Reference to Elfrida as a future growth area
- Province removed the reference to Elfrida
- Province’s decision appealed by City and Landowners
Chronology

- No resolution to appeals at this time

- City preparing an updated Municipal Comprehensive Review and Land Budget Analysis to determine the exact amount of land required to accommodate growth to 2041

- Ontario Municipal Board hearing dates have not been scheduled

Background

- Although the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) and Rural Hamilton Official Plan (RHOP) relating to the Elfrida lands are under appeal, urban boundary expansion policies are in effect (in the UHOP)

- Urban boundary expansion policies in the UHOP:
  - Provide guidance and direction for studies required to bring Elfrida into the urban boundary and assign appropriate land uses (Municipal Comprehensive Review, background studies, public consultation, secondary plan)
Background Studies

- Municipal Comprehensive Review
  - Land Budget Analysis (supply and demand for residential, commercial & employment land up to 2041)

- Subwatershed Study
  - Stormwater, infrastructure, natural heritage system impacts

- Secondary Plan
  - Detailed policy and land use direction for future growth

Scope of the Study

- Water / Wastewater Servicing Master Plan
- Agricultural Impact Assessment
- Archaeological Assessment
- Natural Heritage Review
- Transportation Management
- Financial Investment Strategy
- Urban Design Guidelines
- Phasing / Staging / Implementation
- Commercial Lands Review
- Cultural Heritage Assessment
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Input from Phase 1 Consultation: Vision

The Elfrida Growth Area is envisioned to become a complete, transit-supportive, mixed-use community that is compact, well-connected and both environmentally and economically sustainable, through a long-term strategy that respects the neighbouring land uses.
Input from Phase 1 Consultation: Principles

1. Develop in an **environmentally appropriate manner** that protects and restores the natural environment.

2. Encourage the **responsible use of resources** to ensure long-term sustainability, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and reduce demands on energy, water, and waste systems.

3. **Manage growth** over time that is logical, efficient, and cost effective.

4. Ensure a diverse community with a **mix and range of land uses** to ensure a proper balance of residential, employment, community facilities, and services.

5. Develop a **well-designed and connected community** of residential neighbourhoods that provide for a range of housing types and choices.

6. Ensure an **efficient transportation network** that includes mobility options, is transit supportive, includes active transportation, walking and cycling, and accommodates vehicles.

7. Provide an **interconnected system of streets and pedestrian supportive streetscapes**.

8. Provide for a **connected and integrated parks, open spaces, and trails system**.

9. Use **green infrastructure** to make use of the absorbing and filtering abilities of plants, trees, and soil to protect water quality, reduce runoff volumes, and recharge groundwater supplies.
Input from Phase 1 Consultation: Concepts

Development Program: 3 Concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Natural Heritage System</th>
<th>Development Program 1</th>
<th>Development Program 2</th>
<th>Development Program 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>entrance/toil</td>
<td>do not consider</td>
<td>moderate environmental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>residential</td>
<td>retail sense</td>
<td>retail sense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Community Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mixed-pods of develop</td>
<td>Moderating commercial, focus on existing road networks</td>
<td>permeable and connective, identify walkways and trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Design Details</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>centred system of parks, large neighborhood parks</td>
<td>very large community park, smaller neighborhood parks</td>
<td>variety of parks, linked to NID/GDAH and within neighborhood service belt (all)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>no major commerce, neighborhood focus</td>
<td>focus on major roads, some neighborhood commercial</td>
<td>mix of small and large scale retail, focused in core and corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>connected to main system, standard street width</td>
<td>school campus associated with central park</td>
<td>centred in neighborhoods, urban scale roadways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Distribution</td>
<td>integrated and even distribution of low, medium, and high density housing in neighborhood areas</td>
<td>major mixed-use centre at Upper Centennial Parkway and James Road, high density housing focused in centres</td>
<td>medium and high density housing distributed in centres and corridors, medium and low residential in neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (Education)</td>
<td>employment related to primary road access</td>
<td>no employment, only major retail and services</td>
<td>employment campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>focus on LDO, increase SRAH points</td>
<td>at SRAH points - institutional</td>
<td>construction of LDO and SRAH points</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions:
Schools: 3 (All Ordinary Required) Hamilton North west District School Board: HMB2119
Community: 565, 420 students, 2,400
Residences: 1,000 in 1,500 homes, 7,600
http://www.hmb2119.com\~hmb2119/index.html

Appendices by author: M.A. Business Administration, Queen's University
Land density: 5.00
High density: 1.76
City of Hamilton Development Charis background study: October 2014
Mixed Use / Commercial

Concept 1
Development Pods

Concept 2
Central Node

Concept 3
Nodes & Corridors

Institutional & Parks

Concept 1
Development Pods

Concept 2
Central Node

Concept 3
Nodes & Corridors
Concept 1: Development Pods
Natural Heritage System

Legend:
- Secondary Plan boundaries
- Residential
- Commercial
- Employment
- Elementary School
- Secondary School
- Place of Worship
- Community Centre
- Neighbourhood Park
- Natural Heritage System
- Roads
- Utility Services
- Neighbourhood (Not shown)

Residential

Concept 2
Central Node

Concept 3
Nodes & Corridors
Concept 1: Development Pods
Natural Heritage System + Roads

Legend:
- Residential
- Commercial
- Employment
- Elementary School
- Secondary School
- Place of Worship
- Community Centre
- Neighborhood Park
- Natural Heritage System
- Roads
- Utility Corridor
- Neighborhood (HCM controls)

Concept 1: Development Pods
Natural Heritage System + Roads + Mixed Use / Commercial

Legend:
- Secondary Plan Boundary
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Concept 1: Development Pods
Natural Heritage System + Roads + Mixed Use / Commercial + Institutional & Parks

Legend
- Residential
- Commercial
- Institutional
- Parks
- Utility Center
- Place of Worship
- Natural Heritage System
- Neighboring Parks
- Roads
- Neighborhood

Concept 1: Development Pods
Natural Heritage System + Roads + Mixed Use / Commercial + Institutional & Parks + Residential

Legend
- Residential
- Commercial
- Institutional
- Parks
- Utility Center
- Place of Worship
- Natural Heritage System
- Neighboring Parks
- Roads
- Neighborhood
Concept 1: Development Pods

Concept 1: Development Pods within the context of existing and planned development
Concept 2: Central Node
Natural Heritage System

Concept 2: Central Node
Natural Heritage System + Roads
Concept 2: Central Node
Natural Heritage System + Roads + Mixed Use / Commercial

Legend:
- Secondary Plan Boundary
- Low Rise Residential
- Mid Rise Residential
- High Rise Residential
- Commercial / Mixed Use
- Employment
- Elementary School
- Secondary School
- Place of Worship
- Community Centre
- Community Parks
- Neighbourhood Parks
- Natural Heritage System
- Stormwater Management Pond
- Roads
- Utility Corridors
- Neighbourhood 1.5km radius

Concept 2: Central Node
Natural Heritage System + Roads + Mixed Use / Commercial + Institutional & Parks

Legend:
- Secondary Plan Boundary
- Low Rise Residential
- Mid Rise Residential
- High Rise Residential
- Commercial / Mixed Use
- Employment
- Elementary School
- Secondary School
- Place of Worship
- Community Centre
- Community Parks
- Neighbourhood Parks
- Natural Heritage System
- Stormwater Management Pond
- Roads
- Utility Corridors
- Neighbourhood 1.5km radius
Concept 2: Central Node
Natural Heritage System + Roads + Mixed Use / Commercial + Institutional & Parks + Residential

Legend:
- Development/Development
- Low-Rise Residential
- Mid-Rise Residential
- High-Rise Residential
- Commercial/Office
- Employment
- Elementary School
- Secondary School
- Place or Metro

- Community Centre
- Community Park
- Residential Park
- Natural Heritage System
- Water Management Pond
- Rails
- Library
- School (K-8th)
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Concept 2: Central Node within the context of existing and planned development

Concept 3: Nodes & Corridors
Natural Heritage System
Concept 3: Nodes & Corridors
Natural Heritage System + Roads + Mixed Use / Commercial + Institutional & Parks

Legend:
- Community Centre
- Residential
- Neighbourhood Park
- Neighbourhood Green
- Stormwater Management Pond
- Roads
- Major Corridor
- Neighbourhood (within radius)

Concept 3: Nodes & Corridors
Natural Heritage System + Roads + Mixed Use / Commercial + Institutional & Parks + Residential

Legend:
- Community Centre
- Residential
- Neighbourhood Park
- Neighbourhood Green
- Stormwater Management Pond
- Roads
- Major Corridor
- Neighbourhood (within radius)
Concept 3: Nodes & Corridors within the context of existing and planned development
### Development Yields

**Total People and Jobs (p+j)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Concept 1</th>
<th>Concept 2</th>
<th>Concept 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross Land Area</strong></td>
<td>905.70 ha</td>
<td>1,000.34 ha</td>
<td>968.62 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>80 p+j combined</strong></td>
<td>72,456</td>
<td>80,027</td>
<td>77,490</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Population equivalent to the size of Peterborough or Belleville

---

### Inputs to the Evaluation of Concepts

Concept 1  | Concept 2  | Concept 3  |
---         |           |           |
**Evaluation Inputs**
- Public
- Community Focus Group
- City Staff Team
- Technical Advisory Committee
- Consulting Team

**Preferred Land Use Plan**
Evaluation of Concepts

The Concepts shown tonight are schematic illustrations that highlight key relationships of different development patterns.

It is anticipated that no one Concept shown tonight will be selected in its entirety. Your comments on the layers of each Concept will help the team identify the “best of” each Concept to become the preferred concept plan.

Comment on the characteristics/layers of the Concepts. Input will become part of the analysis contributing to the project team’s preparation of a recommended land use vision for Elfrida.

That refined concept shall be the focus of our next public information centre in spring 2018.

Evaluation Themes

- Ensure a compact, complete and healthy community
- Respond appropriately to long term urban structure implications
- Develop in an environmentally appropriate manner that protects, restores and enhances the natural environment and its associated features and functions
- Protect opportunities to farm land
Evaluation Themes

- Conserve cultural heritage
- Promote a coordinated, efficient and cost effective transportation network
- Promote coordinated, efficient and cost-effective water, wastewater and stormwater management systems
- Promote fiscal responsibility

Elevated Water Storage Facility and Pumping Station Study for Pressure District 7

- The purpose of this Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) study is to select the preferred sites for a new elevated water storage facility and pumping station.
- This new infrastructure is required to provide water supply for future growth within Pressure District 7 (PD7), and to address security of supply and water system balancing.
- To meet projected population growth, the elevated water storage facility is required by approximately 2021 and the pumping station by 2027.
Overview of the Municipal Class EA Process

- The Ontario Environmental Assessment Act (EAA) requires that most municipal infrastructure projects follow an approved Class EA process.
- This study is being conducted in accordance with the approved requirements for a Schedule “B” project as described in the Municipal Engineers Association’s Municipal Class EA document.
- The study is currently in Phase 2: Alternative Solutions. The results of the evaluation – the preferred sites for the elevated water storage facility and pumping station – will be presented at a second Public Information Centre (PIC) in Spring/Summer 2018.

Study Area and Alternative Sites

Contains public sector data made available under the City of Hamilton’s Open Data License.
Tonight’s meeting

**Table group discussions** to provide comments on the three concepts with respect to the location and distribution of the:

- Natural heritage system
- Roads
- Mixed use/commercial uses
- Institutional uses and parks
- Residential uses

**Input will assist the team in identifying the “best of” each concept to help prepare a preferred land use scenario for the Elfrida Growth Area**

The preferred land use plan will be prepared considering all inputs on the three concepts.
Next Steps

Evaluation of the Concepts with inputs from
• the public
• consulting team
• City of Hamilton
• Technical Advisory Team
• Community Focus Group

Preparation of draft preferred land use scenario

Review study progress [www.hamilton.ca/elfrida](http://www.hamilton.ca/elfrida)

Contact us:
Elfida Growth Area Study
Alissa Mahood, MCIP, RPP
905-546-2424 Ext. 1250 | E-Mail: alissa.mahood@hamilton.ca

Water Storage Facility and Pumping Station Study
Elizabeth Panicker, Project Manager
905-546-2424 Ext 6393 | Email: elizabeth.panicker@hamilton.ca
Community Meeting #3
Preferred Community Structure Ideas
Agenda & Meeting Purpose:
Public Information Centre #3

Agenda:
• Review Display materials (6:00 – 6:30pm)
• Presentation (6:30 – 7:00pm)
• Working Groups and Reporting Back (7:00 – 8:30pm)

Meeting Purpose:
• Review qualitative evaluation of three options
• Present and receive your input on the Preferred Community Structure Ideas Plan (Draft)
Study Purpose

- The Elfrida Area has been identified as the preferred location to accommodate new greenfield growth to 2031 and beyond.

- This area was selected through the City’s comprehensive Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (GRIDS) process.

- Although the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) and Rural Hamilton Official Plan (RHOP) relating to the Elfrida lands are under appeal, urban boundary expansion policies are in effect (in the UHOP).

- City preparing an updated Municipal Comprehensive Review and Land Budget Analysis to determine the amount of land required to accommodate growth to 2041.

How We Got Here – Consultation Process

- PIC #1 - June 21 and 22, 2017, resulting in the development of a Vision Statement, Guiding Principles, a list of important Community Characteristics and six Preliminary Land Use Explorations.

- PIC #2 – December 6, 2017, resulting in feedback on the 3 Development Options and evaluation criteria.

- Qualitative evaluations of the Development Options have been prepared.

- Preferred community structure ideas have been identified based on the evaluation.

- Community Focus Group meetings #2 and #3 held to review Development Options and emerging Preferred Community Structure Ideas.
Background Studies

- Municipal Comprehensive Review
  - Land Budget Analysis (supply and demand for residential, commercial & employment land up to 2041)
- Subwatershed Study
  - Stormwater, infrastructure, natural heritage system impacts
- Secondary Plan
  - Detailed policy and land use direction for future growth
- GRIDS 2
  - Population and employment forecasts (2041)

Scope of the Study

- Secondary Plan
- Water / Wastewater Servicing Master Plan
- Agricultural Impact Assessment
- Archaeological Assessment
- Cultural Heritage Assessment
- Natural Heritage Review
- Transportation Management
- Phasing / Staging / Implementation
- Financial Investment Strategy
- Urban Design Guidelines
- Commercial Lands Review
Evaluation of Development Options

- Qualitative analysis of Development Options by technical disciplines based on 25 evaluation criteria (8 themes), identified by the Study Team.

- The draft evaluation is a work in progress. The complete evaluation will be included in the Final Report.

- Evaluation provides direction in preparing the Preferred Concept Plan, that is pending, based on further inputs from the:
  
  - City’s Municipal Comprehensive Review (GRIDS II) to determine land needs to 2041 and the timing/phasing of growth within Elfrida; and
  
  - Recommendations of the City’s Subwatershed Study to finalize the Natural Heritage System.

- A detailed technical evaluation of the Preferred Concept Plan will be undertaken and supported by further transportation, water/wastewater, and stormwater management analysis.
Evaluation of Options – Concept 1

DEVELOPMENT PODS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNICAL AREA</th>
<th>EVALUATION BY AREA</th>
<th>REASONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Lacks a broader mix of land uses (i.e., commercial/retail) within accessible walking distance. Has significant natural heritage, parks, green space and likely trail opportunities.
- Limited north-south/behaviour connections does not support the establishment of a connected community. Also negatively impacts transit opportunities.
- Conserves all core features, all headwater drainage features, all wetland/wetland areas - model treatment & connected natural heritage system.
- Potential for a high level of retention of existing cultural heritage in area.
- Greatest number of natural heritage crossings mitigate with transitless technology. Must natural system for stormwater management.
- Opportunities for phasing to minimize impacts on existing farm operations in the short and mid-term.
- Lower development yields will result in less revenues for the City.
- Meets medium/high-density opportunities, but in a dispersed manner. Difficult to service with public transit, disconnected and density not focused on corridors.

Evaluation of Options – Concept 2

CENTRAL NODE
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[Map of Hamilton with various facilities and land use areas marked]
## Evaluation of Options – Concept 2
### CENTRAL NODE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNICAL AREA</th>
<th>EVALUATION BY AREA</th>
<th>REASONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Improved road connectivity, and more parkland. Not very ‘walkable’; the single central node may encourage a reliance on cars. Does not provide for a complete community. First and last mile connectivity would be a challenge as trips would be centred on the central commercial node.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conserves only core features, resulting in a discontinuous natural heritage system, limits long-term viability (movement of wildlife/seeds/plant materials).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepares increased commercial development in the current location of three identified cultural heritage resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Would likely require the highest fire flow, and largest diameter watermain and ensure this its central high density node. Difficult to phase cost-effectively.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for phasing to minimize impacts on existing farm operations in the short and mid-term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assuming market demand is sufficient to capture the proposed supply, Option 2 would likely result in the greatest fiscal impact to the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A single major node results in a less connected community and limited active transportation opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Evaluation of Options – Concept 3
### NODES AND CORRIDORS

[Map diagram showing various locations and corridors with various symbols and colors representing different elements and paths.]
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### Evaluation of Options – Concept 3

**NODES AND CORRIDORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNICAL AREA</th>
<th>EVALUATION AREA</th>
<th>REASONING AND RECOMMENDATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides the greatest diversity of land use/residential built form/housing densities. Accommodates neighbourhood serving commercial and employment opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Linear green space provides trail opportunities to complement active transportation. Better options for transit and phasing, with 3 primary nodes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conserves core features of the Subwatershed Study as well as some headwater drainage features. Connectivity and consideration for natural corridors is accommodated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential to retain portions of existing cultural heritage resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Requires the most additional connections to the existing trunk sewer. Fresh water sources to incorporate traditional and new stormwater management techniques.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for phasing to minimize impacts on existing farm operations in the short and mid-term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Assumption market demand is sufficient to capture the proposed supply. Option 3 would likely result in the second greatest fiscal impact to the City.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Best connectivity, diverse range of densities and nodal locations along corridors to encourage active transportation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A Successful Community

**VISION**

The Elfrida Community is envisioned to become a complete, healthy, transit-supportive, mixed-use community that is compact, well-connected and both environmentally and economically sustainable, through a long-term strategy that respects the neighbouring land uses.

**PRINCIPLES**

1. Develop in an environmentally appropriate manner that protects and restores the natural environment.

2. Encourage the responsible use of resources to ensure long-term sustainability, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and reduce demands on energy, water, and waste systems.

3. Manage growth over time that is logical, efficient and cost-effective.

4. Ensure a diverse community with a mix and range of land uses to ensure a proper balance of residential, employment, community facilities and services.
A Successful Community

PRINCIPLES (cont’d)

5. Develop a well-designed and connected community of residential neighbourhoods that provide for a range of housing types and choices.

6. Ensure an efficient transportation network that includes mobility options, is transit supportive, includes active transportation, walking and cycling, and accommodates vehicles.

7. Provide an interconnected system of streets and pedestrian supportive streetscapes.

8. Provide for a connected and integrated parks, open spaces, and trails system.

9. Utilize green infrastructure to make use of the absorbing and filtering abilities of plants, trees, and soil to protect water quality, reduce runoff volumes, and recharge groundwater supplies.

Preferred Community Structure Ideas: Nodes & Corridors

Major Greenlands System

The Natural Heritage System mapping is not final and is subject to the final recommendations of the Subwatershed Study.
Preferred Community Structure Ideas: Nodes & Corridors

Major Road Network

Preferred Community Structure Ideas: Nodes & Corridors

Parks and Open Space System
Preferred Community Structure Ideas: Nodes & Corridors

Mixed Use Centres

Preferred Community Structure Ideas: Nodes & Corridors

Mixed Use Transit Corridors
Preferred Community Structure Ideas: Nodes & Corridors

Community Centres

Preferred Community Structure Ideas: Nodes & Corridors

Elementary and Secondary Schools
Next Steps

We are currently beginning Phase 3 - Recommended Option, to develop the preferred land use scenario and Secondary Plan for Elfria.

Additional studies are required to inform the future Secondary Plan, some of which are already underway, such as GRIDS II and the Subwatershed Study. These plans will contribute to further informing the Elfria Growth Area Study, and assist in the final phase of this study; developing a preferred land use scenario and Secondary Plan.

Upcoming events include:

• Planning Committee Meeting:
   September 4, 2018

• Community Focus Group Meeting (#3b)

• Public Workshop (#3b)

Your input will help inform the preparation of the Recommended Option and Secondary Plan
QUESTIONS?

Melanie Pham, MCIP, RPP
P: 905-546-2424 Ext. 6685
E: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca

Alissa Mahood, MCIP, RPP
P: 905-546-2424 Ext. 1250
E: Alissa.Mahood@hamilton.ca