



UPPER WEST SIDE

Community Infrastructure Assessment Report

UPPER WEST SIDE SECONDARY PLAN

Prepared For:

City of Hamilton

Prepared By:

Corbett Land Strategies Inc.

November 2023

Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction..... 1

1.1 UWS Study Area 1

2.0 UPPER WEST SIDE SECONDARY PLAN 3

2.1.1 Scope 3

2.1.2 Methodology 4

3.0 RECREATIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT..... 5

3.1 Purpose and Background..... 5

3.2 Basis..... 6

3.3 Existing Recreational context..... 6

3.3.1 Indoor Infrastructure (>500m and >1000m)..... 6

3.3.2 Outdoor Infrastructure (<500m and <100m)..... 7

3.4 POLICY ANALYSIS 8

3.4.1 Urban Design Policies..... 8

3.4.2 Community Facilities / Services Policies..... 8

3.4.3 Recreation Master Plan..... 10

3.4.4 Recommendations..... 11

3.4.5 Recreation Trails Master Plan (2016) 13

3.4.6 Hamilton Public Libraries Facility Master Plan (2019) 19

3.5 Recreational Needs Analysis..... 22

3.5.1 Community and Recreational Facilities..... 22

3.5.2 Recreational Trails..... 24

3.5.3 Libraries..... 25

3.6 Conclusions 25

3.6.1 Opportunities and Constraints..... 25

3.6.2 Recommendations..... 26

3.6.3 Next Steps..... 27

4.0 PARKLAND ISSUES & NEEDS ASSESSMENT 28

4.1 Purpose and background..... 28

4.2 BASIS..... 28

4.3 Existing Parks, tRAILS AND AMENITY SPACE 29

Community Infrastructure Assessment Report

Upper West Side Secondary Plan

4.3.1	Parks, Trails and Amenity Space Located within <500m	29
4.3.2	Parks, Trails and Amenity Space Located within <1000m.....	29
4.3.3	Parks, Trails and Amenity Space Located within <2000m.....	29
4.4	Policy analysis.....	30
4.4.1	Urban Design and Community Facilities/Services Policies.....	30
4.4.2	Parks Master Plan (2023).....	32
4.4.3	Recreation Master Plan (2022).....	39
4.4.4	Cycling Master Plan (2017).....	42
4.4.5	Parks Needs Analysis	44
4.4.6	CONCLUSIONS.....	46
5.0	SCHOOL NEEDS ASSESSMENT	49
5.1	PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND	49
5.2	EXISTING CONTEXT	49
5.3	Existing Schools and applicable boards	49
5.4	School facility demographics.....	53
5.4.1	Enrollment Projections and Capacity for Schools.....	53
5.4.2	Enrollment and Capacity Trends	56
5.4.3	Enrollment Projection Methodology	56
5.4.4	Projected Pupil Yield HWDSB.....	57
5.5	PLANNING CONTEXT	58
5.6	School accomodation assessment.....	59
5.6.1	Locational Criteria	59
5.6.2	Schools Site Design Criteria	1
5.6.3	School Site Characteristics.....	3
5.6.4	Active and Sustainable Transportation.....	4
5.7	School and city recreation facility and outdoor recreation analysis.....	8
5.7.1	Parkland.....	8
5.7.2	School Sites and Recreational Facilities.....	9
5.7.3	Co-Location School Site Analysis.....	9
6.0	Analysis	12
6.1	Oppurtunities and constraints	12

Community Infrastructure Assessment Report

Upper West Side Secondary Plan

6.1.1 Opportunities..... 12

6.1.2 Constraints..... 12

6.1.3 Next Steps..... 13

7.0 CONCLUSION 14

8.0 REFERENCES..... 15

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Corbett Land Strategies Inc. (herein referred to as “CLS”) has been retained to complete a Community Infrastructure Assessment in support of the Upper West Side Secondary Plan. This report focuses on the evaluation and analysis of the community’s Community Infrastructure needs and has been prepared as a guiding document for the proposed Secondary Plan. This analysis includes providing distinct recommendations on recreational, parkland, and school accommodation needs. Each component will be reviewed separately to ensure all areas are taken into account and incorporated within policies of the Secondary Plan.

This report assists the Upper West Side Secondary Plan in planning for a complete community by assessing the community infrastructure needs including community and recreation centres, arenas, parks, health care and social service facilities, day care centres, seniors’ centres, emergency medical services, fire services, police services, cultural facilities, places of worship, museums, schools, universities and colleges, and libraries where these facilities can be publicly or privately owned or operated. This report includes an assessment of the potential community infrastructure needs to the existing surrounding area and future residents to determine if there are any underserved or overserved needs within the community area. This report will specifically assess the policy requirements of recreational centres, parks and schools.

1.1 UWS STUDY AREA

As the Upper West Side Secondary Plan is required to be comprehensively assessed, this report has examined a broader area (UWS Study Area) bounded by Twenty Road West to the north, Upper James Street to the east, Dickenson Road West to the south and Glancaster Road to the west. The UWS Study Area block includes a total area of 388 hectares (960 acres). The UWS Secondary Plan area, where development is proposed to occur, consists of approximately 283 hectares (700 acres). Please refer to Figure 1 to review the context map.



Figure 1: Existing Conditions and Secondary Plan Boundaries

2.0 UPPER WEST SIDE SECONDARY PLAN

On November 4th, 2022, the Province approved the City's Urban Hamilton Official Plan, with approved modifications, amendments to the City of Hamilton Urban (OPA 167) and Rural Official Plans (OPA 34). The approved official plan amendments outline new policies and mapping to guide growth and development in the City to the year 2051. One of the major changes that came from this decision is to incorporate parts of the UWS Secondary Plan into the urban boundary.

In doing so, lands added to the urban boundary are required to undertake a Secondary Plan process. As such, the UWS Secondary Plan is seeking to refine the land use from "Urban Expansion Area – Neighbourhoods" and "Urban Expansion Area – Employment", into more localized and urban designations. Please note, the remainder of the subject lands are located within the Airport Employment Growth District (AEGD) Secondary Plan area where the lands are designated as "Airport Light Industrial", "Airport Prestige Business", and "Natural Open Space".

The Upper West Side Secondary Plan area proposing the achievement of a complete community that will include a variety of uses such as residential, mixed use, schools, parks and trails, enhanced natural heritage corridor, and stormwater uses. The Community Infrastructure Assessment report will assist in providing guiding policies and recommendations on if and where additional community facility uses should be incorporated into the community plan.

2.1.1 Scope

In Chapter B of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP), there are three main policy goals for providing community facilities. These goals include the following:

B.3.5.1 Policy Goals

3.5.1.1 Create a vibrant, active and supportive City by providing community facilities/services that support a high quality of life for all residents.

3.5.1.2 Achieve equitable and efficient access, distribution, and integration of community facilities/services which meet the needs of people of all ages, backgrounds, and capabilities throughout all stages of their lives and across the City.

3.5.1.3 Provide community facilities/services in an efficient sustainable manner that optimizes their use, minimizes their environmental impacts, and promotes their flexibility to adapt to changing needs.

By incorporating these primary goals, the scope of work will include a detailed analysis of applicable planning policies available while assessing the recreational needs, parks and school needs. As per the UHOP and requirements for a Secondary Plan, this Community Infrastructure Assessment report will provide the following:

1. An inventory of existing community facilities within the Secondary Plan area and immediate surrounding existing area;

2. An evaluation of the required community facilities such as recreational facilities, parks and open spaces as well as schools;
3. An identification of the location criteria associated with each community facility component; and,
4. Overall policy recommendations pertaining to the infrastructure requirements and implementation of the community facilities needed based on our findings.

This report should be reviewed in conjunction with other planning reports prepared for the Upper West Side Secondary Plan area.

2.1.2 Methodology

The approach taken for this report has been summarized below:

- Existing Conditions – as determined within the report’s scope, an overview of the existing community facilities within the Upper West Side area will be conducted to provide context to the existing community facilities within the area.
- Existing Policies and Requirements – based on the existing facilities in place, an analysis on the existing literature such as the AEGD, City of Hamilton Recreation Master Plan, City of Hamilton Recreational Trails Master Plan and Hamilton Parks Master Plan will be reviewed to determine the existing area and future area community facility requirements.
- Future Assumptions – a further analysis will be completed in order to determine appropriate locations for any required facilities and recommendations for the Secondary Plan area regarding the implementation of the recommended infrastructure needs.

3.0 RECREATIONAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT

3.1 PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

In accordance with the creation of the Upper West Side Secondary Plan, this section focuses on the Recreational Needs Assessment (RNA). The RNA was prepared to understand the current and envisioned recreational context in the city of Hamilton and how the Upper West Side lands fit into both the present and future recreational context in Hamilton. The RNA aims to address several important questions that will help in the development of the Upper West Side lands, which include:

- What is the existing recreational infrastructure picture for the Upper West Side Lands and surrounding area?
- What does the future of recreational infrastructure in the Upper West Side lands and surrounding area look like from the perspective of City of Hamilton staff and Council?
- What policies guide recreational infrastructure development in the City of Hamilton?
- What recreational infrastructure and amenities is proposed for the Upper West Side lands and surrounding area?
- What are the recreational desires and barriers of the public? How can the Upper West Side lands potentially address those desires and barriers?

Ultimately, the RNA will act as a guiding tool for not only the developers of the Upper West Side lands, but also for future development in the surrounding area. The presence of the RNA will ensure that recreational infrastructure is properly provided in this area and that communities are created in a complete and harmonious manner. The approach taken for this report has been summarized below:

- Existing Conditions – as determined within the report’s scope, an overview of the existing community facilities within the area. community facilities within the Upper West Side area will be conducted to provide context to the
- Existing Policies and Requirements – based on the existing facilities in place, an analysis on the existing literature such as the AEGD, City of Hamilton Recreation Master Plan, City of Hamilton Recreational Trails Master Plan and Hamilton Parks Master Plan will be reviewed to determine the existing area and future area community facility requirements.
- Future Assumptions – a further analysis will be completed in order to determine appropriate locations for any required facilities and recommendations for the Secondary Plan area regarding the implementation of the recommended infrastructure needs.

3.2 BASIS

The RNA is a culmination of extensive quantitative and qualitative analysis of existing literature and overarching City of Hamilton policies and master plans. Notable stages in the methodological approach for the RNA included:

1. Review of City of Hamilton reports, drawings, and databases on the existing recreational context in Hamilton.
2. Analysis of City of Hamilton policies relating to recreational infrastructure and amenities, such as the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, Recreation Master Plan, Recreational Trails Master Plan, and Library Master Plan.
3. Extraction and review of particular desires, opportunities, and barriers relating to recreational infrastructure and amenities.
4. Formation of Opportunities, Constraints, and Recommendations (both Policy and Physical).

As a final note, the scope of the RNA was solely focused on the Upper West Side lands and surrounding area. The analysis and recommendations outlined in this report are not representative of the City of Hamilton as a whole and must be understood in the report’s geographical context. Directly using recommendations and analysis from this report without first understanding the socio-economic and human dynamics of the Upper West Side lands and surrounding area is not suggested. Even future developments that occur in the surrounding area of the Upper West Side lands are encouraged to compare social, economic, and geographical characteristics before utilizing the recommendations brought forth in this plan.

3.3 EXISTING RECREATIONAL CONTEXT

3.3.1 Indoor Infrastructure (>500m and >1000m)

The City of Hamilton is home to a multitude of indoor recreational facilities and amenities ranging from community centres to arenas to libraries and museums. As per the following table, no facilities are located within a range of less than 2000m

Upper West Side Lands – Indoor Infrastructure			
<i>Infrastructure Type</i>	<i><500m</i>	<i><1000m</i>	<i><2000m</i>
Arenas	-	-	1. Mountain Arena
Libraries	-	-	1. Turner Park Library 2. Mount Hope Library 3. Terryberry Library
Recreation and Community Centres	-	-	1. YMCA – Les Charter Family 2. Mount Hope Community Hall/Youth Centre 3. Redeemer Sports Complex

Museums and Galleries	-	-	1. Canadian Warplane Heritage Museum
-----------------------	---	---	--------------------------------------

3.3.2 Outdoor Infrastructure (<500m and <100m)

The City of Hamilton is home to a multitude of indoor recreational facilities and amenities ranging from community centres to arenas to libraries and museums.

Upper West Side Lands – Outdoor Infrastructure			
<i>Infrastructure Type</i>	<i><500m</i>	<i><1000m</i>	<i><2000m</i>
Beaches	-	-	-
Bikeways	-	-	
Campgrounds	-	-	-
Golf Courses	-	-	1. Willow Valley 2. Glancaster Golf and Country Club
Parks	1. Kopperfield Park	1. Turner Park 2. Homebrook Park	1. Kennedy East Park 2. William Connell Park 3. William Schwenger Park 4. Allison Neighbourhood Park 5. Fair Park 6. Falkirk West Park 7. Meadowlands Neighbourhood Park 8. Tiffany Hills Park
Trails	1. Kopperfield Park	1. Homebrook Park Pathway	1. Kennedy East Park Pathway 2. William Schwenger Park Pathway 3. Rymal Road West Multi-Use Path 4. Allison Park Pathway 5. Olmstead Natural Open Space 6. Tiffany Hills Park Pathway 7. Meadowlands Neighbourhood Park
Spray Pads	-	-	1. Kennedy East Park 2. William Schwenger Park 3. William Connell Park 4. Allison Neighbourhood Park

3.4 POLICY ANALYSIS

3.4.1 Urban Design Policies

The Urban Design section of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (2022) offers an extensive overview and vision for the city of Hamilton should be shaped. Urban Design, according to the Urban Official Plan, is delineated into both the public and private sector with the public realm being associated with planning and design issues of roads, sidewalks, plazas, parks and open space and the private realm focusing on areas within private property boundaries (sec. 3.3.). Through section 3.3.1 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan the City outlines several overarching urban design goals that aim to provide direction on how Hamilton's urban fabric should be developed; however, the ones mentioned below are the most relevant to recreational amenities. They include:

- Enhance the sense of community pride and identification by creating and maintaining unique places.
- Provide and create quality spaces in all public and private development.
- Promote development and spaces that respect natural processes and features and contribute to environmental sustainability.
- Encourage innovative community design and technologies.

As it relates specifically to recreational amenities, the Urban Hamilton Official Plan asserts that community health and well-being shall be enhanced and supported through a multitude of actions (sec. 3.3.2.9), including:

- b. ensuring an equitable distribution of accessible and stimulating amenity areas, including the development of places for active and passive recreation uses.*
- c. encouraging development of complete and compact communities or neighbourhoods that contain a variety of land uses, transportation, recreational, and open space uses.*

3.4.2 Community Facilities / Services Policies

The City of Hamilton Urban Official Plan (2022) also provides detailed policies on community facilities and services. These components of the urban fabric are lands, buildings, and/or structures that provide services for health, education, recreation, social or cultural activities, security, and safety (sec. 3.5). Some examples of community facilities and services include, community and recreation centres, arena's, day care centres, parks, senior's centres, cultural facilities, museums, schools, and libraries (sec. 3.5). Community facilities and services should be provided through collaboration and partnership amongst all levels of government, public agencies, and citizens and in a manner that ensures they meet changing community needs (sec. 3.5).

Community facilities and services, as per section 3.5.2 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, are separated into both private and public owned community facilities and services. While there are some overarching policies for both types of community facilities and services, there are also specific ones related to publicly owned. The policies are described further in the table below:

Privately and Publicly Owned or Operated Community Facilities/Services	
<i>Section #</i>	<i>Policy</i>
3.5.2.1	All new public buildings which are publicly or privately owned and/or operated community facilities
3.5.2.1(a)	Shall comply with Section B.3.3 – Urban Design Policies and B.3.4 – Cultural Heritage Policies
3.5.2.1(b)	Shall be easily accessible by walking, cycling, and public transit where provided
3.5.2.1(c)	Shall be located and designed to be barrier free and to comply with all accessibility legislation, standards, and guidelines
3.5.2.1(d)	Where proposed adjacent to residential uses, shall be designed and operated to limit noise, traffic, and privacy impacts on neighbouring residents
3.5.2.1(e)	Should meet all of the following design criteria where possible: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. main entrances shall front onto a public road; ii. parking shall be provided to the side or rear of the main building and be screened and landscaped; iii. pedestrian walkways shall link parking facilities and public side-walks to entrances; iv. cycling infrastructure such as bicycle parking and paths shall be provided; v. the design of landscaping and lighting shall be of high quality and appropriate to the site; vi. lighting should highlight the design of buildings.
3.5.2.5	New or renovated community facilities can create a focus for neighbourhood rejuvenation, and are encouraged to locate in transition areas identified in secondary plans or by other City initiatives
3.5.2.7	New public buildings and community facilities shall be encouraged to include publicly accessible space such as meeting rooms and multi-purpose rooms for the use of community groups, where feasible
Publicly Owned or Operated Community Facilities/Services	
<i>Section #</i>	<i>Policy</i>
3.5.2.9	Proposals for new development and redevelopment shall take into account the availability and location of existing and proposed public community facilities/services, and be phased so new public community facilities/services can be provided efficiently, effectively, and in a logical fashion

<p>3.5.2.10</p>	<p>Public community facilities/services shall be provided in an equitable, sustainable, efficient manner and their use optimized through application of the following policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) Partnership and collaboration among providers and funders of community facilities/services, including the City, shall be strongly encouraged. (b) The use of existing community facilities/services shall be optimized to serve the surrounding community, wherever feasible, before the development of new facilities is considered. (c) Where community facilities/services are deemed to be surplus, other community facility/service uses shall be given first priority in disposal of the property. (d) Shared use of sites and buildings, including clustering/co-locating of facilities into campus-like settings with shared parking facilities, shall be strongly encouraged.
<p>3.5.2.11</p>	<p>Public buildings and public community facilities/services provide a focal point, image and sense of identity for communities. Clustering/co-locating of new facilities which support a range of services on a shared site or in a shared building optimizes efficiency and improves convenience and accessibility. Clustering also creates a major destination that can be readily served by transit, facilitates service integration, and provides flexibility for program or use change as community needs change.</p>
<p>3.5.2.13</p>	<p>All new public buildings and public community facilities/services shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) be designed to reflect and enhance local community character, image, identity, and sense of place; (b) be encouraged to include public art as part of overall site and/or building design; (c) provide equitable public access to telecommunication (web access); and, (OPA 167) (d) be in compliance with the Corporate Energy and Sustainability Policy and constructed to promote water conservation, energy efficiency, renewable energy systems and/or alternative energy systems, including district energy, in accordance with Policy B.3.7.2, where feasible. (OPA 167)

3.4.3 Recreation Master Plan

The City of Hamilton Recreation Master Plan (2022) brought forth several notable findings related to not only the current infrastructure provided in Hamilton, but also to how the community views the recreational infrastructure available in the city. With respect to community findings, the City of Hamilton completed a community survey in the summer of 2021, which allowed citizens the

opportunity to provide feedback on recreational infrastructure in Hamilton. Notable findings from that survey include the following:

- 47% of respondents were unable to participate in recreation and parks activities as often as they would like.
- The most common indoor and outdoor sports and activities in Hamilton include swimming (indoor and outdoor), use of playgrounds, use of spray pads, and fitness and weight training, with 43% to 68% of all households participating.
- Nearly three-quarters (74%) of respondents have utilized City of Hamilton indoor recreation facilities since 2019.
- The typical household visits Hamilton recreation facilities between 20 and 52 times per year
- Facilities that are viewed as priorities for investment are playgrounds, community/recreation centres, indoor pools, and spray pads.

In terms of recreation facilities, the City provides an extensive list on the types of recreation facilities available and an overall inventory of each type. A detailed list on each type of recreational facility and their inventory is provided below:

Recreational Facilities in Hamilton	
<i>Type</i>	<i>Inventory</i>
Community Recreation Centres	23
Indoor Pools	23
Outdoor Pools	10
Gymnasiums	16
Seniors Recreation Spaces	12
Arenas	25 ice pads in 20 arenas
Community Halls	27

3.4.4 Recommendations

Based on the aforementioned findings the City of Hamilton provided a detailed recommendations list outlining specific actions items, as well as a general timing for the implementation of such action. This comprehensive list is provided below:

Recreational Facilities – Recommendation Summary		
<i>Subject Area</i>	<i>Recommendations</i>	<i>Timing</i>
	Prepare a CRC Renewal and Redevelopment Strategy in the short-term to guide major reinvestment in existing facilities.	Short-Term

Community Recreation Centres	Establish new growth-related CRCs (7) in: Waterdown, Binbrook, Fruitland-Winona, South Mountain, Saltfleet, Growth-related needs in Lower Hamilton	Short-Term to Longer-Term
Indoor Pools	Modernize indoor pools as part of CRC renewal projects, where feasible.	Short-term and ongoing
	Develop indoor pools as part of the following growth-related CRCs: Waterdown, South Mountain, Saltfleet, Growth-related needs in Lower Hamilton.	Short-term to Longer-Term
Outdoor Pools	Redevelop existing outdoor pools: Victoria Park, Chedoke Pool, Ancaster	Short-term to Longer-Term
	Develop new outdoor pools to address growth-related needs in the following areas as opportunities allow: Hamilton Mountain and Lower Hamilton	Medium-Term to Longer-Term
Gymnasiums	Develop gymnasiums as part of all new and expanded CRCs, where feasible	Short-term and ongoing
Seniors Recreation Spaces	Expand existing seniors' recreation centres (e.g., Sackville Hill Seniors Centre, Ancaster Seniors Activity Centre) to meet growing program needs.	Short-Term
	Consider enhanced seniors' programming space at the following locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Alexander Park Community Hub project (short-term) – in partnership with local club if warranted/supported at this location - Proposed Fruitland-Winona CRC (short-term) – replacement for Winona Senior Citizen Centre - Proposed South Mountain CRC (medium-term) - Proposed Saltfleet CRC (medium-term) - Work with community partners to address potential needs in Hamilton Mountain and Upper Stoney Creek (longer-term) 	Short-term to Longer-Term
	Renew the following arenas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dave Andreychuk Mountain Arena (short-term) - Chedoke Twin Pad Arena (short-term) 	Short-term and ongoing

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - others to be determined on a case-by-case basis over the medium and longer-terms, with consideration of adding other needed recreational spaces and ability to use year-round 	
Arenas	<p>Decommission the following arenas in the short-term to align supply with demand and realize cost efficiencies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Stoney Creek Arena – remove arena from service (add gym to Stoney Creek RC) - Saltfleet Arena – remove arena from service (redevelop as a CRC without ice pads); note: prior to retiring Stoney Creek and Saltfleet Arenas, ensure suitable community access to ice time within Lower Stoney Creek - Eastwood Arena – remove arena from service (replace one ice pad as part of broader CRC development in the medium to longer term) - conversion of other single pad arenas (to floor-based activities, etc.) may be considered in the medium- to longer-term, where appropriate 	Short-term and ongoing
	<p>Develop additional arenas to address growth-related needs (3 additional ice pads, for a total of 28) in the medium to longer-term. Specific strategies will depend on closure or repurposing of selected single pad arenas</p>	Medium-Term to Longer-Term
Community Halls	<p>Evaluate needs for multi-use and multi-partnered community hubs in growing rural settlement areas, such as Mount Hope (short-term).</p>	
	<p>Evaluate needs for multi-use and multi-partnered community hubs in growing rural settlement areas, such as Mount Hope (short-term).</p>	

3.4.5 Recreation Trails Master Plan (2016)

City of Hamilton Trail Network

The Recreational Trails Master Plan (2016) builds upon the 2007 Recreational Trails Master Plan in that it provides updates on Hamilton wide trail initiatives that were brought forth under the 2007 master plan. In addition to that, it also analyzes and identifies characteristics (i.e., built and natural

features, trail design opportunities) for each specific ward that helps guide the recommendations provided later in the report.

Building upon the 2007 Recreational Trails Master Plan, the City of Hamilton outlines several key trail initiatives that are proposed to be implemented (see table below). The proposed initiatives were based upon findings from an online survey that was accessible to citizens and that indicated connectivity and trail linkages as high priorities. The online survey brought forth by the City of Hamilton also brought forth several interesting facts relating to citizen usage and types of trail users. Trails in Hamilton, for instance, are primarily used for hiking (40.7%) and walking and jogging (41.40%). In addition, trail users in Hamilton are predominately constituted of cyclists and pedestrians walking and jogging at a rate of 68.4%.

Summary of 2015 Recreational Trail Initiatives			
<i>Ward</i>	<i>Initiative #</i>	<i>Trail Type</i>	<i>Trail Initiative Name</i>
1	1	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Locke Street Rail Bridge
	2	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Stuart Street Rail Link
2	3	Proposed Blvd. Trail	Burlington Street Boulevard Trail
	4	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Hunter Street-Escarpment Rail Trail Link
	5	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Central Park Master Plan Trail
3	6	Proposed Blvd. Trail	Ottawa Street South Boulevard Trail
	7	Proposed Upgraded Trail	Ottawa Street South-Bruce Trail Link
4	8	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Proposed Pipeline Trail (Museum of Steam and Technology to Mahony Park)
	9	Proposed On-road Route	Glengrove Avenue-Red Hill Valley Link
	10	Proposed Blvd. Trail	Burlington Street East Boulevard Trail
	11	Proposed Upgraded Trail	Existing Pipeline Trail (Main Street to Strathearne Avenue)
5	12	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Battlefield Park-Bruce Trail Link
	13	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Eugene Street-Red Hill Valley Link
	14	Proposed On-road Route	Centennial Parkway Link

Community Infrastructure Assessment Report

Upper West Side Secondary Plan

	15	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Sam Manson Park Trail
	16	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Eastport Drive Lift Bridge Link
6	17	Proposed Blvd. Trail	Eramosa Karst C.A. Boulevard Trail
	18	Proposed Blvd. Trail	Mountain Brow Boulevard Trail
	19	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Mount Albion Link (East Mountain Trail Loop)
7	20	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Limeridge Mall Hydro Corridor Trail
	21	Proposed Blvd. Trail	Rymal Road East Boulevard Trail
	22	Proposed Multi-Use & Blvd. Trail	Park Trail Connections (Upper James Street to Limeridge Mall Hydro Corridor Trail)
8	23	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Upper James Street-William Connell Park Link
	24	Proposed Blvd. Trail Upgrade	Fennel Avenue Boulevard Trail
9	25	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Heritage Green Sports Park Link
	26	Proposed Upgraded Trail	Devil's Punchbowl Link
10	27	Proposed Blvd. Trail	Dewitt Road Boulevard Trail
	28	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Cherry Beach Road Link
11	29	Proposed Blvd. Trail	Ridge Road Boulevard Trail
	30	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Barton Street Pedestrian Promenade
	31	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Jones Road Link
	32	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Twenty Road Link
	33	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Upper James Street Link
	34	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	White Church Road West-Airport Link
	35	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	White Church Road West Link
	36	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Fairgrounds Community Park Link
	37	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Summerlea West Park-Fletcher Road Parkette Link

	38	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Highway 56-NPCA Entrance Link
	39	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Swayze Road-Cemetery Road Link
12	40	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Shaver Estates Trail
	41	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Tollgate Drive Link
	42	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Hamilton Drive Link
	43	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Hydro Corridor-White Church Road Link
13	44	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	York Road-Valley Community Centre Park Hydro Corridor Trail
	45	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Old Guelph Road Trail
	46	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Sanctuary Park Link
	47	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Spencer Gorge-Bruce Trail Link
14	48	Proposed On-road Route	Highway 6 Cycling Link
	49	Proposed Blvd. Trail	Highway 8 Boulevard Trail
15	50	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Mountain Brow Road Link
	51	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Rock Chapel Road Link
	52	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Northlawn Avenue-Parkside Drive Link
	53	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Chudleigh Street Link
	54	Proposed Multi-Use Trail	Mosaic Drive to Highway 6 Link

The Recreational Trail Master Plan (2016) also delineates trails into three categories: Multi-Use Recreation Trail (Class A), Multi-Use Recreation Trail (Class B), and Recreation Trail (Class C). Additional details on each of those trail classifications are outlined further in the table provided below.

Recreational Trail Categories			
	<i>Multi-Use Recreation Trail (Class A)</i>	<i>Multi-Use Recreation Trail (Class B)</i>	<i>Recreation Trail (Class C)</i>

<p><i>Description and Connectivity</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City-wide functions and important transportation and commuter routes connecting communities, neighbourhoods, parks, community facilities, commercial sites, institutions and residential areas • 4-season potential transportation corridor with opportunities for significant connectivity through the City • Provide access to major destinations throughout the City • Some connect to surrounding municipalities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City-wide function and available as a transportation route during the spring, summer and fall seasons and possibly winter • Local routes within City-owned parkland between points of interest and neighbourhood park facilities • Maintenance access routes within parks and around storm water management ponds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trails designed for recreational purposes that may include the use of private and public lands • Created by the City or volunteer group that has an established arrangement with the City where the trail is on public land, or with the land owner where the trail is located on private land
<p><i>Typical Location</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideally located outside of the road right-of-way in continuous linear corridors • Can be located within the road right-of-way 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideally located outside of the road right-of-way in continuous linear corridors (off-road) • Within City-owned parkland • Some locations, particularly in developed neighbourhoods, they provide short connections between off-road segments • On urban arterial, collector or rural roads where there is ample right of way between the edge of the road (curb for urban cross section and shoulder for rural cross section) and the limit of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Established woodlots • Natural areas • Typically not connected to Class A or Class B trails

		right of way to maintain a minimum separation between the road and the trail (boulevard multi-use pathways)	
<i>Hamilton Examples</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Lakes Waterfront Trail • Hamilton Harbour Waterfront Trail • Cootes Drive Trail • Glenside Trail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • East Mountain Trail Loop • Red Hill Valley Trail • Chedoke Radial Recreational Trail 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Valley Inn Road trail • Jackson Heights Park trail

Recommendations

In addition to the 2015 initiatives provided in the previous section, the Recreational Master Plan also outlines several recommendations relating to network implementation, promotion, trails maintenance, and a scoring system for developmental priority establishment. A more detailed analysis on the recommendations brought forth by the City of Hamilton is provided below.

- Network Implementation Strategy
 - Establishing New Priorities
 - This section recommends the following criteria in planning the development of the trail system:
 - Field Observations
 - Developing and redeveloping the trail network in highly utilized locations;
 - Establishing main corridors connecting important community destinations (e.g. schools, community centres, major sports fields, etc.);
 - Developing key City and Regional trail connections;
 - Working with development charges and developer build scenarios;
 - Developing Community Trail loops;
 - Taking advantage of the re-development of lands;
 - Linking trail sections to frequently visited destinations throughout the City;
 - Allowing off-road trail access to current and planned transit nodes and stops;
 - Establishing new subdivisions spine trail routes as part of the subdivision planning and design approval process; and
 - Scheduling implementation with planned Provincial, Regional, and Local capital projects to take advantage of possible cost savings.

- Scoring System for Establishing Implementation Priorities
 - In the determination of what trail segments are recommended to proceed in, a series of 10 criterion are applied to the list of trail initiatives.
- Interdepartmental Collaboration
 - Trails serve important recreational, transportation, and public health benefits and the delivery of an effective network will require continued interdepartmental collaboration among City departments.
- Comprehensive Implementation
 - The implementation should include the following steps: preliminary review, feasibility assessment, detailed design, tender, and implementation, monitoring and maintenance, and plan updates.
- Outreach, Promotion, and Potential Funding Sources
- Managing Trails and Maintenance Expectations
 - Establishing a Trail Maintenance Plan
 - Maintenance Partnerships
 - Location and Trail Alignment Maintenance Considerations
 - Trail Surfacing Materials Maintenance Considerations
 - Winter Maintenance of Trails

3.4.6 Hamilton Public Libraries Facility Master Plan (2019)

The City of Hamilton completed the Master Library Plan in 2019 and it outlines specific profiles for each library branch, as well as the current condition of library facilities in Hamilton. In total, there are 22 library branches including the Central Library located throughout Hamilton. A further analysis on each library branch is provided below.

Hamilton Public Libraries Facility Master Plan – Branch Characteristics		
<i>Facility Name</i>	<i>Catchment Area</i>	<i>Population Served</i>
Ancaster	178.0 km ²	36,575
Barton	5.0 km ²	95,200
Binbrook	92.4 km ²	17,520
Bookmobile	1,138.1 km ² (City of Hamilton)	563,480
Carlisle	77.2 km ²	7,110
Central	11.4 km ²	87,410
Concession	3.1 km ²	13,105
Dundas	50.6 km ²	24,290
Freelton	119.0 km ²	7,835
Greenville	12.1 km ²	3,990
Kenilworth	23.4 km ²	23,575
Locke	4.4 km ²	8,135

Lynden	178.0 km2	5,710
Mount Hope	91.5 km2	14,990
Red Hill	19.7 km2	21,745
Saltfleet	12.6 km2	18,475
Sherwood	10.1 km2	20,720
Stoney Creek	22.3 km2	25,570
Terryberry	14.1 km2	59,625
Turner Park	26.0 km2	60,980
Valley Park	86.6 km2	26,165
Waterdown	39.5 km2	19,815
Westdale	7.6 km2	14,370

Recommendations

The Library Master Plan also outlines recommendations for each specific branch based on factors such as the service provided, building condition, and financial allotment. A description of the recommended actions for each branch is outlined in the table below.

Hamilton Public Libraries Facility Master Plan - Recommendations	
<i>Facility Name</i>	<i>Recommended Action</i>
Ancaster	Monitor use of the facility and growth in the community.
Barton	Monitor and maintain.
Binbrook	Occupancy granted December 19, 2017. Monitor and maintain.
Bookmobile	Currently stops are being reviewed and deposit collections are being added to supplement services between stops. A replacement plan for 2 existing vehicles needs to be developed.
Carlisle	\$1 million in funding has been secured by the Ward Councillor to be put towards a new branch. A feasibility study has been approved by the Board. Staff have been directed to secure further funding.
Central	Investigate use of trust funds and/or other funding for Phase 4 renovations. Replenish reserves prior to allocating to Central Phase 4. \$1.8 million window replacement project has completed Phase 2 of 3. Lifecycle replacement of windows on floors 2-6, primarily along York Boulevard side scheduled for replacement 2019.
Concession	Monitor and maintain.
Dundas	Monitor and maintain.

Community Infrastructure Assessment Report

Upper West Side Secondary Plan

Freelton	Monitor and maintain.
Greensville	Library Board has approved the new Greensville project. Design is complete. Working with the school board in tendering. Proposed completion in 2020/2021.
Kenilworth	Monitor and maintain.
Locke	Monitor and maintain.
Lynden	Monitor and maintain. New building opened in 2013. Construction of patio completed in Spring 2015.
Mount Hope	Relocate to another location when an appropriate partnership opportunity presents itself. Note: This has tentatively been included in the 10-year capital plan in 2022. Funding would still need to be identified and secured.
Red Hill	Identified as a possible location for study to align with community and HPL business needs.
Saltfleet	Monitor and maintain. Long term look for opportunities to partner with the City to locate the branch in downtown Stoney Creek.
Sherwood	Monitor and maintain.
Stoney Creek	Monitor and maintain. A new Winona/Stoney Creek branch has tentatively been included in the 10year capital plan for 2024. Funding would still need to be identified and secured.
Terryberry	Monitor and maintain. HVAC and boiler replacement have been identified as capital priority needs.
Turner Park	Monitor and maintain. Work with City and YMCA to investigate options to expand/ reconfigure parking lots. Need to address roof leaks, roof window insulation and high ceiling light replacement.
Valley Park	Library Board and the City have approved the project. Design complete with construction beginning in 2019. The \$1.25 million funding from Heritage Green Community Trust has been secured.
Waterdown	Monitor and maintain. New branch opened in December 2015.
Westdale	Monitor and maintain. Carpet replacement scheduled for Spring 2019 with program room refresh and service desk replacement. Replacement of rooftop HVAC unit identified as a priority.

3.5 RECREATIONAL NEEDS ANALYSIS

3.5.1 Community and Recreational Facilities

The Recreation Master Plan (2022) was prepared to analyze whether the city’s recreational portfolio will be able to meet the current and future recreational needs of Hamiltonians. In completing that analysis, the master plan was also able to offer updated goals and targets for specific recreational amenities throughout Hamilton to ensure that population growth in Hamilton is also met with the growth of important community recreational facilities. Using a variety of criteria, such as available capacity, recreational distribution gaps, and projected demographic trends the City outlines specific planning targets and also recreational amenity expansion targets for 2051. These targets are illustrated in the table below.

Recreational Amenity Goals and Targets				
Type of Facility	Current Provision Level	Future Planning Target	Total Existing Facilities	Total Required Facilities by 2051
<i>Community/Recreation Facilities (CRC)</i>	1 community recreation centre per 25,400 residents	1 community recreation centre (municipal or not-for-profit) for every 27,500 residents Consideration may also be given to service radius of up to 2.5 km.	23	30 (+7)
<i>Indoor Pools</i>	1 indoor pool (municipal or not-for-profit) per 25,400 residents	1 indoor pool (municipal or not-for-profit) for every 30,000 residents Consideration may also be given to a service radius of up to 2.5 km	23	27 (+4)
<i>Outdoor Pools</i>	1 outdoor pool per 58,400 residents 1 per 9,500 children and youth aged 5-19 years	1 outdoor pool for every 10,000 children and youth aged 5-19 years Consideration may also be given to service radius of up to 2 km	10	12 (+2)
<i>Gymnasiums</i>	1 gymnasium per 36,500 residents	1 gymnasium within each new CRC	16	23 (+7)

	Note: includes school gymnasiums that are operated under agreement			
<i>Seniors Recreation Spaces</i>	1 seniors recreation space per 48,670 residents	A service radius of up to 2 km will be used to evaluate new Class B seniors' spaces. To achieve this target, four to five new Class B seniors recreation space locations will be required by 2051	12	17 (+5)
<i>Arenas</i>	1 ice pad per 23,360 residents	1 municipal (or partnered) ice pad for every 4,500 youth (or roughly one ice pad per 28,750 total persons) Consideration may also be given to a service radius of up to 2.5 km.	25	28 (+3)
<i>Community Halls</i>	1 community hall per 21,630 residents	None – assessment is case-specific	27	TBD

As it relates to the Upper West Side lands, the currently provided recreational facilities addresses certain future planning targets outlined in the Recreation Master Plan, but some are not addressed with the current inventory. Based on the table provided below, it is evident that significant investment will need to be made with respect to recreational amenities nearby to the Upper West Side lands. Beyond that of Community/Recreation Facilities, the future planning target for each of the other recreational facilities is not achieved for the subject lands. As such, the Upper West Side lands are currently significantly underserved and lack notable recreational amenities.

Upper West Side Lands – Recreational Amenities		
<i>Type of Facility</i>	<i>Facility Name</i>	<i>Future Planning Target Achieved (Yes/No)</i>
<i>Community/Recreation Facilities (CRC)</i>	YMCA – Les Charter Family	Yes – facility is within 2.5 km radius to Upper West Side lands.

<i>Indoor Pools</i>	-	No – there are no facilities within the 2.5 km radius to the subject lands.
<i>Outdoor Pools</i>	-	No – there are no facilities within the 2 km radius to the subject lands.
<i>Gymnasiums</i>	-	No – there are no new CRCs nearby to the subject lands.
<i>Senior Recreation Spaces</i>	-	No – while the YMCA and Redeemer Sports complex are present within 2.5 km, they are not designated as <i>Senior Recreation Centres</i> as per the Recreation Master Plan.
<i>Arenas</i>	-	No – projected population of ~20,000 for the Upper West Side lands and additional population of existing neighbourhoods exceeds the planning target.
<i>Community Halls</i>	-	TBD

3.5.2 Recreational Trails

Recreational trails are an amenity that are only becoming more desired by citizens in Hamilton. In the Recreation Master Plan, for instance, it was noted that interest for additional public spending on trails has only been rising amongst citizens (sec. 3.5). However, this interest is not only related to traditional hiking, jogging, and cycling trails, but also outdoor ice rink trails that can be utilized during the winter months. In fact, the online survey completed for the Recreation Master Plan indicated that 55% of respondents designated Outdoor Ice Rinks and Trails as a High Priority for Investment. This was the sixth highest amenity out of the 29 amenity options available.

The Upper West Side lands have several notable trail systems within a 500 m to 2000 m radius, as evidence by the table provided in section 1.2.2. What seems to be absent from this area are ice rink trails that are becoming increasingly popular to citizens of Hamilton. In fact, the Recreation Master Plan indicates that there is only one skating trail in the city of Hamilton (sec. 6.18). That being the case, significant investment in the construction of such recreational amenities would likely be beneficial for not only the Upper West Side lands, but also the surrounding area as well. In addition to that, further understanding on whether the currently existing trails network in the Upper West Side lands area is sufficient for the current and projected population is critical. Across both the Recreation Master Plan and Recreational Trails Master Plan there is no standard or planning target relating to recreational trails. Though there are approximately nine trails within a

500 m to 2000 m radius from the subject lands questions arise on the effectiveness and sufficiency of the current trails network.

3.5.3 Libraries

There is one library located in the Upper West Side lands surrounding area (<2.5 km) known as the Turner Park Library Branch (23,681 ft²), which is located 352 Rymal Road East and is connected to the existing YMCA – Les Charter Family. This library is proposed to undergo \$1,526,000 in expenditures over the next 15-years with a majority of the expected work to occur in a 6+ year period.

In terms of recommendations for libraries, there are no specific City-wide recommendations on advancing the number of libraries currently provided outlined in the Hamilton Libraries Facility Master Plan. The Recreation Master Plan, however, does make reference to the inclusion of the Hamilton Public Library as a partner in community/recreation centre and community hall projects. However, being that there is already a community/recreation centre and library within the 2.5 km radius outlined in the Recreation Master Plan, there is likely not a need to provide additional library services for this area. While there might be an opportunity for the addition of a community hall and library in the Upper West Side lands area, this would be determined during later planning processes as per the Planning Target outlined in the Recreation Master Plan.

3.6 CONCLUSIONS

3.6.1 Opportunities and Constraints

Upon a review of all the existing recreational infrastructure surrounding the Upper West Side area lands, there are some notable gaps. Recreational amenities, such as indoor pools, outdoor pools, gymnasiums, senior recreation spaces, and arenas are not present within a 2000 metre radius of the subject lands. What should be noted, however, is this is likely due to the fact that uses currently existent on the Upper West Side lands and areas to the south, east, and west of the subject lands are more rural, agricultural in nature and likely did not necessitate a need for extensive amounts of such amenities. Being that significant development is being proposed on the Upper West Side lands and surrounding area consideration must be made on addressing the notable gaps in available recreational amenities in the area.

Where the Upper West Side lands could lend themselves is to the construction of such currently absent amenity spaces. Seniors' recreation spaces (Class B), for instance, are proposed under the Recreation Master Plan to be evaluated using a service radius of up to 2 km. Based on that evaluation methodology, there is no current Seniors Recreation Space (Class B) within 2 km of the subject lands, and, even more broadly speaking, the surrounding area. In fact, the closest Class B Seniors Recreation Space known as the Main Hess Senior's Activity Club is approximately 8 km away from the subject lands, as per the Recreation Master Plan. This notable gap in service could be addressed through the utilization of a portion of the subject lands to develop such an amenity space. The construction of this recreational amenity could both eliminate the service gap for future residents of the subject lands and also existing citizens in the surrounding area.

3.6.2 Recommendations

Development Recommendations

Based on findings from the Recreation Master Plan, Recreational Trails Master Plan, and Hamilton Public Library Facilities Master Plan there are several recreational amenity options that should be brought forth. For one, the construction of ice trails in currently existing trail networks in the surrounding area would be highly beneficial. Citizens have indicated an increasing desire to have such an amenity space be invested in, which will likely only increase once the Upper West Side lands are developed and approximately 20,000 new citizens begin living in this development. Further, additional thought should be put towards the construction of indoor pools, outdoor pools, gymnasiums, and senior recreation spaces at either existing recreational amenities in the surrounding area or areas currently planned for recreational infrastructure development. This can be achieved through the co-location of recreational infrastructure. For instance, the nearby YMCA – Les Charter Family could be redeveloped in a manner that adds a senior recreation space to the existing building, which would address the current recreational amenity gap that is present in the Upper West Side lands area.

Policy Recommendations

Recreational infrastructure in the Upper West Side lands area could also be advanced through the implementation of additional policies. Places of Worship, for instance, were not reviewed in either one of the master plans analyzed previously and the City of Hamilton does not have a master plan or report dedicated solely towards Places of Worship. While not a traditionally viewed recreation facility or infrastructure, places of worship are critical community hubs for citizens and provide a multitude of community services (i.e., after school programs, seniors programs) to citizens. As such, this type of infrastructure should be analyzed as it relates to the Upper West Side lands area to establish a baseline on whether the existing infrastructure is sufficient for the approximately 20,000 additional residents expected with the development of the Upper West Side lands. Precedent examples of such studies include the following:

- City of Brampton Places of Worship Policy Review (2008)
- City of Markham Review and Assessment of Places of Worship (2015)
- Town of Whitchurch-Stouffville Places of Worship Study Future Directions Report (2016)
- Town of Milton Draft Community Facility and Human Services Impact Analysis Report (2019)

Additional policy focus should also be towards the existing Hamilton Library Facilities Master Plan. The current master plan solely focuses on the existing conditions each library branch and any upgrades proposed for each branch. What seems to be absent is a baseline standard indicating whether the existing library infrastructure is sufficient for both Hamilton as a whole and specifically the Upper West Side lands. Currently there is only one library within 2000 metres of the subject lands, so a determination on whether that can service the current and future population is critical.

An analysis to determine baseline standards would allow for the City of Hamilton to examine the current inventory and, if deemed necessary, construct additional libraries to eliminate the service gaps present. This policy recommendation could also be implemented for the recreational trails master plan. Determining a baseline standard for understanding whether the existing infrastructure provided is sufficient for communities would be highly beneficial for not only the city of Hamilton but also the Upper West Side lands. The determination of such baseline standards, especially as it relates to the Upper West Side lands, could be first initiated through community consultation meetings with local citizens and communities. A more comprehensive policy vision for the subject lands and surrounding area could be established through such a process.

3.6.3 Next Steps

To achieve the recommendations outlined above, there are several steps that should be taken. They include the following:

1. Initiate discussions with the City on recreational infrastructure findings and recommendations for the Upper West Side lands area.
2. Examine whether additional studies and reports can be completed through a joint partnership between CLS and the City of Hamilton.
3. Implement community consultations and informal meetings with citizens in the areas surrounding the Upper West Side lands.
4. Analysis on City of Hamilton capital budget, specific timelines for proposed recreational infrastructure work, and future recreational infrastructure proposed for Upper West Side lands area.
5. Prepare action plan based on consultations and additional analysis that guides how the recommendations proposed in this report can be implemented.

4.0 PARKLAND ISSUES & NEEDS ASSESSMENT

4.1 PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

In accordance with the creation of the Upper West Side Secondary Plan area, the Parkland Issues Needs Assessment (PINA) is included within this section. The PINA was prepared to understand the current and envisioned parkland context in the city of Hamilton and how the Upper West Side lands fit into both the present and future parkland context in Hamilton.

The PINA aims to address several important questions that will help in the development of the Upper West Side lands, which include:

- What is the existing parkland and cycling infrastructure picture for the Upper West Side Lands and surrounding area?
- What does the future of parkland and cycling infrastructure in the Upper West Side lands and surrounding area look like from the perspective of City of Hamilton staff and Council?
- What policies guide parkland and cycling infrastructure development in the City of Hamilton?
- What parkland and cycling infrastructure and amenities are proposed for the Upper West Side lands and surrounding area?
- What desires and barriers do the public have as it relates to parkland and cycling infrastructure? How can the Upper West Side lands potentially address those desires and barriers?

Ultimately, the PINA will hopefully act as a guiding tool for not only the developers of the Upper West Side lands, but also for future development in the surrounding area. The presence of the PINA will ensure that parkland and cycling infrastructure is properly provided in this area and that communities are created in a complete and harmonious manner.

4.2 BASIS

The PINA is a culmination of extensive quantitative and qualitative analysis of existing literature and overarching City of Hamilton policies and master plans. Notable stages in the methodological approach for the PINA included:

1. Review of City of Hamilton reports, drawings, and databases on the existing parkland and cycling context in Hamilton.
2. Analysis of City of Hamilton policies relating to parkland and cycling infrastructure and amenities, such as the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, Parks Master Plan, and Cycling Master Plan.
3. Extraction and review of particular desires, opportunities, and barriers relating to parkland and cycling infrastructure and amenities.

4. Formation of Opportunities, Constraints, and Recommendations (both Policy and Physical).

As a final note, the scope of the PINA was solely focused on the Upper West Side lands and surrounding area. The analysis and recommendations outlined in this report are not representative of the whole City of Hamilton and must be understood in the report’s geographical context. Directly using recommendations and analysis from this report without first understanding the socio-economic and human dynamics of the Upper West Side lands and surrounding area is not suggested. Even future developments that occur in the surrounding area of the Upper West Side lands are encouraged to compare social, economic, and geographical characteristics before utilizing the recommendations brought forth in this plan.

4.3 EXISTING PARKS, TRAILS AND AMENITY SPACE

4.3.1 Parks, Trails and Amenity Space Located within <500m

In the area surrounding the Upper West Side Lands area there is very minimal parkland and cycling infrastructure. Some of the uses in the nearby neighbourhood are outlined in the table below.

Parkland, Trail, and Cycling Infrastructure (<500 m)	
<i>Infrastructure Type</i>	<i>Name</i>
Natural Open Space	Garth Street/Twenty Road Open Space
Neighbourhood Park	Kopperfield Park
Bicycle Lane	Garth Street

4.3.2 Parks, Trails and Amenity Space Located within <1000m

At a 1000 m radius of the Upper West Side lands the parkland and cycling infrastructure still significantly lacks. It includes the following:

Parkland, Trail, and Cycling Infrastructure (<1000 m)	
<i>Infrastructure Type</i>	<i>Name</i>
School Site	Corpus Christie Elementary
Open Space	Kennedy East Open Space
Neighbourhood Park	Homebrook Park

4.3.3 Parks, Trails and Amenity Space Located within <2000m

At a 2000 m radius of the subject lands the amount of parkland and cycling infrastructure notably increases. The infrastructure options at the 2000 m radius are outlined below.

Parkland, Trail, and Cycling Infrastructure (<2000 m)	
<i>Infrastructure Type</i>	<i>Name</i>
Neighbourhood Park	Carpenter Neighbourhood Park

School Site	St. Thérèse of Lisieux Elementary
Neighbourhood Park	Kennedy East Park
City-Wide Park	Turner Park
Neighbourhood Park	Allison Neighbourhood Park
General Open Space	Olmstead Site
Neighbourhood Park	Ryckmans Neighbourhood Park
Community Park	William Schwenger Park
School Site	St. Thomas More Secondary
Parkette	Meadowbank Dr. Parkette
Neighbourhood Park	Falkirk West Park
School Site	Tiffany Hills Elementary
Parkette	Fair Park
Paved Multi-Use Path	Rymal Road West Multi-Use Path
Paved Multi-Use Recreational Trail	William Schwenger Park Pathway
Paved Multi-Use Recreational Trail	William Connell Park Pathway
Paved Multi-Use Recreational Trail	Olmsted Natural Open Space
City-Wide Park	William Connell Park

4.4 POLICY ANALYSIS

4.4.1 Urban Design and Community Facilities/Services Policies

The Urban Hamilton Official Plan (2022) details specific goals and objectives that lands designated as parkland and trail should aim to achieve. Section 3.3.9 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, for instance, states that community health and well-being shall be enhanced and supported through the following actions, where appropriate:

- creating high quality, safe streetscapes, parks, and open spaces that encourage social interaction, physical activity and active transportation; (OPA 167)
- encouraging development of complete and compact communities or neighbourhoods that contain a variety of land uses, transportation, recreational, and open space uses

Specific policies directly relating to parkland are outlined in section 3.5.3 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (2022). Overarching parkland policies include the following:

- The uses permitted on lands identified as Parkette, Neighbourhood Park, Community Park, City-Wide Park, General Open Space, and Natural Open Space on Appendix A – Parks Classification Map and designated on secondary plans of Volume 2 shall be parks for both active and passive recreational uses, community/recreational facilities, and other open space uses.
- Notwithstanding Policy C.3.3.4, ancillary commercial uses that are complementary to Community and City-Wide Parks and support the primary open space use such as, food

concessions, recreational equipment rentals, and water oriented recreational uses, may be permitted provided such uses do not interfere with or have negative impacts on the open space nature of the land.

- Lands designated Natural Open Space in the secondary plans are generally part of a park or conservation area. They have environmental features and are intended to be preserved in their natural state. Where appropriate, limited recreational activities/uses may be permitted including trails, picnic areas, forest management, and conservation management.

The City further expands upon the aforementioned overarching policies through the establishment of a parks hierarchy (sec. 3.5.3.4). In essence, the City separates parkland into four specific categories – Parkettes, Neighbourhood Parks, Community Parks, and City-Wide Parks. A further description of each parkland category is discussed below.

- Parkettes are small open spaces which have no or limited recreational facilities. They are generally located in the older urban areas where they serve an important function in the provision of open space opportunities.
- Neighbourhood Parks primarily cater to the recreational needs and interests of the residents living within its general vicinity. Residents can easily walk or bike to these parks. Neighbourhood Parks are generally comprised of municipal parkland, containing a mixture of passive areas, sports facilities, informal and formal play areas, and may include natural areas. They serve a population of approximately 5,000 people and have a minimum size of approximately 2 hectares.
- Community Parks serve more than one neighbourhood, but are not intended to serve the City as a whole. Community Parks have more intensive recreational facilities such as sports fields, and recreational and community centres. These facilities shall have good transportation access along adjacent arterial or collector roadways and provide adequate parking to meet anticipated demand. Community Parks in the urban area should appropriately be located along transit routes. They serve a population of approximately 20,000 people and have a minimum size of approximately 7 hectares city wide.
- City-Wide Parks are municipally, regionally, provincially or nationally significant destinations that meet the needs of residents and are of interest to visitors. These facilities are often associated with major recreation, education or leisure activities and may have natural, historic, or unique features. They range greatly in size and type.

Building upon the parkland hierarchy provided in section 3.5.3.4 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (2022), the City details specific parkland standards and developmental guidelines. Section 3.5.3.11 highlights a parkland standard for each type of park, except Parkettes (see table below). Parkettes have no parkland standards because of their small size and limited recreational opportunities and shall only be purchased in exceptional circumstances where no other parks or

open spaces exist in the vicinity nor are there any other opportunities to purchase Neighbourhood or Community Parks (sec. 3.5.3.12). Additionally, lands designated as General Open Space and Natural Open Space are not considered parkland and, therefore, have no standards (sec. 3.5.3.13).

Parkland Standards		
<i>Park Classification</i>	<i>Per 1,000 Population (Ratios)</i>	<i>Minimum Service Radius/Walking Distance</i>
Neighbourhood Parks	0.7 ha/1000	800 m
Community Parks	0.7 ha/1000	2 km
City-Wide Parks	0.7 ha/1000	N/A

As a final note, the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (2022) also states that through the preparation of secondary plans or neighbourhood plans, the City shall determine the amount and type of park required based on the following considerations:

- (a) *the parkland standards in Policy B.3.5.3.11*
- (b) *projected population*
- (c) *the location of other parks in adjacent areas*
- (d) *the feasibility of locating parks near schools and Natural Open Spaces*
- (e) *the feasibility of providing a range of parkland spaces for all residents within a safe walking distance; and, (OPA 167)*
- (f) *site characteristics (slope, natural features, frontage in a public road) as defined by the Parks and Open Space Development Guide, adopted by Council. (OPA 167)*

4.4.2 Parks Master Plan (2023)

Policy Findings

In September 2023 the City of Hamilton released their Parks Master Plan. This report solely focuses on parkland that is owned and operated by the City of Hamilton, and also seeks to understand the current parkland conditions in Hamilton and how existing gaps and challenges can be addressed. Using findings from community engagement activities (i.e., online surveys, workshops, and organized discussion guides) and additional analysis from City staff on precedent best practices, the City was able to prepare a comprehensive and illustrative Parks Master Plan.

Building upon the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, the Parks Master Plan highlighted the specific classes of parks available for citizens. An additional piece of analysis that occurred in the master plan, which was not conducted in the Official Plan, was with respect to other publicly accessible lands that are not viewed as parkland. The Parks Master Plan description of each park classification is the following:

- **City-Wide Parks:** Generally larger park sites that typically contain many park functions, and major recreational and cultural facilities and are considered municipally, regionally, provincially, and/or nationally significant park destinations. They are often associated with unique natural, historic, or cultural features that spurred their acquisition and guided their development. Their size and shape vary substantially, as does the nature of their contributions to parkland within the city. They are zoned with the City Wide (P3) Zone, which permits a wide range of community leisure, recreation, and commercial uses (e.g. marina, farmers market, commercial recreation, etc.). The attractions and events found within these parks draw residents together from across the City, and act as tourism destinations for visitors. Their size and attractive draw requires greater transportation infrastructure and maintenance to support greater amount and density of use.
- **Community Parks:** Community Parks are typically four to seven hectares in size and are located near higher-order streets and roadways. They are intended to serve multiple neighbourhoods or approximately 20,000 residents but may also serve as Neighbourhood Park space to nearby residents and workers. They often provide enhanced recreational amenities, such as sports fields, spray pads, community gardens and support amenities such as parking and washrooms. They should have multi-modal transportation access, including transit options in urban areas, and be adjacent to arterial or collector roads. They are zoned with the Community Park (P2) Zone, which includes uses such as recreation and urban farmer's markets.
- **Neighbourhood Parks:** Neighbourhood Parks provide smaller, well-distributed park space throughout the city, ensuring that all residents have access to the park system within walking distance of their home. They are intended to serve the local neighbourhood, or approximately 5,000 people. The typical size of a Neighbourhood Park is two hectares and they provide a wide array of local park functions, including passive space for gathering and relaxation, playgrounds, sport courts, and pathway systems. They should be accessible by active transportation modes such as walking and cycling, sited within a neighbourhood along collector or local roads. They are zoned with the Neighbourhood Park (P1) Zone, which permits recreational and community garden uses, but prohibits larger facilities such as arenas, indoor pools, and tennis courts.
- **Parkettes:** The size and location of Parkettes across the city varies, but they are typically under one hectare. They are often located within long established areas where larger blocks of parkland are challenging to provide. These small spaces offer limited recreational facilities or infrastructure, with a general focus on passive use such as seating. They occur within multiple zones, particularly Neighbourhood Park (P1) and Open Space (P4) Zones, that allow for recreational and natural open space uses. Hamilton's Official Plan does not set a provision target for this park type. The small size of these spaces preclude many recreational uses traditionally associated with parkland, and they are not included in subsequent assessments of parkland provision to meet municipal provision targets.

Lands that do not fall under the scope of parkland, but that the Parks Master Plan considers as Other Publicly Accessible lands, include school sites, natural open space, and general open space. Definitions of each of those uses are provided below:

- **School Sites:** Lands that unofficially supplement local park provision by providing communities with additional green spaces, sports fields, and playgrounds. School sites are outside of municipal control and, therefore, are not a substitute for true municipal parks.
- **Natural Open Space:** Includes public lands that contain significant ecological and natural landscapes and features. This includes the Niagara Escarpment lands which are a significant landform within the city, as well as creeks and ravines, steep slopes and wetlands, and woodlots. Their location is determined by where the ecological core areas, corridors, and habitat patches are located, especially along the Escarpment. While they may provide some passive recreational opportunities, such as trails, seating, and lookouts, they are not considered municipal parkland and are not included in the provision analyses in this report. These lands are zoned with the Conservation/Hazard Land (P5) Zone in urban areas, where permitted uses are in line with the zone's title and functions. In rural Hamilton, the Rural Conservation/Hazard Lands (P6-P8) Zones apply, which extend permitted uses to agricultural (and services supporting agricultural) as well as to single-detached dwellings.
- **General Open Space:** This broad class includes other publicly accessible open space, which may require an entry fee or charge, that are not City parks but provide community gathering and recreational uses. Examples include golf courses, trails and multi-use pathways, urban plazas and squares, picnic areas and beaches. This class also includes City-designated and owned museum and heritage spaces which are primarily open space (as opposed to indoor facilities only). General Open Space are scattered throughout the city. These lands are zoned with the Open Space (P4) Zone, which permits recreational, natural, and special open space uses, including golf courses, cemeteries, and botanical gardens, among others.

The Parks Master Plan also offers a high-level overview of the current supply of parks and open space in Hamilton and how it relates to the existing population. The report highlights that currently there are 1.98 hectares of total municipal parkland per 1000 people (19.8 m² per person), but only 0.51 hectares of neighbourhood parkland per 1000 people (5.1 m² per person) (see below for additional analysis on parkland statistics). In addition to that, the Parks Master Plan also determines two baseline standards for parkland. The first is a target of 2.1 hectares per 1000 people, which is the City of Hamilton wants to achieve across the city. The second target is a minimum of 0.7 hectares per 1000 people (7 m² per person), an identical target to that outlined in the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.

Parkland Statistics in City of Hamilton				
Class	# Existing (+ Planned)	Total Area (Ha)	Median Size (Ha)	Max Size (Ha)
City Wide	24	470.52	17.41	96.44
Community	72 (+3)	357.58	3.98	21.95
Neighbourhood	172 (+24)	298.53	1.44	7.08
Parkette	109 (+11)	28.64	0.21	1.42
School Site	114	315.32	2.14	17.30
Natural Open Space	88 (+2)	815.39	3.42	100.92
General Open Space	49 (+4)	518.08	2.14	145.58

Recommendations

To guide the recommendations brought forth in the report, Staff first undertook an analysis on best practices from municipalities throughout Canada. Notable trends determined from this analysis include road conversions to parks, diverse sporting facilities, active adult programs, public art, community gardens, seniors programs, casual and unstructured park use, parks to support mental health, free recreational opportunities, multi-use parks, and connections with nature. Based on these findings Staff determined the following takeaways:

- Consider multi-generational and multi-cultural needs within parks.
- Support increased greenery, natural elements, and trail-based recreation to allow people to connect with nature and gain mental health benefits.
- Design spaces to be multi-use and flexible to adapt to shifting needs and preferences overtime.
- Increase the amount of parks space and the amenities and facilities within that offer free opportunities for exercise, recreation, and leisure to improve equitable access to parks.

The City also determines that there are several priority areas and focus factors that should be used as guides to the establishment of new parkland and the acquisition of new parkland properties. Focus factors include areas with low or no other municipal parkland, existing high density, high density (planned intensification), transit-oriented development corridors, low-income, and areas with high child and youth population. The master plan also focuses on specific areas within Hamilton that are in need of parkland and labels such neighbourhoods as ‘very high’, ‘high’, and ‘medium’ priority areas. A comprehensive list of neighbourhoods deemed priority areas is provided below.

Planning Area	Neighbourhood	% of People Below Minimum 0.7ha / 1000 Target (only Nbhd Parks)	# of People Below Minimum 0.7ha / 1000 Target (only Nbhd Parks)	% of People Below Minimum 0.7ha / 1000 Target (Any Municipal Park)	# of People (2021) Below Minimum 0.7ha / 1000 Target (Any Municipal Park)	Average Focus Factor Score	Focus Factor Score x # People Below Minimum 0.7ha / 1000 Target (Any Municipal Park)	Parkland Acquisition Priority
Lower Hamilton	Durand	97%	12,109	78%	9,742	2.72	26453	Very High
Lower Hamilton	Gibson	96%	7,298	74%	5,611	3.20	17934	Very High
Lower Hamilton	Beasley	92%	6,574	63%	4,458	3.02	13458	Very High
Lower Hamilton	Landsdale	85%	6,540	65%	5,010	2.59	12951	Very High
Lower Hamilton	Corktown	100%	7,736	54%	4,183	2.97	12444	Very High
Glanbrook	4100	50%	6,225	43%	5,420	1.60	8691	High
Glanbrook	4200	26%	5,894	15%	3,324	2.31	7671	High
Lower Hamilton	Crown Point	85%	4,447	69%	3,584	2.11	7545	High
Lower Stoney	Fifty Point	73%	2,595	73%	2,593	2.57	6675	High
Lower Hamilton	St. Clair	73%	2,345	72%	2,300	2.85	6558	High
Ancaster	Lampman	85%	3,580	59%	2,495	2.23	5561	Medium
Lower Hamilton	Stinson	92%	4,042	47%	2,077	2.67	5546	Medium
Upper Stoney	Nash North	99%	3,444	49%	1,691	3.04	5135	Medium
Flamborough	1400	52%	12,312	11%	2,633	1.92	5056	Medium

Ultimately, the City breaks down their recommendations into three main groups – short, medium, and long-term actions. Short-term actions are to be implemented either immediately or in the next four years, while medium-term actions should be implemented between 5-10 years and long-term actions 10-years and beyond. The recommendations brought forth by Staff in the Parks Master Plan are outlined below.

Short-Term Actions

- Develop a proactive strategy to communicate priority parkland acquisition focus areas across different business units with the City (including parks, planning, funding, and financing business units). This will help identify opportunities for land acquisition through partnerships, land trades, or infrastructure development projects.
- Adopt the following parkland service level through a City-Initiated Official Plan Amendment to table B.3.5.3.1 - Parkland Standards:
- All residents should have access to a Neighbourhood or other park with equivalent functions, within a 500 metre walking distance of their dwelling.
- Complete amendments to align the Official Plan and the Parkland Dedication By-law with this Master Plan by:
 - Amend the Official Plan B 3.3.2.10 to allow for temporary and permanent road closures to support public gathering and open space programming.
 - Amend the Official Plan B 3.5.3.16 to explicitly incorporate social equity factors into the determination of parkland amount and type
 - Develop land specifications and rules around the use of privately owned public spaces.
 - Revise the Community Planning Permit System as a tool to aid in the acquisition of infrastructure, parkland, or monetary contributions, in exchange for offering a more streamlined and transparent approval process for high priority areas.

- Revise Section 5 of the Parkland By-law to ensure that townhouse units, multi-unit dwellings, and downtown redevelopments are supported by sufficient parkland.
- Exploring the potential to eliminate discretionary discounts and require parkland dedication for lands that are currently exempt (such as institutional) to reduce the financial shortfall
- Use the parkland priority acquisition mapping in this plan for land acquisition prioritization and develop a priority location list with the following information: location, ideal parkland size, associated acquisition cost.
- Work with other departments to align with initiatives such as the Transportation Master Plan: City in Motion to improve the connectivity of parkland within the city.
- Where land for parks is not available, explore repurposing existing public space for inclusive open space and park use.
- Regularly present a short annual monitoring report to Council overviewing changes in parkland service levels and near-term acquisition priorities.
- As part of a regular City property portfolio review, consider park use and needs, where underused city-owned land could be repurposed to fund new parks in areas of high need.
- Update the Park and Open Space Development Guide to facilitate multifunctional design and flexible use.
- Seek funding opportunities from other levels of government to improve park access and connectivity (e.g. bundle park acquisition into land purchases for rail-lines or other infrastructure projects).
- Identify parkland priorities that can be achieved in conjunction with the recommendations set out in the City's Recreation Master Plan.
- Develop land specifications and rules around the use of privately-owned public spaces.
- Where possible, complete comprehensive block planning in high growth urban areas, in alignment with approved plans and studies, by working with landowners to ensure parks are properly sited within redevelopment areas, and land dedication is coordinated to support and connect functional park space.
- Build on existing partnerships with Hamilton school boards and institutions by establishing a formal funding, acquisition, and programming partnership model to advance further opportunities to jointly use schools, campuses, and parks.
- Continue to partner with the school boards to understand potential school closure criteria and potential closure locations, to assess possible future purchases for park and City use, in advance of closures.
- Engage Real Estate staff for any negotiations on the sale of surplus lands to help ensure that parks-related interests are a priority.
- Establish a funding, acquisition and programming partnership model with community agencies, user groups, and advocacy organizations to creatively find ways to increase park provision, naturalization, stewardship, and programming.

- Continue to capitalize on the City's right of first refusal to acquire excess school sites when the opportunity arises to secure expanded parkland without developer competition, or to hold in reserve as a land bank to swap with developers for parkland.

Medium-Term Actions

- Increase contributions to the Parkland Acquisition Reserve to ensure that the City has the resources to acquire sufficient parkland in response to growth.
- Streamline parkland acquisition processes so the City can act when new opportunities for parkland acquisition become available. Work to acquire parkland earlier in the development process at a lower cost.
- Prioritize multi-use, inclusive and accessible park designs. Multifunctional park space should be prioritized in areas where acquisition is challenging, or high use is expected. Adopt flexible approaches to park programming to allow parks to pivot to meet the needs of residents.
- Seek out philanthropic contributions to help increase parkland and open space. This may be accomplished through outreach and communication to interested donors about potential land dedication opportunities (i.e. dialogue with foundations and Conservation Authorities).
- Improve connectivity by extending the pathway and cycling network on utility rights-of-way through expanded or new partnerships.
- Investigate opportunities to acquire underutilized properties to convert to parkland in the urban area, prioritizing high need areas.
- Create a standard process to proactively pursue land purchases of parks in undeveloped areas once a secondary planning process has been completed.
- Create and update plans for individual parks to identify opportunities to repurpose underused park spaces in alignment with current trends and needs.
- Expand partnerships with the Hamilton Conservation Authority, Conservation Halton, the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority, the Grand River Conservation Authority, and the Bruce Trail Conservancy to link parkland through regional connections to other open spaces and align with future land acquisition strategies.
- Conduct a review and revision of the Park Master Plan to update acquisition priority mapping and report on the current state of parkland provision and funding.

Long-Term Actions

- Identify opportunities to acquire lands in advance of significant development pressure to hold in reserve as a land bank to swap with developers for parkland in other areas of the city.
- Form partnerships with aggregate site owners and operators to explore the viability of quarry rehabilitation to public parkland.

4.4.3 Recreation Master Plan (2022)

The Recreation Master Plan (2022) illustrates several important findings as it relates to parks and park amenities. As noted in the Recreation Needs Assessment (RNA), the City of Hamilton completed a community survey in the summer of 2021 where City staff were informed on how citizens viewed parks, park space, and park amenities, in addition to recreational spaces as well. Notable findings as it relates to parkland include:

- Park washrooms (74%), playgrounds (66%), spray pads (57%), wading pools (44%), outdoor fitness stations (34%), leash free dog zones (26%), and outdoor running tracks (23%) were some of the highest priority investment park amenities.
- 48% of citizens indicated that they will require new or additional recreation and park facilities in the future.
- 93% of respondents feel that recreation and park facilities are important to their quality-of-life.

In terms of park facilities, the City provides an extensive list on the types of facilities commonly provided at parks and an overall inventory of each type. A detailed list on each type of park facility and their inventory is provided below:

Park Facilities in Hamilton	
<i>Type</i>	<i>Inventory</i>
Soccer and Multi-Use Fields	190
Football Fields	18
Baseball Diamonds	195
Cricket Fields	2
Playgrounds	256 sites
Outdoor Fitness Stations	9
Tennis Courts	79
Pickleball Courts	36
Basketball and Multi-Use Courts	106.5
Beach Volleyball Courts	0
Bocce Courts	39
Lawn Bowling Greens	4
Spray Pads	69
Wading Pools	8
Skateboard Parks	8
Bike Parks and Pump Tracks	1
Leash Free Dog Areas	12
Outdoor Rinks and Skating Trails	71
Community Gardens	14
Golf Courses	2

Outdoor Running Tracks	5
Support Buildings in Parks	-
Washroom Buildings in Parks	-

Recommendations

Based on the aforementioned findings the City of Hamilton provided a detailed recommendations list outlining specific actions items, as well as a general timing for the implementation of such action. This comprehensive list is provided below:

Parks Goals and Targets			
<i>Type of Facility</i>	<i>Current Provision Level</i>	<i>Future Planning Target</i>	<i>Total Required Facilities by 2051</i>
Soccer and Multi-Use Fields	1 field (ULE) per 87 registered participants (all ages), or approximately 1:2,860 residents.	1 ULE:100 registered participants	31
Football Fields	1 unlit equivalent per 27,160 residents	Case Specific Assessment	TBD
Baseball Diamonds	1 diamond (ULE) per 67 registered participants (all ages), or approximately 1:2,620 residents.	1 ULE:80 registered participants	35
Cricket Fields	1 cricket field per 292,000 residents	1:150,000	3
Playgrounds	1 playground location per 2,280 residents, or approximately one per 235 residents aged 0 to 9	500m to 800m radius within residential areas	TBD
Outdoor Fitness Stations	1 outdoor fitness location per 64,900 residents	1:60,000 and up to 2km radius	5
Tennis Courts	1 court per 7,390 residents	1:8,000 and 2km to 2.5km radius	23
Pickleball Courts	1 court per 16,220 residents	up to 2km radius	TBD
Basketball and Multi-Use Courts	1 court (full court equivalent) per 5,480 residents, or one per 605 residents aged 10 to 19 years	1:650 youth ages 1019 and up to 1km radius	24.5
Beach Volleyball Courts	-	pilot projects recommended	2-4

Community Infrastructure Assessment Report

Upper West Side Secondary Plan

Bocce Courts	1 court per 14,970 residents	-	-
Lawn Bowling Greens	1 lawn bowling green per 145,990 residents	-	-
Spray Pads	1 spray pad per 8,460 residents; 1 per 880 children aged 0-9 years	1 to 1.5km radius within residential areas	TBD (maintain current supply)
Wading Pools	1 wading pool per 73,000 residents; 1 per 7,600 children aged 0-9 years	-	-
Skateboard Parks	1 skate park per 73,000 residents, or one per 8,040 residents aged 10 to 19 years	1:7,500 youth ages 10-19 and 1km to 5km radius	3-4 (plus skate dots)
Bike Parks and Pump Tracks	1 pump track per 584,000 residents	up to 5km radius	2-3
Leash Free Dog Areas	1 leash free dog zone per 48,670 residents	minimum of 1 leash free dog zone per City ward	+4
Outdoor Rinks and Skating Trails	1 outdoor ice skating amenity (natural or artificial) per 8,225 residents (actual provision can vary from year-to-year); one artificial rink or trail per 146,000 persons	1 to 5km radius within residential areas	2 artificial (plus natural rinks)
Community Gardens	1 community garden location per 41,710 residents; excludes non-municipal locations	Site-specific analysis	TBD
Golf Courses	1 municipal golf club per 291,980 residents, or one hole per 10,815 persons	-	-
Outdoor Running Tracks	1 municipal outdoor running track per 116,790 residents	-	-
Support Buildings in Parks	-	Site-specific analysis	TBD
Washroom Buildings in Parks	-	Site-specific analysis	TBD

4.4.4 Cycling Master Plan (2017)

The Cycling Master Plan aims to provide an overview of the cycling network in the city of Hamilton. It goes on to silo the cycling infrastructure into linear and non-linear facilities whereby linear facilities include bicycle lanes, bike paths, paved shoulders, bicycle boulevards, alleyways, and multi-use recreational trails. Non-linear facilities, on the other hand, include sharrows, signals, crossrides, bike boxes, roundabouts, speed humps, catch basin grates, stairs with bicycle trough, trailhead entryways, and wayfinding. However, it should be noted that for the purpose of this report analysis will solely focus on multi-use recreational trails and bike paths because of the fact that these types of cycling infrastructure are most prominent in parkland, which is what this report centres around. A definition of each linear and non-linear facility is provided below for clarification purposes.

Cycling Infrastructure		
	Type	Definition
Linear Facilities	Bicycle Lanes	Designate a portion of the roadway for the exclusive use of cyclists through signing and pavement markings.
	Bike Paths	Visually very similar to multi-use recreational trails, but are for the exclusive use of cyclists, typically because a dedicated pedestrian facility (typically a sidewalk) is adjacent.
	Paved Shoulders	Part of the continuous paved platform of a roadway, but are separated from the motor vehicle lane by a solid painted edgeline.
	Bicycle Boulevards	Slow-speed, low-volume streets where walking or bicycling are sometimes/often given priority.
	Alleyways	Alleyways were considered as a possible option for resolving “pinch points” in the cycling network, but no such routes are included in the primary cycling network.
	Multi-Use Recreational Trails	Paved or packed loose-material trail that is physically separated from vehicular traffic by an open space or barrier.
		Sharrows

Non-Linear Facilities	Signals	Traffic signals heads with bicycle icons. Hamilton is transitioning to video detection of approaches at signalized intersections that require activation.
	Crossrides	Crossrides are recognized cycling crossings by the MTO, with their distinctive “elephant’s feet” markings.
	Bike Boxes	In Hamilton, bike boxes are typically designed with green pavement to create greater visibility to all road users.
	Roundabouts	N/A
	Speed Humps	The design of speed humps aims to minimize the side-slope of the speed hump near the curb face (maintaining suitable drainage), to maximize a suitable approach width in the bicycle lane for bicycle traffic.
	Catch Basin Grates	Where feasible, catch basin inlets are provided to provide a clear path for cyclists on the roadway.
	Stairs with Bicycle Trough	The City has a practice to construct stairs which are part of multi-use trails or bicycle routes with a trough for bicycles.
	Trailhead Entryways	Suitable barriers include stationary bollards, dropdown bollards, boulders (armour stone), and P-gates.
	Wayfinding	Wayfinding is a signing approach to provide road users with positive guidance to destinations “at a glance” without having to stop.

The Cycling Master Plan also brings forth several notable statistics and information relating to multi-use recreational trails and bike paths. Between 2009 and 2017, for instance, approximately 16 kilometres of multi-use recreational trails were installed in Hamilton leading to a 12.1% increase in this type of cycling infrastructure. As of 2017, there is 82.7 kilometres of multi-use recreational trails planned for the city, which would increase its total percent of the cycling network to 24%. It was also determined that some of the more widely used cycling infrastructure include multi-use recreational trails, such as the Cootes Drive Multi-Use Recreational Trail and Hamilton-Brantford Rail Trail.

The City concludes the master plan by outlining an implementation strategy for cycling infrastructure. As it relates to multi-use recreational trails, the City proposes to develop 39.4

kilometres of this cycling type in the urban area and an additional 31.3 kilometre in Hamilton's rural area. In total, these proposed additions will cost approximately \$8,500,000. The Cycling Master Plan, however, does not provide any recommendations on updating the cycling network nor about implementation.

4.4.5 Parks Needs Analysis

Parkland Provisioning

The City of Hamilton is home to a variety of different parkland ranging from neighbourhood parks to city-wide parks. In fact, the Parks Master Plan highlights that across Hamilton citizens have access to 1.98 hectares of municipal parkland (city-wide, community, and neighbourhood parks) per 1000 people. However, there are several areas across Hamilton that lack significant parkland infrastructure comparatively to other neighbourhoods. The Durand, Gibson, Beasley, Landsdale, and Corktown neighbourhoods have an average of 67% of citizens below the minimum 0.7 ha per 1000 people target for all municipal parks. The area in which the Upper West Side lands are located has 43% of the population below the minimum 0.7 ha per 1000 people target for all municipal parks, which, in turn, makes it a 'high' priority area for the City of Hamilton.

The City also notes in the Parks Master Plan that 'good community planning in an urban context' are municipal parks that are within an 800 metre catchment area (5-10 minute walk, 2-minute cycle, or 1 minute drive). Based on that standard it is clear that the many neighbourhoods in Hamilton, especially that of the Upper West Side lands, do not facilitate 'good community planning in an urban context'. The area surrounding Twenty Road West, which is where the subject lands are located, only has two parkland amenity spaces in the form of Kopperfield Park and Homebrook Park that are within an 800 metre catchment area. As it relates to the Upper West Side lands specifically, these parks are only 800 metres from the northern portion of the subject lands and, as such, citizens located to the south of the subject lands and surrounding area have no access to parkland within 800 metres.

What the aforementioned information indicates is that significant investment in parkland infrastructure should occur in the area surrounding the Upper West Side lands. This area is significantly underserved with respect to parkland, which likely eliminates the ability for existing residents to access parkland amenities. The development of community parks, neighbourhood parks, or parkettes, could help bridge that current parkland gap for the area surrounding the Upper West Side lands. Should there be a desire to intensify land uses, the construction of a School Site with an open space area that is accessible and usable for local citizens could also mitigate the existing parkland gap.

Park and Cycling Infrastructure

When analyzing the current parkland infrastructure allocation in relation to the future provisioning goal outlined in the Recreation Master Plan (2022), there are several infrastructure types that are noticeably absent in the area surrounding Twenty Road West. They include:

- Playgrounds
- Leash Free Dog Areas
- Community Gardens
- Cricket Fields (Lindsey to look into)
- Pickleball Courts (Lindsey to look into)
- Outdoor Fitness Stations (Lindsey to look into)
- Outdoor Rinks and Skating Trails

The notable absence of such parkland infrastructure is concerning being that the community survey outlined in the Recreation Master Plan (2022) indicated residents' strong attraction to certain uses outlined above. Playgrounds, for instance, were one the highest priority investment amenities according to respondents at a rate of 66%, while outdoor fitness stations and leash free dog zones were also highly important at rates of 34% and 26% respectively. Based on this, consideration of such parkland infrastructure should be made in the Twenty Road West area, especially as it relates to the Upper West Side lands.

Types of Parks, Trails and Parkland Amenities Suitable for the UWS Study Area

The Recreational Master Plan (2022), as noted in the Recreational Needs Assessment, provided a detailed overview on the types of activities that citizens in Hamilton commonly participate in. Activities that would often times be present in parks with some of the highest levels of participation include, playing at playgrounds (52%), playing at spray pads (47%), playing at wading pools (27%), and off-leash dog walking (19%). Based on these participation levels targeting the inclusion of such activities in the creation of parkland infrastructure in the Upper West Side lands area would be beneficial. This would likely ensure high utilization levels of parkland in the area due to the presence of infrastructure with high levels of participation.

An additional factor that must be considered in the development of parkland in the Upper West Side land area is specific age characteristics. The amenities and ways of interaction for citizens 40 years and older likely significantly differs compared to that of a person who is between the ages of 20 and 30. Using census data for the City of Hamilton it was determined that the average age for the Upper West Side land area is 42 years old and that approximately 240 of the 400 people that live in the area are above 40 years of age. Such an age cohort can be expected to desire park activities that allow them to stay physically active but that are also relaxing and low impact. Options could include fitness and weight training facilities, off-leash dog walking, pickleball courts, lawn bowling, community gardens, and athletic tracks for walking or running. Consideration of such infrastructure would likely be substantial in ensuring the utilization of any parkland that is developed either on the Upper West Side lands or in the surrounding area.

4.4.6 CONCLUSIONS

Opportunities and Constraints

What the above analysis on the existing parkland context in the Upper West Side area and surrounding neighbourhoods indicated is well below a satisfactory standard as it relates to parkland and associated infrastructure. This area has approximately 43% of the population below the minimum 0.7 ha per 1000 people target for all municipal parks, a rate that leads it to fall under the 'high' priority category. In addition to that, this area also lacks parkland infrastructure that residents have indicated as priority infrastructure, which includes playgrounds, leash free dog areas, and outdoor fitness stations. However, similar to the Recreational Needs Assessment, the lack of parkland and parkland infrastructure in the Upper West Side lands area can likely be attributed to the more rural and agricultural nature of this area. The currently more rural and agricultural nature of the Upper West Side lands and surrounding neighbourhoods, in addition to the presence of the nearby Hamilton Airport, does not provide strong reasoning for the provisioning of parkland and the development of parkland infrastructure.

However, the future development of the Upper West Side lands and, subsequent projected population growth of the area by approximately 20,000, necessitates the need for additional parkland and associated infrastructure. To address this expected need the City of Hamilton should strongly consider the Upper West Side lands. These lands are currently being proposed to include dedicated parkland and community space areas that could be utilized for the development of parks and priority investment infrastructure, such as playgrounds, leash free dog zones, and outdoor fitness stations. The noticeable gap in such infrastructure and current status as a 'high' priority parkland area could be addressed through the utilization of specific parcels of land already designated to be used as parks and open space on the Upper West Side lands.

Physical Recommendations

As previously noted, infrastructure that should be considered for development either on the Upper West Side lands or in the surrounding area includes the following:

- Playgrounds
- Leash Free Dog Parks
- Parkland
- Outdoor Rinks and Skating Trails
- Outdoor Fitness Stations

Policy Recommendations

The provisioning of parkland and parkland infrastructure could also be advanced in the Upper West Side lands and surrounding area through the implementation of specific policies. One policy that can be advanced is that of the Cycling Master Plan (2017). In its current state it does not provide a baseline or standard relating to acceptable levels of cycling infrastructure, especially multi-use recreational trails, for specific population sizes. This means that the City of Hamilton cannot analyze whether the existing cycling network is acceptable or whether additional cycling infrastructure needs to be developed in specific areas that are currently lacking such infrastructure. Such a policy update could be implemented through consultation with citizens and also private development corporations. This would allow the City of Hamilton to determine what areas exactly are noticeably deficient in cycling infrastructure, as well as the type of cycling infrastructure that is desired and would be beneficial for particular areas of Hamilton. It also would allow for joint partnership opportunities to potentially emerge whereby private organizations and developers could utilize portions of their lands for the development of such infrastructure.

Another policy that could be implemented that may aid in the provisioning and servicing of municipal parks is one that centres around public-private partnerships. Throughout North America there are several examples of public-private initiatives emerging specifically as it relates to municipal parks and include the following:

- Discovery Green (Houston, Texas)
- Market Square (Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania)
- Burnett Park (Ft. Worth Texas)
- Waterfront Park (Louisville, Kentucky)
- Landsdowne Park (Ottawa, Ontario)

This policy would likely aid the City of Hamilton in creating the greatest and most widely utilized parks, as it has been found to provide several benefits. For one, Waterfront Park and Burnett Park were determined to have extremely high levels of park maintenance which allowed for the parks to remain clean and safe (Wilson, 2011). In addition, it has also been found that such partnerships incentivize developers to invest in parks due to the ability for parks to increase the attractiveness of an area. A community park in Oklahoma referred to as the Gathering Place was developed out of a public-private partnership and was designed to make Tulsa a more attractive place for businesses and residents (Feller, 2020). The City of Hamilton can utilize developers desire to make their communities attractive by allowing them the ability to help design and maintain key public amenity spaces like parkland and parkland infrastructure.

Next Steps

To achieve the recommendations outlined above, there are several steps that should be taken. They include the following:

Community Infrastructure Assessment Report

Upper West Side Secondary Plan

1. Initiate discussions with the City on parkland, parkland infrastructure, and cycling infrastructure findings and recommendations for the Upper West Side lands area.
2. Implement community consultations and informal meetings with citizens in the areas surrounding the Upper West Side lands.
3. Analysis on City of Hamilton capital budget, specific timelines for proposed parkland, parkland infrastructure, and cycling infrastructure work, and future parkland, parkland infrastructure, and cycling infrastructure proposed for Upper West Side lands area.
4. Prepare action plan based on consultations and additional analysis that guides how the recommendations brought forth in this report can be implemented.

5.0 SCHOOL NEEDS ASSESSMENT

5.1 PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND

In accordance with the Upper West Side Secondary Plan, the School Needs Assessment will be focused on in this section. In order to achieve a complete community, analysing the needs of school infrastructure, pupil accommodation and location of schools is essential in contributing towards the common goal of the Upper West Side community. From the sections above, we examined the community and emergency facilities such as parks and open spaces, recreational facilities and other community amenities that can be included within the Upper West Side Secondary Plan area. The next step is to examine the inclusion of schools within the community area to continue to not only achieve a complete community but improve the quality of the built environment and public realm.

As such, the purpose of the School Needs Assessment is an important piece within this report as the existing and future community will need to understand how many schools are needed and the appropriate location for these schools to be constructed based on best use land use practices and urban design guidelines.

5.2 EXISTING CONTEXT

Located within the Secondary Plan area are potential development sites that can facilitate the accommodation of future schools. It is important to note, that not included within the landownership consortium but within the secondary plan bounded area is a parcel of land owned by the Hamilton Wentworth Catholic District School Board (HWCD SB). This parcel is approximately 4 hectares (10 acres) in area. Even though these lands are privately owned by the Catholic School Board, this report has included this parcel within the analysis as a means to fully consider all school accommodation criteria and opportunities presented within the secondary plan block.

5.3 EXISTING SCHOOLS AND APPLICABLE BOARDS

Within the Upper West Side Secondary Plan area, there are two prominent school boards that would evaluate the area to determine future school infrastructure needs based on catchment areas and pupil enrollment requirements. These two boards, the Hamilton Wentworth District School Board (HWDSB) and Hamilton Wentworth Catholic District School Board (HWCD SB), will require a School Needs Assessment completed in order to determine how many future schools will be needed within the feeding area and within the proposed Upper West Side community.

The HWDSB consists of approximately 78 elementary schools and 14 secondary schools within the Hamilton area. In total, the public school system provides 92 school facilities to Hamiltonians.

SCHOOL TYPE:	NO. OF SCHOOLS:
Junior Elementary School	18
JK-8 School	56
Middle School	4
Secondary School	14

Total	92
--------------	-----------

The Upper West Side area is positioned between three elementary school boundaries and located within a secondary school boundary, with the closest high schools being Nora Frances Henderson, Westmount and Sir Allan MacNab. As for secondary schools and shown on Figure 3, the closest elementary schools are James Macdonald (grades JK – 5), R.A Riddell and Gordon Price (grades JK – 8). However, the properties located within the study area are located in the following catchment areas: Mount Hope, R.A. Riddell and James Macdonald.

The HWCDSB consists of approximately fifty-two elementary schools and eight secondary schools. The closest elementary schools are Corpus Christi and St. Therese of Lisieux, with the closest high school being St. Thomas More. From the HWCDSB school boundary maps, Twenty Road West is the bounding line for St. Thomas More catchment area, therefore, the Upper West Side area is not located within a secondary school boundary. As for elementary schools, the Upper West Side area is located within only one catchment area which is the St. Therese of Lisieux school boundary area.

SCHOOL TYPE:	NO. OF SCHOOLS:
Elementary School	52
Secondary School	8
Total	92




Figure 2: HWCDSB Catchment Area



Figure 3: HWDSB School Catchment Areas

5.4 SCHOOL FACILITY DEMOGRAPHICS

5.4.1 Enrollment Projections and Capacity for Schools

Within the HWDSB Facilities Master Plan, are guiding principles that aim to assist the school board in providing equitable, affordable and sustainable learning facilities for all students attending public facilities. Included within this Master Plan is the Long-Term Facilities Master Plan (LTFMP) (2023) to guide the board towards more sustainable facilities. The specific guiding principles related to elementary and secondary schools, where local parameters may influence the thresholds have been provided below.

Elementary

- a. School Capacity – optimal school capacity would be 450 to 650 students, which creates two to three classes for each grade.
- b. School Grade/Organization – Kindergarten to Grade 8 facilities.
- c. School Site Size – optimal elementary school site includes play fields, parking lot and building. For new site acquisition, optimal size approximately 6 acres and for existing schools is based on local circumstances.
- d. In dual track schools, enrolment between French Immersion and English track should ensure that the balance supports ideal program delivery. i.e. There should be enough French Immersion enrolment to support a successful program but should not exceed 60%.

Secondary

- a. School Capacity – optimal school capacity would be 1,000 to 1,350 students.
- b. School Site Size – optimal secondary school site includes a sport field, parking lot and building. For new site acquisition, optimal size is approximately 15 acres and for existing schools is based on local circumstances.

The guiding principles have been incorporated into the analysis of the following table. Using the capacity forecasts, the capacity for the existing elementary and any applicable secondary schools are included below for both the public and catholic school boards.

Community Infrastructure Assessment Report
Upper West Side Secondary Plan

Elementary School	Mount Hope		RA Riddell		James Macdonald		Total No. of Students
	No. of Students	Perc. (%)	No. of Students	Perc. (%)	No. of Students	Perc. (%)	
Capacity	363	100%	594	100%	317	100%	1274 (100%)
Current Capacity	425	117%	746	126%	340	107%	1511 (119%)
Forecasted Capacity (by 2029)	573	158%	696	117%	366	115%	1635 (128%)
Forecasted Capacity (by 2033)	574	158%	704	119%	377	119%	1655 (130%)
Deficit/Surplus Pupil Places	-211	--	-110	--	-60	--	-381 (-30%)
Secondary Schools	Ancaster High		Sir Allan MacNab		No Third Highschool		Total No. of Students
	No. of Students	Perc. (%)	No. of Students	Perc. (%)	No. of Students	Perc. (%)	
Capacity	1281	100%	1350	100%	N/A	N/A	2631 (100%)
Current Capacity	1155	90%	765	57%	N/A	N/A	1920 (73%)
Forecasted Capacity (by 2029)	1263	99%	871	65%	N/A	N/A	2134 (81%)
Forecasted Capacity (by 2033)	1176	92%	859	64%	N/A	N/A	2035 (77%)
Deficit/Surplus Pupil Places	+105	--	+491	--	N/A	N/A	+596 (23%)

Notes (Source HWDSB):

Elementary Schools

- Projected enrollment expected to increase due to existing residential and projected development.
- Projected 300 pupil place deficit between 3 schools by 2024-25
- Potential addition required at Mount Hope – pending capital priority approval and Ministry of Education funding.
- Projections do not include potential students from proposed Upper West Side Secondary Plan Application.
- No capacity in existing schools to accommodate new elementary schools.

Secondary Schools

- Projected enrolment expected to increase due to existing residential and projected development.
- There is a current and projected surplus pupil lace between the two schools.
- Projections do not include students from the proposed Upper West Side Secondary Plan Application.
- Currently, existing schools are expected to have capacity to accommodate students from the Upper West Side Secondary Plan area.

Elementary School	St. Therese of Lisieux	
	No. of Students	Percentage (%)
Capacity	668	100%
Current Capacity	655	98%
Forecasted Capacity (by 2029)	975	146%
Forecasted Capacity (by 2033)	1196	179%
Deficit/ Surplus Pupil Places	-528	--
Secondary School	Not Applicable	
N/A	N/A	N/A

Notes (Source HWCDSB):

Elementary School

- St. Therese of Lisieux is operating at a utilization rate of 98% and is projected to significantly exceed its operating capacity by 2029 by 320 students to upwards of 552 students – which represents a utilization rates of 148% to 183% respectively.
- By 2033, projected enrolment is estimate to greatly exceed operating capacity at St. Therese of Lisieux by 541 students, upwards of 992 students, which represents utilization rates of 181% to 249% respectively.
- The Board’s current EDC by-law identifies the need for 619 pupil place elementary school in the South Ancaster or Mount Hope area by approximately 2029 and this recommendation does not take into consideration the additional 634, to upwards of 1295 students projected for the Upper West Side Secondary Plan area.
- In summary, one (1) to potentially two (2) Catholic elementary school sites will be required in the future secondary plan area.

Secondary School

- HWCDSB has confirmed that the area secondary school(s) have sufficient capacity to accommodate projected enrolment.
- The boards next Education Development Charge (EDC) Background Study is to be completed July 2024 which may also inform on possible changes/ updates to area secondary school requirements.

5.4.2 Enrollment and Capacity Trends

In addition to the public school's approach to accommodate existing facilities and meet capacity projections on the interim, the HWDSB incorporates a Portable Allocation Process within their framework for making use of and reducing the reliance of temporary student accommodation (LTFMP, 2023). As some schools are near capacity, constructing temporary portables and portapaks is a method that is employed regularly. A portapak, which differs from a portable, is considered an individual classroom that is dependent from the school, and provides a grouping of transportable classrooms attached by a corridor (LTFMP, 2023). A portapak is generally not considered for schools with long-term enrollment pressures with no future accommodation relief anticipated.

Although this strategy has become the standard process to combat growth for elementary schools, it is important to incorporate the appropriate planning measures at the development stage or secondary plan process for future school sites so that school facilities are able to expand and adapt rather than consistently spend on maintenance and construction costs for new portables. Providing portables in the short term may not be considered the best long-term solution as the cost to purchase a new portable is approximately \$125,000 along with the cost of \$75,000 to move the portable. In addition, to heat and cool the building along with other costs, is approximately \$30,000 annually (LTFMP, 2023). Not to mention demolition costs and other associated costs to plan for these temporary fixes.

5.4.3 Enrollment Projection Methodology

Specifically, for the HWDSB, enrollment projections are based on two main components: the historic school community data and new residential development student data (LTFMP, 2023). The figure below has captured the public board's process, taken from the HWDSB Long Term Facilities Master Plan, where to determine both the historical data and projected data, projection software is key in the enrollment methodology. The secondary planning process along with the new residential data based on housing types helps the school boards to better calculate future student enrollment projections for the area.




Figure 4: Enrollment Projection Methodology (HWDSB)

5.4.4 Projected Pupil Yield HWDSB

As stated above, new residential forecasts are generated by housing units based on housing types such as single-family dwellings, semi-detached, townhomes and apartment buildings. For the HWDSB elementary school, a single-family home would be equivalent to at least one student, however the higher the density the higher the student yield. For example, 5 townhome units would yield approximately 1 student (LTFMP, 2023). The yield calculation based on housing type is lower for secondary schools. The following table incorporates the public school board’s average yields and the secondary plan’s projected unit scenario based on density to assist in project pupil yields for the area.

Projected Pupil Yield HWDSB

2023 School Board Average						
	Elementary Pupil Yield Rate	Secondary Pupil Yield Rate	UWS Proposed Units	Elementary Pupil Yield	Secondary Pupil Yield	
Single Family (Low Density)	0.2632	0.096	429	113	41	
Townhome (Medium Density)	0.1991	0.0553	3757	748	207	
Apartment (High Density)	0.0068	0.0028	1181	8	3	

Total			5367	868	252
Notes (Source HWDSB):					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yields provided are from the Hamilton wide average yields for homes ages 1-20 years old. Neighbourhood specific yields vary by geographic area and age of home. • Unit counts are project numbers based on Formal Consultation submission. Update unit counts have been applied. • The minimum unit count scenario would yield approximately 1,200 elementary school students and 714 secondary school students • Based on the project unit counts and yields, HWDSB would require 2-4 elementary school sites depending on file unit count. Medium and higher densities will yield more pupil accommodation requirements • Based on the project unit count and yields HWDSB would not require a secondary school site since the students can be accommodated within the existing schools (i.e. Ancaster High and Sir Allan MacNab) 					

Projected Pupil Yield HWCD SB

2023 School Board Average						
	Elementary Pupil Yield Rate	Secondary Pupil Yield Rate	UWS Proposed Units	Elementary Pupil Yield	Secondary Pupil Yield	
Single Family (Low Density)	0.19	N/A	429	81	0	
Townhome (Medium Density)	0.096	N/A	3757	360	0	
Apartment (High Density)	0.006	N/A	1181	7	0	
Total			5367	449	0	
Notes (Source HWCD SB):						
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yields provided are from the Multi-year Accommodation Plan, 2017-2019 • The current EDC By-law is indicating the potential need for a second elementary school which will need to be accommodated in the secondary plan area. 						

5.5 PLANNING CONTEXT

Within Hamilton’s Urban Official Plan, educational facilities are generally designated as Institutional. As such, to follow the policies and guidelines in place, the land use plan proposed for the Upper West Secondary Plan is proposing to designate potential school sites as Institutional. Within this designation, the policy goals that are applicable to elementary or secondary schools include the following:

- Encourage the development of individual institutions and institutional campuses as important community resources and recognized focal points in the urban fabric (E.6.1.1)

- Ensure the integration and harmonious relationship between institutional areas and adjacent land use designations, particularly from a transportation and urban design perspective (E.6.1.3).
- Support arts and cultural facilities in conjunction with institutional uses, as important components of quality of life (E.6.1.4)

The analysis completed in the sections below explore the location criteria, school site characteristics required, as well as the impacts and design components that take into account the compatibility of an institutional use to support the policy goals of the Institutional designation. The information will be gathered to assist in the preparation of the guiding policies for the Secondary Plan.

5.6 SCHOOL ACCOMODATION ASSESSMENT

5.6.1 Locational Criteria

Existing School Site Location

As stated, the HWCDSB owns a 4-hectare (10 acre) parcel of land within the Upper West Side Secondary Plan study area. This parcel is located to the northeast of the site, abutting the existing hydro corridor. Through the comments received from the Formal Consultation process, the school board has determined that a minimum of 2.43 hectares (6 acres) within 130m of road frontage onto a municipal collector road is needed. The remainder of the lands can be utilized for either a park connection or be designated for other uses to accommodate the school facility. The current location of the school owned lands is identified in Figure xx. Please note, the school board is not a participating landowner within the Upper West Side Secondary Plan area but would like to remain as a commenting agency in order to achieve a neighbourhood that will best suite the future school facility.

Location Criteria Analysis

Determining the most advantageous location for a new school site can be determined by undertaking best practices. By reviewing the City’s Official Plan, the policies related to schools and location requirements have been noted below in the following table:

Policy	Required Criteria
Parks Hierarchy and Open Space Categories B.3.5.3.17	Preference shall be given to locating Neighbourhood or Community Parks adjacent to school sites.
Education Facilities B.3.5.5.7	New elementary schools may be located adjoining parks provided the School Board provides adequate outdoor space on their lands to meet their needs.
B.3.5.5.8	New educational facilities shall comply with Sections B.3.5 – Community Facilities/Services Policies, and B.3.3 – Urban Design Policies.

Urban Design Policies B.3.3.1.3	Create pedestrian oriented places that are safe, accessible, connected, and easy to navigate for people of all abilities.
B.3.3.1.5	Ensure that new development is compatible with and enhances the character of the existing environment and locale.
B.3.3.1.6	Create places that are adaptable and flexible to accommodate future demographic and environmental changes, including the impacts of a changing climate
B.3.3.2.5	Places that are safe, accessible, connected and easy to navigate shall be created by using the following design applications, where appropriate: a) connecting buildings and spaces through an efficient, intuitive, and safe network of streets, roads, alleys, lanes, sidewalks, pathways, and trails; c) ensuring building entrances are visible from the street and promoting shelter at entrance ways; d) integrating conveniently located public transit and cycling infrastructure with existing and new development;
Neighbourhoods Designation E.3.2.9	New elementary schools may be located adjoining parks provided the School Board provides adequate outdoor space on their lands to meet their needs.
E.3.2.10	Schools shall be designed to be accessible to those children they serve with minimum exposure to traffic hazards. Adequate bus loading and unloading facilities both on and off-site shall be incorporated into the design as needed.
3.5 Medium Density Residential E.3.5.5	Medium density residential uses shall be located within safe and convenient walking distance of existing or planned community facilities, public transit, schools, active or passive recreational facilities, and local or District Commercial uses
3.6 High Density Residential E.3.6.4	High density residential uses shall be located within safe and convenient walking distance of existing or planned community facilities/services, including public transit, schools, and active or passive recreational facilities.
3.10 Community Facility/ Services E.3.10.2	The City shall encourage a diverse range of community facility/service uses and promote the sharing of facilities and resources as capacities permit
E.3.10.3	Existing secondary schools on sites of 4 hectares or less shall be permitted to expand subject to the applicable policies of Section B.3.5 – Community Facilities/Services Policies.

General Location Criteria:

The general location criteria for school sites have been determined below:

- located near park space; either Community or Neighbourhood parks;
- connected to sidewalks, other pedestrian pathways with wide enough pedestrian corridors that can accommodate wheelchairs (i.e., safe network of streets, roads, alleys, lanes, sidewalks, pathways, and trails);
- school is compatible with existing and future neighbourhood;
- located and connected to public transit;
- located and connected to cycling infrastructure;
- located off of an arterial road or collector road to allow for adequate bus loading and unloading and ability to provide safety traffic measures; and,
- medium and high density residential uses shall be located within safe and convenient walking distances.

It is recommended that the Secondary Plan include the noted locational criteria for developing new school sites within the study area to help ensure schools are set up to thrive.

Additional Location Criteria:

In addition to the general location criteria listed above, the School Site Design Guidelines for Active & Sustainable Transportation, prepared by IBI Group for the City of Hamilton, provides further guidance on school site design and orientation. Some of the items mentioned in the report have captured above, yet it is important to complete a through analysis of site design to better inform the recommendations provided within this report for the Secondary Planning process.

From this report, it is recommended that school sites be located centrally within communities/ neighbourhoods. Ideally, within a 15-minute walk (approximately 800m) from the school site (SSDGAST, 2022). An example of centrally located school is provided in the report and shown below:



Within the Upper West Side Secondary Plan area, an 800m buffer has been provided to the residential area as well as the proposed school sites, see Figure 6.




Figure 5: School Walkability Analysis

As shown in Figure 5, the existing owned parcel by the catholic school board is able to accommodate an 800m walking buffer for future students within the east of the secondary plan area, even though the site is not centrally located within the secondary plan area. The proposed public school board location is able to accommodate the central area of the secondary plan. As future school sites may be required for the area, the western portion of the secondary plan area should be considered as third school site option. This would ensure all future students are able to walk to school according to the 800m buffer strategy.

The next additional location criteria to consider is proximity to community facilities. The report raises a good point, where students may not be travelling directly between their place of residence and school facility. As there are before and after school classes, students may need to access other public facilities such as recreational or community centres, libraries and parks/ open spaces. As the Official Plan supports the location of schools next to parks and open spaces, which assists in reduced travel and travel barriers, the concern can be the cluster of schools and public facilities. Meaning, it is recommended that the sites be carefully laid out to ensure the large buildings do not impede travel unintentionally. Having adequate connecting paths and building orientation are important considerations to avoid any travel hinderances.

5.6.2 Schools Site Design Criteria

To compliment the school site location criteria identified, the HWDSB Elementary School Design Guidelines (2018) document provides additional site design criteria to assist in supporting an overall school accommodation assessment. As a thorough analysis of the UHOP was completed for suitable location sites as well as other guiding documents, some of the site criteria as already been identified. However, the HWDSB has provided more detailed information to further assist in informing the Secondary Plan policies.

The following table below included compiled and summarized information of the site design criteria provided within the HWDSB Elementary School Design Guidelines. Also, included within the table are policy recommendations to be included within the Secondary Plan.

SCHOOL SITE DESIGN CRITERIA FOR CONSIDERATION:	POLICY RECOMMENDATION:
<p>Vehicular Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bus loading area sized to meet the anticipated number of buses. <li>• Schools with two frontages to locate bus lay-by at side of the school <li>• Locate the bus zone so that passengers do not need to cross any vehicular traffic. <li>• Locate the bus loading zone east of but not directly beside playgrounds, windows, and doors where students can be exposed to vehicle emissions. <li>• Separate student, bus, and staff vehicular traffic. 	<p>From previous literature on school street access, a school site should have at least access to two street frontages.</p> <p>Further consideration to bus loading zone locations should be applied for student safety.</p>

<p>Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Surface parking design should <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigate urban heat-island effect; ○ Manage stormwater runoff on-site; ○ Incorporate best-practice Low Impact Development techniques; ○ Create direct, legible, safe and comfortable pedestrian and bicycle routes; ○ Enhance the public realm. • Provide no more than the minimum number of parking spaces as designated by the municipal by-laws and the Board’s specific site requirements for staff, visitors, and students. • Provide barrier free parking adjacent to the main entrance and so that people do not need to cross any vehicular traffic to enter the building. • Anticipate the need for school expansion by way of future portables. With this in mind, provide flexible areas that may be converted into future parking as required • Provide landscaped islands and/or drainage swales to reduce heat island effect and mitigate stormwater runoff. • Locate driveways opposite existing or proposed driveways and streets to avoid offset intersections and traffic difficulties. 	<p>Parking areas should not only take into account safety measures and better pedestrian connectivity to built form but Low Impact Development (LID) measures should be considered for not only improved aesthetics but for climate change and sustainable measures.</p>
<p>Pedestrian Circulation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a clear, legible, and continuous pedestrian network throughout the site and parking areas. • All grade transitions are to be fully accessible, incorporating the City of Hamilton Urban Braille Standards. • Link active transportation routes from building entrances to public sidewalks and bicycle network 	<p>Selective parking locations along with pedestrian circulation work hand in hand to ensure navigation of parking lots, site access for pedestrians and active transportation to succeed in safe student navigation.</p>
<p>Bicycle Circulation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locate fixed, well-lit bicycle racks in a paved area that can be supervised from the interior of the school. Provide weather protection for bicycle racks where possible. • Short-term bike parking range: 0.5 – 3 spaces/10 students (minimum 2 spaces) or 3 (+) 0.06-0.0 spaces/100m² of interior floor area. 	<p>Further bicycle guidelines for site design can be found in Hamilton’s Site Design Guidelines.</p>
<p>Outdoor Amenity Spaces (active/ passive)</p>	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a series of flexible hard and soft surface amenity areas to accommodate a range of uses over time • Provide a variety of shaded outdoor spaces including along active transportation pathways on the school site, and adjacent to large open areas for areas of reprieve. • School yards located adjacent to municipal parks may share facilities and a fence between the properties may not be necessary. 	<p>From the UHOP, school sites are encouraged to be located next to parkland or open space. This allows for active and passive recreation to occur.</p> <p>Parkland design policies should be considered to improve outdoor amenity spaces as well as predict future needs of the schools for various activities and expansion needs.</p>
<p>Landscaping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An integrated landscape strategy should incorporate Low Impact Development (L.I.D.) Standards • The distribution of landscaping throughout the site can soften hardscapes, including parking areas, maximize shade and provide important storm water runoff mitigation measures. • Landscape design can enhance the quality of the architecture and accommodate programmed activities such as visual arts, physical education and a safe exterior space for special education classes. 	<p>Climate change should be factored in when designing and implementing landscaping areas.</p> <p>Enhanced landscaping with architectural design elements can assist school sites in shaping an environmental suitable for additional programs and activities.</p>
<p>Future Addition/ Portables</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designate area for future portables (up to six) on the site. • Provide washroom facilities and parking spaces for up to six portables. 	<p>When design school and connected park spaces, policies should be considered to improve outdoor amenity spaces as well as predict future needs of the schools for various activities and expansion needs.</p>

5.6.3 School Site Characteristics

Based on information received from the Secondary Plan Formal Consultation application process, and planning criteria provided within other Hamilton and public school documents, the following school characteristics should be included in concert with the locational criteria recommended above.

- Size locations for new school facilities should be at least 2.4 hectares (6 acres) to 3.2 hectares (8 acres) or at least 4 hectares in size according to the UHOP (Section E.6.2.1);
- Sites should typically be located centrally within the neighbourhood, where the school is walkable and easily accessible;

- Street frontage on at least two sides of the school site for increased accessibility;
- School site should not be encumbered by hydro corridors or other servicing easements such as storm and utility;
- Traffic calming devices should be implemented such as crosswalks, speed humps and reduced speed zones;
- Roundabouts near schools are not preferred; and,
- School sites connected to parkland and open space is encouraged.

Further school site characteristics can be found within the Urban Design Guidelines prepared by NAK Design Strategies.

5.6.4 Active and Sustainable Transportation


From the locational criteria analysis, ensuring schools are located along a street network that accessible to all students and promotes not only walkability but other forms of active transportation. The City of Hamilton has prepared a report to assist in implementing important policies and guidelines when planning for a new community for school site design in mind. In 2022, IBI Group prepared the School Site Design Guidelines for Active & Sustainable Transportation for the City of Hamilton.

This guiding document is important to review when preparing a school accommodation assessment for a secondary plan area. As such, the report sheds light on the City's efforts to grow the use of active and sustainable travel modes to schools. This report states specifically that the strategies presented within this report are applicable to elementary and secondary schools, new school sites within an urban and suburban context. In addition, this report can "provide an important role during the secondary planning and/or subdivision application processes for choosing the school site, laying out the street grid, establishing planning and engineering standards, and building controls that will help to set up the school site for success" (SSDGAST, 2022, p 1).

Why is Active and Sustainable Transportation Important?

Based on school trip trends the City has been collecting, travel to school by active modes such as walking and cycling has steadily declined. The City surmises that factors for this decline can include perceived safety concerns, the convenience of driving, and existing car-centric infrastructure (SSDGAST, 2022). As a result, City's report notes that "91% of Canadian children and youth are not getting the recommended levels of daily physical activity, and 26% of Canadian children and youth are considered overweight or obese" (SSDGAST, 2022, p 3). From the following figure below, the City has noted the increase in automotive use between 2006 to 2016.

Exhibit 2-1: City of Hamilton School Travel Modes (16 and under), 2006-2016



Source: Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS)

To accompany the figure above, the below statistics provided by the City have been compiled into the following table with included recommendations prepared by Corbett Land Strategies in response to the statistics provided.

PROVIDED STATISTICS	RECOMMENDATION
A person’s risk of obesity is reduced by 5% for each kilometre walked per day and increases by 6% for each hour spent in a car per day. By switching from driving to active modes of travel to school, both children and their parents are therefore dually reducing their risk of obesity and accompanying adverse health effects.	During the Secondary Plan process, policies are to be included to encourage cycling lanes and more pedestrian connection corridors. By providing more pedestrian connections will increase the convenience of walking over using an automobile.
Replacing a driving trip with walking or cycling saves an average of 0.85 kg of CO2 per kilometre, not including the further reduction in emissions due to decreased congestion on the roads.	Encouraging a reduction in car dependency will improve the air quality within neighbourhoods during peak school drop off times.
Replacing car trips with active modes can save society \$1.70 per kilometre in overall economic benefits such as time savings and health expenses while saving individuals and families \$0.43 per kilometre in direct travel expenses	Reducing the use of automotive trips will assist families in car dependency overall and provide for safer communities with less traffic congestion.
Almost 60% of cyclists and 46% of walkers reported enjoying their commute, compared to 37% of people commuting by car. Increased active travel to school can	Policies can be included in the Secondary Plan to improve cycling infrastructure such as

<p>therefore improve the quality of life of students, staff, and parents in a very real way.</p>	<p>supporting transportation cross-sections within the Urban Design Guidelines to separate cycling lanes from the roadway.</p> <p>Schools connected to parks can assist in cyclists and walking pedestrians overall commute due to improve aesthetics and overall health.</p>
--	---

To assist with improving active transportation and reducing the statistics noted above, the City of Hamilton has a guiding principles document, the Hamilton Active and Sustainable School Travel Charter (2015), which details the City’s long-term commitment between the City and school boards to provide the support and resources needed. It is important to note that Charter recognizes the role that the built form and stakeholder collaboration and partnerships must create, which is a culture supportive of active and sustainable travel. Upon reviewing both charters for the HWDSB and the HCDSB, the principles and goals are the same, where Hamilton is equally as dedicated.

Within the Charter, the following five (5) principles along with the corresponding action items have been compiled below.

No.	PRINCIPLE:
1.	<p>Street design for comfort, convenience, & safety for all users</p>
	<p>Commit to creating public spaces that are balanced towards all modes, ages, and abilities of travel.</p>
	<p>ACTION ITEMS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the installation and all season maintenance of cycling facilities and walking facilities leading to and around the schools • Reduce speed limits and install traffic calming devices along school commuting routes • Work with public transit (HSR) where applicable to provide timely and reliable service for students and staff
2.	<p>PRINCIPLE:</p>
	<p>Supportive land-use and site planning</p>
	<p>Ongoing comprehensive, collaborative approach to school site and school site design policies and planning that contributes to a health community. These policies apply to both new and existing schools.</p>
<p>ACTION ITEMS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locate schools that meet community needs and anticipated future growth • Ensure site design guidelines and current best practices are implemented to maximize opportunities for walking, cycling and transit use 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure complete community design that provides live, learn, work, shop, and play opportunities for convenient access by walking, cycling and transit • Design for green and active schools that encourage physical activity by including plants, trees, school gardens, and outdoor classrooms
3.	PRINCIPLE:
	Personal & community safety
	Environments that are design and maintained to reduce crime and the fear of crime promote active transportation.
	ACTION ITEMS:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adopt community designs that provide attractive walking environments such as adequate lighting, graffiti removal, building design, street greening, way-finding, and redevelopment of vacant lots and buildings • Conduct neighbourhood walkabouts to audit and identify personal security concerns • Provide safety education and awareness through curriculum and community partnerships • Increase policing in high-crime areas and high risk areas
4.	PRINCIPLE:
	Partnerships, collaboration, and shared responsibility
	Collaborate with all partnerships for a comprehensive approach to planning, implementation, and evaluation of active and sustainable transportation.
	ACTION ITEMS:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement School Travel Plans for all schools to ensure safe routes to school • Support and implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies for staff, parents, and where applicable students • Identify and eliminate challenges to using active and sustainable transportation for the trip to, from, and during school • Advocate for resources and investments from all sectors to build active and healthy community
5.0	PRINCIPLE:
	A culture of active and sustainable transportation
	The community takes a leadership role in creating a culture where active and sustainable transportation is the norm where we live, learn, work and play.
	ACTION ITEMS:
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Champion education and awareness activities related to active and sustainable transportation • Participate in local, regional, and international events that encourage active transportation • Develop policies and support environmental changes for active and sustainable transportation

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the resources and training required to champion and build capacity for active and sustainable transportation
--	--

From the five (5) principles listed to assist the City and school boards, it is clear that incorporating the principles into Secondary Plan policies is key to shaping the community/ neighbourhood at the early planning stages followed by more detailed planning policies to improve the success of new school facilities. The City of Hamilton has site plan design policies that can be followed more closely at the detailed site planning stage.

5.7 SCHOOL AND CITY RECREATION FACILITY AND OUTDOOR RECREATION ANALYSIS

5.7.1 Parkland

As discussed during the Parkland Issues Needs Assessment section, appropriate park space and open spaces are determined through the City’s Secondary Plan process, whether privately initiated or not or through Neighbourhood Plans. Through the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, the City will determine the amount of park based on the considerations listed in policy B.3.5.3.16:

- a) *the parkland standards in Policy B.3.5.3.11;*
- b) *projected population;*
- c) *the location of other parks in adjacent areas;*
- d) *the feasibility of locating parks near schools and Natural Open Spaces;*
- e) *the feasibility of providing a range of parkland spaces for all residents within a safe walking distance; and, (OPA 167)*
- f) *site characteristics (slope, natural features, frontage in a public road) as defined by the Parks and Open Space Development Guide, adopted by Council. (OPA 167)*

In addition, and explored above, the City has park type classifications such as City Wide Parks, Community Parks, Neighbourhood Parks, Parkettes that apply to Secondary Plans to determine if there is enough parkland and which types of parks are appropriate for the community based on area and population. Specifically, this section will focus on Community Parks and how the proposed Community Park within the Upper West Side Secondary Plan and how this park space can be utilized to maximize the benefits for the community. To recap, a community park is defined as follows by the City’s Park and Open Space Development Guide (2020):

“[Community Parks] serve more than one neighbourhood but are not intended to serve the City as a whole. Community Parks have more intensive recreational facilities such as sports fields, and recreational and community centres. These facilities shall have good transportation access along adjacent arterial or collector roadways and provide adequate parking to meet anticipated

demand. Community Parks in the urban area should appropriately be located along transit routes. They serve a population of approximately 20,000 people and have a minimum size of approximately 7.0 hectares city wide” (p 7).

The proposed community park provides approximately 7.9 ha in area and is located along one of the main collector roads of the site, which would meet the City’s definition of a community park.

In addition, the community is also located next to a school site. Based on City’s planning policies and recommendations from the school boards, having a school site located next to a park or open space area provide the community will multiple benefits which have been explored. The next section will focus on how to integrate a school site with a recreational facility.

5.7.2 School Sites and Recreational Facilities

The proposed community park within the Secondary Plan area can be considered to provide a recreational facility based on the findings and recommendations within the Recreational Needs Assessment portion of this report. The study area is underserved and therefore the Secondary Plan community can benefit from having a recreational facility constructed within the community area. As such, the proposed community park is in a strong position on the land use plan to provide an opportunity to provide an elementary school site connected to a recreational facility.

5.7.3 Co-Location School Site Analysis

Examples of co-location school sites within the City of Hamilton, where more than one school coexists on a large block of land, have been captured below in Figures 7, 8 and 9. These examples show different park spaces connected to either natural spaces, community or neighbourhood parks and different school boards. In Figure 7, the community park or neighbourhood provides for recreation opportunities and is able to reduce neighbourhood traffic with increased walking opportunities for two schools. Within Figure 8, a catholic high school and elementary school are connected and also serve the local community due to infrastructure for the high school and a public soccer field available for seasonal recreational leagues. Also, there is a community feature where washrooms, and a splash pad and a playground are available for visitors. There are parking spaces available as well for visitors enjoying the park space. In Figure 9, the high school and recreational facility are located within the downtown. As such, the area is built up with minimal park space. However, a large recreational facility is connected to the school site increasing opportunities for school activities during the day and after school.




Figure 7: Public and Catholic School Co-location Example




Figure 8: Catholic Highschool and Elementary School with Recreational Facility Options



Figure 9: Public High School and Recreation Centre Example

6.0 ANALYSIS

6.1 OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS

6.1.1 Opportunities

The analysis completed for the School Assessment and Accommodation section of this report has determined opportunities to assist the school board, the City and the preparation of the Secondary Plan. One of the main opportunities identified is developing facility partnerships for either active transportation with the City to better serve students and accessibility to facilities or to improve upon expansion opportunities or cohabitation projects. For example, the HWDSB hosts regular community planning and facility partnership meetings to meet the following objectives:

- Participation in a facility partnership;
- Contribution to land-use or green space/park plans; and,
- The opportunity to co-build when considering building a new school or undertaking a significant addition or renovation.

The HWCDSD takes a similar approach where the goal of hosting community planning and facility planning partnerships is to:

- Acquire Facility Partnerships through a lease/ license of unused school space; and,
- Build Facility Partnerships with planned capital projects including major facility renovations/ additions and the building of new schools.

Other than maintaining and developing partnerships, inserting policy into the secondary plan will be of great benefit to future sites which will be discussed in the policy recommendation section.

6.1.2 Constraints

From the literature reviewed above, policy recommendations have been listed below.

- School Site locations should be approximately 6 acres in size with access to at least two street frontages.
- Either a Community or Neighbourhood park or open space should be located next to a school site.
- Pedestrian connectivity opportunities should be embedded in policy to promote the development of sidewalks, other pedestrian connections that are accessible, cycling pathways and neighbourhood trails. Safety and traffic calming measures should also be included where applicable.
- Incorporate Hamilton's Active and Sustainable School Travel Charter Principles & Actions where possible into policy.
- Site design considerations should be encouraged in secondary plan policies.

6.1.3 Next Steps

To achieve the recommendations outlined above, there are several steps that should be taken. They include the following:

1. Initiate discussions with the school boards on preferred site locations within the secondary plan area and discuss possibility of co-location opportunities.
2. Initiate discussions with the City and school boards to discuss parkland options and recreational facility partnership opportunities.
3. Incorporate policy recommendations into Secondary Plan to guide development for the community area.

7.0 CONCLUSION

This report has taken an in-depth approach at analysing community infrastructure components such as recreational needs, parkland needs and school facility needs for a new secondary plan community. It has been determined that the Upper West Side Secondary Plan area is able to provide the community recreational opportunities through an enhanced natural corridor with trails, park spaces to be provided with can be located next to a school site and recreational facility opportunities through the utilization of a proposed community park. The opportunities and constraints for the area have been assessed and recommended policies will be circulated to incorporate into the Secondary Plan's guiding documentation.

Prepared by:

Candice Hood

Candice Hood, BA, CPT
Associate Development Planner
Corbett Land Strategies Inc.
5045 South Service Road, Suite 301
Burlington ON L7L 5Y7
candice@corbettlandstrategies.ca
289-725-0121

Approved by:

Nick Wood

Nick Wood, RPP, MCIP, MES(PI)
Vice-President, Planning
Corbett Land Strategies Inc.
5045 South Service Road, Suite 301
Burlington ON L7L 5Y7
nick@corbettlandstrategies.ca
416-420-5544

8.0 REFERENCES

- Facilities Master Plan. HWDSB. (October 6th, 2023). Retrieved from: <https://www.hwdsb.on.ca/about/school-renewal/facilities-master-plan/>
- Feller, G. (July 20, 2020). Leveraging Public-Private Partnerships. National Recreation and Park Association. Retrieved from <https://www.nrpa.org/parks-recreation-magazine/2020/august/leveraging-public-private-partnerships/>
- Hamilton Active and Sustainable School Travel Charter. City of Hamilton. (2015) [Pdf].
- HWDSB Elementary School Design Guidelines. HWDSB. (2018). [Pdf].
- Long Term Facilities Master Plan (LTFMP). HWDSB. (2023). Retrieved from: https://www.hwdsb.on.ca/wp-content/uploads/2023/10/LTFMP_Full_Report_2023.pdf
- Park and Open Space Development Guide. (2020). City of Hamilton. Retrieved from: <https://www.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/2022-11/pedpolicies-park-open-space-development-guide.pdf>
- School Site Design Guidelines for Active & Sustainable Transportation. Prepared by IBI Group. (November 30th, 2022). [Pdf].
- Wilson, A. (2011). Public Private Partnerships in Urban Parks: A Case Study of Five U.S. Parks [Master's Thesis, Cornell University]. Retrieved from chrome extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://ecommons.cornell.edu/server/api/core/bitstreams/cc1702f-a217-42c0-8d91-d4b037584b42/content