



Hamilton

Hamilton Elfrida Growth Area Study

### Community Focus Group Meeting #2

Country-Wide Recycling

November 13, 2017

6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

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

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

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

#### **Raised during Option 1: Development Pods**

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

### Option 1

What I like	What I don't like	General
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Development applications are running up against species at risk issues. We've lost several species completely in recent years. Setting aside more space is a better thing for species.</li> <li>More space helps with climate change resiliency.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fragments land parcels</li> <li>This extent of PSW has not been ground-truthed. We're aware of errors after years of monitoring this work.</li> <li>How can lands farmed for 100+ years be flagged as NHS?</li> <li>Will this be a rural landscape? It doesn't look like we are planning for that. Are hedgerows worthy of protection?</li> <li>Arterials along 56 should intersect. Should aim to consolidate stop lights.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Probably the most car dependent concept</li> <li>Most proactive with regards to Natural Heritage protection</li> <li>Can Eflrida rely on adjacent commercial areas? Yes.</li> </ul>

### Option 2

What I like	What I don't like	General
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most liked from a development perspective.</li> <li>Will be most efficient from a servicing perspective. (Quite a pro-development outcome.)</li> <li>Most accurately reflects what is "truly" Natural Heritage.</li> <li>Node makes sense at this location</li> <li>Seems to support transit support.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Least liked from an environmental perspective.</li> <li>Not real walkability along Upper Centennial (major highway). Do you pull density off Upper Centennial to encourage the walkability internally?</li> <li>May be issues with shadowing on existing residential.</li> <li>Much of that "Square" central node is a swamp all year.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>***What flood mapping is being used in this area?</li> <li>(Some fixation on "commercial" meaning traditional single storey formats. Look at the label?) "Town centre"</li> <li>Should connect community node to a large central park.</li> <li>***What are the planned widenings for Rymal and Upper Centennial in current plans?</li> <li>The truck route up for review. Do we have the ability to look at this area differently.</li> </ul>

### Option 3

What I like	What I don't like	General
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Like how the elements of the community are more spread out, everyone can access.</li> <li>Farming and gardening could occur as part of a park.</li> <li>Makes a lot of sense as a phasing solution. A complete community per block.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SE-most green is a farmhouse (cultural feature?).</li> <li>Why do we have circular arterial roads? Where is this major road taking people? Shouldn't it connect the grid? Hamilton's history on this is that a grid works better.</li> <li>If someone wants an organic farm, they should start it themselves—City shouldn't be in this business.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Antagonism toward farming and organic is not what others hear in the public.</li> <li>Would you hybridize this plan within a grid/road system? Could probably keep more NHS that way, too.</li> </ul>

**Options to enhance in the presentation**

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

**Next Steps**

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