

# City of Brantford Waterfront Master Plan Terms of Reference

## PUBLIC FEEDBACK REPORT February 26 Workshop



This report has been prepared by an independent facilitator. It is not intended as a verbatim account and is provided here as a record of the input.

For further information, contact:  
Tricia Givens, Senior Policy Planner,  
City of Brantford:  
[tgi\\_ns@brantfrod.ca](mailto:tgi_ns@brantfrod.ca)

Sue Cumming, MCIP, RPP  
Cumming + Company  
Tel: (866) 611-3715



**City of Brantford**  
**Waterfront Master Plan**  
**Terms of Reference**  
**PUBLIC FEEDBACK REPORT**  
**February 26<sup>th</sup> Workshop**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1.	Context for Workshop	Page 2
2.	Public Expectations for the Waterfront	Page 4
3.	Study Components	Page 5
4.	Community Participation and Communications	Page 7
5.	Environmental Issues	Page 8
6.	River and Tributary Access and Utilization	Page 9
7.	Planning and Development	Page 10
8.	Implementation	Page 11

**APPENDIX**

	Recorded Flipchart Points from the Table Discussions	Page 12
--	--	---------

# City of Brantford

## Waterfront Master Plan, Terms of Reference

### PUBLIC FEEDBACK REPORT on February 26<sup>th</sup> Workshop

#### 1. CONTEXT FOR THE WORKSHOP

The City of Brantford is undertaking a Waterfront Master Plan Project for lands associated with the Grand River within the City of Brantford. City Staff prepared a draft Terms of Reference for the selection of a consultant to undertake the study. Recognizing the importance of gaining public input prior to the commencement of the study, the City invited members of the public and community stakeholders to review the draft Terms of Reference (TOR) and provide input on public expectations and proposed study components. The TOR was made available through the City's web site and people were invited to attend a community workshop held on February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2009.

The public workshop was advertised in the Civic News on Friday February 13<sup>th</sup> and February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009. It was also advertised on the City's website in early February in several locations: "Corporate News", "Public Meetings", and "City Projects". Finally, public notice was circulated to seven Committees of Council, provided to City Council, and as part of a mail out for identified stakeholder groups and interested members of the public (37 notices were mailed out).

Sue Cumming of Cumming + Company, an independent Facilitator and public consultation consultant, was retained to engage the community and its stakeholders in discussion at this workshop and to report on the ideas and suggestions put forward by the public. Over 70 members of the community attended the workshop. The meeting started with a presentation by City Staff, which provided an overview on the Terms of Reference, providing explanation and reasons as to why each item was included. This was followed by round table discussions with each participant sharing ideas and thoughts on what ideas they would like to see considered for incorporation into the TOR.

The primary discussion topics at the February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2009 workshop were:

- Public Expectations and Big Opportunities;
- Study Components and Information;
- Community Participation and Communications;
- Environmental Issues;
- Rivers and Tributary Access and Utilization;
- Planning and Development;
- Implementation.

A participant guide was provided to each person as a tool to assist with the table discussions.

The Facilitator prepared the Public Feedback Report. The views and ideas expressed in this Report serve to provide an understanding of the important directions that the public would like to see incorporated into the Waterfront Master Plan. The main body of the report includes a synthesis of the key points that were frequently noted throughout the workshop discussions. The synthesis was put together by the Facilitator to highlight these key ideas. To ensure full transparency in the reporting of the input received through the workshops, the Appendix to this Report includes summary tables from the discussions.

## **2. PUBLIC EXPECTATIONS FOR THE WATERFRONT MASTER PLAN**

At the Workshop held on February 26, 2009 Members of the public communicated their expectations for “big opportunities” specific to what the Waterfront Master Plan could/should achieve for the City. A number of important themes emerged from the workshop discussion that will become a lens through which the ultimate waterfront plan will be viewed. The City of Brantford community values the creation of a Plan for the Waterfront that has high standards for environmental protection, preservation, and restoration. They value rigorous controls and programs for water quality, source water protection, natural and built heritage, and archaeological resource management. Further, the community values the limitation of future growth coupled with a high degree of regulation specific to all types of development in proximity to the Waterfront. There is a desire to incorporate opportunities for participation for people of all ages with the view of creating a viable waterfront for future generations. In addition to these overarching values, the public is looking for the waterfront plan to result in the following:

- a. A healthy waterfront ecosystem inclusive of a vegetation canopy along the river and continuous wildlife corridors and native tree species;
- b. Views towards the waterfront that are not impeded by rooflines and buildings;
- c. Open public access to everyone in non-ecologically sensitive areas connected to the downtown and City;
- d. Access for different users (for fishing, canoeing, swimming, hiking, walking etc);
- e. Mobility access for those in a wheelchair, walkers and with strollers;
- f. Pedestrian infrastructure (including benches, signage, facilities, benches, bicycle parking);
- g. Interpretative signage regarding ecological, historical, & cultural features;
- h. Eco-tourism and heritage tourism opportunities (i.e. Brants Ford, Watts Dam etc.);
- i. An “outdoor living laboratory” for environmental and heritage education and awareness;
- j. Mechanism for public acquisition of waterfront lands;
- k. Eco-development standards for any new development i.e. buffering requirements, public access, views and vistas, green building standards, tree protection;
- l. Sustainable commitment for realizing the Waterfront Plan Vision;
- m. Renewed partnerships with neighbours (County, Six Nations, GRCA);
- n. Enforcement of negative human actions along the Waterfront;
- o. Mohawk Lake and Canal areas clean up as a priority;

### 3. STUDY COMPONENTS

The workshop discussion provided input on how the study was organized. The draft TOR is organized into three key areas as follows - environmental, Waterfront access & utilization, and planning & development. The discussion on study components led to the following input:

- 3.1. Suggested changes, improvements to study components:
  - a. Look at information from governments and organizations such as county, Six Nations, Province, other communities, GRCA, etc.
  - b. Heritage/Archeological & Resource/Education needs to be strengthened.
  - c. Access and Utilization section should include “recreation planning” with focus on active connections to the waterfront - cyclists, walkers, etc.
  - d. Enhance and address educational opportunities in the study:
    - Educating Brantford citizens and schools about waterfront;
    - Interpretative signage regarding ecological, historical, cultural features.
  - e. Expand opportunities for tourism and destination draw of the waterfront:
    - Opportunities for new tourism (use of river itself, parks, trails and picnic areas);
    - Market the river as a destination point;
    - Cultural economic development - appropriate built development in appropriate locations and opportunities for tourism/cultural interpretive “celebrate the environment”;
    - Showcase the resource to the community - “bring people to the river”;
    - Public ownership for community stewardship;
    - Celebrate industrial/historic culture;
    - Event marketing (community meeting place);
    - Recreational canoe launching etc opportunities on City side;
    - Promotion of Brant’s Ford (historic significance and historic sites) and Natural areas (Lim’s Park, Waterworks Park, connections to Lorne Bridge).
  - f. Use external programs to augment data/reference base on key areas i.e. (government/private sector (additional info).
  - g. Add enforcement to the “Planning and Development” section.
  - h. Develop a plan for accessibility and safety.
  - i. Review how land claims could impact creation and implementation of Waterfront Plan.
  - j. Consider how to improve public transit to waterfront access points.

- k. Consider zoning changes to reflect woodlots as woodlots.
  - l. Reporting & measures to deal with upstream spills of raw sewage from other municipalities.
- 3.2 Additional Information identified by participants:
- a. User survey input - how many people using the river would be helpful.
  - b. Plan of ANSI (Areas of National & Significant Interest).
  - c. Information about Archeological areas.
  - d. Information on endangered species/habitat.
  - e. Create of Species/Flora/Fauna Inventory List.
  - f. Better Mapping (Boat & Trailer Launch).

#### 4. COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND COMMUNICATIONS

Section 3.0 of the Terms of Reference outlines the Community Participation and Communications Strategy for the Waterfront Master Plan Study. The City has incorporated into the TOR ways to ensure good public dialogue on the development of the plan. At the workshop, participants confirmed the importance of a robust public participation program. The following highlights the ideas expressed at the workshop on ideas and approaches for consulting with the public and stakeholders:

- a. Ensure a completely transparent process.
- b. Frequent and regular consultations.
- c. People prefer more collaborative approaches to discussing study components as the Waterfront Master Plan is developed. Workshop style meetings are encouraged at key milestones on the scope and extent of the detailed studies, on the draft plan, final plan and implementation strategies.
- d. A workshop is recommended at the beginning of the process to develop the Waterfront Vision.
- e. Aim to include a broadened outreach to include a wide spectrum of stakeholders. It was noted that attendance by representatives from the County and Six Nations would be desirable.
- f. Improve outreach/relationships with canoe outfitters, eco-tours, rafting, kayaking, etc to get their input on our waterfront plan
- g. Would like to see the notification process expanded to include contact with School Boards to involve school children and youth.
- h. Consider placing posters to advertise meetings in public places.
- i. Public input to encourage and discuss opportunities for stewardship is recommended with ideas being considered for: resident donation of plants and saplings, management of gardens; school involvement, etc.
- j. Summaries of public meeting input to be provided following each event.
- k. Some expressed that workshops could be shorter; others felt a focused amount of time (3 to 4 hours) was effective in promoting an understanding of ideas and full discussion.
- l. Interested in seeing outcomes from February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2009 workshop in report form as part of the background material provided to potential consultants and as building piece for the study work.
- m. Keep people informed.
- n. Consider holding multiple meetings in different locations to attract people from all over the City.
- o. Consider stakeholder interviews including property owners, land developers and community groups to solicit further input.
- p. Consider placement of residents on advisory committees;
- q. Ensure that there are written commenting opportunities available for those that cannot attend sessions.
- r. Appreciative of attendance by City Councillors and City staff at public sessions.

## 5. ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Section 4.2 of the Terms of Reference outlines the program for reviewing Environmental Issues. Significant study components include the following:

*Water Quality,*

*Review of review of the Exceptional Waters designation of the Grand River,*

*Wildlife corridors and habitat or sensitive features,*

*Identification of natural heritage along waterfront corridor,*

*Tree canopy along waterfront corridor:*

*Appearance and usability of the flood protection dykes along with criteria for development in order to protect the integrity of the dyke structure, and*

*Review the Endangered Species Act and provide policy recommendations*

Natural environmental protection, restoration and enhancement of the waterfront lands are important to residents. Workshop participants identified a number of significant outcomes that they would like to result from the study as follows:

- a. Maintenance and enhancement of a healthy vegetation canopy along the river.
- b. Creation of continuous wildlife corridors along the length of the river.
- c. Restoration and protection of natural features and habitat.
- d. Replanting of native trees species.
- e. Regular monitoring of sediment control, slope stability and erosion.
- f. Controls and programs to improve water quality, source water protection and groundwater protection.
- g. Mandatory requirement to treat all storm water in adequate storm water management systems prior to entry into waterways.
- h. Strong language around enforcement of provincial wetland policy.
- i. Mohawk Lake and Canal areas clean up as a priority.
- j. Maintain agricultural lands that do not require fertilization.
- k. Education on prescription medication run-off and stewardship.

## 6. RIVER AND TRIBUTARY ACCESS AND UTILIZATION

Section 4.2.2 of the Terms of Reference also outlines the program for reviewing River and Tributary Access & Utilization. Significant study components include the following:

*Trails and Parks along the River, Tributaries, and Mohawk Lake;*

*Preserving and interpreting municipal history;*

*Access to the River by the Public;*

*Safety.*

Improved public access and utilization for residents and visitors was discussed at the workshop. Workshop participants identified a number of significant outcomes that they would like to result from the study as follows:

- a. Increased accessibility for people of all ages and abilities to participate along the waterfront actively and passively.
- b. Free open access to everyone in non-ecologically sensitive areas.
- c. Categorize and define different access points for different users (for fishing, for canoe launch, for swimming, for hiking, walking etc).
- d. Plan for mobility access for those in a wheelchair, walkers and with strollers.
- e. Pedestrian infrastructure with benches, way-finding signs, facilities, benches, parking, bicycle parking.
- f. Integrate access points into new developments.
- g. Integrate access points to trails and pedestrian connections in the City.
- h. Create infrastructure for access to waterfront (i.e. transit locations, parking).
- i. Public land acquisition to achieve goals of creating accessibility to the waterfront.
- j. Enhanced views and vistas to and from the waterfront:
  - Views from the waterfront that are not impeded by rooflines and buildings;
  - Vistas and view corridors to the waterfront;
  - Define setbacks from shorelines.

## 7. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Section 4.3 of the Terms of Reference also outlines the program for reviewing Planning and Development policies and standards. Significant study components include the following:

*Development Analysis*

*Land Use Analysis*

*Site Specific Analysis*

Key themes from the workshop discussion included Identifying areas where development would be permitted and requiring any development to conform to eco-development standards (including buffering requirements, public access, views and vistas). Stronger restrictions are desired for prohibiting development in sensitive areas. The following outcomes were noted:

- a. High standards of/for any development.
- b. Limits for future growth along waterfront.
- c. High degree of regulation of any development along the Waterfront;
- d. Designation of ecologically sensitive areas, ANSIs and other open space areas to be protected from development in perpetuity.
- e. Recognition and designation of built form and archaeological sites of cultural/historical significance (i.e. Canal, Mohawk Lake, Davisville).
- f. Lands secured in public ownership.
- g. Heritage and tourism opportunities.
- h. Preservation of natural open spaces.
- i. Responsible stewardship and usage of lands.
- j. Linkages of Natural Areas.
- k. Prohibit encroachment from abutting lands into waterfront areas.
- l. Set development standards, increased buffering, eco-development standards.
- m. Enforce guidelines consistency.
- n. Understanding of effect of settlement in area with intent to protect watershed quality.
- o. Include review of partnership opportunities as part of implementation.

## **8. IMPLEMENTATION**

Implementation of the Waterfront Master Plan Outcomes is of concern to participants. There is a view that plans and projects identified in the past have not come to fruition. There is community support for ensuring that a viable and achievable plan is developed with a timeframe established for implementation. A consulting team who understands the City's culture and the history and who has a strong understanding of preserving wildfire habitats in an urban context is needed. Key outcomes should include sustainable funding, identification of sources of funding for various projects and community stewardship to achieve goals.

## **APPENDIX RECORDED FLIPCHART POINTS FROM THE TABLE DISCUSSIONS**

The following are the transcribed notes from the table discussions as they were recorded verbatim from the flipcharts.

## DISCUSSION #1: BIG OPPORTUNITIES

What do you see as the big opportunities to be addressed in the Waterfront Master Plan?

**Table 1**

1. All levels of government involved and coordinated
2. Identify natural features such as wetlands, etc all along the river and enhance where it is appropriate
3. Improved mapping of entire river length
4. A plan - not just for City Hall, but all residents of Brantford
5. Improve access and usability of the river (visual, physical, etc) for residents and visitors
6. Make Mohawk Lake usable (clean up) and identify/clean up canal
7. Incorporate needs of today and for future generations
8. Planned for increased usage
9. Maintain water quality
10. Respect the historic role of the river and determine its role for the future (historic - trade/industry, future recreation)

**Table 2**

1. Canal - Mohawk Lake
2. (brownfields, clean-up, work in parallel with brownfields, canal clean-up, green power - relates to river;
3. Tourist potential (use of river itself, parks, trails and picnic areas;
4. Regain “ownership” of river as a community, appreciation, pride, education and resource;
5. Brant’s Ford (historic significance and historic sites);
6. Natural areas (Lim’s Park, Waterworks Park);
7. Lorne Bridge;
8. Green Power (Alfred Watts power plant)
9. Renewed partnerships with neighbours (County, Six Nations, GRCA) - stakeholders important for implementation;
10. GRCA Vision (dovetail with this vision, have draft vision, wait until GRCA done with their vision)
11. Protect source areas (population growth, clean water, manage growth);

**Table 3**

1. Restore and protect habitat;
2. Restore public ownership of lands;
3. Define the setback from shorelines;
4. Study effect of settlement in area with intent to protect watershed quality;
5. No negative effects of settlements;
6. Designate areas of natural/historic significance. Use Ontario Heritage Act i.e. Davisville, Fens;
7. Handicap/senior accessibility to areas i.e. parking/ramps/ benches, etc.
8. Responsible stewardship and usage of lands;
9. Usable areas to be used for access points - parks, parking, etc.
10. Maintain tree canopy, treescapes;
11. Seamless integration with community;
12. Clean up Mohawk Lake/Canal areas.

**Table 4**

1. Protect Brantford water supply;
2. Waterfront as a destination;
3. Keep developers out of certain areas;

4. Protect and expand existing natural features;
5. Provide linkages of Natural Areas;
6. Set development standards;
7. Enforce guidelines consistency;
8. More ecotourism;
9. Enforcement of wetland policy - provincial;
10. Recognizing Heritage sites, canal, Mohawk Lake, Davisville;
11. Educating Brantford citizens and schools about waterfront.
12. Opportunity to educate and study of the environment by people of all ages in environment, open space, post-secondary education;
13. Only one we have - must preserve it;
14. Opportunity to provide direction to Official Plan for rezoning;
15. Understand circle of life of natural environment;
16. Mandatory requirement to treat all storm water in adequate storm water management systems prior to entry into waterways/silt retention systems, construction and agriculture;
17. Opportunities for ongoing funding “reserve account” for acquisition of waterfront lands;
18. Plant trees - increase;
19. Find sources of funding for implementation/foundations i.e. infrastructure/etc.
20. Public incentives.

**Table 5 & 13**

1. Protect and co-exist with biodiversities and respect their needs
2. Protection of groundwater resources
3. Significant recreational opportunities
4. Protection of vegetation canopy - cleaner air, preserve and propagate wildlife
5. Water quality
6. Restoration of natural environment
7. Retention of continuous natural environment corridor along length of river as a connection for wildlife
8. Economic development - appropriate built development in appropriate locations and opportunities for tourism/cultural interpretive “celebrate the environment”
9. Recreational canoe launching etc opportunities on City side;
10. Environmental protection - flora and fauna;
11. Access opportunities (natural areas);
12. Create parks;
13. Save heritage tourism;
14. Geology protection;
15. Water source protection;
16. Wildlife corridor (no hunting, sanctuary);
17. Land use policies

**Table 6**

1. Protect and enhance the natural areas within the corridor;
2. Define width of the corridor - not see roof- smoke stack sky line;
3. Ensure public access to the corridor;
4. Showcase the resource to the community; bring people to the river;
5. Keep integrity of river and improve upon it;
6. Public ownership for community stewardship;
7. Preservation, creation of vistas;
8. Healing source for community;

9. Deal with land claim issues;
10. Allow development with minimal impact on the river itself;
11. In conjunction with the existing trails develop a network that would be of use to public and tourism;
12. Opportunity to implement change;
13. Opportunity to develop eco-tourism;
14. Walk the talk;
15. Preservation of ecology for future generations;
16. Preserve rare wetlands;
17. Preserve our drinking water protect (up above);

**Table 11**

1. Maintain agricultural lands that do not require fertilization (i.e. flood plains, no silt run-off);
2. Establish firm guidelines to protect watercourse and watershed; learn how to refurbish existing habitat;
3. No impacting water quality;
4. Be an example for other municipalities (i.e. clean water, less chemicals);
5. Protecting wildlife;
6. River accessibility (min. limits for perimeter);
7. Avoiding depletion of clean water;
8. Education on prescription medication run-off and stewardship
9. First Nations respect and view of land uses;
10. Future growth (set limits, limit loss of water);
11. Hold other communities accountable

**Table 12**

1. Outdoor rollerblading park similar to skateboarding park;
2. Launch point for canoeing;
3. Preserve heritage and tourism opportunities;
4. Preserve natural open spaces;
5. Celebrate industrial/historic culture;
6. Expand trail network for all types of users;
7. Access parking for out of towners or across town;
8. Wheelchair accessible spots;
9. Market the river as a destination point;
10. Rehabilitation of Mohawk Lake;
11. Educational awareness (school curriculum);
12. Protecting remaining wetlands;
13. Opportunity for fishing;
14. Event marketing (community meeting place);

## DISCUSSION #2: STUDY COMPONENTS

1. The TOR are organized in three key areas
  - a. Environmental
  - b. River and tributary access and utilization
  - c. Planning and development
2. Are there any study components that you feel are missing?
3. Is there additional information (see page 13) that should be looked at?

### Table 1

1. “Municipal History” should address historic & contemporary cultural issues
2. Provide guidelines for naturalization of Waterfront & Habitat creation to be followed for development & restorative efforts
3. Look at information from governments and organizations such as county, six nations, province, communities, GRCA, etc
4. Include information re: rare/risk species, etc
5. Ensure a completely transparent process
6. Frequent and regular consultations

### Table 2

1. Heritage/Archeological & Resource/Education needs to be strengthened, areas missed for study?
2. Battle of 1812 occurred here (need to preserve area)
3. 4.2.2 RETITLE specifically “recreation” planning i.e. mountain biking vs. cyclist vs. walkers vs. natural areas= consult
4. Create education section on its own
5. Environment, watershed care
6. Strengthen GRCA vision
7. Use Brant Riverfront Development Plan (80-82) chaired by Ed Wong & Mary J
8. Balance between “access” and “preservation” i.e. erosion, 4 wheel drive vehicles, eagle protection, snow mobiles, safety

### Table 3

1. Historic buildings preserved, protected- Built Environment (TOR)
2. Use external programs to augment data/reference base on key areas i.e. (government/private sector (additional info)
3. Archeological areas (TOR)
4. Endangered species/habitat (add info)
5. Species/Flora/Fauna Inventory List (add info)
6. Species at risk/special concern/threatened
7. Balance habitats
8. Developmental impacts on the Waterfront mitigate/lesson impact (TOR) (Environment)

### Table 5

1. Better Mapping (Boat & Trailer Launch)
2. Where to Start

### Table 6

1. Add ENFORCEMENT to the “Planning and Development” section
2. Add Heritage component which consists of built and archeological featured
3. Additional Information
  - Outdoor recreation in the Grand River (Paris-Grand River) corridor (March 5, 2001)
  - Grand River (Paris-Brantford) Field Report (Marney Isaac, Dr. John FitzGibbon & Ryan Plummer) Exceptional waters program

- ANSI (Areas of National & Significant Interest)

**Table 12**

1. Partnership Opportunities
2. Barriers (accessibility safety, and the environment)
3. Business Development (catalyst)
4. Land Claims

**Table #**

1. Public Transit to waterfront access points
2. Include school board and university for input
3. Zoning changes to reflect woodlots as woodlots
4. Invite 6 nations, county to participate
5. Access to big islands
6. Do we know how many people are using the river? Canoers, fishing, out of town visitors

**Table #**

1. Identification of Lands that are under Land Claim. Six nations stakeholders, some of the developing areas, may or may not actually be developable a work in progress
2. Further involvement opportunities with community
3. Reporting & measures to deal with upstream spills of raw sewage from other municipalities
4. Improve outreach/relationships with canoe outfitters, eco-tours, rafting, kayaking, etc to get their input on our waterfront plan

## DISCUSSION #3: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

1. What are the big goals?
2. What key topics need to be addressed in the study?
3. Are there any changes to the TOR that you would suggest?

### Table 1

1. Identify public ownership strategies for ecological health
2. Investigate ways to 'upgrade' and maintain ecosystem health potential

### Table 2

1. Balance between access and preservation
2. Preserve wetlands
3. Identify in a plan other wetland areas not just GRCA significant wetlands
4. You can still build on wetlands re: by-law changes needed?
5. Implementation of more stringent controls during the building process
6. Sediment control by-law by Council and enforcement plan
7. Tree protection - grading by-law
8. Green projects - funded (energy, carbon emissions control ...)
9. Ground water enhancement program - explore

### Table 3

1. Replanting of native tree species i.e. Carolinian Forest
2. Zero footprint on River is a goal
3. ANSI's on Fen and other significant areas
4. Adjacent lands to be considered as essential to ANSI's, ESA's etc.
5. Complete presentation of all ecologically sensitive areas including rezoning to reflect preservation permanently
6. Continuum of corridors for wildlife
7. No ANSI's, not fragment only in one area, where?
8. Everyone has a designated use and area for selective uses
9. Increased public education on issue of correlation of Rivers health / human health

### Table 4

1. Regular monitoring of SWP and stats as to locations in the City area
2. Preserve and protect tree canopy and By-law
3. Respect of ANSI and perched fen and canal
4. Historic sites, Archaeology
5. Any development be implemented and sustained with environmental standards specific to River / Waterfront

### Table 5

1. Preserve water quality
2. Vegetation of tributaries and appropriate areas of flood plain
3. Watts( re- revitalize) hydro station - destination and protection

### Table 6

1. Clearly define development area
2. Protection, enhancement and restoration

### Key Topics

1. ANSI
2. Source Water Protection
1. Slope

### **Table 7**

1. Need natural areas outside the floodplain i.e. stream corridors and woodlots
2. Environmental legislation enforcement i.e. building code - silt management / runoff. Improved municipal structure for enforcement and follow up.
3. Not just endangered species but “At Risk”
4. Review projected tree canopy health i.e. insects moving this way.
5. Healing medicines from environment
6. Erosion / slope protection
7. Add info: Grand River.ca / exceptional waters “State of the Resource Report
8. Grand River Fisheries Management Plan
9. Other water quality studies by GRCA
10. Waterfront plans of other communities i.e. best practices
11. Implication of changes to Navigable Waters Act
12. Distinguish between “natural environment” and ‘human need’
13. Environment (natural forested areas vs. manicured park).

### **Table #? - Not listed**

1. Residential zoning - removal within area of study
2. Water treatment facilities improvement
3. Protection of water source - must keep in mind
4. Integration with GRCA Plan/ Study
5. Sustainability
6. Preserve recreational use - enjoyment
7. Rubber dams at railway bridge - replace Lorne Dam -
8. Lake Effective -Fishing
9. Kayaking
10. Boat access
11. Canoeing
12. i.e. Milton 1985 - 86 Plan P& R
13. Integration of man with nature strategy
14. Wildlife protection
15. Safety
16. What is public / private lands determine value of private lands
17. Strategy required

### **Table 11**

1. Prevent extinction of species - all of God’s creatures
2. Water quality sustaining availability of same
3. Education
4. Think outside ‘the box’ for resources i.e. land owners to donate and community - saplings, bushes

### **Table 12**

1. Preservation of natural resources
2. Adverse affect of pollution (local and upstream)
3. Protection of wildlife

4. Limiting development (protecting open space)
5. Monitoring of illegal dumping and disposal of waste

Topics that need to be addressed:

1. Eco-tourism
2. Illegal dumping
3. Preservation of trails system
4. Tree canopy

Changes:

1. Discussion of what is coming downstream

## **DISCUSSION #4: RIVERS AND TRIBUTARIES ACCESS & UTILIZATION**

1. What are the big goals?
2. What key topics need to be addressed in the study?
3. Are there any changes to the TOR that you would suggest?

**Table 1**

1. Categorize and define different access points for different areas (fishing, canoe, trails, views, etc)
2. Provide different options for transportation to access points (parking, bike racks, etc)
3. Integrate access points into new developments
4. Guidelines for minimizing development impacts on trail system and access points
5. Integrate access points so they look natural and part of the environment
6. Include suggestions for interpretive/educational signage regarding ecological, historical, cultural etc. Features along river & accessible for people with impairments

**Table 2**

1. Define existing “access”, create access that are formalized and natural access points
2. Utilization needs to include recreation
3. Criteria for type of access (such as materials)
4. Consideration for disabilities
5. Signage, marker points for visually impaired
6. Comprehensive signage includes educational, directional, safety
7. Consideration for navigational signage for canoe travel

**Table 3**

1. Free; open access; to everyone in non ecologically sensitive areas
2. Access to be appropriate in appropriate areas at appropriate times
3. Utilize viewing areas to their potential
4. Utilize the river for recreation, no power boats
5. Recreation faculties to access river, availability to access from/to river
6. Use River to fund raise (duck races, canoe, bath-tub races)
7. Use Dyke tails to do the same

**Table 6**

1. Parking

2. Ongoing maintenance
3. Safety for individuals (women)

**Table 7**

1. Finding balance for accessibility and maintaining natural not paved areas (do not pave everywhere; not everywhere naturalized)
2. Liability should not triumph all. Safety is important but personal responsibility weighs in- don't limit options

**Table 12**

1. Availability of parking
2. Signage for various uses
3. Access for all citizens (ex. Disabled)
4. Safety and Security
5. Walk-ability (connections to different areas of the City)
6. Identifying Tourist attractions
7. Add informational signage (highlighting flora and fauna)

**Table#**

1. Access: Focus on what is right/opportunities
2. sustainability (preservation)
3. Utilization (rubber dam idea)
4. Accessibility points
5. Signage
6. Land title
7. Allow environmentally sensitive area- allow to be incorporated into the master plan- flexibility

**DISCUSSION TOPIC #5: PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT**

1. What are the big goals?
2. What key topics need to be addressed in the study?
3. Are there any changes to the TOR that you would suggest?

**Table 1**

1. What is considered to be a reward to developers / landowners who maintain the trail/
2. Should consider the impact of existing residential development along waterfront/ trails/ lands and determine impact mitigation measures (dumping, vegetation removal, etc).

**Table 6**

1. Bullet 4.4.6 - Prohibit encroachment from abutting property owners onto municipally owned and / or buffer strips e.g. D'Aubigny Creek and Clear Creek
2. Enforcement is key.
3. Preserve green corridor along canal
4. Setting priorities for Mohawk Lake and clean up of canal
5. Completion of Mohawk Lake - Greenwich Brownfield prior to clean up of Lake and Canal
6. Comprehensive Master Plan of development for each site specific area e.g. hardy Road (Northwest) Birkette Lane

**Table 7**

1. Not just building heights - should include any part of a building
2. Identify mechanism for funding and land acquisition

3. Review methods of enforcement - ask for forgiveness easier than asking permission
4. Balance between finding appropriate places for residential development to occur vs. totally natural spaces
5. Green infrastructure plan - stricter development guidelines for municipality

**Table 9**

1. Sustainable growth
2. Involvement of community
3. Tourism opportunities
4. Make sure attractions / stakeholders are aware and involved
5. Maintenance / water quality / clean
6. Private lands - public input / waterfront master plan - before any changed development
7. Role of Economic Development Strategy
8. Sell property - grandfather right of access once property changes hands.

**Table #**

1. New approach to urban design guidelines to ensure non-intrusive practices
2. City should be 'land banking' specifically along the waterfront to ensure preservation
3. Appropriate / increased buffering areas between different land uses
4. The effect of upstream development and its Official Plans, Environmental Assessment

**Table #**

1. Support PJ and their work in D'Aubiny
2. More monitoring of creeks / brooks / etc to give us a greater idea of River health
3. Media to inform public of events involving Waterfront improvements (i.e. Clean ups)
4. Promote greater public knowledge of municipal / provincial standards -i.e. 'Places to Grow Strategy)

**Table #**

1. Study to identify areas in private hands which would prefer to have as public land - City "1<sup>st</sup> right of refusal?"
2. Explore policy for acquiring lands
3. Expand public ownership of lands abutting river
4. Land trusts? Explore?
5. Wait incorporate GRCA information - and new vision statements, before Council makes development decisions
6. Create development control zone by-law
7. Site control by-laws more stringent and an enforcement plan outlined
8. Improve notification process by City to expand beyond what is legislated by Province.

**Table 12**

1. Acquiring heritage properties for protection
2. Urban design guidelines
3. Eco-development standards
4. Land acquisition where threat of development will harm natural heritage
1. Explicit explanation of how zoning / by-law will be used to limit uses

## DISCUSSION TOPIC #6: IMPLEMENTATION

1. What key topics need to be addressed in the study?
2. Are there any changes to the TOR that you would suggest?

### Table 3

1. Redesign the city website to be citizen friendly
2. Continuity in public participation including 3 more workshops just like this
3. Consulting team who understands the cities culture and the history
4. A strong understanding of preserving wildfire habitats in an urban context
5. Include a cost benefit analysis
6. Timelines for completion of project
7. Identifying sources of funding for various projects and support groups
8. Get it done!

### Table 12

1. Continue consultation process
2. Heavy advertisement (flyers, radio) to reach people who are not web friendly or do not receive the paper
3. Keep residents informed

### Table #

1. Broader public consultation
2. Community engagement
3. Timely

## DISCUSSION TOPIC #7: CONSULTATION

1. From your experience, what constitutes a “good” consultation?
2. What ideas and approaches would you recommend for this study?
3. What participation tools would you recommend?

### Table #? Not Listed

1. Consultation with all stakeholders;
2. Wildlife study;
3. Power to the people (i.e. big \$\$ cannot exert their position above the people);
4. Cost of development vs. the status quo;
5. Proper waste/trash disposal study;
6. Stewardship (i.e. if property owners have extra plant life; saplings, donate to City for land restoration - managed by master gardener/schools to assist;
7. Have set target dates (i.e. 30% tree canopy by 2020);

### Table #

1. Different notification process - contact school boards to involve youth; to attend meetings; ads in public places; visited frequently;
2. Attendees of meetings be provided with synopsis of information presented;
3. Workshops are good (like today)

### Table #? Not Listed

1. Summary of today’s notes available for all who attended;
2. With time for review;
3. Time after consultation for digestion and further input;
4. Citizen membership on task force;
5. Professional review of notes;

6. Need for meaningful summary of input received today, opportunity to respond;
7. Citizens choose stakeholders for future involvement;
8. City Council obligation to consider review in decision process.

**Table # Not Listed**

1. A robust public participation process
2. At least three more meeting like this
3. Better microphone and sound system
4. Not just public information session - like workshops - more collaborative
5. We love working with our City staff

**Table # Not Listed**

1. Multiple hands on design charrette style - co-design (engage artists to conceptualize what would be the look of success;
2. Workshop collaborative style;
3. Stakeholder interviews including property owners/developers/ advisory committees, community groups;
4. Written commenting opportunities for those unable /unwilling to attend meetings;
5. Involvement of elementary and secondary schools as well as post secondary;

**Table # Not Listed**

1. Consultation workshops include Six Nations and Brantford Media;
2. Things done in a timely fashion;
3. Keep people informed;
4. More meetings in order to accommodate those who cannot make it;
5. More time needed to read documents;
6. Thank you for the pizza, cookies and drinks;
7. It was nice to have the Councillors here too!