



Clair-Maltby

Transform. Connect. Community

Workshop 2 Parks & Open Spaces What we heard – Summary Report

February 17, 2020

City of Guelph

Clair-Maltby Secondary Plan Open Space System Strategy

Community Engagement Summary Report

The City of Guelph has initiated the Clair-Maltby Secondary Plan and Master Environmental Servicing Plan (MESP) Study to plan the last unplanned greenfield area of the City. The study area covers approximately 414 hectares located between Clair Road and Maltby Road in the southeast corner of Guelph. The Open Space System Strategy looks at parks and open spaces in the area and is one component of the Secondary Plan process, which strives to be inclusive, with a significant amount of community engagement and Council input, to ensure that everyone has the opportunity to remain informed and involved in the process.

Dr. Rebecca Sutherns of Sage Solutions, a collaborative planning company in Guelph, was hired to design and facilitate four public workshops to gather feedback and input on community park options for Clair-Maltby. The feedback provided will help establish policy directions that will inform the creation of the secondary plan for the Clair-Maltby area. The final secondary plan will become part of the **City's Official Plan**.

The first pair of workshops, held September 25, 2019, were attended by 46 people across two sessions in the afternoon and evening. They provided input on park size, location and function and a proposed **"moraine ribbon."** **The same content** and questions asked at the in-person workshop were made available **on the City's online community engagement site, Have Your Say Guelph, for two weeks in early October.** Sixteen people completed the online survey. The City also received three letters providing additional feedback. A summary report of the feedback from the first workshop is available [online](#).

The second workshops took place November 19, 2019 with 86 people in attendance at the afternoon and evening sessions. An update on the comments received during the first meetings framed the criteria for considering six proposed park scenarios for Clair-Maltby, as well as continued input into the placement of the moraine ribbon. The same content and questions from the workshops were posted in an online survey for residents to complete between November 21 and December 5. Of the 48 people that completed the online survey, 28 people did not attend an in-person workshop. Fifteen indicated they had also attended an in-person workshop and another five did not specify whether or not they had attended an in-person workshop. This made it challenging to combine results quantitatively so as not to double count feedback from those who both attended a workshop and completed the online survey. A high-level summary of the feedback provided from the second round of input is provided here. A [detailed report with the full feedback received from the second workshops and the online survey is available online.](#)

Community Park Short-listed Options

Participants were asked to review six park scenarios (three options for one large (10 ha) park, three options for two medium-sized (5 ha) parks) and provide their views on the pros and cons of each. These options were identified or created from the feedback provided after the first workshops/online survey, as were the criteria participants were invited to apply to evaluate them.

Park Scenario	Pros	Cons
Plus Sign	Centrally located (Point repeated frequently within each relevant cell). Accessible Spreads out location of community parks in that portion of city Good topography for passive uses	Interferes with proposed affordable housing (Point repeated frequently within each relevant cell) (City provided outside assumptions/parameters). Environmental concerns (grading required)
Tree	Good road access (Point repeated frequently within each relevant cell). Welcoming entrance to city Flat Near high-density development Respects initial staff choice (City provided outside assumptions/parameters).	Not centrally located (point repeated frequently within each relevant cell). Too close to Puslinch City would not have control over what happens around it; on edge of jurisdiction Not well connected to NHS and Moraine Ribbon Expensive to service (sewage needs to be pumped up hill) Costly to developer (City provided outside assumptions/parameters).
Triangle	Sightlines and proximity to Hall's Pond (point repeated frequently within each relevant cell). Well connected to NHS and Moraine Ribbon (point repeated frequently within each relevant cell). Centrally located Mostly flat Existing parking and infrastructure Accessible Already being used for recreational purposes	Too close to Bishop Macdonell and the rec centre More traffic on Gordon Street Poor access (transit) Not suited to a large facility Loss of development (City provided outside assumptions/parameters).
Checkmark & Coffee Cup	Near high density housing (Comments here were fewer and more varied)	Would lead to congestion Too close to Bishop Macdonell Cannot connect the two parks Located adjacent to Gordon Street corridor
Star & Plus Sign	Best option for two medium-sized parks Accessible Central (Other comments were varied)	Threat to affordable housing (City provided outside assumptions/parameters). Would prefer one large park Not near Hall's Pond Too close to Bishop Macdonell
Triangle & Plus Sign	Central Connected Could join the two parks	Threat to affordable housing (City provided outside assumptions/parameters). Less access Not near the pond Too small

Moraine Ribbon

Opinions remain mixed on the moraine ribbon, with a slight emphasis toward a lack of support based on the comments received in the second round of input.

Those in favour of **the moraine ribbon think it's an excellent idea, that it is progressive and exciting.** They see it as a benefit for trails, water filtration, wildlife. It creatively adds more greenspace and parkland.

Those against the moraine ribbon see it an unnecessary — **it's "a buffer to a buffer."** They feel it would impinge too much on development and that trails could go in linkages. They would rather see the land used for development.

General Comments

There were several questions and concerns raised related to the size of the proposed park not meeting the **requirements of the City's Official Plan based on population projections, as well as a perceived risk of** losing a proposed affordable housing project in Clair-Maltby. City staff reiterated that current and projected development plans for land in the Clair-Maltby area were not being taken into consideration during this process. Feedback from the public, in both the meetings and online survey, indicates that people struggled with this limitation.

Concern was also expressed about the low number of participants in the engagement activities relative to the population of the city. It was noted that the feedback would not be considered representative of the entire community, but that multiple engagement opportunities have and will be provided.

For more information on the Clair-Maltby Secondary Plan project visit: guelph.ca/clair-maltby