

## MEMO

**TO:** Tara Tran

**FROM:** John Tassiopoulos and Valentina Chu

**SUBJECT:** Mohawk Lake District Plan – Results and Analysis of Public Open House #2 and Online Survey Voting

**DATE:** February 15, 2019

---

### Introduction & Purpose

Three land use concepts for the Mohawk Lake District Plan area were developed based on extensive input provided by City staff and from the public at the Public Open House Meeting #1, held on March 29, 2018. These concepts were further developed and refined over the course of the year from comments by City staff and our study team into three conceptual plan options:

- **Option 1 – Outdoor Events & Festival Focus** - *A destination for major cultural events and festivals. The primary land uses include a large purpose-built event area with associated parks and open spaces, an institutional area, and some mixed commercial and institutional uses;*
- **Option 2 – Culture and Community Focus** - *A destination for both cultural gatherings and community and commercial services. A balance of land uses that include a multi-purpose open space, several options for mixed commercial and institutional uses with potential upper-story residential, and an institutional are; and,*
- **Option 3 – Community Services Focus** - *Primarily a destination for community services, including large institutional areas, and options for mixed commercial and institutional uses with potential upper-story residential. The space may be campus format with smaller scale public gathering spaces.*

These options were presented at Public Open House #2 (November 28, 2018) and posted on the City's website, with an online survey, to receive comments on the option most preferred. In both instances the engagement of the public included:

1. a simple **voting process** of selecting which option was most preferred; and
2. asking respondents to **comment** on what they liked about their selected option.

The Public Open House #2 was attended by over 100 residents (92 signed -in but more than one hundred were counted) and the online survey was completed by 544 respondents. This robust response required that we not only review the general preferred voting, but also look at

the commentary in order to inform our team's determination of which option(s) should be further developed into a preferred plan for the study.

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide a general outline of the public feedback received at the Public Open House #2 and from the on-line survey that was posted on the City's website (December 13, 2018 to January 14, 2019) with respect to the three conceptual plan options developed for the Mohawk Lake District Plan's brownfield area. As part of the process of identifying a preferred or hybrid plan option, the review of voting selection of most preferred and least preferred option, along with identifying common themes of why an option was preferred, is essential. The review and the results of the comments will help inform next steps and assist in the selection of a preferred plan that will be more fully developed into a demonstration plan for the study area. The memo and tables below provide a summary of the results and the major themes that were identified in the review of the comments received. The following sections provide an analysis and highlight recurring themes in the comments received from the public engagement session and survey.

### PART A – PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE MEETING #2

The Public Open House Meeting #2 was held on November 28, 2018 in which 92 people signed in. Not every participant signed in on the attendance sheets which suggests that the actual number of participants was beyond 100 attendees. The three conceptual plan Options were presented to those in attendance providing highlights of their respective land use structure and their differences.

#### 1. Results of Voting for the Preferred Option

Following the presentation, the public was asked to vote on their preferred Option out of either Option 1 (Outdoor Events and Festivals), Option 2 (Culture and Community), and Option 3 (community services). The participants were each given one large green dot sticker to represent their most preferred option and one large red dot sticker to represent their least preferred option. Table 1 shows the results of votes for and against each with respect to each option.

*Table 1 – Most Preferred vs. Least Preferred Option Votes (November 28, 2018)*

OPTION	MOST PREFERRED	LEAST PREFERRED
Option 1: Outdoor Events and Festival Focus	35	14
Option 2: Culture and Community Focus	26	4
Option 3: Community Services Focus	8	35

Based on the voting activity, most participants indicated a preference towards Options 1 and 2 with 35 and 26 votes, respectively, selecting it as them “most preferred” options. Option 2 is distinguished from the other Option 1 by having only 4 votes, the fewest, within the “least preferred” category. Option 3 was given 35 the “least preferred” votes and the lowest “most preferred” assignment with only 8 votes.

## CD2019-265 Appendix E

The participants were also each given three small green dot stickers to indicate their “likes” and three small red dots to indicate their “dislikes” of the land uses proposed within each Option. Tables 2 to 4, below, summarize the results of land use type “likes” and “dislikes” of each option (See Appendix A for photos of the activity boards).

Although this portion of the public voting was not as clear as the simple voting for the preferred Option, as noted in Table 1 above, it did provide some general preferences with respect to land use allocations in each Option. Following each table, we have provided a brief analysis with respect to the voting.

***Table 2 – Option 1 Outdoor Events and Festival Focus: Likes and Dislikes***

LOCATION OF VOTING DOT	LIKES	DISLIKES
4.8 Acre Park & Open Space	3	3
12.5 Acre Park & Open Space	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>
4.6 Acre Park & Open Space	2	2
4.4 Acre Museum	<b>7</b>	0
7.2 Acre Mixed Use	<b>7</b>	3
2.0 Acre Museum	<b>6</b>	0
10.0 Acre Institutional	1	3

The results of land use preference for Option 1 was interesting because although it was the most preferred concept plan the park and open space land uses that are the focus of this Option were generally equal in terms of likes and dislikes with the exception of the largest park and open space. The mixed-uses were positive while the museum uses were the only uses that had no “dislikes”. The Institutional use had more negative than positive votes even though there were only four total votes.

***Table 3 – Option 2 Culture and Community Focus: Likes and Dislikes***

LOCATION OF VOTING DOT	LIKES	DISLIKES
1.8 Acre Park & Open Space	3	0
2.7 Acre Mixed Use	0	<b>4</b>
3.3 Acre Mixed Use	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>
15.0 Acre Park & Open Space	<b>10</b>	1
4.4 Acre Museum	2	1
10.0 Acre Institutional	<b>4</b>	0
2.0 Acre Museum	2	1
7.2 Acre Mixed Use	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>

## CD2019-265 Appendix E

The results of land use preference for Option 2 were also interesting because whereas in Option 1 large park and open space use had more dislikes than likes, the largest space in this Option had the largest number of "likes" and the smaller park space also received only positive votes. With respect to the Mixed Uses it appears that the larger area was preferred while the smaller areas, on the north side of the Option, were not. What was slightly puzzling was that in this Option the same 10.0 acre Institutional use indicated in all three Options, received only positive votes. The Museum uses were again positively selected but with fewer overall votes and not unanimously as per Option 1.

**Table 4 – Option 3 Community Services Focus: Likes and Dislikes**

LOCATION OF VOTING DOT	LIKES	DISLIKES
1.8 Acre Park & Open Space	1	0
2.7 Acre Mixed Use	0	3
4.8 Acre Mixed Use	3	2
1.3 Acre Park & Open Space	2	3
10.9 Acre Institutional	2	<b>8</b>
4.9 Acre Museum	2	0
10.0 Acre Institutional	0	1
2.0 Acre Museum	0	0
4.3 Acre Mixed Use	2	0
2.9 Acre Park & Open Space	3	0

The results of land use preference for Option 3 were not generally definitive because of the very low number of votes for both "likes" and "dislikes" which indicates a lower interest by participants which is consistent with the Table 1 results noting that this was the least preferred of all the Options. Compared to the number of votes for land uses observed for Options 1 and 2 (58 and 48 respectively) only 23 total votes, 12 of which were "dislikes", were counted for Option 3. The majority of the "dislikes" centred on the 10.9 acre Institutional use on the north side of the Option. The other uses 3 votes or less so it was difficult to discern clear preference due to the low number of votes.

### **2. Results of the Review of Comments Posted on the Options**

In addition to the voting process that took place during the Public Open House, participants were also provided with adhesive notes were also distributed to participants to allow them to provide more detailed comments and feedback on the three Options. These comments were placed on the Options by participants and were recorded by the Study Team. Although not all the comments were specific to land uses in each option and preference there were some recurrent commentary themes that were identified in each Option.

## **CD2019-265 Appendix E**

### ***a. General Comments for Option 1***

A total of 42 comments were provided and recorded for Option 1 and included the following general themes:

- The provision of green spaces was appreciated and there was a concern about ensuring that they are not underutilized and that they include indoor and outdoor uses to ensure that use is not only seasonal;
- Ensure connectivity to surrounding trails and to connect to the Canal area;
- There was general support for the creation of a promenade along the north edge of the Option and adjacent to a naturalized Canal area;
- Provision of commercial/retail that contributes to evening or night life uses; and,
- Desire for more residential uses and interest in what types of residential uses will be introduced in this Option.

### ***b. General Comments for Option 2***

A total of 19 comments were provided and recorded for Option 2 and included the following general themes:

- There was general interest and support with respect to trails; and,
- There were a few instances where it was asked if a promenade as per Option 1 could be introduced in this Option to ensure increased foot traffic.

### ***c. General Comments for Option 3***

A total of 20 comments were provided and recorded for Option 3 and included the following general themes:

- There was general interest and support with respect to new trails, connection to existing trails and connectivity to the canal and to the adjacent indigenous areas; and,
- There were references to the provision of affordable housing and housing on Mohawk Street; and,
- There was concern about whether there was demand for the extent of Institutional uses in this Option.

## **3. Conclusions on Voting Results and Comments from Public Open House #2**

Given the above voting results and review of the comments received at the Public Open House we arrived at the following conclusions and recommendations:

- Based on the Table 1 results, Option 1: Outdoor Events and Festival Focus garnered the largest number of “most preferred” votes (35 votes) while Option 2: Culture and Community Focus was second in voting (26 votes) and had the lowest number of “least preferred” votes (4 votes) compared to Option 1’s (14 votes). Option 3

## CD2019-265 Appendix E

- overwhelmingly received the most “least preferred” votes (35 votes) with the lowest “most preferred” votes (8 votes). **Based on the simple voting process we can conclude that both Options 1 and 2 were the “most preferred”;**
- Noting that Options 1 and 2 were the “most preferred”, we can turn to the finer grain of voting for land use “likes” and “dislikes” as indicated in Tables 2 and 3 above:
  - There was overwhelming support for the Museum uses as indicated in both plans;
  - The Parks and Open Space uses for Option 2 received much more positive support than those in Option 1 which either received equal number of “likes” and “dislikes” for the smaller park spaces while the largest 12.5 acre parcel received more negative as compared to positive votes (12 to 9 votes);
  - With respect to Mixed-Uses the 7.2 acre parcel on the south side of both Options when added received mostly positive votes ( 15 “likes” vs. 8 “dislikes”). The Mixed-Uses on the north side of Option 2 generally received negative votes; and,
  - The most obvious inconsistency was found in the Institutional use which although being identical in size, configuration and uses on the south side of both Options 1 and 2 only received positive support In Option 2.

Based on the voting on land uses we note that there doesn’t appear to be support for the full extent of parks and open space configuration on the north side of Option 1 while there was limited support for Mixed-Uses on the north side. This begs the question then what is actually desired on the north side if Option 1 park spaces, Option 2 mixed uses and Option 3 institutional uses are all not supported, then what is? **Given this conundrum and inconsistencies in response noted we believe that the land use range presented in Option 2 should be provided in Option 1, with adjustments to reduce the Park and Open Space uses could potentially achieve a more supportable Option;**

- The only information to be gleaned from the Option 3 land uses preferences was that the large Institutional 10.9 acre parcel on the north side received the greatest number of “dislike” (8 votes) which was significant as all other land uses received between 0 and 3 votes. **Given that neither Options 1 or 2 include this large Institutional land use, it can be concluded that the participants did not support this use in this location;** and,
- The review of the comments received for each of the Options provided the following themes with respect to preferred uses and activities:
  - Parks and Open Spaces in the Options 1 and 2 were perceived positively but there was concern that if too much is dedicated to this use it may be underutilized;
  - Comments for all three Options noted the need to ensure trail connectivity both within the proposed Options and to existing trails, the Canal and to adjacent Indigenous areas, where possible;
  - There was consistent interest in the development of a Promenade along the north side of the Options;

## CD2019-265 Appendix E

- Option 1 was criticized for not including more residential uses while there was an interest in the provision of affordable housing in Options 2 and 3; and,
- Some desire was expressed in the provision of commercial/retail uses that included evening/night time function.

Noting the earlier inconsistencies in bullet 2 above, these general comments provide additional direction and **support for the land use range presented in Option 2 with the addition of a promenade, commercial / retail uses, and trail connectivity.**

### PART B – ONLINE SURVEY RESULTS AND COMMENTS

In addition to Public Open House #2, an online survey was undertaken between December 13, 2018 and January 14, 2019. This survey reached 544 participants, of which approximately 15% were from Ward 1, 13% were from Ward 2, 16% were from Ward 3, 13% were from Ward 4 and 26.5% were from Ward 5. The remaining 16.5% were either not from Brantford, didn't know what Ward they resided in or left the answer blank.

*Table 5 – Online Survey Participation by Ward (Online Survey – January 14, 2018)*

WARDS	Survey Participants	%	Attended POH #2	Duplication %
Ward 1	81	15	6	7
Ward 2	72	13	6	6
Ward 3	84	16	4	5
Ward 4	73	13	4	5
Ward 5	<b>144</b>	<b>26.5</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>
Non-Resident, Unsure, Blank	90	16.5	4	4
<b>Total</b>	<b>544</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>N/A</b>

Ward 5 had the highest number of participants in the survey which is to be expected as the Mohawk Lake District Plan study is located within Ward 5. The distribution of participants from other Wards was fairly evenly distributed which shows that the neighbouring Wards had equal interest in the project.

Out of the 544 online participants, 496 responded that they did not attend the Public Open House Meeting #2 held on November 28, 2018 while 35 participants responded that had attended, and 12 participants did not respond to this question. This shows that the survey was able to reach a great number of participants the majority of whom identified themselves as residents of a City Ward (approximately 83.5%) and that only a small number of participants (6%) indicated that they had also attended Public Open House #2 with the potential for duplication or “being counted twice” was very low (4 to 8%).

## CD2019-265 Appendix E

### 1. Results of Voting for the Preferred Option – Online Survey

As per the Public Open House voting on the preferred Option, the same three Options were presented and online participants were asked to select their preferred Option; Table 6 below provides the results of the online voting.

**Table 6 – Most Preferred vs. Least Preferred Option Votes (Online Survey – January 14, 2018)**

OPTION	MOST PREFERRED	%
Option 1: Outdoor Events and Festival Focus	217	40
Option 2: Culture and Community Focus	129	24
Option 3: Community Services Focus	185	34
No Option Chosen	13	2
TOTAL	544	100

The participants of the online survey were asked to select their preferred option. Option 1 was preferred by 40% of participants, Option 2 was preferred by 24% of participants and Option 3 was preferred by 34% of participants. Similar to the Public Open House Meeting #2, more participants preferred Option 1. What was surprising was that Option 3 garnered preferred votes than Option 2 which differed significantly from the input recorded at Public Open House #2.

### 2. Review of Comments on Why Option was Chosen

Following the online survey's request to select a preferred Option, it was followed by the following question:

*“Tell us a bit more about why you like the option that you picked in Question 3. Are there any aspects of that option that could be improved?”*

To understand the results to this question we reviewed the responses and tried to identify common themes with respect to preferences as they applied to each Option.

#### a. General Comments for Option 1

The participants that chose Option 1 chose this option due to their preferences for the following attributes they identified in its design:

- More outdoor recreational areas and event spaces for festivals and other community activities;
- More outdoor open green spaces, parks and connection to trails;
- Felt this Option would satisfy needs of a range of Brantford residents;
- A stronger sense of community and providing more family-friendly activities;
- Large green interface with and connectivity potential to the Canal;
- Potential for large outdoor special events and venues;
- Preservation of nature;



## CD2019-265 Appendix E

- Potential to attract visitors as a destination for events;

In reviewing the comments, it was noted that of the 217 respondents that preferred Option 1, 75 respondents (approximately 35%) left the comment section, on why they liked that Option, blank.

When asked where the respondents lived, 3 did not live in Brantford and 15 left the response blank, for a total of 18. Of these 18 respondents 13 indicated unanimously that they liked Option 1 because of the significant park and open space areas and the potential of a venue to hold large events.

Some participants who chose Option 1 also highlighted some items to keep note of including:

- There was a general concern about not including too much residential use and what form that residential use may take. Comparatively, the Public Open House #2 respondents, criticized the lack of potential residential in Option 1.

### ***b. General Comments for Option 2***

The participants that chose Option 2 chose this option due to their preferences and following attributes they identified in its design:

- Most balanced approach; a good mix/balance of uses between commercial, residential, institutional and green space;
- There is still the opportunity for large outdoor space for festivals and large events;
- A cultural hub;
- Potential new housing and affordable housing opportunities
- Connection with neighbours; and,
- Feeling this Option will generate more tax revenue for the City.

Some participants who chose Option 2 also highlighted some items to keep note of including:

- Have regard for local culture especially with respect to indigenous groups;
- Consider incorporating indigenous design approaches (e.g. Helen Betty Osbourne Ininiw Educational Resource Centre -Norway House - and The Forks, Winnipeg)
- Paying attention to providing enough parking;
- Support for the idea of a “Main Street” as indicated in Option 3;
- Emphasis on connection to trails and walkability and integration with canal, surrounding parks, and trail systems;

In reviewing the comments, it was noted that of the 129 respondents that preferred Option 2, 43 respondents (approximately 33%) left the comment section, on why they liked that Option, blank.

When asked where the respondents lived, 7 did not live in Brantford and 8 left the response blank, for a total of 15. Of these 15 respondents 8 of them provided comments on why they preferred Option 2 and it was generally because of the balanced approach between the mix of uses while maintaining significant park and open space areas.

### *c. General Comments for Option 3*

The participants that chose Option 3 chose this option due to their preferences and following attributes they identified in its design:

- Feel that Brantford requires more community services and those currently serving the community are outgrowing current location and many referred to creating a community services “hub”;
- Many mentioned that the community services focus of this Option was preferred for the accommodation of a new facility for Lansdowne Children’s Centre;
- Preferred this Option over the concern that large park spaces would be dependent on events and festivals leading to underutilization; they are costly to maintain, and that there were already parks/green spaces in the City;
- Many felt this Option would provide greater tax revenue to the City through the Institutional and Mixed Use of the Option;
- Mixed Uses were seen as a chance to provide housing and to support more life and greater activity; and,
- There were suggestions that the Option could benefit from additional park space.

In reviewing the comments, it was noted that of the 185 respondents that preferred Option 2, 69 respondents (approximately 37%) left the comment section, on why they liked that Option, blank.

When asked where the respondents lived, 35 did not live in Brantford and 10 left the response blank, for a total of 45. This was nearly three times the number of either Options 1 or 2. Of these 45 respondents, 30 of them provided comments on why they preferred Option 3. More than half -17 respondents - indicated that the Community Services Focus could provide more space specifically for the Lansdowne Children’s Centre or a children’s treatment centre. The remaining respondents mentioned that more community services were need in Brantford.

Comments regarding new space for the Lansdowne Children’s Centre (LCC) are highlighted because this specific use was particularly identified 31 times overall (17% or 1 in 6 respondents) as the reason for selecting Option 3. This response level, combined with nearly 19%, or approximately 1 in 5 respondents identifying that they did not reside in Brantford, raises the concern that the results of the survey may have been skewed by a concentrated effort by proponents of the LCC and respondents who were not residents of Brantford. Of the 31 times the LCC was cited in the Option comments, a total of 13 citations were made by non-residents (approximately 42%).

### **3. Conclusions on Online Survey Results And Comments (January 14, 2019)**

Given the above overall voting results and a review and analysis of the comments received from the Online Survey, we arrived at the following conclusions and recommendations:

- Based on the Table 6 results, Option 1: Outdoor Events and Festival Focus garnered the largest number of “most preferred” votes (217 votes, or approximately 40%) while Option 3: Community Services Focus was second in voting (185 votes, or

## CD2019-265 Appendix E

approximately 34%) and Option 2: Culture and Community Focus was third (129 votes, or approximately 24%) We believe that the very different result of voting for Option 3 between the online survey and Public Open House #2, where Option 3 overwhelmingly received the highest number of “least preferred” votes (35 votes vs. 14 and 4 for Options 1 and 2 respectively) may be attributed to a large number of respondents who were either not Brantford residents, or who specifically identified this Option as preferred to accommodate the needs of the Lansdowne Children’s Centre. This activity may have skewed the results of voting. Subtracting non-residents (35), brings the total “most preferred” votes (150 adjusted votes) closer to the total votes for Option 2 (129 votes – 7 non-resident = 122). Regardless, Option 3 was still second in voting even with the non-weighted and simple subtraction. **Based on the simple voting process we can conclude that Option 1 again was the “most preferred”. With respect to the results for Options 2 and 3, however, we believe that there may be a need to weight the “most preferred” voting of Brantford residents in comparison to non-residents. This is important because as noted in sections 2 a. and 2 b. above, Options 1 and 2 only had 3 and 7 non-resident votes;**

- As with the concern above regarding the potential skewing of Option 3 results, the **study team and City staff should consider whether all land uses proposed for in Options and 2 should also be weighted evenly;** and,
- There was general support for the following land uses and elements once we consider and consolidate the comments for all three Options:
  - Connectivity to and integrating of proposed Options into the surrounding community, trails, the canal and other park features;
  - Potential for large outdoor special events and venues destination with the ability to attract visitors for such events was mentioned frequently in Option 1 and also Option 2 comments;
  - Criticism of Option 1 centred around the lack of residential uses and concern of utilization of such a large park and green open space area;
  - Option 2 was predominantly selected by respondents because of its balanced approach for all the proposed uses and because it balances the potential for a large event space with the mixed uses that could introduce other forms of housing and housing affordability; a good mix/balance of uses between commercial, residential, institutional and green space;
  - Option 2 respondents generally felt that this Option would be the most sustainable for providing tax revenue to the City;
  - Option 2 respondents indicated an interest in ensuring indigenous areas and uses are considered in the design and that indigenous design be incorporated;
  - Option 3 was predominantly selected by respondents who felt that Brantford was lacking community service facilities or felt existing services had outgrown their current facilities;
  - Option 3 respondents were concerned with large park / event spaces and the potential lack of utilization while the idea of a mixed use “Main Street” that provided greater activity and social amenity were supported; and,

- Option 3 respondents felt it could benefit from additional park space.

Based on the consolidated comments it appears that Option 1, with the tempering of park and open space uses along with “Main Street” mixed use areas, including additional institutional uses, would address the preferences expressed in the consolidated comments. Interestingly, given the range of comments and criticisms expressed, **we believe that the land use range presented in Option 2 along with additional Institutional uses with could potentially result in a hybrid of the plans, leading to a supportable Option.**

### PART C – PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT RESULTS & POSSIBLE PREFERRED OPTION

Having reviewed and analysed the voting preferences and comments with respect to the public engagement events of the November 28<sup>th</sup>, 2018 Public Open House #2 and the Online Survey results of January 14, 2019 we have been able to gauge preferences with respect to particular Options, as well as, identify the mix of land uses the public participants/respondents would support as a preferred plan for the brownfield area within the Mohawk Lake District Plan. From our review of public engagement results and materials, we have concluded the following:

- In both instances **Option 1 was the preferred plan, however**, the critiques of this Option and desired improvements mentioned by participants and respondents in both sessions suggest that **it requires further refinement**;
- The retention and improvement of the Museum uses was supported;
- The Parks and Open Space uses were highly desired especially with respect to supporting special events and event venues. However, there was concern as to whether the full extent of these uses proposed for Option 1 were excessive, would perhaps be underutilized and be slightly more compact to allow for other uses. It was noted that the green space in Option 2 received greater support;
- The Parks and Open Space uses were seen as a natural interface to the Canal, that could integrate proposed connections with existing trail networks, and could be part of a potential Promenade design for Greenwich Street;
- The Mixed Uses received varying support depending on the Option proposed. Public Open House #2 participants gave the Mixed Use areas either neutral or negative votes for the parcels on the north side of the study area, while the Online Survey respondents indicated a preference for Options 2 and 3 because these uses could potentially provide more housing, general activity and the creation of a “Main Street”. Furthermore, Option 1 received criticism for not including more residential uses in both public engagement forums;
- The Institutional uses, especially those proposed on the north side of the study area in Option 3 received very little support in the Public Open House, however, the respondents to the online survey selected the community services focus of Option 3 ahead of Option 2. Even if we account for potential skewing of results noted in section B.2.c. there was a feeling that existing services had outgrown their current facilities and more space for

## CD2019-265 Appendix E

community services should be provided. It suggests that although we do not identify support for a large Institutional use on the north side, we do consider accommodating a more modest Institutional uses, to be appropriate on the north side;

- The Promenade Corridor indicated in Option 1 had consistent interest and support from both public open house participants and online survey respondents. We noted comments from those that preferred Options 2 and 3 that the Promenade be included in those Options as well; and,
- Numerous comments through the public engagement materials spoke to the desire to potentially connect to adjacent indigenous areas through trails and to consider indigenous design in the plan, where possible.

Taking all of these conclusions into account and factoring in the analysis of the public engagement processes, **we recommend that we move forward with a combination of Options 1 and 2, with added modest Institutional uses on the north side, provision of a mixed use “Main Street” and the introduction of a Promenade Corridor for Greenwich Street along the extent of the brownfield area.**

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'JT' with a large loop and a trailing line.

John Tassiopoulos MCIP, RPP  
Senior Project Manager

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Valentina' with a trailing line.

Valentina Chu  
Project Planner and Urban Designer