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Civicplan was retained by the Durand Neighbourhood Association (DNA) to develop a better understanding of local character in their downtown urban neighbourhood. This report provides a summary of the findings and outcomes of the Durand Neighbourhood Character Project.

CivicSurveys

The Durand Neighbourhood Character Citizen survey was conducted using CivicSurveys, a public engagement platform developed by Civicplan.

Civicplan provides innovative land use planning, community engagement, strategy development and research services to the public, non-profit, and private sectors. For more information visit civicplan.ca
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Executive Summary

The Durand neighbourhood is situated at the intersection of the old and new Hamilton. Its built environment tells the story of generations arriving, building, and growing with the city. Yet today, as newfound energy and renewed dynamism take hold in the city, Durand is at the forefront of the ‘new Hamilton.’ The juxtaposition of old and new is an ongoing challenge for the neighbourhood, as it attempts to balance intensification and renewal while maintaining the neighbourhood’s existing character.

Neighbourhood character, in the context of this study, refers to the look and feel of an area. It is made up of a number of factors that contribute to how private homes connect with the public street, or what makes up a streetscape. The Durand Neighbourhood Character Study’s purpose is to understand the neighbourhood context and make recommendations for future policy to help maintain neighbourhood character through periods of change.

The Durand Neighbourhood Character Study Report

The Durand Neighbourhood Character Study Report presents an overview of the results of the Study. It is organized into six sections. The report begins with an introduction to the Durand neighbourhood, its history, its current pace of change, and the existing municipal policy and regulatory frameworks that govern development in the area. The next three sections present research and data related to maintaining neighbourhood character, first with a review of the innovative approach used in Ottawa, Ontario that informed a “Durand-designed” neighbourhood character research approach that included a neighbourhood street audit and resident survey. The last two sections present detailed recommendations informed by the research, and next steps for the Durand Neighbourhood Association (DNA), which initiated this project.

Durand Neighbourhood Context

The Report’s introductory section presents a brief history of the Durand neighbourhood, a review of the level of change over the last 15 years, and finally a more detailed discussion of the existing policy framework that shapes development activity in the area.

The review of existing municipal policy documents for the Durand neighbourhood highlights two key findings. First, that existing regulation, for example the Neighbourhood Plan and primary zoning by-law, are significantly dated. The second finding is that within existing municipal plans and policies, there are useful elements that support creating specific rules to maintain Durand’s unique neighbourhood character. For example, in the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, the 1987 Durand Neighbourhood Plan, existing zoning regulations, and the Durand Neighbourhood Built Heritage Inventory.
Maintaining Neighbourhood Character

The next three sections of the Report present research and data related to maintaining neighbourhood character including a review of the Ottawa case study, followed by the results of a “Durand-designed” model of street audits and a resident survey, as tools to analyze the current neighbourhood.

Neighbourhood Street Audits

The Ottawa approach served as an inspiration for Durand as it is flexible, targeted, transparent, and enforceable. Civicplan developed a streetscape character auditing tool that expanded on the experience from the Ottawa approach. The basis of the audit tool was for citizen auditors to collect data on 10 streetscape character factors throughout Durand. For the study, 23 zones were identified.

The results of the audit provided a number of insights into the existing built environment and character of the neighbourhood. This includes that there are different areas with distinct character elements throughout Durand, as well as some common elements that reach across the neighbourhood. The Report details the results of each factor and graphically represents these results to illustrate which factors are dominant in different areas across the neighbourhood.

Neighbourhood Survey

A resident survey was conducted as part of the Study. The goal of the survey was twofold; first was to help inform Durand residents about neighbourhood character, the look and feel of their streets. Second was to gather insight from Durand residents about how they view the influence of the 10 different character elements on their streetscapes.

In total, 174 residents responded to the survey, representing a cross section of people who live in the neighbourhood, by age, type of residence and length of time living in the neighbourhood. The results demonstrated valuable insights into which factors the respondents saw as positively influencing their neighbourhood and what sorts of new development they would like to see. The survey results indicated strong parallels between what character factors residents valued and the dominant characteristics of the different areas of the neighbourhood, as identified in the street audits.

Recommendations and Next Steps

Building on existing neighbourhood policy research, the neighbourhood character audits, and the resident survey, the final sections of the Report provide detailed recommendations for future policy change to maintain neighbourhood character. Additionally, the Report presents next steps to provide direction for the DNA on how to begin to address the issue of neighbourhood character in the short term, while also ensuring that the unique character of the neighbourhood is recognized and maintained in future planning regulation and policies.
Recommendations for Policy Change

Durand requires a new Secondary Plan as it is an area undergoing change where general policies are insufficient to guide redevelopment and the current Durand plan is 30 years old. The Report presents a number of specific policy recommendations for a new Secondary Plan that build off of existing policy, the neighbourhood audit, and resident survey results.

Also, the Report recommends that the outcomes from the neighbourhood street audits and resident survey should inform the update of the city-wide Comprehensive Zoning By-law when it enters the Residential Zones phase. The results in the Report are useful in the design of how zones may be delineated to allow more compatible development within the existing neighbourhood.

Next Steps

Finally, the Report provides specific short, medium, and ongoing strategies for the Durand Neighbourhood Association. These include guidance on using the Report research to advocate for changes and updates in municipal policy affecting the neighbourhood, as well the creation of a Zoning Overlay Pilot Project, using a Streetscape Character Analysis, that could assist in maintaining Durand’s neighbourhood character.
1.0 Introduction

Durand sits at the intersection of the old and new Hamilton. Its built environment tells the story of generations arriving, building, and growing with the city.

You see the story of Hamilton on every street, from the initial settlements and estates, to the Victorian and Edwardian booms, to the intensification of the 1960s and 1970s. It also reflects the legacy of economic turbulence. While much of the neighbourhood remained stable, a number of estate homes became apartments and some buildings fell into decline. Yet today, as newfound energy and renewed dynamism take hold in the city, Durand is at the forefront of the 'new Hamilton.' Historic homes are being renovated and new condo towers are rising, as the neighbourhood’s commercial corridors bustle with activity and young families join the community.

The juxtaposition of old and new will be an ongoing challenge for the neighbourhood, as it attempts to balance intensification and renewal with protection of the neighbourhood’s existing character.

The Durand Neighbourhood Character Study was undertaken at the direction of the Durand Neighbourhood Association (DNA) as it attempts to manage growth in a way that reflects and respects its community’s character. The goals of the study are to provide a greater understanding of neighbourhood character in Durand, to better understand the existing landscape, and finally, to provide the DNA with recommended actions to advocate for maintaining its neighbourhood’s character.

1.1 Context and History of Durand

The Durand Neighbourhood is located south of downtown Hamilton and is bounded by James Street to the east, Main Street to the north, Queen Street to the west and the Niagara Escarpment to the south (Figure 1).

The land that is now the Durand Neighbourhood was originally purchased as a 274 acre property in 1791 by a few wealthy speculators, including George Hamilton, the founder of the city.¹ The neighbourhood was named for James Durand, a prominent Hamiltonian. From the 1840s to the mid-1870s the population of the Durand exploded from just a few buildings to being over fifty percent developed. The neighbourhood was fully developed by the end of the 19th century, with a diversity of dwellings being constructed of varied size and scale.²

By the mid-20th century, change and development were increasing in the neighbourhood, and by the 1970s many examples of earlier architecture had made way for high rise apartment style buildings, particularly in the northern part of the neighbourhood. Strong tensions around development in Durand were at play through the latter part of the 20th Century, with the Durand Neighbourhood Association (est.1972) becoming a strong proponent for responsible neighbourhood planning and preservation of neighbourhood character.
Figure 1: Durand Neighbourhood Boundaries
1.2 What is Neighbourhood Character?

Neighbourhood character, in the context of this study, refers to the *look and feel* of an area. It is made up of a number of factors that contribute to how private dwellings connect with the public street, or what makes up a streetscape. The Durand Neighbourhood Character study focuses on how to maintain the look and feel of streetscapes. While there are various buildings of all shapes and sizes in any neighbourhood, the focus of this project is on low to mid-rise residential housing, which is six storeys or less in height.

1.3 Current Pace of Neighbourhood Change

While there are visible signs of development in the Durand neighbourhood, one tangible way to measure the levels of development over time includes a review of Committee of Adjustment (COA) applications. These provide insight into changes in residential neighbourhoods, as COAs relate to smaller-scale building alterations. These applications, alongside rezoning applications and development applications, are tools used by the municipality to request reports from private developers on the uses and changes to properties, while also providing opportunities to inform the public. A review of the number of COA applications over time can provide a sense of whether the level of change in a neighbourhood is increasing or decreasing. Figure 2 summarizes the number of COA applications in Durand over the last 15 years. Between 2001 and 2016, there was an increase in COA applications, suggesting an uptick in neighbourhood development activity. Note that this does not include development applications or rezoning applications, just COA applications for variances and severances. To get a sense of the types of COA applications these represent, Table 1 provides detail on selected applications.

![Figure 2: Durand COA Applications 2001-2016](image)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>File Number/Type</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44 Inglewood Dr</td>
<td>HM/A-15:1174</td>
<td>To permit the construction of a new single family dwelling following the demolition of the existing single family dwelling, altering building footprint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor Variance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257 Park St S</td>
<td>HM/B-16:865</td>
<td>To divide up the land and using it for a townhouse development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Consent/Land Severance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>126 Hess St S</td>
<td>HM/A-15:3036</td>
<td>To permit the construction of a third storey addition to the existing single family dwelling along with altering the allowed building footprint.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor Variance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167 Bay St S</td>
<td>HM/A-15:087</td>
<td>To permit the conversion of the existing two (2) family dwelling to a multiple dwelling containing four (4) dwelling units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor Variance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minor Variance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.4 Existing Municipal Policy Related to Neighbourhood Character

As a first step in investigating neighbourhood character, a review of relevant existing policy is useful. There are existing rules and guidelines in place that City officials use to evaluate new home construction or additions to an existing house in established neighbourhoods. These are set out in the Official Plan, Secondary (neighbourhood) plans, and zoning by-laws. In terms of Durand, the relevant documents are not all of the same age, which impacts their appropriateness and effectiveness.

1.4.1 Official Plan

The Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) provides high level support for the maintenance of neighbourhood character in Durand. The current UHOP was adopted by City Council in 2009 and was approved by the Province of Ontario in 2011 and therefore provides the most up to date policy context for the neighbourhood. The UHOP sets the goal of establishing, “compact and healthy urban communities that provide opportunities to live, work, play, and learn.”

The UHOP identifies elements of Hamilton’s urban structure including neighbourhoods, open space, employment areas, and major activity centres. This structure forms the basis for land use designations. The following land use designations are applied to the Durand neighbourhood as shown in Figure 3:

- Neighbourhoods
- Open Space
- Mixed Use – Medium Density
- Downtown Mixed Use

An Established Historical Neighbourhood

The UHOP provides relevant policies that pertain to Durand in the Established Historical Neighbourhoods section under General Cultural Heritage Policies for Urban Areas. Specifically, “Established historical neighbourhoods are neighbourhoods that were substantially built prior to 1950. These neighbourhoods exhibit unique character, provide examples of historical development patterns, and contain concentrations of cultural heritage resources.” Further, policies state that, “The City shall protect established historical neighbourhoods, as identified in the cultural heritage landscape inventory, secondary plans and other City initiatives, by ensuring that new construction and development are sympathetic and complementary to existing cultural heritage attributes of the neighbourhood, including lotting and street patterns, building setbacks and building mass, height, and materials.”
Figure 3: Official Plan Land Use Designations for Durand"
1.4.2 Durand Neighbourhood Plan

The most current Neighbourhood, or Secondary Plan for Durand was developed in 1987\textsuperscript{11}. The Plan breaks down the neighbourhood into 5 character areas (Figure 4) as follows:

**Area 1: Commercial and Institutional**

The northeast quadrant of the neighbourhood was home to various important commercial and institutional buildings that were significant parts of the downtown core, such as City Hall, the YWCA, and Whitehen.

**Area 2: High Density Residential Area**

The area south and west of Area 1, stretching from Main St. to Robinson St., was described as a zone of high-density residential development. The Plan notes that the original 1973-74 Neighbourhood Plan was motivated in part by resident concerns over the spread of this type of development to existing low-density areas.

**Area 3: Transition Area**

The area between Robinson St. and Herkimer St. had a lower density than Area 2, but had a high rate of conversions of single-family homes into multiple units. Maximum permitted building height was often 12 storeys.

**Area 4: Single Family Residential Area**

Stretching from Herkimer St. to the Escarpment, this area was characterized by single-family homes on large lots that generally increased in value as they approached the escarpment. This Area was one of the most in-demand residential areas in the city and had remained relatively stable over the years, with limited in-fill.

**Area 5: James Street Commercial Area**

This commercial strip stretching along James from Main St to Markland St. was also one of the city’s main transportation arteries. It contained many amenities for local residents, including grocery stores, personal services, and restaurants.
Figure 4: Durand Character Areas from 1987 Neighbourhood Plan

Figure 2: Durand Neighbourhood Character Areas
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Although it is thirty years old, there are many goals and policies within the 1987 Neighbourhood Plan that are relevant to the issue of neighbourhood character. Specifically, goals exist around:

- Maintaining the distinctive residential nature of the neighbourhood
- Preserving areas of historical and/or architectural significance
- Designing new development or redevelopment in a manner that takes compatible form with the surrounding environment
- Maintaining public participation in the implementation of the plan

Additionally, there are a number of objectives and policies that propose how to implement the stated goals. Specific policies are offered that relate to residential densities, rules around renovation and redevelopment, as well as urban design principles. Some relevant policies that relate to built form and neighbourhood character include:

- Encouraging preservation and adaptive reuse of buildings, especially if the building is deemed of historical or architectural significance, contributes to the streetscape
- Prioritizing human scale and human interaction with local built form through consideration of height and massing of buildings
- Ensuring all new development proposals are compatible with the existing character of the neighbourhood
- Enhancing the form and appearance of buildings and their inter-relationships, as well as the preservation and enhancement of heritage buildings and areas
- Maintaining character in the vicinity of heritage buildings by ensuring new buildings will be compatible in scale, height, proportions, material, and style

Some of these goals, objectives, and policies can also inform updated neighbourhood planning and will be discussed in the recommendations section of this report.
1.4.3 Existing Zoning

Zoning by-laws provide additional regulation for neighbourhoods. The majority of Durand falls under City of Hamilton Zoning By-Law No. 6593, originally passed in 1950. The Northern most portion of the neighbourhood (from Hunter Street to Main Street) falls under the newer Downtown Zoning By-Law.

The City of Hamilton is updating city-wide Comprehensive Zoning By-law No. 05-200 in stages. In July and October 2015, the City passed a series of zoning by-law amendments to add new zones for the rural area. The next phase of Zoning By-law No. 05-200 is focused on Commercial and Mixed Use Zones. Of particular relevance to Durand is an update to Residential Zones that will be dealt with in a subsequent phase.

The current zoning from By-Law No. 6593 remains in effect for Durand and impacts the ability of the neighbourhood to maintain neighbourhood character. Figure 5 shows the different zones that cover Durand. Of particular relevance are zones that allow development of heights that would significantly alter the character of neighbourhood streets. For example, some zone districts (e.g. E, E-1) keep single family dwellings at 2.5 storeys or less. However, within these zones, multi-family dwellings can have heights up to 12 storeys, in some circumstances. For E-3 districts, development can range between 8-18 storeys.19

Thus, zoning in its current form is not conducive to maintaining neighbourhood character in contemporary Durand.
Figure 5: Current Zoning in Duand
1.4.4 Heritage Conservation Districts (HCD)

Heritage Conservation Districts (HCD) are areas that are protected by a municipal by-law, passed under Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act (OHA), by City Council. HCDs protect areas that are considered to be historically or culturally significant and require special care and attention in the planning process to ensure that they are conserved. As part of a HCD, a heritage permit is required for any alterations or additions to external building fabric, whether old or new to ensure it maintains the integrity of the district. Currently, there are two HCD in Durand: the MacNab-Charles and the Durand-Markland Heritage Conservation District (Figure 6).

![Fig 6: Durand Heritage Conservation Districts](image)
1.5 Durand Heritage Inventory

The City of Hamilton’s Durand Neighbourhood Built Heritage Inventory (hereafter referred to as The Inventory), which was finalized in March 2016, provides a valuable overview of the neighbourhood’s existing heritage stock. In the Fall-Winter period of 2015 and 2016, City staff worked with community members and ERA Architects to create The Inventory. The architects provided analysis of each of the 988 buildings in the neighbourhood to determine their heritage contribution.

The Inventory defined four classifications of heritage value:

- **Significant Built Resource (SBR):** the property is of considerable historic, aesthetic and/or contextual value; it is likely well known to local, regional or national communities.

- **Character-Defining Resource (CDR):** the property strongly reinforces its historic context, clearly reflecting a characteristic pattern of development or activity, property type, or attribute of the area.

- **Character-Supporting Resource (CSR):** the property maintains or supports its historic context, and can be related to a characteristic pattern of development or activity, property type, or attribute of the area.

- **Inventory Property (IP):** the property is not currently considered to contribute to its historic context, but could acquire value in the future; or the property has been heavily modified to the point where its heritage value may have been lost. Cultural heritage value may be identified through further research or detailed field investigation.

According to the Inventory, Durand has a substantial stock of heritage character and character-supporting buildings. These buildings reflect a number of time periods, among which are pre-Confederation, Victorian, Edwardian, and post-War. Further, these buildings are spread throughout the neighbourhood, with nearly every block containing SBR or CDR resources (Figure 7).

The Inventory found that:

- 27 percent of properties in the study area either have landmark status or are important in defining the present character of the neighbourhood;
- 101 were Significant Built Resources;
- 162 were Character-Defining Resources.

The Inventory recommended:

- 76 percent of the buildings in the neighbourhood be placed on Hamilton’s Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.
- 60 additional buildings be designated as heritage buildings under Part IV of the OHA.
Durand is a neighbourhood with a long history and rich character assets. While some work has been done already to better understand the contemporary neighbourhood, there are a number of deficiencies in existing planning documents. Concerted efforts need to be made to address these deficiencies by capitalizing on the opportunities identified in this policy review that can address the issue of neighbourhood character. There is interest in the local community in seizing these opportunities and taking innovative approaches to maintain character that move beyond the traditional heritage preservation approach.
2.0 The Ottawa Approach

The Durand Neighbourhood Character Project began with a focus on introducing a different approach to managing character to the neighbourhood and looking towards innovative steps moving forward. In Ottawa, an inventive approach is used to set rules for development to help maintain neighbourhood character. Thus, the first phase of the Durand Neighbourhood Character Project reviewed models of describing and preserving character in mature neighbourhoods, specifically focusing on the Ottawa approach, as concrete inspiration.

2.1 Why Ottawa

The Ottawa example provides a number of characteristics of interest for the Durand Neighbourhood Association, specifically, it is:

**Flexible:** Ottawa uses an approach where ‘Your street gives you your rules.’ This allows differences across a neighbourhood to be taken into account and avoids a ‘one size fits all’ set of rules.

**Targeted:** Applied as an “overlay” to specific neighbourhoods. This allows a particular area or neighbourhood to have an additional set of rules along with the regular zoning by-law that applies to all residential areas city-wide.

**Transparent:** Uses tools that allow citizens to better understand the character rules for their street. This allows engaged citizens to better participate in the development and maintenance of their neighbourhood.

**Enforceable:** The Ottawa approach was defendable at the Ontario Municipal Board, which makes it more likely to be legally acceptable elsewhere in the province. The key element of the ruling from the OMB determined that municipalities do have the authority to regulate neighbourhood character, under Section 34 of the Planning Act, R.S.O.1990 and that neighbourhood character requires looking along a street, or ‘streetscape character’.

With the Ottawa approach, property owners retain complete architectural freedom to design a new home or addition, as long as three key attributes that define the dominant character of a streetscape are maintained or strengthened. These three attributes relate to: front yards, parking, and the orientation of the main door.

To define these attributes, the City of Ottawa developed a user-friendly tool called a Streetscape Character Analysis (SCA). This allows the community to assess what is considered the dominant neighbourhood character on a streetscape, and the rules that new development needs to follow to strengthen that character. A SCA is primarily undertaken by the developer, but it is user-friendly enough that it can be conducted by the community (e.g. residents, home owners). After a required SCA is completed, it is submitted to City officials for their approval. It is then used to evaluate whether a proposed development project is consistent with the dominant character of the street or not. To learn more about how a SCA works and in what circumstances it is used, please see Appendix A.
2.2 Results of Ottawa Approach in Durand

To better determine how the Ottawa approach would work in Durand, a sample of four zones were identified and sample Streetscape Character Analyses were conducted on each zone. The outcomes of the SCAs include a three letter “Character Code” for each area that summarizes the character of the area under investigation. Figures 8-11 show the outcomes for each area.

**Figure 8: Streetscape Character Analysis of Charlton Avenue**

This Streetscape Character Analysis (SCA) focuses on three blocks of Charlton Ave between James St. S. and Bay St. S. This analysis spans three blocks because the number of included lots was lower than elsewhere due to a variety of structures not applicable to the SCA. Included are both detached homes and low-rise apartment buildings. Excluded are commercial/professional buildings, as well as mid-rise apartment buildings. All the structures included in the analysis were constructed late in the 19th Century or early 20th Century. The home marked with an * indicates there reference house for the analysis.

The SCA for this area demonstrates that the dominant character is A:A:A. See below for details on how this was determined.

**Front Yards**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Houses</th>
<th>Dominant Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A: Fully landscaped yard</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B: Landscaped in front of the house width only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C: Landscaped in front of part of the house</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D: Small or no landscaped yard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parking and Driveways**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Houses</th>
<th>Dominant Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A: No streetscape impact from on-site parking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B: Low streetscape impact from on-site parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C: Medium streetscape impact from on-site parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D: High streetscape impact from parking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main Door**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Houses</th>
<th>Dominant Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A: Main door facing the street</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B: Main door does not face the street</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This Streetscape Character Analysis (SCA) is focused on Hess Street South, on a portion of the street near the southern boundary of the Durand neighbourhood. The streetscape is made up of larger housing typology situated just below the Niagara Escarpment. The house marked with a * indicates the reference house for the analysis.

The SCA for this area demonstrates that the dominant character is B-B-A. See below for details on how this was determined.

### Front Yards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Houses</th>
<th>Dominant Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A: Fully landscaped yard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B: Landscaped in front of the house width only</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C: Landscaped in front of part of the house</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D: Small or no landscaped yard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking and Driveways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Houses</th>
<th>Dominant Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A: No streetscape impact from on-site parking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B: Low streetscape impact from on-site parking</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C: Medium streetscape impact from on-site parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D: High streetscape impact from parking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Main Door

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Houses</th>
<th>Dominant Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A: Main door facing the street</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B: Main door does not face the street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This Streetscape Character Analysis (SCA) is focused on Robinson Street, a street in the centre of the Durand neighbourhood, which runs from West to East from Queen Street South to James St. S. The block included in the analysis sits between Hess St. S and Caroline St. S. The streetscape is made up of mostly intact Victorian housing of up to three stories in height. The house marked with a * indicates the reference house for the analysis.

The SCA for this area demonstrates that the dominant character is A A A A. See below for details on how this was determined.

### Front Yards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Houses</th>
<th>Dominant Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A: Fully landscaped yard</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B: Landscaped in front of the house width only</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C: Landscaped in front of part of the house</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D: Small or no landscaped yard</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parking and Driveways

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Houses</th>
<th>Dominant Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A: No streetscape impact from on-site parking</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B: Low streetscape impact from on-site parking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group C: Medium streetscape impact from on-site parking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group D: High streetscape impact from parking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Main Door

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number of Houses</th>
<th>Dominant Character</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group A: Main door facing the street</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group B: Main door does not face the street</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The outcomes from the sample SCAs conducted in Durand show that there were two distinct “character codes” across all four areas. This points to some character consistency in certain areas, as well as some character diversity across the neighbourhood. However, the sample was too small to make any broad conclusions across the neighbourhood.
2.3 AGM Information Session

An information session was held at the Durand Annual General Meeting (AGM) in Fall 2015. The session was intended to introduce the Durand Neighbourhood Character Project and to describe the Ottawa approach as a potential inspiration for a Hamilton model. The meeting included a question and answer session to gather feedback on whether there was interest in investigating the issue of neighbourhood character further. Three key themes emerged from the session:

1. There was interest in looking at strategies to address neighbourhood character in Durand and the Ottawa model was viewed as a good framework to draw from.

2. There was an interest in a “made-in-Durand” solution that would look at additional factors beyond the three from Ottawa.

3. There was interest in reaching out to Durand residents to better inform them about neighbourhood character, while also seeking their input on what factors they thought were important.

The outcomes and feedback from Phase One provided direction on how to continue the project in Phase Two. Specifically, more detailed information about existing streetscape character in Durand was needed. Therefore, conducting street character audits more broadly across the neighbourhood, utilizing a more diverse set of factors that contribute to character, would be required. This would provide a good data set from across Durand that builds on the initial sample that showed there was character diversity as you move street to street. Additionally, there was need to create opportunities for more citizen involvement and outreach to further educate residents on the issue of neighbourhood character as well gather a wider range of views from Duranders.
3.0 Neighbourhood Street Audits

A detailed citizen audit tool was developed and employed across different parts of the Durand neighbourhood. The audit tool was designed to be conducted by residents, which was an important part of the overall Durand Neighbourhood Character Project. By having citizens walk their streets and gather information on dwellings in their neighbourhood, residents can become central players in the planning and understanding of their community. Further, they become informed advocates moving forward. This is consistent with goals of the 1987 Durand Neighbourhood Plan.

3.1 Audit Development and Workshop

The first step in the audit portion of the study was the creation of the audit tool itself. The factors under review were based initially on the Ottawa approach, then further informed by a best practice review of other jurisdictions where the impact of neighbourhood character has been studied (Ontario, Alberta, United Kingdom, Australia), and finally from input from the Durand Neighbourhood Association. The factors collected in the audit are outlined in Table 2. The audit tool was then designed and tested to be user-friendly for citizens who volunteered to assist with the study, both online and on paper.

Table 2: Audit Tool Factors Collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Range/Detail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>Measured in Storeys (1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Type</td>
<td>Single, Semi, Row, Apartment Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Façade Material</td>
<td>Brick, Wood, Stucco, Vinyl, Stone, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation of Front Entrance</td>
<td>Facing Street Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaping</td>
<td>Range – Fully Landscaped to No Landscaping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mature Tree</td>
<td>Present on Front Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Impact of Streetscape</td>
<td>Range – No Impact to High Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garages</td>
<td>Visible / Not Visible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage Alignment with Structure</td>
<td>Aligned, Protrude, Set Back</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In total, 23 audit zones were selected from across the Durand Neighbourhood to capture an adequate sampling of the diversity of the neighbourhood (Table 3 and Figure 12). As mentioned previously, only structures that were six storeys or less were included as part of the audits. In total, 439 residential dwellings of six storeys or below were included in the audit.

A workshop for the citizen auditors was held on October 17th, 2016. The workshop began with a presentation by architect Graham McNally from Toms + McNally who provided an overview of multiple street characteristics and showed how they can influence the look and feel of a streetscape. From there, a step-by-step walkthrough of the audit tool was presented and the audit zones were assigned to attendees.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th># of Houses/Buildings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hess South</td>
<td>Aberdeen to Escarpment</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Aberdeen East</td>
<td>James to Bay</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Turner</td>
<td>Aberdeen to Escarpment</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Aberdeen West</td>
<td>Caroline to Queen</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Markland West</td>
<td>Caroline to Hess</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Markland to Aberdeen</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Herkimer East</td>
<td>James to Bay</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Herkimer West</td>
<td>Caroline to Hess</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bay Street South</td>
<td>Herkimer to Aberdeen</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Bay Street North</td>
<td>Robinson to Herkimer</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Charlton East</td>
<td>James to Bay</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Charlton West</td>
<td>Bay to Hess</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Robinson</td>
<td>Caroline to Hess</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Duke West</td>
<td>Caroline to Queen</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Hess North</td>
<td>Hunter to Duke</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>Duke to Charlton</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Wesanford</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Duke East</td>
<td>James to Bay</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>MacNab South</td>
<td>Bold to Herkimer</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>MacNab North</td>
<td>Bold to Hunter</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Markland East</td>
<td>James to Bay</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>St. James Place</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bold St.</td>
<td>Bay to Hess</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>439</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 12: All Audit Zones
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3.2 Audit Results

Between October 17th and 31st, 2016, 20 citizen auditors conducted the audits for their assigned zone(s). The following section summarizes the results.

Audit Notes

For the purpose of the audit, an important distinction was made between form and function of a dwelling. Form refers to the original design purpose of the dwelling, for example, a large single family detached home. Function refers to the current use of the dwelling, for example that same single family detached home may now be divided into multiple apartments, or it may be used for professional offices. The audit was concerned only with form – its original built purpose.

In addition, while the selection of audit zones attempted to evenly cover Durand geographically, the number of houses/buildings within each zone varies (Table 3). This is due to a variety of housing types and sizes in each zone. Thus, when reporting the aggregate results from the audits, the average from each audit zone was used so that areas with greater number of dwellings would not be over represented in the results.
3.2.1 Building Height

Building height is a key factor related to neighbourhood character. Building height can affect a number of aspects, including shade on neighbours, privacy, and compatibility with neighbouring structures.

Seven categories of height measured in storeys were included on the audit, as follows:

- 1 Storey
- 1.5 Storeys
- 2 Storeys
- 2.5 Storeys
- 3 Storeys
- 3.5 Storeys
- 4-6 Storeys

Buildings with a half storey (1.5, 2.5, 3.5) referred to dwellings that appeared to have an additional living space on the top level, but the roof of that space was not the full width of the floor.

As noted in Figure 13, the majority of the averages of the zones in the neighbourhood (51%) were 2.5 stories high. 81 percent were in the 2-3 storey range.

Figure 14, below, displays a map that illustrates the distribution of the main heights of dwellings observed in the audits. In most audit zones (17), a majority of dwellings were 2.5 storeys. In three zones a majority of dwellings were 3 storeys, while in another two zones, a majority of dwellings were 2 storeys, and in one zone, the dwelling height was tied between 2 and 2.5 storeys (40% each).

The 2.5 storey dominant zones form an “L” shape on the west and south sides of the neighbourhood (see Figure 10). The 2 and 3 storey zones are clustered mainly in the north-east end of the neighbourhood, in the area from Herkimer to Hunter and Bay to James.
Figure 14: Dominant Housing Type Across Individual Audit Zones
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3.2.2 Housing Type

Housing form, or typology, is another factor that influences neighbourhood character. This refers to what kinds of buildings populate a street, for example single family detached homes, town or row houses, or apartment style dwellings. It is important to reiterate that this study is concerned with dwellings of six storeys or less.

Four types of dwelling were specified in the audit, as follows:

- Single family detached home
- Semi-detached
- Row/town house
- Apartment-style building

As noted, the importance of a dwelling’s form was the important consideration in the context of this factor.

Figure 15 illustrates the general results of the audits for all zones. The majority of dwellings (72%) in the audit zones were single family detached homes. This was followed by apartment-style buildings (12%), row/town houses (9%), and then semi-detached homes (7%).

As illustrated in Figure 16 below, single family detached homes were the majority type of dwelling in most audit zones (19). Two zones had a majority of apartment-style dwellings and two zones had ties; in one, single family detached homes and semi-detached represented 35 percent each, and in the other, row/town houses and apartments each represented 39 percent.

The single-detached dominant zones forms an “L” shape on the west and south sides of the neighbourhood (see Figure 12). The semi-detached, row/town, and apartment style dominant zones are clustered in the north-east end of the neighbourhood, in the area from Herkimer to Duke and Bay to James.
### 3.2.3 Façade Material

Façade material refers to the type of material used on the front of the dwelling. A continuity in façade material, over the course of several houses or buildings, helps define a neighbourhood’s character.

Five types of façade were available for auditors to highlight, including:

- Brick
- Stone
- Stucco
- Wood
- Vinyl siding

Auditors looked for the dominant façade material on each building. In the few cases where façade materials were approximately 50/50, the material on the exterior of the first floor was identified as dominant.

Figure 17 illustrates the percentages of façade material for all audit zones. In a majority of zones (77%) brick was the dominant type of façade material. The next most common types were stone (11%), stucco (9%), and then vinyl and wood (1% each).

Brick was the dominant façade type in most audit zones (21). Stucco was the majority façade in one zone, while stone was the majority type in another. These two outlier zones were located in the south end of the neighbourhood. (see Figure 18).

While 21 of the zones are majority brick, this material is more dominant in certain areas than others, for example in 10 of the zones, brick represented over 90 percent of all façade types.
Figure 18: Dominant Façade Material Across Individual Audit Zones
3.2.4 Front Door Orientation

This factor deals with how the house or building faces the street. Is the main door or entrance oriented towards the street, or is it on the side or back? Entrances that face the street help create more connection between the house and the streetscape.

Auditors recorded door orientation toward the street on a yes/no basis.

In cases where buildings had more than one entrance, as sometimes happened with single detached buildings converted into multiple units, the doorway that appeared to be the main original entrance was recorded. This decision reflects the importance of the original form of the dwelling over its current function.

The dominant orientation noted for all audit zones was for the main entrance to face the street (95%) (see Figure 19).

As displayed in Figure 20 below, the lowest percentage of doors facing the street was 76 percent; it was followed by zones with 84 percent and 85 percent. All other zones were 90 percent or greater, with eight zones at 100 percent.

There is limited geographic grouping or patterning for the entrance orientation.
Figure 20: Dominant Orientation Across Individual Audit Zones
3.2.5 Landscaping

A landscaped front yard is one of the most noticeable factors when considering neighbourhood character. Landscaping refers to grass, bushes, gardens, trees, walking paths, and decorative features. How much of the front yard is landscaped? Does it just cover the area in front of the house, or extend across the entire lot?

Auditors were asked to select from four options of landscaping:

- Fully landscaped: the entire width of the lot facing the street is landscaped.
- In front of house: the area directly in front of the house is landscaped, but not the entire lot width. Buildings in this category often had driveways on one side.
- Part of the front of the house: the lot has landscaping, but part of the area in front of the house is not landscaped, often due to parking.
- Small/no landscaped front: there is little to no landscaping in front of the building. This is often the result of either full lot width parking or the building having limited setback.

The largest single percentage of audit zones fell into the fully landscaped category (44%) (see Figure 21), with 12 zones meeting the criteria. Of the remaining zones, six were landscaped in front of the building, three had no landscaping, one was partially landscaped, and one was tied at 33 percent each between fully landscaped and landscaped in front of the building. Interestingly, there was significant diversity within each audit zone, with only 14 of the audit zones having a landscape option with over 50 percent prevalence, three zones above 80 percent, and only one at 100 percent.

There is limited grouping of similarly landscaped zones. The least landscaped zones tend to be on the west side of the neighbourhood and there is a strong presence of zones with landscaping only in front of the house in the south and south-east (see Figure 22).
Figure 22: Dominant Landscaping Across Individual Audit Zones
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3.2.6 Mature Trees

An established tree canopy is a factor common to many older neighbourhoods. Large, mature, trees contribute to the character of the streetscape as do the houses themselves. Tracking this factor involves looking at whether individual properties have mature trees, meaning a tree over two storeys in height, in the front of the property.

Auditors were asked to indicate the presence of a mature tree on the lot facing the street on a yes/no basis.

Auditors only recorded the first tree, so if there was more than one tree it was not counted.

Durand has a robust tree canopy, with the auditors recording an average of 55 percent of the lots across the zones with a mature tree (see Figure 23). The majority of lots in 14 of the 23 zones had a mature tree. Only the Wesanford zone (#17), which is an outlier for several reasons, had no trees (see Figure 24).

As illustrated in Figure 24 below, the north-western side of the neighbourhood tends to have fewer mature trees. By contrast, the other parts of the neighbourhood have mature trees on a majority of the properties.

Figure 23: Presence of a Mature Tree across All Audit Zones

An example of a street lined with multiple mature trees.
Figure 24: Presence of Mature Trees across Individual Audit Zones
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3.2.7 Parking

The extent of front yard, street accessible parking, relative to the overall lot, can impact the relationship between the property and the street.

A range of types of front parking were provided for auditors, including:

- No impact: there was no parking on the site facing the audit street.
- 1/3 of lot width: no more than 1/3 of the lot was parking. This could be in front or at the side of the building.
- 1/3 – 1/2 of lot width: up to half the lot, usually including at least part of the front of the building, was dedicated to parking.
- 1/2 or more of lot width: the front of the lot was dominated by parking.

While the single largest category in the neighbourhood was no impact of parking (41%) (see Figure 25), all ranges were represented. Following the ‘no impact’ category was parking on a 1/3 of the lot width (36%), then parking on between 1/3-1/2 of the lot width (12%), and parking on 1/2 or more of the lot width (11%). In total, 13 of the 23 zones included the no impact on parking as the dominant factor. Also, it should be noted that 13 of the zones had properties representing all four categories and only 6 were over 80 percent dominated by one of the categories.

Figure 26 displays the distribution of parking types. The neighbourhood tends to divide into three segments: the north, middle, and south. The north segment, from Bold St. north, has a variety of types of parking impact. The middle segment, from Herkimer to Duke, is largely a no impact parking area, and the south segment, from the escarpment to Aberdeen, is mostly parking on 1/3 of the lot width. However, it should be noted that there are pockets of other characteristic-dominant zones within these areas.
Figure 26: Dominant Parking Impact Across Individual Audit Zones
3.2.8 Garages

The existence and placement of a garage can have an impact on the character of a streetscape. Likewise, the size of a driveway, relative to the overall lot, can impact the relationship between the property and the street.

Auditors recorded the presence of a garage on the lot facing the street on a yes/no basis.

In addition to recording whether or not the property had a garage, the auditors also recorded the relationship of that garage to the house. There were three categories for this characteristic:

- **Aligned**: the garage is aligned with the front of the building.
- **Protrude**: the garage protrudes from the front of the building.
- **Set Back**: the garage is set back from the front of the building, often as a separate structure.

Garages needed to be facing the audit street to be recorded. Therefore, if a building on Aberdeen, for example, had a garage, but that garage’s door faced on to Hess St, then it was not counted as having a garage visible from the audit street.

The overall presence of garages across the audit zones was 28 percent (see Figure 27). The majority of buildings did not have garages visible from the front of the street. Only five of the 23 zones were garage-dominant, with Zone 5 recording the highest number of garages at 92 percent (see Figure 28). 13 of the zones had 80 percent or more without garages. When buildings did have garages, most often they were set back (62%).

The audit zones most likely to have garages are in the south and south-east area of the neighbourhood.
Figure 28: Dominant Garage Presence Across Individual Audit Zones
4.0 Resident Survey

To better comprehend how residents of Durand view neighbourhood character, and to gauge feedback about what factors are important to residents’ understanding of the look and feel of their streets and neighbourhood, Civicplan conducted a resident survey. The survey was designed to gather feedback about the same factors that were being assessed as part of the neighbourhood audits.

4.1 Survey Notes

The survey design was informed by a best practices review of other jurisdictions that have studied the impact of neighbourhood character. Specifically, we looked at other jurisdictions in Ontario and Alberta.

The Durand Neighbourhood Survey was conducted both online and on paper from October 20, 2016 to November 18, 2016. The survey was available via the durandcharacter.com website, while paper copies of the survey were available at Durand Coffee on Charlton Avenue throughout this period. The survey was promoted on social media and through the Durand Neighbourhood Association email list. Further, additional outreach efforts were conducted to increase survey participation from seniors in the neighbourhood.

Respondents were asked three categories of questions, beginning with general information about the individual respondent (e.g. age). This was followed by detailed questions about streetscape character factors. Specifically, respondents were asked to describe the influence of 10 different factors on the character of their street. Finally, they were asked to provide additional details about their own observations of their neighbourhood.

In total, 174 responses were received both on paper and online.
4.2 Resident Information

In terms of resident information, respondents were asked to indicate their age range, how long they have lived in the neighbourhood and what type of dwelling they live in (e.g. apartment, townhouse, etc.).

4.2.1 Age

Figure 29 displays the breakdown of responses by age of respondent. The majority of respondents (96%) were over the age of 25. The single largest age category were respondents between 40-64 years of age (39%), followed by those between the ages of 29-39 and those over 65 years old, each at 29 percent of respondents.

4.2.2 Length of Time in Neighbourhood

Respondents shared the length of time they have lived in the Durand neighbourhood. Figure 30 displays the percentage of time respondents indicated they have lived in the neighbourhood by year ranges.

The largest segment of respondents indicated that they have lived in Durand for a relatively short period of time, between one and five years (39%). This was followed by people who have lived in the neighbourhood for between six to ten years (17%), then those who have been there for more than 30 years (13%).
4.2.3 Type of Dwelling

The last of the general information questions asked respondents to indicate the type of dwelling they currently live in. Figure 31 illustrates the responses by percentage. The majority of respondents (51%) indicated they live in a single family, detached home. The second largest segment of respondents were people living in apartments (39%). Of the respondents living in apartments, 21 percent indicated they lived in dwellings with more than seven storeys, while 18 percent indicated dwellings with six storeys or less.

Figure 31: Type of Dwelling
4.3 Streetscape Character Factors

The second section of the survey asked respondents to rate how 10 different factors influenced the character of their street. The influence rating ran from positive to negative, with the centre point as neutral. The following sections detail the responses for each of the 10 factors. Each section details the general responses for each of the factors, as well as additional information about how different age groups (those under 40 and those over 40 years of age) responded to the questions. Finally, the questions related to the height of dwellings were assessed based on the type of residences indicated by respondents, specifically whether or not they lived in apartments.

4.3.1 Mature Trees

There are multiple reasons why the presence of large, mature trees on a streetscape is important in cities, from improved air quality to reduction in heating and cooling costs. Respondents were overwhelmingly positive about the influence of this factor, with 95 percent indicating that this was a somewhat positive (10%) or positive (85%) (Figure 32).

Under 40 / Over 40

There was no difference in the level of support for this factor by age, both those respondents under 40 years, and over 40 years old indicated that mature trees contributed positively to the look and feel of a streetscape.

Relation to Audit

The survey results align with the audits which showed mature trees were a prominent element of streetscapes.

Figure 32: Large, Mature Trees
4.3.2 Landscaped Front Yards

The second factor was the influence of landscaped front yards on the character of the streetscape. Landscaping, such as lawns, gardens and other green features on the front of the property, provide greater differentiation between the street and the dwelling. As displayed in Figure 33, 87 percent of respondents indicated that landscaped front yards positively influence the character of their streetscape.

**Under 40 / Over 40**

While this was a positive factor for all age groups, those over 40 were marginally more positive on its influences (88%) than those under 40 years of age (85%).

**Relation to Audit**

The survey results align with the audits that showed that the vast majority of properties were either fully landscaped or at least landscaped in front of the house.

![Figure 33: Landscaped Front Yards](image)
4.3.3 Front Entrance

How people access a dwelling, whether through an entrance at the front of the building or via the side or back, influences how the dwelling connects with a streetscape. As Figure 34 illustrates, survey respondents indicated that a front facing entrance positively influenced the character of their streets (86%).

Under 40 / Over 40

The positive nature of this factor was equally supported across age ranges.

Relation to Audit

The survey results align with the audits that showed that the vast majority of properties had a front door facing the street.

Figure 34: Front Entrance Location
4.3.4 Height of Dwelling: 1-3 Storeys

The diversity or uniformity of dwelling height affects a streetscape in various ways. Respondents were asked to indicate the influence of different scale of dwellings by storey height. Figure 35 illustrates responses related to dwellings of 1-3 storeys.

Of all the survey respondents, the majority (53%) indicated that 1-3 storey buildings had a positive influence on streetscape character. Additionally, 16 percent indicated that it was somewhat positive.

**Under 40 / Over 40**

In terms of the breakdown by age, respondents under the age of 40 were more likely to gauge this factor as positive. 75 percent of these respondents indicated this was positive or somewhat positive, whereas 66 percent of those above 40 selected these responses.

**Relation to Audit**

The survey results align with the audits which showed that over 80 percent of zones had average heights of 1-3 stories.

*Figure 35: Dwelling Height, 1-3 Storeys*
4.3.5 Height of Dwelling: 4-6 Storeys

Respondents were asked about their views on the influence of dwellings from 4-6 storeys. As illustrated in Figure 36, the results are not as definitive with lower level dwellings. A combined 41 percent of respondents indicated this height category of dwellings was a positive or somewhat positive influence on their streets, while 37 percent indicated it was a negative or somewhat negative influence. The largest single group of respondents (24%) indicated that 4-6 storey dwellings are positive influence on the streetscape. While 22 percent indicated they were neutral about the impact, and 21 percent indicating it was somewhat negative.

Under 40 / Over 40

When the data is broken down by age group, similar to the previous factor, those under the age of 40 (45%) indicated that this type of dwelling had a positive or somewhat positive influence on their street. Fewer of those over 40 (39%) saw this as a positive or somewhat positive influence. Additionally, those over 40 were more neutral (25%) than younger respondents (18%) about this factor.

Figure 36: Dwelling Height, 4-6 Storeys
4.3.6 Height of Dwelling: More than 7 Storeys

In terms of the influence of dwellings of seven or more storeys, respondents indicated that this form of dwelling had a more negative influence on the streetscape. As detailed in Figure 37, a majority of respondents (54%) indicated that this building type was either negative or somewhat negative, as compared to 29 percent that indicated that it was positive or somewhat positive.

Under 40 / Over 40

The views about this factor by age demonstrates a change from the previous height categories. Whereas those under 40 years of age viewed dwellings of 6 storeys or less more favourably than their older counterparts, the responses shift with dwellings of seven storeys or greater. While the majority of both groups indicated that this was a negative or somewhat negative influence on the street (57% under 40, 53% over 40), a larger percentage of those over 40 years of age felt that this factor had a positive or somewhat positive influence (33% over 40 to 21% under 40).

Figure 37: Dwelling Height, More than 7 Storeys

[Diagram showing distribution of responses: Negative 32%, Somewhat negative 22%, Neutral 16%, Somewhat positive 7%, Positive 22%]
4.3.7 Apartment-Style vs All on Height of Dwelling

As apartment-style dwellers comprised a significant percentage of respondents (39%), their responses related to the height of dwellings was compared to total respondents for additional context. Figure 38 illustrates the responses of apartment-style dwellers as compared to all respondents as related to the dwelling height factor.

Figure 38: Apartment-Style Dweller Responses: 1-3 Storey Dwellings

Those respondents who reside in apartment-style dwellings were slightly more positive (56%) about the influence of 1-3 storey dwellings than the total percentages of respondents (53%). They were less likely to be neutral and negative about the influence of these dwellings.
In response to the question about 4-6 storey dwellings (Figure 39), respondents from apartment-style dwellings were more positive than the total respondents. 55 percent of apartment-style dwellers noted positive or somewhat positive, as compared to 41 percent of all respondents. Additionally, apartment dwellers were less negative (23%) as compared to all respondents (37%) about the influence of this scale of dwellings on a streetscape.

Figure 39: Apartment-Style Dweller Responses: 4-6 Storey Dwellings

Figure 40: Apartment-Style Dweller Responses: 7 Storeys or Greater
As displayed in Figure 40 above, there is a difference between respondents who live in apartment-style dwellings and all respondents to the questions of the influence of greater than seven storey dwellings. 41 percent of respondents from apartments see dwellings greater than seven storeys as a positive influence on their streets, as compared to 29 percent of all respondents. In terms of negative impact, the difference is 39 percent of respondents from apartments versus 54 percent of all respondents view this scale as a negative.

4.3.8 Similarity in the Type of Housing

Another character factor is related to the similarity of type of housing that appears on a street. This refers to the type of dwelling form, for example whether it is a single family detached home, a town or row house, an apartment style dwelling, among others. Figure 41 displays the responses to the influence of this factor.

The majority of respondents (53%) indicated that similarity in the types of housing form was a positive or somewhat positive influence on a street. This factor, more than others, displayed a larger number of respondents indicating they were neutral about its influence (32%). A small percentage (15%) indicated that similarity in housing type was negative or somewhat negative.

Under 40 / Over 40

Respondents over the age of 40 were more positive about the influence of the similarity of housing type on the streetscape. 57 percent of this segment of respondents indicated positive or somewhat positive, while 45 percent of those under 40 indicated these responses.

Figure 41: Similarity in Type of Housing
4.3.9 Garages

The presence of garages can impact the character of a streetscape. As such, respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they felt garages were a positive or negative influence on the streetscape. Figure 42 displays the breakdown of responses to this factor by percentage.

The largest segment of responses by percentage for this factor was the neutral category (43%). This was followed by 35 percent of respondents who indicated that garages had a negative or somewhat negative impact on the street, and 22 percent indicating garages had a positive or somewhat positive influence.

Under 40 / Over 40

The responses to this factor differed by age group. While a majority of respondents under the age of 40 were neutral on this factor (52%), the second largest segment of respondents in this age range saw this as negative or somewhat negative (35%), and only 13 percent indicated it was positive or somewhat positive.

By contrast, the percentages for respondents over the age of 40 were more evenly spread, with 34 percent indicating this factor was negative or somewhat negative, 39 percent who were neutral, and 27 percent who viewed this as positive or somewhat positive.

Relation to Audit

The large number of neutral responses in the survey might be a function of the fact that the overall presence of garages across audit zones was only 28 percent.

Figure 42: Garages
4.3.10 Front Yard Parking

The presence of parking at the front of a property, such as a driveway or parking pad, is another factor that influences the character of a street. Specifically, parking reduces the amount of space at the front of a dwelling for landscaping. Figure 43 shows the responses to the influence of this factor.

The largest single percentage for this factor was neutral (29%). While 34 percent of respondents indicated that front yard parking was a positive or somewhat positive factor, 37 percent indicated it was negative or somewhat negative. Thus, this is not as decisive a factor in influencing the character of streetscapes as some of the others.

Under 40 / Over 40

The presence of front yard parking was viewed differently by age. Responses from those under 40 years of age indicated a more even split of opinion, with the largest single segment (39%) as neutral. This was followed by 31 percent who indicated this was a negative or somewhat negative influence, and 30 percent indicating it was positive or somewhat positive.

For respondents over the age of 40, 40 percent indicated that this was negative or somewhat negative factor, and 37 percent indicating it was positive or somewhat positive. 24 percent were neutral on the influence of front yard parking.

Relation to Audit

The survey results suggest a lack of consensus on this issue, while the audits showed that over 77 percent of zones had low, or no street impact from parking.  

Figure 43: Front Yard Parking
4.3.11 Façade Material

The similarity or diversity of façade material influences the character of a streetscape, as it suggests continuity in dwellings, separate of building type. Figure 44 displays survey respondents’ views on the influence of this factor.

Respondents were notably positive about the influence of similar façade materials. While the positive category was the single largest, at 32 percent, the majority of respondents, (57%) selected positive and somewhat positive. There was a large percentage of neutral responses to this factor (30%), with only 13 percent indicating that this was a negative or somewhat negative factor influencing streetscape character.

Under 40 / Over 40

Responses to the influence of similarity of façade materials on character broken down by age demonstrated similar views. The majority of both age groups indicated that similarity in façade was a positive or somewhat positive factor (61% under 40, 55% over 40).

Figure 44: Façade Material
4.4 Types of New Development

Respondents were asked to indicate their preference of the type of new development that would fit best on their street. As intensification projects throughout the Durand neighbourhood are currently underway and planned for the future, it is helpful to get a sense from residents about what types of new development would be acceptable. Figure 45 illustrates the most popular responses by dwelling type, as indicated by respondents.

Of all respondents, the single most popular type of new development was for new single family detached homes (32%). This was followed by row/townhouse (22%) and semi-detached homes (21%). The next most popular option was for apartment style dwellings lower than six storeys. Only three percent of respondents indicated support for apartment styles dwellings at seven storeys or above.

Five percent of respondents chose other options, which included respondents indicating that they did not want to see any new development in the neighbourhood, those identifying the need for a mix of types all at a lower height, and finally there was an emphasis on encouraging affordability in any new developments in the neighbourhood.

With respect to how different segments of respondents viewed new development, Figures 46 and 47 below display responses by age and by type residence.

Figure 45: Types of New Development
Responses to the question about new development types is quite similar when viewed by the two age groups. Some small differences are present, specifically, those over 40 were more in favour of single family detached homes as a new development form. Those under 40 indicated that low level but increasingly denser forms of new development are more favourable, for example semi-detached, row/townhouses, and apartment style dwellings of six storeys or less.
The most popular type of new development for those living in apartments was for lower height apartment type buildings. Respondents who do not live in apartments favoured single family detached homes. Semi-detached homes and row/townhouse types of development were both similarly popular for both types of respondents.

Figure 47: Types of New Development by Respondent Type

4.5 Survey Summary

The resident survey collected ample data on the view of Durand residents on how character factors influence their streets. A summary of key survey results are as follows:

- Many of the character factors in the study, such as mature street trees, front facing entrances, landscaped front yards, were seen as positively influencing the character of a streetscape.
- In general, lower dwelling heights were viewed as a more positive influence.
- In terms of new development, again lower heights were viewed more favourably for future intensification in the neighbourhood, although there was a notable difference between the responses of apartment-style and house dwellers on this question.
- There was a parallel between many survey results and the audit data. Specifically, where audit results reported a dominant factor, (e.g. mature trees) these factors were viewed by survey respondents as positive influences on streetscapes.
5.0 Recommendations

The following section builds on existing neighbourhood policy research, the neighbourhood character audits, and the resident survey to detail specific recommendations for maintaining neighbourhood character in Durand. The recommendations are ordered by each policy framework that should be updated.

5.1 A New Durand Secondary Plan

The previous Durand Neighbourhood Plan is 30 years old and is slated to be updated in the mid-term. Building on the policy context set by the new Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP), a new Durand Secondary Plan could provide specific principles, objectives, and policies on issues such as land use and design guidelines. By creating a new secondary plan specific to the Durand neighbourhood, the City will be able to promote land-use and development that reflects the contemporary context and needs of the neighbourhood.

Durand is a good candidate for an updated secondary plan as described in the policy goals of the new Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP). Specifically, the UHOP suggests that secondary plans are appropriate in areas "undergoing change where general policies are insufficient to guide redevelopment or warrant localized reconsideration, and in particular: areas in need of stability and strengthening such as older residential neighbourhoods, commercial areas and heritage areas."28

Further, any planning that supported the maintenance of existing Durand neighbourhood character would be consistent with the City's assessment of built heritage in the neighbourhood. The City of Hamilton Durand Neighbourhood Built Heritage Inventory recommended that 76 percent of the buildings in the neighbourhood should be placed on Hamilton's Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.29 The report further recommended that 60 buildings be designated under Part IV of the OHA.30

Suggested Policies for a Durand Secondary Plan

Existing secondary plans developed for Strathcona, Ainslie Wood Westdale, and the West Harbour neighbourhoods in Hamilton provide some useful guidance and structure for a new Durand plan. Specifically, there are a number of principles, objectives, and policies approved in these Secondary Plans that could speak to the issue of maintaining Durand's neighbourhood character within the contemporary planning policy context of the City of Hamilton. Additionally, the previous Durand Neighbourhood Plan from 1987 also contains a number of policies that are still relevant to the community.

Drawing from the audits, survey and policy research, the follow sections provide some suggested inclusions in a revised Durand Secondary Plan.
5.1.1 Vision

A Durand Secondary Plan would present a vision for the neighbourhood. This vision could explicitly speak to the older urban character of the neighbourhood, and to the need for redevelopment to be consistent with, and complementary of, existing character.

5.1.2 Principles

Following on the vision, a Durand Secondary Plan should establish a set of principles, some of which can expand on the issue of maintaining neighbourhood character.

- One principle could speak to the **historic nature** of the neighbourhood given its settlement pattern, age of structures, and important role in the growth and development of Hamilton.
- In addition, Durand’s explicit **urban nature** should be articulated as a principle. This could speak to the compact urban form, street pattern, distinctive streetscapes that all contribute to the identity of the neighbourhood.
- Building on the tradition in the neighbourhood, including provisions in the 1987 Durand Neighbourhood Plan, **community participation** should be embedded as a principle of a new Plan and its ongoing implementation.

5.1.3 Objectives

A set of objectives for Durand should be established in the Secondary Plan that would speak to the type of development desired. Certain objectives, similar to those found in other secondary plans, can be directed at the theme of neighbourhood character. Objectives could strengthen the existing neighbourhood by stating the intent for development to:

- Promote and protect character of the neighbourhood
- Encourage development that reflects the neighbourhood character of Durand through attention to elements of urban design
- Protect and enhance locations identified as stable residential areas
- Protect and preserve existing trees while providing new planting where appropriate
5.1.4 General Policies

A Durand Secondary Plan can provide more specific policies that would articulate what should be considered when evaluating an application for development or redevelopment. These can be consistent with policies in other secondary plans.36

Some policies can relate to height, massing, and scale stipulating that:

- The height, massing, scale and arrangement of buildings and structures should be compatible with adjacent development and should be sympathetic to the character of the neighbourhood. This is consistent with policies in the Strathcona and West Harbour Secondary Plans.

Other policies can relate to design elements at the street level stipulating that:

- Changes to the existing housing stock, such as new infill construction and renovations, should be comparable to existing housing styles on the same block and street. This is consistent with a policy in the Ainslie Wood Westdale Secondary Plan where new construction is encouraged to reflect similar housing styles, massing, height, setbacks, and other elements of style as the adjacent homes, on the same block and street.37

5.1.5 Residential Designations

Policies related to residential land use designations would be included in a Durand Secondary Plan. These designations are zones that outline height limits for future development. Following the model of other recent secondary plans in Hamilton39, Durand would have several land use designations, three of which are of particular relevance when considering policies about maintaining residential neighbourhood character:

- **Low Density Residential**: This designation would keep maximum building heights at 2.5 storeys which would be consistent with large parts of the neighbourhood as found in the streets audits (see Figure 14).

- **Medium Density Residential**: This designation would keep maximum building heights at 6 storeys, which is the tallest height of structures examined in the streets audits. Further, policies for these designations could also stipulate that infill development be sympathetic and complementary to the existing character of the neighbourhood, including built form, massing, and materials that are compatible with existing adjacent residential forms.

- **High Density Residential**: This designation would allow maximum building heights of up to 10 storeys. These heights could pose problems with maintaining neighbourhood character on lower density streets and thus, additional policies can be proposed to mitigate this. For example, an Urban Design Brief could be required for new high density development demonstrating what steps are being taken to improve compatibility with lower density built forms (e.g. step backs).
5.1.6 Cultural Heritage Policies

As an established residential neighbourhood, policies in a Durand Secondary Plan should address cultural heritage. Policies that exist in other contemporary secondary plans\(^\text{39}\) provide direction on how rules can stipulate that:

- New development respect the design of any surrounding heritage buildings including those within heritage conservations districts, including factors such as:
  - Maintaining a consistent street orientation
  - Maintaining building heights that reflect the existing built form
  - Reflecting the character, massing and materials of the surrounding buildings.

- Intensification through the conversion of existing built heritage should be encouraged only where original building fabric and architectural features are retained. This can include limiting alterations to principal facades and limiting the paving of front yards for parking.

5.1.7 Cultural Heritage Landscapes

A cultural heritage landscape is a defined geographical area characterized by human settlement activities that have resulted in changes and modifications to the environment, which is now considered to be of heritage value of interest.\(^\text{40}\) Between the Ainslie Wood Westdale and the Strathcona Secondary Plans, 10 Culture Heritage Landscapes are identified based on a variety of reasons. Some of the landscapes and their rationale for significant are outlined in Table 4.
Table 4: Selected Culture Heritage Landscapes in Strathcona and Ainslie Wood Westdale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Landscape</th>
<th>Neighbourhood</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MacNab's Survey</td>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>This cultural heritage landscape encompasses the area west of Strathcona Avenue, south of York Boulevard and north of King Street. The existing character of this area is early-twentieth century one to two-storey dwellings. The lot sizes in this area vary slightly in width and depth, but tend to be deeper than the lots in other areas of the Strathcona Neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill's Survey</td>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>Part of a larger survey by James Mills, this cultural heritage landscape encompasses the area south of King Street, east of Dundurn Street, north of Main Street and west of Queen Street. The area is divided into narrow residential lots containing mid- to late-nineteenth century, one to two-storey single and semi-detached residences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arnold's Survey</td>
<td>Strathcona</td>
<td>The lands contained in J. Arnold's Survey include some of the earliest to be developed in the Strathcona Neighbourhood. This area comprises the lands north of King Street, east of Strathcona Avenue, south of York Boulevard and west of Queen Street. The intact streetscapes of this area are characterized by narrow, shallow parcels of land containing mid-nineteenth century one- to two-storey single detached dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke Survey</td>
<td>Ainslie Wood Westdale</td>
<td>This area is bordered by Main, Emerson, Broadway and the Escarpment. The survey is an early 20th century survey of single family homes south of McMaster university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran’s Housing Area</td>
<td>Ainslie Wood Westdale</td>
<td>This area is located on streets south of Main St West, spanning from Haddon to Stroud. The area contains single family houses built following the end of the Second World War.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Suburb of Westdale</td>
<td>Ainslie Wood Westdale</td>
<td>The Westdale planned suburb is one of, if not the, first planned communities in Canada. It was built on 800 acres of land bordered on the east side by what is now the 403, on the west by McMaster, and between Cootes Paradise and Main street.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variety of rationale described in Table 4 demonstrates that one or more culture heritage landscapes could be designated in Durand based on a variety of factors, such as clusters of housing form with similar attributes ranging from intact streetscapes, housing type, and lot shape. With a culture heritage landscape, any new development can be required to provide a cultural heritage impact assessment that would identify and evaluate all potentially affected cultural heritage resources. This provides another "lens" through which to view neighbourhood character. Figure 48 shows some potential clusters for cultural heritage landscape that could be explored further.
Figure 48: Potential Cultural Heritage Landscapes Alongside Existing Heritage Conservation Districts
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5.1.8 Natural Heritage Policies

Policies in a Durand Secondary Plan can speak to the issues of natural heritage and the street canopy stipulating that:

- Street trees should be planted and replaced along streets in the community to improve and maintain the appearance of the streetscapes. This is consistent with policies in the Ainslie Wood Westdale Secondary Plan.42

5.1.9 Urban Design Policies

Policies regarding urban design can be included in a Durand Secondary Plan. These policies can address how new development should create and enhance the existing neighbourhood character through elements like a focus on the pedestrian experience and promoting human-scaled design, while creating links between built form and the neighbourhood character. More specifically, urban design policies can stipulate that:

- Development or redevelopment within Durand shall be sympathetic to and reflect the character of the existing built form for the neighbourhood.

- Elements such as landscaping, trees, setbacks, and massing should be used to minimize the impact of adjacent lower density residential from new development or redevelopment.

5.1.10 Urban Design Guidelines

Further, Urban Design Guidelines can be developed that will elaborate on how development or redevelopment can help maintain neighbourhood character in Durand. The purpose of the Urban Design Guidelines is to describe and direct design, and illustrate how design elements can guide future redevelopment and intensification potential. The Strathcona Urban Design Guidelines are an excellent, Hamilton-focussed model that can provide inspiration for Durand.

Typically, a set of design principles frame the guidelines. For Durand and the maintenance of its character, such principles could include the direction that:

- New development should address (face) the street so that it reinforces the streetscapes of the neighbourhood.

- New development that brings intensification should be moderately scaled so that it is more compatible with the existing built fabric. By referencing surrounding structures, new development should provide appropriate transitions within the neighbourhood.

- The pedestrian environment should be enhanced through development or redevelopment, including the provision of amenities such as street trees.
Under principles, **Built Form and Streetscape Guidelines** can then suggest that:

- Development shall be designed with a scale that balances height and massing with street widths and provides appropriate transitions to adjacent areas.
- Primary building entrances shall face the street and provide direct access from public sidewalks through well defined pathways to promote pedestrian safety and convenience.
- The number and widths of vehicular driveways and accesses shall be minimized, where possible.
- Street trees are an important part of the public realm and should be used to enhance the role of the street and promote visual interest.
5.2 Zoning

The next level of policy that should be used to help maintain Durand’s neighbourhood character is zoning. Zoning regulates at a parcel by parcel level and covers elements such as how the property may be used, such as lot sizes and dimensions, parking requirements, building heights, and distance from the street. Zoning should be consistent with the Official Plan and any applicable Secondary Plans.

5.2.1 Existing Zoning

The majority of Durand falls under City of Hamilton Zoning By-Law No. 6593, originally passed in 1950. The Northern most portion of the neighbourhood (from Hunter Street to Main Street) falls under the newer Downtown Zoning By-Law. Under current zoning some zone districts keep single family dwellings at 2.5 storeys or less. However, for multi-family dwellings, heights can go up to 12 storeys in some circumstances and higher density development can range between 8-18 storeys depending on the particular location.

The City of Hamilton is updating city-wide Comprehensive Zoning By-law No. 05-200 in stages. In July and October 2015, the City passed a series of zoning by-law amendments to add new zones for the rural area. The next phase of Zoning By-law No. 05-200 is focused on Commercial and Mixed Use Zones. Of particular relevance to Durand is an update to Residential Zones that will be dealt with in a subsequent phase.

5.2.2 Updates to the Comprehensive Zoning By-law No. 05-200

Outcomes from the Durand Neighbourhood Street Audits and Citizen Survey can be used as inputs into the update of the city-wide Comprehensive Zoning By-law when it enters the Residential Zones phase. This can inform how zones might be delineated to allow more compatible development within the existing neighbourhood. For example, the dominant lower heights (e.g. 2.5 storeys) around many parts of the neighbourhood could inform an update to where larger scale development is allowed and not allowed (e.g. up to 10-12 storeys).

This is consistent with the general approach to zoning in the existing by-law. However, a more location sensitive approach for heights could be applied. This would be consistent with policies for urban design contained in the 1987 Durand Neighbourhood Plan which suggested that zoning should be reviewed to ensure, “reduced heights for portions of the neighbourhood where lower heights predominate or where there are significant heritage buildings or streetscapes which should not be disturbed.”

Aside from height, many other elements can be incorporated into an update of the Comprehensive Zoning By-Law. Currently, one part of the By-Law that is already updated deals with the issue of parking across all property types. Of relevance to Durand is the section that deals with Single Detached Dwellings, Semi-Detached Dwellings and Duplex Dwellings. Policies. Current policies regarding driveways would allow some dwelling units to have a driveway width of up to 50 percent of the lot width. This width would be inconsistent with the dominant character width found in the street audits (see Figure 26). Thus, a more specific solution would need to be employed in Durand.
5.3.3 Durand Neighbourhood Zoning Overlay

Aside from updates to the Residential Zones in the Comprehensive Zoning By-law, the DNA can advocate for the approach whereby a neighbourhood overlay is adopted that ensure than an additional set of rules are applied to Durand that would address elements that speak to maintaining neighbourhood character. Specifically, there can be rules for some of the elements that were included in the street audits, consistent with the Ottawa overlay. The Ottawa approach stipulated that the dominant characteristics for each element would form the rules for development or redevelopment along a particular streetscape.

Further, the DNA could advocate that a mechanism similar to Ottawa’s Streetscape Character Analysis (SCA) be employed to determine what rules would apply to properties that fall under the overlay. In this way, “Your Street Gives You Your Rules” provides transparency as to why rules might be different street to street. It also provides flexibility street to street, which would accommodate some of the variations in character elements found in the Street Audits. The nature of the SCA also aligns well with the idea of active public participation in the implementation of policies related to neighbourhood planning, which was an original objective of the 1987 Durand Neighbourhood Plan and should be continued as part of an update to the Plan.

It is important to reiterate that the idea that surrounding houses on a street should give you a framework for rules moving forward is not new in the Hamilton context. As discussed earlier, the Ainslie Wood Westdale Secondary Plan contained policies that specifically advocated for this approach. The Streetscape Character Analysis simply puts more detail on what elements of the surrounding houses are important and enshrines the process at the zoning level as an overlay.

The overlay is applied as a zoning by-law amendment, so this could be investigated and applied on top of the updated zoning by law. An example of the Ottawa by-law is provided in Appendix B. The Streetscape Character Analysis (SCA) approach was explored earlier, including how it might look in Durand. For more information, the formal (SCA) manual is provided in Appendix A.

Note that the Ottawa approach uses three of the elements used in the Durand character audits and they cleared an appeal at the OMB. Potentially, additional character factors could be managed through other mechanisms and policies (e.g. secondary plan, zoning).
6.0 Implementation and Next Steps

The recommendations outlined in Section 5 touch on a number of issues, across a variety of policy areas. However, implementation of many recommendations will depend on the City of Hamilton’s timelines. Thus, the following list prioritizes suggested next steps for the Durand Neighbourhood Association to forward its efforts to maintain neighbourhood character.

The goal of the next steps is to provide direction for the DNA on how to achieve effective and concrete protections for neighbourhood character in the short term, while also ensuring that the unique character of the neighbourhood are recognized and protected in future planning regulation and policies.

**Short Term Actions**

1. **Confirming Timeline for A New Durand Secondary Plan**

   The previous Durand Neighbourhood Plan is 30 years old and requires updating. A new secondary plan will be a major policy tool to help maintain neighbourhood character in Durand. While a new secondary plan has been identified for Durand, the timing has not been confirmed and is marked by the City as a “mid-term priority”.

   **Action:** The DNA should confirm a timeline for a new Durand Secondary Plan.

2. **Durand Neighbourhood Zoning Overlay and Streetscape Character Analysis Pilot Project**

   As many municipal planning policy documents, including the secondary plan and zoning by-law, will potentially not be updated for a number of years, a neighbourhood overlay and streetscape character analysis pilot project should be considered for Durand. Ideally, an overlay should be introduced in coordination with an updated zoning by-law. However, the current timelines for this are uncertain, and therefore the pilot study should be considered in the short term.

   An overlay could ensure that an additional set of rules are applied to Durand that would address elements that directly address maintaining neighbourhood character. In addition, the DNA could advocate that a mechanism similar to Ottawa’s Streetscape Character Analysis (SCA) be employed to determine what rules would apply to properties that fall under the overlay.

   The Pilot project would allow the DNA, and the City, to build on key elements of existing regulation (e.g. 1987 Secondary Plan elements highlighting the importance of maintaining public participation in the implementation of the plan, or the UHOP, which details the importance of “established historical neighbourhoods”). An Overlay Pilot Project would allow the City to test this model, building on the research identified in this report, leading to a more permanent solution when the relevant policies and regulations are updated.

   **Action:** The DNA should advocate for an Overlay Pilot Project for Durand, employing a streetscape character analysis tool.
Medium Term Actions

3. **Updates to the Comprehensive Zoning By-law No. 05-200**

The majority of Durand falls under the old City of Hamilton Zoning By-Law No. 6593. The City of Hamilton is updating the new city-wide Comprehensive Zoning By-law No. 05-200 in stages. In July and October 2015, the City passed a series of zoning by-law amendments to add new zones for the rural area. The next phase of Zoning By-law No. 05-200 is focused on Commercial and Mixed Use Zones. Of particular relevance to Durand is an update to Residential Zones that will dealt with in a subsequent phase.

**Action:** Outcomes from the Durand Neighbourhood Street Audits and Citizen Survey should be used as inputs into the update of the city-wide Comprehensive Zoning By-law when it enters the Residential Zones phase.

4. **A New Durand Secondary Plan**

When the development of a new Durand Secondary Plan gets underway, the recommendations, policy research and data contained in this report can provide input for that process.

**Action:** Recommendations from this report, as well as the results of the Durand Neighbourhood Street Audits and Citizen Survey should be used as inputs into the development of the new Durand Secondary Plan.

Ongoing

5. **Current Durand Planning**

While the DNA pursues clarity on the timing of regulatory and zoning updates, it should continue to actively engage in public processes related to changes being sought for properties in the neighbourhood, for example via Committee of Adjustment or rezoning applications. The results of this report can assist the DNA in this effort in three ways, first it provides a detailed chronology of existing (albeit outdated) policy and regulation relating to the neighbourhood. Second, the streetscape audits provide detailed data about a variety of specific character elements across the neighbourhood, highlighting distinct areas where certain character features are dominant and should be preserved. Finally, the results of the resident survey provides the DNA with clear direction from a cross section of residents about the importance of maintaining neighbourhood character.

**Action:** The outcomes contained in this report, including the neighbourhood research, street audits and citizen survey, could be used to inform contemporary planning decisions in Durand including through Committee of Adjustment applications, development, or re-zoning applications.
7.0 Conclusions

Durand is at a transformative moment in its history. It is a neighbourhood facing the challenge of managing new development and redevelopment while maintaining existing neighbourhood character.

The Durand Neighbourhood Association (DNA) is rising to this challenge. It is working to better understand the existing character of its neighbourhood and the perspectives of its residents. This knowledge will help lay the foundations for future residential development that complements and enhances the existing community, helping the neighbourhood to grow in a way that reflects and respects its long history.

This study provides valuable information and guidance for the DNA, City planning staff, civic leaders, and the community as a whole.

At its heart, this is a made-in-Durand solution. While it builds on a selection of existing planning documents and best practices for understanding neighbourhood character, it is rooted in the local community. It reflects not just the thoughts and input of local residents about their neighbourhood, but also their direct participation in cataloguing its existing built environment. The steps proposed here provide the Durand Neighbourhood Association with several avenues it can pursue to promote growth and change in the neighbourhood that is consistent with its existing character.
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