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Executive Summary

This report explores the opportunities and challenges of developing a community land trust model for the Beasley neighbourhood of Hamilton, Ontario as a means of implementing the Beasley Neighbourhood Plan and managing the neighbourhood’s long-term development. It is intended as a background study to provide context and a timeline for further research into the financial and legal feasibility of the model.

The community land trust model is introduced, including its historical development in Canada and the United States, its key features, size and staffing, uses, and start-up considerations. It is found that the community land trust model is flexible and capable of addressing issues in both strong and weak market communities.

In the Beasley context, it is found that the CLT model should be used for enhancing and maintaining affordability, attracting new residents to support businesses, neighbourhood intensification, and community empowerment. Particular areas of the neighbourhood are most in need of attention due to their abundance of underutilised land and importance for the neighbourhood and city’s overall revitalisation.

It is recommended that a steering group be formed to secure funding for technical research into the feasibility of a Beasley Community Land Trust. An approximate timeline is provided for the first four years of operation.
# Contents

Acknowledgements 4
Executive Summary 5
List of Tables and Figures 8

1.0 INTRODUCTION 10
   1.1 Purpose 11
   1.2 Methods 11

2.0 BEASLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN 13
   2.1 Background 13
   2.2 Goals 14
   2.3 Implementation 14

3.0 COMMUNITY LAND TRUSTS 16
   3.1 Introduction 16
   3.2 U.S. and Canadian Development of the Model 16
   3.3 Key Features 18
   3.4 What are CLTs Used for? 19
   3.5 CLT Personnel and Service Areas 23
   3.7 Facilitation vs. Development 23
   3.8 Homeownership Support Programs 24
   3.9 Critical Success Factors 24

4.0 BEASLEY BACKGROUND STUDY 25
   4.1 Introduction 25
   4.2 Context 25
   4.3 Community Survey 26
   4.4 Neighbourhood Profile 27
   4.5 Existing Land Uses 28
   4.6 Land Use Barriers to Revitalisation 39
   4.7 Neighbourhood Change 39
5.0  LAND USE POLICY CONTEXT  
   5.1  Introduction  
   5.2  West Harbour Secondary Plan  
   5.3  Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan  
   5.4  Downtown Heritage Character Zone  
   5.5  Intensive Programs  

6.0  DEVELOPING A BEASLEY CLT  
   6.1  Opportunities  
   6.2  Challenges  
   6.3  Financing a CLT  

7.0  CONCLUSION  
   7.1  Limitations and Areas Requiring Further Study  
   7.2  Action Items for Developing a CLT  

Appendices
# List of Tables and Figures

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Caption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1</td>
<td>Streets in Beasley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2</td>
<td>Beasley in Context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2.0 BEASLEY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Caption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Plan Goals and Objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 3.0 COMMUNITY LAND TRUSTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Box</th>
<th>Caption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Box 1</td>
<td>The Four Waves of Community Land Trusts in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4</td>
<td>Tripartite Governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5</td>
<td>“Bus Barns” Brownfield Redevelopment in Burlington, VT: Before and After</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 2</td>
<td>Skills and People Needed for a CLT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 4.0 BEASLEY BACKGROUND STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Caption</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6</td>
<td>Pre and Post-War Development Co-Exist in Beasley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box 3</td>
<td>Community Survey Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7</td>
<td>Poverty Rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 8</td>
<td>High School Non-Completion Rate Per 1000 Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 9</td>
<td>Population Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 10</td>
<td>Housing and Mobility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 11</td>
<td>Gore Park in South Beasley/Downtown Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 12</td>
<td>Current Land Uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 13</td>
<td>Barton Street in North Beasley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 14</td>
<td>Business Improvement Areas and James North Merchants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 15</td>
<td>Social Services and Social Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 16</td>
<td>Surface Parkling Lots and Auto-Related Businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 17</td>
<td>Varieties of Housing in North Beasley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 18</td>
<td>Example Infill Lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 19</td>
<td>Mix of Land Uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 20  Parks and Green Space with 400m (Walkable) Radius
Figure 21  Vacant Land and Buildings
Figure 22  The Monthly Art Crawl on James North Attracts a New Demographic to the Neighbourhood
Figure 23  William Thomas Condos Rendering
Figure 24  Tivoli Condos Signage
Figure 25  Royal Connaught Condos Rendering

5.0 LAND USE POLICY CONTEXT

Figure 26  The Ferguson-Wellington Corridor
Figure 27  Development Permit Areas
Figure 28  Conceptual Diagram for Proposed John/Rebecca Park
Figure 29  Proposed New Park and Surrounding Building Densities
Figure 30  Zoning
Figure 31  Maximum Building Heights Measured in Stories

6.0 DEVELOPING A BEASLEY CLT

Box 4  CLT Outcomes and Activities
Box 5  Non-Profit Housing Providers with > 100 Units
Box 6  Land Currently for Sale in Beasley

7.0 CONCLUSION

Box 7  Approximate Start-Up Timeline
The Beasley neighbourhood has a population of just under six thousand (Social Planning and Research Council, 2012, p.4) and is located in downtown Hamilton, Ontario, which is 70km southwest of Toronto. Officially bounded by James St. N to the west, Wellington St. N to the east, the CN rail tracks to the north and Main St. E to the south, Beasley encompasses the north-eastern portion of Downtown Hamilton as well as adjoining commercial, residential and industrial lands.

The Lake Ontario/Burlington Bay waterfront and industrial areas lie to the north of the neighbourhood. For the purposes of this study, Beasley’s area has been expanded to include the west side of the James St. commercial district due to the street’s significance in the area’s revitalisation.

Beasley is home to a high concentration of low-income and marginalised residents, attracted to the area by its stock of affordable rental housing, including relatively low cost market-rent units, social housing and seniors housing, and by its centrality, accessibility, and services.

A transitional neighbourhood with a high turnover of residents, Beasley is frequently the “stopping
In addition to the social problems that come to areas with high rates of poverty, Beasley also struggles with a lack of neighbourhood amenities, poor quality housing and a lack of housing options, vacant and underutilised land, and locally unwanted land uses such as industrial warehousing. There is also a high incidence of absentee landlords and real estate speculation (C. Mattina, personal communication, September 15, 2013).

Together these issues continue to prevent reinvestment in the neighbourhood and make it more difficult to address the neighbourhood’s social challenges.

Purpose

The purpose of this report is to explore the opportunities and challenges associated with developing a Beasley Community Land Trust in order address land-use issues and the lack of community influence on development. The CLT is investigated as a tool for the community to help realise its plans, especially where they involve the physical assets of the neighbourhood such as its land, residential and commercial buildings, and public spaces. The report also provides a list of immediate action items and items requiring further study if a CLT is to be developed.

Methods

Because this report has been prepared for use by the Beasley community, it draws on a methodology that aligns more closely with what is traditionally used for community organising. Along with more traditional research, the content of this report has been shaped by conversations over coffee and walks through the neighbourhood, as well as topics discussed at relevant community meetings, presentations, webinars and conferences.
The following formal methods were used to meet the objectives of this report:

**CLT Literature Review** - drawn from relevant academic journals and books, CLT and CLT Network websites, reports and surveys from CLT networks and research bodies, student theses, and media coverage.

**Policy Analysis** – review of plans and policies affecting development and revitalisation in Beasley, including the Beasley Neighbourhood Plan and Neighbourhood Charter, the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan, the West Harbour Secondary Plan, the Downtown Heritage Character Zone, and various financial incentive programs.

**Key Informant Interviews** – informal/conversational interviews with members of the Beasley community and the Beasley Neighbourhood Association, and those who work in the community in the areas of community and economic development, neighbourhood development, urban planning, and social finance/social innovation. This study was also aided by an in-depth conversation with one of the founders of the Neighbourhood Land Trust in Parkdale, Toronto (see Appendix A for a list of topics discussed).

**Case Examples** - gathered from publicly available information on CLT websites and in reports produced by CLT networks in the United States and the United Kingdom and other research bodies such as the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Association and the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.


**Analysis of Neighbourhood Change** – including commercial and demographic changes. Information on neighbourhood change is drawn from media coverage, City of Hamilton documents, personal observation over approximately ten years, and a four hour tour of the neighbourhood from a long-time resident.

**Mapping of Planning and Development Context** – including existing land-uses, vacancies, public land ownership, BIAs, zoning, and building heights. Maps of existing conditions were created from data from the City of Hamilton’s GIS mapping service, tours of the neighbourhood by key informants, and personal observational surveys. Zoning and building heights maps were created from the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (2011).
Beasley Neighbourhood Plan

Background

The Beasley Neighbourhood Association (BNA) first formed in 2007 with the support of the Hamilton Community Foundation’s Growing Roots-Strengthening Neighbourhoods (GRSN) program. GRSN supported four neighbourhoods including Beasley through community development staff, small grants, and capacity building programs.

The objective of GRSN was to support neighbourhood-based activities that were driven by residents and volunteers rather than professional service delivery organisations (Hamilton Community Foundation, 2013). The BNA, originally called Beasley Neighbours for Neighbours, grew out of this program and the need for an organised voice to empower the Beasley community (C. Mattina, personal communication, October 21, 2013).

The first major initiative of the BNA was to create a neighbourhood charter, the bulk of which occurred from 2009-2011 and is still ongoing. Based on the UK model, the Beasley Charter is a voluntary partnership agreement between the community, the City of Hamilton, other service providers, and businesses in Beasley. The charter outlines the roles and responsibilities of each signatory in the effort to

Figure 3: Neighbourhood Plan Goals and Objectives

improve quality of life in Beasley by working together. The most significant deliverable of the Beasley Charter has been the Beasley Neighbourhood Plan, drafted in 2012. Based on community meetings, outreach, and a survey of residents, the plan establishes directions for Beasley’s future social, environmental, economic, and cultural development (Beasley Neighbourhood Plan, 2012, p.11).

Goals and Actions

With the overall goal of fostering ownership and empowerment, the plan is broken-down into four goal areas with multiple objectives, and specific actions that can be taken to support these objectives. The plan goals and objectives are depicted in Figure 3. The four goals are to:

- increase the sense of health, safety, and security
- improve social and cultural connections
- strengthen business and economic opportunities
- improve neighbourhood design

The plan takes a comprehensive approach to community development, recognising the relationship between diverse factors. Included in this is the physical and economic revitalisation of the neighbourhood through:

- neighbourhood intensification
- attracting new residents and development
- encouraging the development of mixed-income housing
- preventing dumping
- improving alleyways
- creating a community garden in or near Beasley Park
- expanding green space and recreational facilities
- making street design liveable
- supporting existing businesses and attracting new ones

Neighbourhood intensification without gentrification, primarily through the encouragement of compact, mixed-income housing, has since been labelled a priority action by the Beasley Neighbourhood Charter (Beasley Neighbourhood Plan, 2012, p.73).

Implementation

Implementation of the neighbourhood plan is led by residents with the support of the City of Hamilton through its Neighbourhood Action Strategy and the Hamilton Community Foundation, who have jointly provided Beasley with a community development worker. Residents are encouraged to pursue partnerships with government, businesses, non-profits and community groups (City of Hamilton, 2013b).

To date, the Beasley community has already taken a number of actions to implement the neighbourhood plan, focusing first on small-scale initiatives that together have had a big impact. Examples of these kinds of initiatives include the creation of community murals in Beasley and McLaren parks (a section of the McLaren park mural is pictured on the cover-page of this document) and movie nights hosted throughout the neighbourhood. Actions like these can “take back” a space, affecting people’s real and perceived safety and sense of community.

The BNA and its partners have also been working on some more complex changes, including an alleyway project that would improve and provide programming to the neighbourhood’s neglected and dangerous alleys, as well as working with the City to redevelop Beasley Park and to improve street and traffic design in problem areas (C. Mattina, personal communication, September 15, 2013).

While recognising the important work that is ongoing in Beasley, the focus of this report is on those objectives set out in the neighbourhood plan that are a greater challenge and require more tools
than are currently at the neighbourhood’s disposal. In particular, the physical development of the neighbourhood presently relies on a combination of private market forces and government regulations and incentives, given that the private, for-profit sector is primarily responsible for delivering development.

The following sections explore the community land trust model as a means of lessening the gap between Beasley’s development plans and the actual delivery of that development. In particular, it will look at the use of the model for revitalising the neighbourhood while protecting affordability.
Community Land Trusts

Introduction

The community land trust (CLT) is an innovative model of land tenure which removes parcels of land from the speculative real estate market and places this land in the hands of a private, non-profit organisation which is mandated to steward its long-term use.

CLTs each serve a particular geographic area and have an open, place-based membership and democratically elected board. “CLTs retain ownership of the land, yet grant the right to use that land to third parties through long-term leasehold agreements. This structure allows the CLT to retain control over who has access to the land, and removes the land cost from the [...] equation which enhances affordability” (CMHC, 2005, p.1).

Community land trusts typically focus their efforts on the provision of perpetually affordable housing, and other social objectives that fall under the umbrella of community and economic development. This distinguishes them from environmental land trusts, which exist to preserve land from development for environmental and/or recreational reasons (BALTA, 2009). In Canada, the environmental land trust is more common and is the focus of the Canadian Land Trust Alliance. The Head-of-the-Lake Land Trust run by the Hamilton Naturalist Club is a local example.

This section will provide an introduction to the community land trust model, covering its history, structure, and mechanisms. It will also review the factors that typically lead communities to start CLTs, both in weak and strong real estate markets.

Since there are numerous explanations of the CLT model already available to the public (see, for example, Bunce, 2013; UN HABITAT, 2012; National CLT Network UK, 2012; Davis and Jacobus, 2008; Davis, 2007; Housing Strategies, 2005) this report will focus on synthesizing what is most useful to the Beasley context. This includes an emphasis where possible on the Canadian context, and on land trusts that are community-driven, focus on revitalisation, and have a neighbourhood service area. It should therefore not be seen as a comprehensive account of the CLT model in all its varying forms and uses.

U.S. and Canadian Development of the Model

The urban community land trust model as it exists today originated in the United States in 1981 with the Community Land Co-Operative in Cincinnati. Today, there are well over 240 CLTs in the United States, with a significantly higher concentration in New England relative to the rest of the country (Thaden, 2012). CLTs can also be found in the UK, Canada, Australia, Belgium, Africa and the Middle East (Lincoln Institute, 2007, Housing Strategies, 2005).

Rosenberg and Yuen (2012) describe the way the model has morphed over time by breaking the movement down into four distinct waves (see Box 1). Although the development of CLTs in Canada has followed a different path historically, the movements in both countries have been converging since the 1990s. A further trend in the model as identified by Davis and Jacobus (2008) is an increased government role in developing CLTs especially since the mid-2000s, although this trend is less apparent in Canada.

According to Housing Strategies’ (2005) report for the CMHC, CLTs first began to appear in Canada in the 1970s but were at that time primarily created by the co-operative housing sector. CMHC distinguishes between three kinds of CLTs: community-based, sector based (co-op sector), and publicly-based. Community-based CLTs which more closely resemble the grassroots American model did not appear in Canada until the later 1990s, and focused on housing like their American counterparts.

Canadian pioneers of that model include the West Broadway CLT in Winnipeg (circa 1999), the
### Box 1: Four Waves of Community Land Trusts in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Key Features</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First Wave</strong> 1969-1970s</td>
<td>• part of the civil rights movement to secure land for rural African-American farmers</td>
<td>• New Communities in Lee County, Georgia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Second Wave** 1980s | • application of the model to urban settings  
• rapid expansion of the model  
• model used in revitalisation and grassroots efforts to resist gentrification  
• The *Community Land Trust Handbook* published in 1982 by the Institute for Community Economics formalised the model, introduced key elements of affordability and long-term stewardship | • Community Land Co-Operative in Cincinnati, Ohio  
• Burlington (now Champlain) Housing Trust in Burlington, Vermont  
• Dudley Street Neighbors Incorporated in Boston, Massachusetts |
| **Third Wave** 1990s-Early 2000s | • housing boom years of the early 90s and associated affordability issues  
• significant government funding for affordable housing  
• larger pool of homebuyers due to access to low-interest, fixed-rate mortgages and low unemployment rates  
• 190 CLTs in 2007, most with primary focus on affordable homeownership | |
| **Fourth Wave** Early 2000s-Present | • smaller pool of potential homebuyers after 2008 market crash and recession  
• introduction of food security as an issue receiving mainstream attention  
• shift in focus beyond homeownership to other tenures  
• introduction of non-residential development including commercial and urban agriculture  
• renewed attention to neighbourhood revitalisation | |

Central Edmonton CLT (circa 1998), the Salt Spring Community Housing and Land Trust Society in British Columbia (circa 2002), and the Calgary Community Land Trust Society (circa 2002).

More recently, the Neighbourhood Land Trust in Parkdale, Toronto has emerged as a fourth-wave start-up CLT with a stated focus on food security through the provision of affordable rental housing, community gardens and commercial space (Richer et. al, 2010).

Compared to the United States, community land trusts in Canada are rare and so is model-specific funding and network support (Housing Strategies, 2005).

**Key Features**

Davis and Jacobus (2008) provides an excellent summary of the key features exhibited by most community land trusts. This summary is based on the original American model as developed by the Institute for Community Economics in 1982, and incorporates some common variations in the model that have developed over time:

"**Nonprofit, tax-exempt corporation.** A community land trust is an independent, nonprofit corporation that is chartered in the state where it is located. Most CLTs are started from scratch, but some are grafted onto existing nonprofit corporations. Most CLTs target their activities and resources toward charitable goals such as providing housing for low-income people and redeveloping blighted neighborhoods, and are therefore eligible for 501(c)(3) [charitable] designation.

**Dual ownership.** The CLT acquires multiple parcels of land throughout a targeted geographic area with the intention of retaining ownership permanently. The parcels do not need to be contiguous. Any buildings already located or later constructed on the land are sold to individual homeowners, condo owners, cooperative housing corporations, nonprofit developers of rental housing, or other nonprofit, governmental, or for-profit entities.

**Leased land.** CLTs provide for the exclusive use of their land by the owners of any buildings located thereon. Parcels of land are conveyed to individual homeowners (or the owners of other types of residential or commercial structures) through long-term ground leases.

**Perpetual affordability.** By design and by intent, the CLT is committed to preserving the affordability of housing and other structures on its land. The CLT retains an option to repurchase any structures located upon its land if their owners choose to sell. The resale price is set by a formula in the ground lease providing current owners a fair return on their investments and future buyers fair access to housing at an affordable price.

**Perpetual responsibility.** As the owner of the underlying land and of an option to repurchase any buildings located on that land, the CLT has an abiding interest in what happens to these structures and to the people who occupy them. The ground lease requires owner occupancy and responsible use of the premises. If buildings become hazardous, the CLT has the right to force repairs. If property owners default on their mortgages, the CLT has the right to cure the default, forestalling foreclosure.

**Open, place-based membership.** The CLT operates within the boundaries of a targeted area. It is guided by, and accountable to, the people who call this locale their home. Any adult who resides on the CLT’s land or within the area the CLT deems as its “community” can become a voting member. The community may comprise a single neighborhood, multiple neighborhoods, or even an entire town, city, or county.

**Community control.** Voting members who either live on the CLT’s land or reside in the CLT’s targeted area
nominate and elect two-thirds of a CLT’s board of directors.

**Tripartite governance.** The board of directors of the classic CLT has three parts, each with an equal number of seats. One-third represents the interests of people who lease land from the CLT; one-third represents the interests of residents of the surrounding community who do not lease CLT land; and one-third is made up of public officials, local funders, nonprofit providers of housing or social services, and other individuals presumed to speak for the public interest.

![Figure 4: Tripartite Governance](image)

**Expansionist program.** CLTs are committed to an active acquisition and development program that is aimed at expanding their holdings of land and increasing the supply of affordable housing and other structures under their stewardship.

**Flexible development.** While land is always the key ingredient, the types of projects that CLTs pursue and the roles they play in developing the projects vary widely. Many CLTs do development with their own staff, while others delegate this responsibility to partners. Some focus on a single type and tenure of housing, while others develop housing of many types and tenures. Other CLTs focus more broadly on comprehensive community development."

*(Davis and Jacobus, 2008, p. 5)*

Not all CLTs adopt all of the key features listed by Davis. For instance, the rising number of CLTs that have been initiated by municipalities in recent years in the United States (Davis and Jacobus, 2008, p.34) may have resulted in a drop in the proportion of CLTs that operate under the tradition of an open membership base that holds voting powers (Thaden, 2012). Nonetheless, a CLT that is inspired by the traditional grassroots model will likely adopt a majority of these features.

Despite the variations in the model, the ground lease remains the primary tool used by CLTs for maintaining stewardship and perpetual affordability. 82% of the organisations surveyed by the National Community Land Trust Network in 2011 reported using the ground lease (Thaden, 2012, p.17).

**What are CLTs used for?**

The CLT model is flexible in its structure and mechanisms, and it can likewise be used to address a variety of issues depending on the context and market conditions in the community it serves.

**Strong-Market Communities**

In communities with already strong real estate markets and high housing costs, the model is typically used to combat residential gentrification, to maintain or increase the stock of affordable housing, and to perpetually limit the escalating resale values of homes (Housing Strategies, 2005).

In these communities, homes may be unaffordable not only to low-income residents but also to those...
with moderate incomes or higher (Mallach, 2005, p.7). Indeed, the 2011 CLT Network Survey found that a large majority of American land trusts are providing housing for those who make up to 80% of the area median income or higher (i.e. 100 or 120%), while occasionally reserving some units for lower income brackets (Thaden, 2012, p.20).

Zukin (2009, 2010) calls attention to the rise of “boutiquing” or upscaling of urban commercial districts since the 1990s, suggesting commercial gentrification may be a new frontier for an increasing number of CLTs in the future. In the case of the Neighbourhood Land Trust in Parkdale, the CLT has been created in part to curb commercial gentrification which has contributed to food insecurity and the loss of neighbourhood serving businesses (Richer et. al, 2010).

**Weak-Market Communities**

In communities that have seen disinvestment, CLTs address different issues because affordability problems are most heavily concentrated among very low-income families (Mallach 2005, p.7). There is also a need to tie housing investment to plans for comprehensive neighbourhood development that would boost housing demand among middle-income earners (Mallach, 2005).

The use of the model for revitalising distressed communities is less common, but has been given renewed attention as part of the fourth wave of CLTs. It requires flexibility and innovation in the model, providing safe and affordable housing in addition to neighbourhood assets that enhance livability and attract new residents such as parks, community gardens, public spaces, and vibrant commercial areas (Rosenberg and Yuen 2012, Sorce, 2012, Gauger, 2006, Mallach, 2005).

To address current housing needs, CLTs in these areas may deal with problems of housing quality that are faced by low income and new immigrant renter households while also creating mixed-income housing in an effort to address concentrated poverty and bring investment to the neighbourhood (Mallach 2005). CLTs in these neighbourhoods may provide rental housing in addition to homeownership opportunities depending on the local context and whether or not the population they serve is homeownership ready (Mallach 2005, p.25).

**Brownfields Redevelopment**

The use of CLTs in weak-market communities frequently involves developing or redeveloping land that the private market has overlooked, since developing it does not fit within the expectations of low-risk, short-term profit. Brownfield lots in these neighbourhoods often fall into this category because they have clean-up costs and risks that are higher than their expected short-term resale value.

*Figure 5: “Bus Barns” Brownfield Redevelopment in Burlington, VT: Before and After*
Because brownfield sites can be so important for an area’s revitalisation, some CLTs take on the challenging role of redeveloping brownfields. For example, the Champlain Housing Trust in Burlington, Vermont actively acquires and remediates unwanted brownfield properties in key parts of the downtown to encourage revitalisation (Hersh, 2007) (see Figure 5 for an example). The organisation now owns more brownfield properties per capita than any other entity (Wernstedt and Hanson, 2009).

Equitable Revitalisation

One of the key tensions facing nearly every effort to revitalise communities is the dual threat of gentrification and displacement that occurs particularly when redevelopment is designed primarily to attract new, higher-income residents. The addition of neighbourhood amenities such as parks and transit and removal of undesirable characteristics such as industrial land uses increases demand for housing in neighbourhoods and drives up property values.

In discussing the impacts of neighbourhood change on low-income residents, Mallach (2007) distinguishes between homeowners, renters and social housing occupants. In all cases, higher cost burdens threaten to displace residents and reduce the overall availability of affordable housing units. Although low-income homeowners can significantly benefit from the changes when their home is eventually sold to a more affluent homebuyer, they may not be able to afford to remain in the neighbourhood.

Mallach also distinguishes between the immediate threat of displacement for existing residents and the overall reduction in the stock of affordable housing

Factors that may lead to displacement include:

- increased property taxes for homeowners
- increased rents for renters
- pressure from landlords to vacate
- eviction from units for social housing residents due to redevelopment or conversion to market-rate units

Factors that reduce the overall stock of affordable housing include:

- increased housing prices
- increased rents
- elimination of rental units when new homebuyers
convert multi-unit properties into single-family homes
- new housing built will target more affluent demographics
- conversion of rentals to condominiums
- conversion of social housing to market-rate housing
- demolition of social housing for “higher and better” uses

(Mallach 2007, p.14).

The goal of revitalisation without displacement is one of striking a balance between the introduction of new residents and businesses into a neighbourhood while enabling existing residents to remain and benefit from these changes. Former Senior Planner of Vancouver Brent Toderian (2013) describes the process of creating what he calls “shared neighbourhoods”, which involves:

“Careful, considered moves to add new and diverse people, reuse and restore vacant buildings, add new stores and services, all while maintaining and hopefully even strengthening the supports and services for the existing and vital low-income community.”

(Toderian, 2013)

In its use for neighbourhood development, the CLT has become a rare tool capable of promoting revitalisation without displacement (Sorce 2012). Gauger (2006) describes the way community land trusts are able to both steer communities into revitalisation and transform over time in response to increasing land values:

“Because a CLT is a representative organisation that assumes perpetual ownership of land, the organisation can initiate long-term and complex planning strategies, respond over time to the changing housing needs of members, and provide additional services to residents. A CLT’s continual ownership of land effectively positions the organisation to deal with an eventual increase in demand for property within the neighborhood. A CLT can both guide the early redevelopment of a neighborhood and continue to guard the interest of low income residents if the area begins to experience gentrification”

(Gauger, 2006, p.8).

Neighbourhood change is a controversial but sometimes necessary step along the road to healthy and vibrant communities. Because CLTs revitalise communities in conjunction with developing permanently affordable housing, they present a concrete solution to the seemingly intractable problem of displacement. The ability for a CLT to do this of course depends on the significance of their land

---

**Box 2 : Skills and People Needed for a CLT**

- Property management
- Law
- Fundraising
- Community development (including social services, affordable housing and homelessness)
- Real estate
- Land development (developers)
- Affordable housing design, construction and renovation (architects and homebuilders)
- City planning
- Government funding programs
- Banks and other lending institutions
- Home inspections
- Financial management and accounting
- Business management
- Communications
- Environmental consulting
- Homeownership education and training

holdings (Fainstein, 2012) and the emphasis that is placed on affordability and the interests of low-income residents (Fraser and Kick, 2007). Additional programming may also be needed to prevent the immediate displacement of vulnerable residents, particularly low-income renters.

**CLT Personnel and Service Areas**

The results of the 2011 National Community Land Trust Network survey suggest that CLTs are typically small organisations with a heavy volunteer base, and they serve a variety of geographic areas (Thaden, 2012).

Box 2 outlines many of the skills and people that contribute to administering CLTs, though this will vary depending on the CLT’s activities.

**Geographic Boundaries**

Of the ninety-six CLTs in the United States who were surveyed, 14% operated at the neighbourhood level, with 16% operating at the city level, and the largest proportion (31%) operating at the county level (Thaden, 2012, p.10).

CLTs operating at the neighbourhood level are more likely to be grassroots and focused on community empowerment, whereas those operating at a larger scale have the advantage of being able to scale-up their operations over time and become less reliant on grants (Davis and Jacobus, 2008). The geographic service area also impacts on what types of funding might be available (Davis, 2007, p. 7).

**Size of Organisation**

Staff-wise CLTs are small, typically employing around three staff members, although one municipally-run CLT reported nine-hundred staff members and the next highest was ninety. 87% of those organisations (n=15) who reported zero paid staff members were recent start-ups, suggesting that CLTs are more likely to be volunteer-driven in the early stages. In terms of governing board size, numbers ranged from zero to twenty-two individuals, with an average of roughly nine.

**Organisational Membership**

Roughly one third of the organisations reported having an organisational membership base. Of those with organisational memberships, one (Champlain Housing Trust) had 5000 members. However, the next-highest membership size was five-hundred and the median number of members was seventy-nine. All of the membership bases were tasked with electing a majority of the governing board, and most were tasked with helping with community outreach and public relations. Two-thirds of the membership bases helped raise money for the organisation.

**Facilitation vs. Development**

One of the key decisions that any CLT must make when starting-up is whether to directly develop the land themselves or to act as a facilitator, working with partners who carry the expertise and resources to act as developers and/or property managers (Davis, 2007, p.11). This decision will greatly shape the CLTs size and need for skills and resources, as well as its ability to determine what developments occur.

Most CLTs that carry-out development themselves do so because there is a need for certain developments and no existing organisation, public or private, that can fill that need (Davis and Jacobus, 2008, p.36). This can be one of the most powerful uses of the CLT model, particularly in neighbourhoods that have experienced disinvestment. However, it is also a massive undertaking for an organisation that may lack any development experience. Commercial developments are particularly difficult.
In some cases, a CLT will address this trade-off by acting as developer on some key projects while partnering with other organisations on the remaining projects. The primary role of the CLT should always be stewardship of land, and one should only diversify into other areas if it does not compromise the original intent of the organisation (Davis and Jacobus, 2008).

**Homeownership Support Programs**

In addition to acting as developers/facilitators of development, many CLTs also provide programming intended to support low-income homeownership. Acting alone or in partnership, CLTs may offer programs such as foreclosure prevention training and home repair education and financing.

**Critical Success Factors**

There is no guarantee that a start-up CLT will succeed in the long-run. However, there are steps a CLT organisation can take that will increase their chances of sustaining their operations. In Housing Strategies (2005) qualitative survey of Canadian and American CLTs, they found the following factors to be critical for their success:

- a sustainable business plan
- strong leadership and administration
- community support
- education and outreach
- community partnerships
- funding and capitalization
- capacity building
- a national network and technical assistance
- government support

Many of these factors are shaped during the crucial early stages when key decisions about the CLT model are made and key partnerships are formed.
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Beasley Background Study

Introduction

This section provides a background study on the Beasley neighbourhood in order to give context for the creation of a community land trust. It is intended to provide information on and an inventory of existing conditions in the Beasley study area.

The study first places Beasley in the context of industrial and downtown decline in Hamilton, including its gradual emergence as a revitalising, post-industrial city. It will then cover the overall strengths and weaknesses of Beasley according to residents, and the neighbourhood's social profile, current land uses, and land-use barriers to revitalisation. Lastly, this study includes a discussion of the onset of neighbourhood change in Beasley.

Context

The city of Hamilton has followed a similar trajectory as many industrial cities following the decline of manufacturing and the rise of the suburb. Rising to prominence during the industrial era of the late 1800s, Hamilton was built as a compact urban area with a vibrant mix of commercial, residential and industrial uses downtown; “Up until the 1950s, Downtown Hamilton was the heart of retail and business activity, and contained healthy and stable residential neighbourhoods” (City of Hamilton, 2012, p.2).

In the post-war era, increasing affluence and the rise of the automobile led many city-dwellers to move out to the cleaner pastures of the suburbs. The City began talking downtown renewal in the mid-1950s after Centre Mall was built in the city’s eastern suburbs, threatening to steal shoppers away from the older downtown area (Rockwell, 2009).

At that time, renewal was a heavily top-down process, exemplified by the expropriation and demolition of six entire city blocks that now contains the Jackson Square Shopping Centre, a suburban-style indoor shopping mall with offices and a hotel (Rockwell, 2009).

Although moderately successful as a shopping centre, Jackson Square and similar auto-centric developments only accelerated the decline of the downtown area. A series of one-way thoroughfares and pedestrian overpasses were implemented that allow traffic to speed through the downtown core relatively unimpeded. Older buildings were torn down and replaced by parking lots and low-rise commercial plazas (see Appendix B for aerial images of Beasley in 19 versus 2011).

Market stresses also contributed to the downtown’s decline. Once the country’s largest steel producer, Hamilton’s traditional economy took a major hit with changing technologies and the new international division of labour. Commercial and office jobs left the downtown core, and many foundries and factories were also left vacant and contaminated.
As one of the oldest and most central neighbourhoods in Hamilton, Beasley has borne the brunt of both the government-led postwar renewal schemes and the market stresses.

Beasley became severely disinvested and residential property values sank, attracting vulnerable residents and adding high poverty, crime and drug use to the list of issues plaguing the neighbourhood. In 2006 Beasley was identified as the poorest neighbourhood in Hamilton and one of the poorest in the country (Dunphy, 2006).

Hamilton is gradually shifting away from its industrial roots to a post-industrial economy based in health care, education, culture and the service industry. In the mid-2000s, parts of Beasley began to turn around, energized by support for resident-driven efforts, a highly engaged arts community, and government investments. However, the neighbourhood continues to face numerous barriers to revitalisation.

Community Survey

A survey of Beasley residents was conducted by the BNA to inform the creation of the neighbourhood plan. The findings of the survey (Box 3) provide a good overview of the strengths and weaknesses of the neighbourhood as understood by residents.

Strengths of the neighbourhood include its character and community as well as its central location close to a mix of shops, services, residential areas, and cultural activities. Residents also noted as a positive the fact that Beasley is currently regenerating.

Issues identified by the survey include negative perceptions of the neighbourhood, vacant and underutilised spaces, unsafe neighbourhood design, and poverty.

Box 3: Positives

- The Heart of the City
- Central
- Diverse and Multi-Cultural
- Historic
- Full of Potential
- Lots of Character
- Urban
- Walkable
- Livable
- Resilient
- Regenerating
- Dynamic
- Good Mix of Shops/Homes/Apartments
- Schools/Hospitals/Services All Around Us
- Creative
- Arts/Entertainment/Festivals
- Rich in Assets
- Strong Sense of Community

Box 3: Negatives

- Empty Spaces
- Vacant Buildings
- Neighbourhood Design
- Traffic and Safety Issues
- Perception of Crime
- Social Issues
- Poverty
- Bad Reputation
- Underrated
- Abused
- Neglected
- Polluted
- Gritty
- Underutilised
- Self-Critical

Neighbourhood Profile

The Social Planning and Research Council of Hamilton (SPRC) produced a series of neighbourhood profiles in 2012 on behalf of the United Way covering those neighbourhoods selected to be a part of the City of Hamilton’s Neighbourhood Action Strategy, including one for Beasley. Selected measures have been included in this report based on their significance in Beasley and relevance for developing a community land trust.

The SPRC profiles are based on 2006 Census data from Statistics Canada, as well as more recent data from the Hamilton Spectator’s Code Red series in 2010. The high school non-completion rates were provided for the Code Red series from the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board.

Unfortunately, updated data on the measures included in this report are not available at the neighbourhood level in Beasley due to changes in data collection methods for the 2011 Census that introduced a voluntary survey in place of the mandatory long-form Census. In addition to general data accuracy concerns with the new survey (Carter, 2013), a low response rate in Beasley’s northern census tract has caused Statistics Canada to not release the data.

Findings

The SPRC found that in 2006 Beasley had a poverty rate that was three times higher than the rest of Hamilton, with almost six in ten residents living below the poverty line. 34% had not completed high school and a further 23% had a high school diploma but no higher education. Disability is also a challenge often linked to poverty. Nearly one third of the population in 2006 had activity limitations.

For children, the poverty rate was significantly higher, at 76% compared to 26% for the rest of Hamilton. This may be explained by the fact that nearly half of families with children in Beasley were headed by lone parents (male and female combined).

Although there was a somewhat smaller proportion of seniors living in Beasley than Hamilton as a whole, those seniors living Beasley faced a much higher poverty rate: 56% in Beasley, versus fewer than two in ten for the rest of the city.

Beasley is an ethnically diverse neighbourhood. In 2006 almost three times more residents identified with a visible minority group (39%) than for the city as a whole. This diversity is contributed to by both newcomer immigrants who arrived between 2001 and 2006 (14% of residents), and less recent immigrants, with 12% of residents having arrived between 1991 and 2000. Beasley also had a slightly higher proportion of people of Aboriginal ancestry than the city as a whole (5% versus 3%).

Beasley has a high rate of residential turnover in general according to the 2006 numbers. Overall, 22% of residents in 2006 had changed address in the past year and nearly 60% had changed address in the past five years. This pattern can be explained in part by insecure tenure; 79% of residents in 2006 were renters (with half of all residents living in apartment buildings of five stories or more), 49% spent thirty percent or
more of their income on housing costs, and 31% spent fifty percent or more (versus 19% city-wide).

Housing affordability is an issue for both renters and owners in Beasley (49% and 31% respectively). Homeowner affordability is more of an issue in Beasley than in the rest of the city, where the rate was 19% in 2006.

**Implications for a CLT**

The numbers suggest that there is an affordable housing issue in Beasley, in addition to an unbalanced rental-to-ownership ratio.

The diversity of people present in Beasley is also a concern as much as it is an asset. Many of Beasley’s residents are marginalised, facing challenges that are more severe and more prevalent than in the broader population. For instance, the Hamilton Community Foundation’s 2011 Vital Signs report identified...
immigrant integration as one of the two most pressing issues facing the City of Hamilton. At the time, Hamilton's immigrant poverty rate of 50% was the highest in the country.

Immigrants face a number of unique issues in accessing housing and employment. For example, immigrants in Hamilton are more likely to seek housing in the private rental market than through social housing, and are thus more likely to spend 50% or more of their incomes on housing, leaving little money for other needs (Hamilton Immigrant Partnership Council, 2012).

Poverty is also the principle cause of hunger and food insecurity. According to the 2013 Hunger Count, 34% of the 7,500 people who accessed Hamilton food banks in 2013 were lone parent families, 76% counted social assistance as their main sources of income, and 68% lived in market rental units (Hamilton Food Share, 2013). The higher proportion of these populations in Beasley suggests that food security is among the concerns for the Beasley neighbourhood.

**Existing Land Uses**

As one of Hamilton's founding neighbourhoods, Beasley was home to some of the city's first industries, including textile mills, metal fabricators and foundries. These industries, the homes of their workers, and the businesses to serve them once co-existed in Beasley, and the legacy of this style of development remains.

Land use in Beasley is extremely disjointed, combining patches of intact older, pedestrian friendly residential and commercial streets with large swaths of low-density, auto-centric land-uses, and a fairly dispersed sprinkling of light and medium industry, residential towers, public, social and religious services, and institutional uses. Several brownfields exist and are typically used for warehousing, left vacant, or paved over for use as parking lots.

Beasley is home to significant sections of the major commercial strips in Downtown Hamilton, including James St. North, “The Gore” (the area surrounding Gore Park), and International Village (King from Mary to Wellington). Other notable commercial areas include:

- Main St./Central Business District
- Cannon St.
- Barton St. (including a small piece of Barton Village)
- Hughson St.
- John St.
- Ferguson Ave.

Beasley is officially divided in half by the boundaries of Downtown Hamilton which run along Cannon Street, and this division is also useful for explaining the different styles of development found in the neighbourhood. James St. North, the western boundary of the neighbourhood, also takes on its own character.
Figure 12: Current Land Uses

- Parkland
- Institutional
- Places of Worship
- Social Services
- Social Housing
- Rental Apartment Towers
- Utilities
- Industrial/Warehousing
- Auto-Related Businesses
- Surface Parking
- Vacant

*Lot Purchased by Good Shepherd

*Based on neighbourhood tour and the City of Hamilton's Vacant Buildings Registry

*Victory Garden
South Beasley

South Beasley is the section of the neighbourhood which is incorporated by the official downtown area. It is therefore home to a greater mix of uses and more high-rise development than in the north of the neighbourhood. Taller building heights can be found especially in the very south along Main Street and the south side of King. A few residential towers can also be found in the area near Wellington and King William.

King Street itself has a fairly pedestrian friendly streetscape with medium-density development of around three or four stories, commercial on bottom with residential on top, and a few taller mixed-use and office buildings on the south side. Other pedestrian-friendly areas in the South include parts of King William and John.

Towards Cannon Street, the division between North and South Beasley, the area gets increasingly residential. In the blocks bounded by Cannon, John, Catharine, and King William there is a large cluster of surface parking lots and auto-repair shops that separate the residential areas to the north and the downtown to the south.

To the east of this, roughly in the centre of the neighbourhood, is the community’s most significant park, Beasley Park. Surrounding Beasley Park is a new school/community centre, J. Edgar Davey Elementary School and a cluster of social services and social services and social services and social services.
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North Beasley

North Beasley is much more residential than the south, and is dominated by low-rise residential development in the form of single family homes, duplexes, and row homes, although there is one block just north of Cannon that contains a small cluster of residential towers (see Figure 16 for mix of housing).

In terms of commercial development, North Beasley has taken on more suburban-style development with the presence of low-rise commercial buildings that are fronted by surface parking. More pedestrian-friendly commercial strips remain along James and the western segment of Barton.

Figure 15: Social Services and Social Housing

Beasley hosts a number of social services and social service agencies, as well as social and seniors housing. The majority of social services are found in South Beasley/Downtown, with the highest concentration being found in the areas surrounding Beasley Park.

Figure 16: Surface Parking Lots and Auto-Related Businesses

A significant amount of land use in Beasley is devoted to the car. For example, surface parking lots, auto-repair shops and car rental lots can be found in heavily concentrated areas and scattered throughout the neighbourhood, sometimes in the middle of residential streets.
Figure 17: Varieties of Housing in North Beasley
Figure 18 Example Infill Lots
Figure 19: Mix of Land Uses
Mix of Land Uses (Continued)
North Beasley also hosts a few functioning factories and large warehouses/shipping and receiving centres, including a large LCBO liquor distribution facility and an equally large Beer Store.

The north-eastern corner of the neighbourhood, which was formerly an industrial area, is dominated by large institutional uses, including a maximum security detention centre and surface parking areas that are provided for the hospital that lies just to the east of Beasley. The northern boundary of Beasley is the CN rail tracks, which physically separate Beasley from the areas to the north, save for a few bridge crossings.

James Street North

James St. North between King William and Barton is a distinct part of the Beasley neighbourhood because it
retains, more than any other area, the older and more pedestrian friendly streetscape. Key architectural features of James St. North include the John Foot Armouries, Christ’s Church Cathedral, the Lister Block, and Liuna Station.

Changes to the neighbourhood that will be discussed in more detail have been largely centred on James North and its emergence as a popular creative district, especially in the areas between Wilson Street and Barton Street.

The west side of James, at Barton, is the planned home of a future GO Transit station in 2015 that will provide train and frequent bus service to Toronto.

**Land Use Barriers to Revitalisation**

The abundance of surface parking lots, auto-repair shops, empty lots, and auto-centric development in Beasley has a significantly detrimental effect on the livability of the neighbourhood, burdening existing residents and preventing new ones from coming.

Surface parking also takes up space that could be used for higher density development, bringing in more residents and businesses. Other land use concerns present in Beasley include:

- insufficient green space and recreation (i.e. zero proper sports fields)
- dangerous alleyways
- undesirable businesses (i.e. large bingo hall, adult entertainment, predatory lending institutions)
- locally unwanted land uses (i.e. LCBO warehouse, transformer station, prison, hospital parking)
- insufficient housing options

Although isolated areas in Beasley have begun to revitalise, further efforts to improve the area will require changes to its physical environment. This is a challenge due to disinvestment, real estate speculation, contaminated land on small lots, and absentee landownership.

**Neighbourhood Change**

Despite the challenges in revitalising Beasley, significant changes have been taking place in recent years within isolated parts of the neighbourhood. An influx of artists have arrived on James Street North, attracted by its historic, pedestrian-friendly character, urban grittyness, and relatively low property values.

James North, as it is known, has gone from what was an already-vibrant street, hosting a mix of neighbourhood-serving shops and services for the surrounding ethnically diverse population, to an internationally recognized arts district complete with numerous artists’ studios, cafes, restaurants, and bars. It has also become a creative industry district with planning, architecture and computer animation firms.

![Figure 22: The Monthly Art Crawl on James North Attracts a New Demographic to the Neighbourhood](image-url)
Although lacking a formalized BIA, the business community there has formed the James North Merchant’s Association to organize and promote the district. The street hosts a monthly Art Crawl every second Friday of the month that attracts hundreds of visitors from within and outside of Hamilton. The annual version of this event, the Supercrawl music and art street festival, attracted well over 80,000 people in 2013 (CBC News, 2013).

Although these changes have mostly been isolated, the James North arts district is increasingly spilling over into the eastern section of King William St. and a small section of Cannon at the intersection with James. However, other adjoining commercial areas remain mostly untouched by the changes, particularly where the historical streetscapes give way to auto-oriented development as they do along Wilson, Barton and Cannon.

Shifts in uses have been occurring along King St., too, although to a much lesser extent. The portion of King St. located in the International Village BIA has seen a rise in boutique-style clothing shops, and this is the kind of business the BIA is actively encouraging in the area (S. Braithwaite, personal communication, July 19, 2013).

Towards the western end of the neighbourhood closer to the central business district, King St. has attracted a small collection of new businesses including regional chains such as Coffee Culture and Burrito Boyz. The Jackson Square shopping centre located at the northwest corner of King and James has also begun to revitalise, most recently with the addition of a full-service grocery store, a gourmet burger chain, and the downtown’s first Starbucks.

*From Top to Bottom:*
*Figure 23: William Thomas Condos Rendering; Source: Hi-Rise Group (2013)*
*Figure 24: Tivoli Condos Signage; Source: CBC (2013)*
*Figure 25: Royal Connaught Condos Rendering; Source: Valery Homes/Spallacci Group (2013)*
The grassroots changes along the James North commercial district have combined with the City of Hamilton's downtown regeneration strategies and the community’s efforts to improve overall conditions in the neighbourhood. Perceptions of the area have begun to shift, increasing property values and fostering a more favourable development climate.

The area’s “hip” vibe has become a marketing strategy for several new condo developments announced in the area, including the Royal Connaught condos (700 units), the Tivoli condos (50 units), and most recently the William Thomas condos (100 units) adjacent to the City’s Lister Block heritage restoration building.

These developments, if they all go ahead, will significantly change the neighbourhood by bringing new and more affluent residents downtown. Increased access to Toronto through the building of a new GO Station on James at Barton in 2015 and potential investments in rapid transit along King and James will be likely to accelerate the changes.

The shifts that have been occurring in Beasley are not necessarily positive or negative. They have encouraged new development, new life, and attracted new people, which the area desperately needed. Indeed, increasing the desirability of the neighbourhood and creating housing for the “creative class” are among the Beasley Neighbourhood Plan's desired actions. However, thus far the changing perception of the area has been limited to the James North vicinity, with visitors to Art Crawl and Supercrawl rarely venturing east into the rest of Beasley (C. Mattina, personal communication, September 15, 2013).

While the presence of artists is normally a strong indicator of an area's gentrification, Beasley also exhibits many of the features that tend to hold gentrification back. These include a concentration of social services and the ongoing presence of unpleasant industrial land uses (Ley and Dobson, 2008).

In the future, if efforts to change Beasley are successful, rising residential and commercial property values may be a concern for many of Beasley’s vulnerable residents. Affordability is also a concern for artists and the long-term sustainability of an arts district.
Land Use Policy Context

Introduction

Community land trusts do not operate in a regulatory vacuum. Any potential development projects must go through the existing land use regulations that are in effect for the given parcel(s) of land. Likewise, land use plans give a sense of the City’s stated investment priorities, which could predict its support for particular projects. Lastly, land use plans anticipate what changes might occur for a particular area.

This section therefore provides an overview of the key plans, design guidelines, by-law, and incentive programs governing land use in Beasley. This is followed by a series of maps that display the City’s land use plans, combining information from separate plans for the West Harbour and Downtown Hamilton. All maps in this section are based on the Urban Hamilton Official Community Plan (2011) and combine relevant parts of the Downtown and West Harbour planning areas.

Overall land use in Beasley is governed by the Urban Hamilton Official Community Plan and two more localised area plans: the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan in South Beasley and the West Harbour Secondary Plan in North Beasley. These plans regulate land use in part through zoning, allowable densities and building heights, and urban design guidelines.

West Harbour Secondary Plan

“Setting Sail: Secondary Plan for West Harbour” was approved in 2005 to govern future development of the City’s waterfront, former industrial lands, and adjacent residential neighbourhoods. It includes plans to relocate heavy industry away from the area and redevelop brownfield sites. Other key objectives include improving access to the waterfront, promoting heritage, and strengthening existing neighbourhoods (City of Hamilton, 2005, p.6).

According to the plan:

“The relocation of remaining industrial uses, the remediation of contaminated land, and the conversion of industrial lands to residential, institutional and commercial uses are promoted in the Ferguson-Wellington Corridor” (City of Hamilton, 2005, p.42).

Other plans for the corridor include residential intensification through medium and high density residential development and the creation of new streets to improve permeability. The plan also calls for expanding and improving Beasley Park to better serve existing residents and serve the new ones introduced in Ferguson-Wellington (City of Hamilton, 2005, p.43).
Cannon, Barton, and James are identified as areas of more gradual change. Along these streets the plan generally calls for reinforcing and enhancing existing uses while protecting buildings of historic value.

Other plans include developing Cannon to better connect the neighbourhoods of West Harbour and Downtown, ensuring redevelopment adjacent to McLaren Park does not contain parking, service and loading areas or blank walls, and encouraging development on the parking lots fronting Barton Street. The City also states that it may allow a reduction in parking requirements along James in order to preserve the historic pattern of development (City of Hamilton, 2005, p.47).

The rest of North Beasley, which mainly consists of low-rise residential blocks, is labeled a stable area. The plan calls for small-scale, incremental changes that reflect the existing character present in those areas.

**Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan**

The Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan “Putting People First: The New Land Use Plan for Downtown Hamilton” is the first formal plan dedicated to the downtown area. It was created in response to peaking concerns over the downtown’s conditions in the late 1990s and recognition that the needs of the downtown are distinct from any other neighbourhood (Plan Review Backgrounder, p.2). It was approved by Council in 2001.

The Secondary Plan aims to reverse the development trends of the post-war era and shift the Downtown away from heavy industry and high-rise offices and towards new economy uses, including “small offices; live/work arrangements; warehouse conversion; and new technology enterprises such as call centres and e-commerce”. For example, it prohibits new stand-alone industrial and manufacturing facilities, but encourages the development of live-work spaces that involve manufacturing and/or processing, so long as they are compatible with neighbouring areas.

The plan also prohibits the creation of new surface parking lots and severely limits the expansion of existing ones, while encouraging design of new buildings that fosters a greater pedestrian environment and the retention and enhancement of the historic fabric of Downtown. A higher standard of urban design is heavily emphasized in the plan. So is a greater connection between the downtown core and its adjacent neighbourhoods through the redevelopment of vacant and underused lots and the creation of new housing.
Development Permit Sub-Areas

Development permit areas (DPAs) allow municipalities to give greater specificity over visions of future land use in particular areas while expediting development in those areas and allowing for more flexibility. The development permit system replaces the zoning by-law, minor variance, and site control processes with a development permit by-law and development permit process for each area (Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, 2008).

The Downtown Secondary Plan establishes boundaries for a DPA and four sub-areas in the south-west corner of Beasley (see Figure 27 for DPA boundaries). While the City has yet to implement development permit by-laws for these areas, it intends to do so (City of Hamilton, 2011). In the meantime, the Secondary Plan outlines specific visions and policies for each DPA sub-area that provide a picture of what the City intends for these parts of Beasley. The DPA sub-areas include:

**The Gore.** The Gore DPA includes the areas adjacent to Gore Park. This DPA aims to protect the Gore's historic role as the City's central gathering place. It also intends to retain and enhance the historic components of the park and its adjacent street wall through appropriate building heights and setbacks.

**Lister.** The Lister DPA includes the areas adjacent to the Lister Block on James and King William. This DPA aims to promote the area’s continued use for specialty retailing and urban entertainment. As part of the policies for this sub-area, “New mixed-use development is encouraged through loft conversions of existing industrial and warehouse buildings and through new buildings on existing vacant lots/surface parking lots” (City of Hamilton, 2001). The Plan also states that building heights should be consistent with the traditional street wall, with heights of 3-4 stories at street line and potentially higher in sections that are set back.

**Rebecca/Wilson.** The Rebecca/Wilson DPA includes the area between downtown and the residential areas, which is currently dominated by parking lots. For this area the Plan envisions low to mid-rise residential development with mixed uses on the ground floor, especially for properties fronting on Wilson St. A major feature of this sub-area is a proposed park in place of the existing city-owned parking lot at the corner of John and Rebecca (see figures and ).

**The Courts.** The Courts DPA runs along Main St. from James to Catharine and includes many important public buildings, including the former court house. The intent of this DPA is to design new development
to properly frame these important buildings, and the policies include mixed-use mid-rise development.

**Plan Update**

An update to the plan was initiated in 2011 in order to bring it in line with the new Urban Hamilton Official Plan, the Provincial Policy Statement, the Places to Grow Growth Plan, and other policies and studies that shape the City’s plans for the Downtown. An updated Downtown Zoning By-law was also created in conjunction with the City’s new official plan in order to implement those policy changes.

Updates to the secondary plan will include a greater emphasis on intensification and higher densities Downtown as well as a high mix of uses. According to the City staff’s backgrounder for the secondary plan update:

“...The Downtown Hamilton area is identified as an Urban Growth Centre in the Places to Grow Growth Plan. Urban Growth Centres are planned to have the greatest density; provide a variety of services to residents across the City as well as to neighbouring municipalities; function as a major employment centre for the City; serve a regional retail function; function as a residential neighbourhood with a large and diverse population with a range of housing types; be promoted as the cultural and institutional centre of the City; and, function as a major transit hub for the City with higher order transit extending out from the Centre” (City of Hamilton 2011, p.4).

**Downtown Heritage Character Zone**

The Downtown Heritage Character zone was approved in 2006 in consort with the most recent Downtown Zoning By-Law (see Figure _ for boundaries). New development that occurs within the Heritage Character Zone is governed by a set of design guidelines that ensure consistency with existing heritage character.

**Incentive Programs**

The City also provides a number of incentive programs to encourage development/redevelopment in the Downtown, the construction of affordable housing and green buildings, the preservation of heritage buildings, and the redevelopment of brownfields. Beasley is a part of the Downtown Community Improvement Project Area, and therefore all of these programs apply to Beasley. The programs will be covered in more detail in the Financing a CLT section.
Figure 30: Zoning

Source: Urban Hamilton Official Plan, 2011
Figure 31: Maximum Building Heights Measured in Stories

Source: Urban Hamilton Official Plan, 2011
Developing a Beasley CLT

Opportunities

Based on the foregoing analysis of the Beasley context and potential of the community land trust model, it is possible to ascertain how and where Beasley could benefit from a CLT.

Beasley’s history in heavy industry and its neighbourhood-killing development patterns spanning half a century continue to lessen the quality of life in the neighbourhood while preventing the revitalisation of James North from spreading eastward. Despite resident-led efforts to improve the neighbourhood and land-use plans which encourage revitalisation and intensification, more tools are needed to reduce dependency on the private market for delivering development.

The community land trust model has been applied to relatively weak-market neighbourhoods like Beasley as means of creating and maintaining community assets to attract new residents and investment while simultaneously protecting the long-term affordability of the neighbourhood for current residents.

There is an opportunity to create a community land trust in Beasley to aid the implementation of the Beasley Neighbourhood Plan and manage the neighbourhood’s long-term development.

Key Activities

Based on the Beasley Neighbourhood Plan and existing conditions in Beasley, it is recommended that a CLT be used in the following ways:

- enhancing and maintaining affordability
- attracting new residents to support businesses
- neighbourhood intensification
- community empowerment

Box 4 summarizes the desired outcomes of a Beasley CLT and the types of activities the CLT and its partners could engage in to achieve these outcomes.

Key Areas

Figure 32 identifies some key areas for the neighbourhood’s development, based on the City of Hamilton’s land-use plans and the present existence of underutilised spaces. These areas are in need of change in order to realise revitalisation:

- Ferguson-Wellington Corridor
- Catharine-Mary Brownfields
- Cannon Auto-Repair District
- Parking Lot Central
- Beasley Park/Community Heart

A Beasley CLT should focus its efforts on these areas when possible in order to maximize its impact.

Potential Partnerships

The Beasley Neighbourhood Association is a well-respected group with several partnerships already established through the Beasley Charter. There is an opportunity to expand some of these partnerships into supporting the operation of a CLT, particularly with the City of Hamilton and social housing providers. Other potential partnerships include working with:

- private developers
- building construction non-profits (i.e. Threshold School of Building and Habitat for Humanity Hamilton)
- foundations (i.e. Hamilton Community Foundation, the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation)
- environmental and food security organisations (i.e. Environment Hamilton)
Housing Providers. Box 5 displays the major housing providers in Hamilton who manage over 100 units. Two of these providers, Good Shepherd Non-Profit Homes and Wesley Community Homes, are signatories of the Charter. Other major providers which operate in the downtown area and may be willing to partner with a Beasley CLT include City Housing Hamilton, Victoria Park Community Homes, Hamilton East Kiwanis Non-Profit Homes, and Urban Native Homes Incorporated.

Non-profit housing providers are excellent partners for community land trusts because they hold the necessary development and property management expertise which can sometimes drain the resources of a CLT organisation that takes those responsibilities on alone. Likewise, housing providers can benefit from the land acquisition mandate and long-term land holdings of a CLT which can give them access to perpetually affordable land.

The City of Hamilton. The City of Hamilton through its Neighbourhood Action Strategy has made a strong commitment to a partnership-based approach to supporting asset-based neighbourhood development. The City may potentially serve as a crucial partner to a Beasley CLT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Outcome</th>
<th>CLT Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Enhancing and Maintaining Affordability | • increasing stock of high quality affordable housing for both renters and owners  
• developing community gardens  
• providing affordable space for non-profits, artists and neighbourhood-serving businesses  
• providing homeownership support programs |
| Attracting New Residents to Support Businesses | • improving existing housing stock  
• developing mixed income housing  
• creating and preserving community assets such as green space, cultural and heritage features  
• increasing property values and attracting private investment  
• developing mixed-use buildings along commercial streets |
| Neighbourhood Intensification | • remediating brownfields for redevelopment  
• redeveloping abandoned and/or blighted properties  
• redeveloping underused properties such as surface parking lots and auto-related businesses  
• creating medium density developments in appropriate areas |
| Community Empowerment | • decision-making through democratically elected governing board  
• implementation of the resident-developed neighbourhood plan  
• asset-building opportunities for low-income residents |
Figure 32: Key Development Areas

- Catharine-Mary Brownfields
- Ferguson-Wellington Corridor
- Cannon Auto-Repair District
- Beasley Park/Community Heart
- Parking Lot Central
The roles that the City of Hamilton could play in supporting the work of a community land trust are expansive and include providing loans and grants, aiding with the difficult and expensive process of acquiring land, and negotiating fair taxation policies on CLT land (Davis and Jacobus, 2008). In many cases, CLTs obtain their land directly from municipal governments, such as through the donation of tax delinquent properties or under-utilised city-owned parcels.

**Challenges**

Although there is great potential for a CLT in Beasley, it should be recognized that setting-up a CLT and acquiring and developing land are challenging, long-term processes. Some of the key challenges that a Beasley CLT will likely face include:

- a limited local precedence for CLTs
- a limited precedence for CLTs of the type proposed
- a lack of readily available affordable land
- barriers to developing properties
- ambivalent support from government for downtown regeneration

**Limited Precedence**

Community land trusts are rare in Canada, resulting in a severe lack of network support and a lack of model-specific funding and policy. For example, achieving charitable status can be very difficult for Canadian CLTs because the Canada Revenue Agency assesses them on a case-by-case basis, meaning they must be able to prove they are benefiting the community in ways that the law regards as charitable.

Canada lacks a national CLT network as exists in the United States and the United Kingdom, and model-specific support such as the UK’s Community Land Trust Fund. The CMHC’s 2005 report on critical success factors for CLTs in Canada is one of the few publications that draw lessons from past and existing CLTs in Canada, and it argues the need for a national CLT network to increase these opportunities for learning (Housing Strategies, 2005).

The CLT model is also new to Hamilton and the use of the model for urban development and non-residential uses is extremely limited in Canada. It will therefore be a challenge to educate community residents, organisations, and government officials on the model and its potential application in Beasley prior to building support and partnerships.

During the authoring of this report a connection has been made with the Neighbourhood Land Trust in Parkdale, Toronto that could provide an ongoing networking opportunity where both organisations can benefit.

**Land Acquisition**

Unlike some CLTs that have formed in response to the opportunity of acquiring large tracts of land
from government or private donations, there is a relative lack of publicly-held land, particularly vacant land, available in Beasley. As a result, a Beasley CLT will often need to take the more expensive and challenging route of acquiring land from the private market. Private land owners and especially real estate speculators will be unlikely to provide land to a CLT for a reasonable price, making land acquisition a tough challenge for a future CLT.

Facing the same situation in Parkdale, the Neighbourhood Land Trust has identified the importance of obtaining charitable status for their organisation to be able to incentivize land donation from the private sector through the provision of tax receipts. They are currently exploring other means of incentivizing donations (K. Kamizaki, personal communications, October 4, 2013).

Low-valued brownfield lands are inexpensive to acquire and present a possible opportunity for land acquisition in Beasley, however they also come with significant risks and potentially high costs before redevelopment can occur.

**Barriers to Development**

A potential CLT would face similar barriers to development in Beasley that are faced by private developers. These include challenges acquiring land and accessing project financing, and the risks and potentially high costs involved in remediating brownfields for redevelopment.

One advantage that CLTs hold over private developers is the ability to leverage resources and forms of funding that have a long-term view and emphasis on impact rather than a focus on short term financial gain.

Likewise, CLTs that engage with the community are more likely to enjoy community support for developments, which can make the development process easier.

**Development Context**

Despite the City of Hamilton’s numerous plans and initiatives to revitalise Beasley and the downtown area, there remain plans and policies which demonstrate ambivalence towards infill development. Likewise, there is a lack of commitment towards implementing existing plans.

For example, the City’s plans and policies surrounding infill and brownfield redevelopment are significantly offset by its push to expand commercial development into greenfield aerotropolis lands. Also, a recent Downtown Parking Study recommended that even more parking be placed in Beasley (City of Hamilton, 2013a), despite the hugely detrimental impact surface parking currently has on the neighbourhood.

Another issue is that a CLT is not well-suited to directly address the city’s street design issues, which make revitalisation extremely challenging. A climate which is more favourable to downtown regeneration and infill is needed to support the work of a Beasley CLT.

**Financing a CLT**

The financing for a CLT can be separated into three major categories: seed funding, project funding, and sustainable operating funds (Housing Strategies, 2005).

**Seed Funding.** Seed funding is needed to cover initial costs during the start-up stages of a CLT, which may include studies, consultants, legal fees, and administration (Housing Strategies, 2005), although in-kind donations can sometimes reduce these costs.
Seed funding is also important for the ability to leverage future funds, as it lends legitimacy to a project as well as resources.

Having funding commitments from community partners early-on in the process can greatly improve the chances of a CLT’s success (Housing Strategies, 2005). Seed funding is usually accessed in the form of grants from governments or foundations, and has a discrete value and duration. Grants for start-up CLTs have ranged between about $10 000 to $200 000, but tend to run around $50 000 or less.

Potential sources of seed funding in Hamilton including the Hamilton Community Foundation, the Ontario Trillium Foundation, and the City of Hamilton.

**Project Funding.** Funding is also needed to cover individual development projects. “Some of the costs that need to be taken into consideration are environmental site assessments, real estate commissions, legal fees, transfer taxes, insurance, and a variety of other costs associated with acquiring, holding, and developing land” (Housing Strategies, 2005).

The amount needed will greatly vary by the specifics of the project, including whether or not the land is donated, and whether the project is a new construction or a rehabilitation of an existing building (or buildings). Box 6 displays two parcels of land that are currently for sale in Beasley, to give a sense of the costs of obtaining land from the private market.

Project funding can be obtained from a variety of sources including financial institutions (traditional banks, credit unions, etc.), foundations, governments, and development incentive programs. Financial support for affordable housing is available through many sources including the City of Hamilton's Affordable Housing Partnership Initiative, the Community Rental Housing Program (Federal/Provincial), and the CMHC.

Sources of project funding are likely to differ depending on the nature and location of the project. The City of Hamilton offers financial incentive programs that pertain to Beasley and could provide funding and/or lessen costs for certain developments:

**Brownfields/ERASE Program**

The Environmental Remediation and Site Enhancement (ERASE) program provides support and incentives for brownfield redevelopment on eligible properties, including matching grants for environmental site assessments, grants for redevelopments based on increase in assessed property values, tax assistance during rehabilitation and redevelopment, and low-interest loans for site remediation work (City of Hamilton, 2010).

---

**Box 6: Land Currently for Sale in Beasley**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Ft²</th>
<th>Current Use</th>
<th>Zoned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>188 Wilson</td>
<td>$139 900</td>
<td>8 226.4</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>Specialty Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>212 King William</td>
<td>$2 495 000</td>
<td>30 456</td>
<td>Parking lot &amp; vacant warehouse</td>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MLS
**LEEDing the Way Community Improvement Plan**

The LEEDing the Way program provides grants to help cover the incremental costs of creating LEED certified buildings.

**Residential Incentive Programs**

- The Commercial Corridor Housing Loan and Grant Program “to provide financial assistance for: converting existing built commercial space into residential units, renovations to existing residential units or construction of new units via building additions. The program is also intended to provide assistance for the costs of creating new residential units on vacant land.” | Loan up to $400,000 ($15,000 per unit)
- Hamilton Downtown Multi-Residential Property Investment Program, “for predominantly residential development together with uses accessory to the residential development.” | Loan up to $5 million

**Commercial Incentive Programs**

- Office Tenancy Assistance Program, “for leasehold improvements to office buildings”. | Low-interest loan up to $450,000
- Business Improvement Area Commercial Property Improvement Grant Program | Matching grant up to $25,000 for corner lot with street frontage > 25ft
- Commercial Façade Property Improvement Grant Program | Matching grant up to $10,000 or $12,500 for corner property

**Heritage Incentive Programs**

- Gore Building Improvement Grant Program | Matching grant up to $50,000
- Hamilton Heritage Property Grant Program, “for structural/stability work required to conserve and restore heritage features of properties; and the conservation and restoration of heritage features of properties that are designated under Parts IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act.” | Grant up to $150,000 for a project at least $560,000 in value
- The Hamilton Community Heritage Fund (HCHF), “for restoration of heritage attributes on properties designated under the Ontario Heritage Act”. | Interest-free loan up to $50,000


**Sustainable Operating Funds.** As initial seed funding runs out, it becomes be important to establish sustainable operating funds from diverse sources, including an element of self-financing through lease fees, membership fees, resale fees and other revenue sources. Core funding can also come from granting organisations, corporate sponsorships, and private donations.

Some CLTs subsidize their charitable activities with market-rate rental income such as that coming from units within mixed-income developments.
Conclusion

A CLT in Beasley can only work if there is sufficient support for forming the organisation and an adequate understanding and acceptance of the challenges that will lie ahead.

Although it is inspiring and important to envision what could be done with a CLT in Beasley, there is a need to temper this process with a recognition that development projects rely on the key ingredients of development financing and land that is available for acquisition, affordable to the organisation, and fitting for the desired use.

It is therefore impossible to establish exactly what a CLT will be able to accomplish nor an exact timeline, as it could be months or years before an appropriate piece of land becomes obtainable. In the meantime, it is possible to establish an organisation with the mandate and readiness to acquire land when it comes available.

Limitations and Areas Requiring Further Study

This report is intended to introduce the CLT model to the Beasley context and explore the opportunities and challenges that exist in developing a Beasley CLT. It is not intended to formally assess the feasibility of a CLT from a financial or legal standpoint.

A formal feasibility study should be completed with the aid of financial and legal expertise to determine whether or not a CLT is likely to be successful. This should include the design of a budget for the first few years of operation. As a part of the feasibility study, it is recommended that innovative financing arrangements be explored as well as various means of incentivizing the donation of land from private owners.

Likewise, a better understanding of market conditions is necessary in order to determine what types of housing and other developments are needed and could be successful in Beasley. Therefore, a market assessment should be completed before proceeding with any development. This should include an analysis of neighbourhood change and an assessment of its potential impact on vulnerable residents.

Upon completion of a feasibility study and housing needs assessment, a business plan should be completed for the short to medium term.

Action Items for Developing a CLT

The proposed action items are adapted from Housing Strategies (2005), Davis (2007), National CLT Network UK (2012), and an interview with the Neighbourhood CLT in Parkdale, Toronto. It also draws from Davis and Jacobus’ (2008) CLT Start-Up Guide (See Appendix E for full guide).

Steering Group

It is recommended that a steering group be formed in order to guide the development of a CLT in Beasley. It is important to establish a group of 5-10 people that together possess the range of skills needed to support a community land trust (See Appendix F for Parkdale NLT’s steering group model). The tasks of the steering group will include:

Short Term (3-8 months)

- formalise a Beasley CLT vision statement and determine program activities (i.e. who will the CLT serve?, what types of development can occur on the CLT land?, will the CLT develop buildings directly and/or rely on community partners?)
- build community support, credibility, and partnerships starting with Beasley Neighbourhood Charter partners, local non-profit housing providers, the Hamilton Community Foundation, and the Canadian Mortgage and Housing Foundation
- seek technical expertise in order to report on a CLT’s feasibility
Box 7: Approximate Start-Up Timeline

2014

Create Steering Group

Vision Statement/Key Decisions

Secure Seed Funding

Housing Market Analysis

Feasibility Study

Incorporate

Develop Business Plan

Seek Charitable Status

Implement Democratic Board

Identify Opportunities for Land Acquisition

Network and Build Support and Partnerships

2015

2016

2017

2018
Conclusion

• undertake a housing market analysis
• secure initial seed funding in for the feasibility study and business plan development
• network and seek the support of more established CLTs, including continuing to network with the Neighbourhood Land Trust in Parkdale.

Medium Term (9 months- 3 years)

• incorporate as a non-profit organisation and pursue charitable status
• have a business plan prepared for the first 3-4 years of operation
• continue to develop partnerships and engage the community about the CLT model
• identify potential opportunities for land acquisition and a pilot development project

Longer Term (3 years+)

In the longer term, the steering group will be replaced by a democratic membership-based model with an elected board of directors. The CLT will actively pursue land acquisition opportunities and continue to build diverse support and resources to carry out its activities.
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Appendix A: Interview Topics for Parkdale CLT

1. Who is involved in creating the CLT in Parkdale?
   a. Is it mainly resident-driven? Existing organisations? Other players?

2. Can you tell me about your decision to create a CLT for Parkdale?
   a. What relevant issues did/does Parkdale face that you hope to address?
   b. How did you find out about the CLT model?
   c. Why did you decide that a CLT was needed to address the issues in your neighbourhood?
   d. What other solutions did you consider?
   e. What benefits do you see coming from the CLT model that you don't see from other solutions?

3. Can you tell me a little about the steps you have already taken in setting up your CLT?
   a. Can you give me an approximate timeline that was required for each step?
      i. Is this what you expected? Longer? Shorter?
   b. How did you decide on a model that is a good fit for Parkdale?

4. What types of resources would a small group need to gather in order to launch a CLT?
   a. About how much money is needed? For start-up costs, lawyers, publicity?
   b. What kind of time commitment is required from residents/volunteers? About how many people working how many hours?
   c. What skills are most needed?
   d. Do or will you have any paid staff?

5. What method(s) have you used to engage residents so far?
   a. Can you tell me about your successes and barriers when engaging residents?

6. Compared to what you know about CLTs in the United States, what have you found unique about the Canadian/Ontario context?
   a. Legal?
   b. Political?
   c. Cultural?

7. What significant barriers you have faced so far?

8. To what factors do you attribute your success so far?

9. What partnerships have been created to help form the CLT?
   a. Which ones have been the most valuable/useful and why?

10. Is there anything else you can tell me about forming a CLT in Beasley, Hamilton based on your group’s experiences?
Appendix B: Beasley 1934 vs. 2011

Source: McMaster University Library: http://library.mcmaster.ca/maps/airphotos/1934.htm
Source: Google Maps, 2011.
Appendix C: Beasley Charter Signatories

- Beasley Neighbourhood Association
- Boys and Girls Club of Hamilton
- City of Hamilton
  - Community Services Department, Recreation Division
  - Neighbourhood Development Strategies
  - Public Health Services
  - Ward 2 City Councillor Jason Farr
- The Commons
- Environment Hamilton
- Faithworks Committee
- First Ontario Credit Union
- The Freeway
- Good Shepherd
- Goodwill, The Amity Group
- Hamilton Police Services
- Hamilton Council on Aging
- Hamilton Downtown Mosque
- Hamilton Skateboard Assembly
- Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board
- Immigrant Women’s Centre
- Streetlight Christian Church
- TCA/Thier & Curran Architects Inc.
- Wesley Urban Ministries

Source: Beasley Charter, 2011
## Appendix D: Hamilton Non-Profit Housing Providers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
<th># Units</th>
<th>Type(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Housing Hamilton</td>
<td>6796</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park Community Homes Inc.</td>
<td>1822</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton East Kiwanis Non-Profit Homes Inc.</td>
<td>717</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoney Creek Community Homes Inc.</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Native Homes Incorporated</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Baptist Non-Profit Housing Corp.</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian Villa of the Res. Church</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Shepherd Non-Profit Homes Inc.</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McMaster Community Homes Corp.</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Community Homes Inc.</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McGivney Community Homes Inc.</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Green Senior Centre</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Elizabeth Villa</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITCA Community Involvement Inc.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancaster Village Non-Profit Homes</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.W.A. Local 1005 Community Homes Inc.</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Senior Citizens Apts Ltd</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA Hamilton</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ebony Group Community Homes of Hamilton</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Devolved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton &amp; District Senior Citizens’ Home RAMBYNAS Inc.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Federal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AbleLiving Services Inc</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Federal, Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lions Freelton Villa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Devolved, Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenian Society of St. Joseph Hamilton</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Devolved, Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaton Place Flamborough Senior's Residence</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Federal, Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howell Non-Profit Homes Inc.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Federal, Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryerson Ancaster Homes Inc.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Federal, Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artaban Non-Profit Homes Inc.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Devolved, Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sacajawea Non-Profit Housing Inc.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Federal, Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Services of Hamilton</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Federal, Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Mental Health Assoc. (Hamilton/Wentworth)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Supported, Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHOICES Association Inc.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Small</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain Injury Services of Hamilton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Supported, Small</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ontario Non-Profit Housing Association, 2013.
Appendix E: CLT Start-Up Checklist

The following guide to building a CLT is copied from *The City-CLT Partnership* by Davis and Jacobus (2008, p.11) and is specific to American CLTs focusing on housing development, although it is broadly applicable to other types of CLTs and those in other jurisdictions. The report is available for free download from the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy at http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/1395_The-City-CLT-Partnership

Key Decisions Before Incorporation

- **Beneficiaries.** Who will the CLT serve?
- **Geographic service area.** Where will the CLT operate?
- **Development.** What kinds of housing or other structures will be developed on the CLT’s land, and what roles will the CLT play in the development process?
- **Governance.** How will the governing board be structured and selected? Will the CLT have membership? If so, what roles will the members play?
- **Resources.** Where will the CLT find funding to pay for projects and operations?

Essential Tasks Before Incorporation

- Assign responsibility for any key decisions about CLT structure, service area, beneficiaries and activities.
- Begin outreach to community residents and stakeholders.
- Evaluate housing market conditions, optimal prices, and likely demand for units serving the target population.
- Estimate the availability and sufficiency of public and private resources for land acquisition, housing development housing subsidies, and CLT operations.
- Conduct legal research as needed.
- Prepare documents establishing CLT and institutionalizing its structure and governance.

Formative Tasks After Incorporation

- Seat and orient the CLT’s first board of directors.
- Design the ground lease and resale formula.
- Create an outreach plan and materials for building CLT membership and for educating the broader community.
- Develop and implement homebuyer selection and orientation programs.
- Create a three-year plan for bringing the CLT’s portfolio to scale, including a staffing plan, operating budget, policies and procedures, and housing development goals.
- Apply for 501(c)(3) designation as a tax-exempt charitable organisation.
- Review municipal and state programs for compatibility with the CLT model and negotiate modifications to expand access to funding sources.
- Negotiate property tax treatment for the CLT’s resale-restricted, owner-occupied housing with the local assessor.
- Building relationships with private financial institutions in preparation for mortgaging of CLT housing.
- Develop job descriptions for staff and complete a hiring process.
Appendix F: Parkdale NLT Start-up Subcommittees

The Neighbourhood Land Trust (NLT) in Parkdale has established an interim board of directors comprised of 10 individuals from various organisations and service providers who represent a broad crosssection of the community, and support the values of a CLT. The interim board of directors is volunteer-based and meets approximately once per month (Kamizaki, 2013).

The group has been organised into four subcommittees in charge of continuing to develop the organisation after its recent incorporation. The subcommittees will see the CLT through at least its first year and its pursuit of charitable status:

“Program Planning subcommittee. This subcommittee supports the development of programs and activities that NLT undertake. It also works directly with key local stakeholders – such as local politicians and land owners – to land acquisition and development. For the first year, the subcommittee works on developing criteria and priorities for land acquisition and community uses of land, and building working relationships with local stakeholders.

Communications and Community Engagement subcommittee. This subcommittee works to reach out to and spread the idea of community land trust to the wider community members – both beneficiaries and supporters. The committee also develops key communication materials and messages while spearheading community engagement and community-based participatory planning in order to promote greater community participation and membership development. For the first year, it focuses on developing communication materials and organizing community workshops.

Legal and Policy/Bylaw subcommittee. This subcommittee’s primary responsibility is organisational development from the legal and governance perspective. The committee works on building a democratic governance model for Parkdale context, while also developing policies and bylaws that reflect the principles of diversity, equity, and democracy. For the first year, the subcommittee works toward obtaining a charitable status with development of policies and bylaws.

Fundraising subcommittee. This subcommittee literally is around fundraising – identifying potential funding opportunities, writing proposals, managing grants, and creating fundraising events.”