1. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA**  
(Added Items, if applicable, will be noted with *)

2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**
   
   3.1 December 5, 2017  
   
   Pages
   
   4. **DELEGATION REQUESTS**

   5. **CONSENT**
   
   5.1 Active Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision Applications (PED18002) (City Wide)  
   
   5.2 Responsible Animal Ownership By-law 12-031 be Amended to Include the Offence of Barking Dog (PED18003) (City Wide)  
   
   5.3 Review of Problems Associated with Increased Visitors to Waterfalls (PED18011) (Wards 6, 9, 13, 14 and 15)  
   
   5.4 Quality Index for Rental Units (PED18026) (City Wide) (Outstanding Business List Item)
6. **PUBLIC HEARINGS / DELEGATIONS**

6.1 Application for Approval of Draft Plan of Condominium (Common Element), for lands located at 1890 Rymal Road East (Glanbrook) (PED18006) (Ward 11)

6.2 Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan and Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (PED18007) (Wards 5 and 9)

(Due to bulk, copies of Appendices "C" and "E" are not printed in the agenda but are available for viewing in the City Clerk’s Office and on-line at www.hamilton.ca.)

6.2.a Written Comments from Meaghan Palynchuk, Manager, Municipal Relations, Bell Canada

6.3 Proposed Transit Oriented Corridor Zones in Zoning By-law No. 05-200 - LRT Extension and Housekeeping Amendments (PED18012) (Wards 1, 3, 4, 5 and 9)

6.4 Application to Amend the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200 for Lands Located at 43-51 King Street East and 60 King William Street, Hamilton (PED18013) (Ward 2)

6.5 Applications for an Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, Draft Plan of Subdivision, and Draft Plan of Condominium, for Lands Located at 154 and 166 Mount Albion Road, Hamilton (PED18014) (Ward 5)

6.6 Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, the Rural Hamilton Official Plan, Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464, Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200, and for Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision "Mountaingate" for lands known as 9255 Airport Road West (Glanbrook) (PED18017) (Ward 11)

7. **STAFF PRESENTATIONS**

8. **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

8.1 Preliminary Screening for the Request to Designate 650 and 672 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton, Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (PED18001) (Ward 8)
8.2 Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) on the City of Hamilton's Refusal or Neglect to Adopt an Amendment to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, Town of Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464, and Draft Plan of Subdivision, for Lands Located at 9684, 9694, and 9714 Twenty Road West (Glanbrook) (PED18009) (Ward 11)

8.3 Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) on the City of Hamilton's Refusal or Neglect to Adopt an Amendment to the Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57, for Lands Located at 941 Old Mohawk Road (Ancaster) (PED18010) (Ward 12)

9. MOTIONS

9.1 Community Improvement Plan Incentives (TABLED) December 5, 2017

9.2 Exemption of Affordable Housing Projects from Application Fees

10. NOTICES OF MOTION

11. GENERAL INFORMATION / OTHER BUSINESS

11.1 Outstanding Business List

11.1.a Items requiring new due dates:
Item "V" – That staff report back on the feasibility of amending the Licensing By-law including comparators across the country, to clearly define adult services in relation to the distinction between strip clubs and other performances, including but not limited to burlesque.
Due date: January 16, 2018
New due date: January, 2019

Item "W" – That staff investigate and report back on the feasibility of implementing a by-law that will ensure that any commercial company that is contracted to remove trees within the City of Hamilton has a City Business Licence.
Due date: January 16, 2018
New due date: January, 2019

11.1.b Item to be removed:
Item "G" - Quality Index for Rental Units (Item 5.4 on this agenda)

12. PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL
13. ADJOURNMENT
PLANNING COMMITTEE
MINUTES 17-020
9:30 a.m.
Tuesday, December 5, 2017
Council Chambers
Hamilton City Hall
71 Main Street West

Present: Councillors M. Pearson (Chair), A. Johnson (1st Vice-Chair), J. Farr (2nd Vice Chair) M. Green, C. Collins, D. Conley, B. Johnson, D. Skelly, R. Pasuta, and J. Partridge

Also Present: Councillor L. Ferguson

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE REFERRED TO COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION:

1. Confirmation of Chair and 1st Vice Chair and appointment of 2nd Vice Chair for 2018

   (Partridge/Skelly)
   (a) That Councillor A. Johnson be confirmed as Chair of the Planning Committee for 2018;

   (b) That Councillor J. Farr be confirmed as 1st Vice Chair of the Planning Committee for 2018;

   (c) That Councillor D. Conley be appointed 2nd Vice Chair of the Planning Committee for 2018.

      CARRIED

2. Active Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision Applications (City Wide) (PED17208) (Item 5.1)

   (Green/Partridge)
   That Report PED17208 respecting Active Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision Applications, be received.

      CARRIED
3. **Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) on the City of Hamilton’s Refusal or Neglect to Adopt an Amendment to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and City of Stoney Creek Zoning By-law No. 3692-92, for Lands Located at 157 Upper Centennial Parkway (Stoney Creek) (Ward 9) (PED17213) (Item 5.2)**

(Conley/Green)
That Report PED17213 respecting Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) on the City of Hamilton’s Refusal or Neglect to Adopt an Amendment to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and City of Stoney Creek Zoning By-law No. 3692-92, for Lands Located at 157 Upper Centennial Parkway (Stoney Creek), be received.

**CARRIED**

4. **Elimination of Paid On-Street Metered Parking on Thursday and Friday Evenings (PED17225) (City Wide) (Item 5.3)**

(Farr/Skelly)
That Report PED17225 respecting Elimination of Paid On-Street Metered Parking on Thursday and Friday Evenings, be received.

**CARRIED**

5. **Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226) (Item 6.1)**

(Far/Partridge)
(a) That Amended Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment Application UHOPA-17-02, by Shannex Ontario Ltd. (c/o Daryl Dixon, Applicant), to remove the “Linkage” from Schedule “B” – Natural Heritage System on the subject lands; to identify a portion of the lands as “Core Area” on Schedule “B” – Natural Heritage System; and to establish a Site Specific Policy to restrict uses within the Neighbourhoods designation as it relates to the “Core Area” in order to facilitate the development of a proposed retirement community and to further refine the limits of the Environmentally Sensitive Area on lands located at 558 Golf Links Road, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED17226, be APPROVED on the following basis:

(i) That the draft Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED17226, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council; and,

(ii) That the proposed amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017).
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(b) That Amended Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-17-002, by Shannex Ontario Ltd. (c/o Daryl Dixon, Applicant), for a change in zoning from the Deferred Development “D” Zone, in Ancaster By-law No. 87-57, to the Major Institutional (I3, 659) Zone (Block 1) and the Conservation / Hazard Land (P5, 663) Zone (Block 2), in Zoning By-law No. 05-200, for the lands located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED17226, be APPROVED, on the following basis:

(i) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED17226, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council;

(ii) That the proposed change in zoning is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017); and,

(iii) That the proposed change in zoning complies with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan upon finalization of Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment No. __;

(c) That staff be directed to schedule the Site Plan Meeting according to the availability of the Ward Councillor;

(d) That the public submissions received regarding this matter did not affect the decision.

Main Motion, as Amended, CARRIED

6. Increase to Permit Fees under the Building By-law (PED17200) (City Wide) (Item 7.1)

(B. Johnson/Pasuta)

(a) That the By-law, attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED17200 to amend City of Hamilton By-law No. 15-058, the Building By-law, be enacted;

(b) That the fees prescribed in the By-law, attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED17200, be included in the User Fees and Charges By-law, replacing the fees listed under the heading “Classes of Permits and Fees under the Hamilton Building By-law”.

CARRIED

7. EV Charger Stations at Public Parking lots (Item 9.2)

(Farr/Collins)
WHEREAS; Downtown Hamilton may be falling behind our neighbouring municipalities like Toronto and Waterloo when it comes to EV Charger Stations at Public Parking lots;
WHEREAS; Toronto has close to 50 and Waterloo close to 20 EV Stations in their downtowns;

WHEREAS; the Province of Ontario is encouraging greater growth of EV stations through the Electric Vehicle Charger Stations Grant program;

WHEREAS; with the Province of Ontario expanding Electric Vehicle Chargers Ontario (EVCO) private /public partnership Grant program, some cities capitalizing at much greater rates than others; and

WHEREAS; it has been reported by various sources that the two EV Charger Stations at the Downtown York Parkade sees the same three cars consistently occupying the two spaces, making it difficult for other electric vehicle owners to get charged during office hours;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

(a) That the appropriate Planning Staff report back to the Planning Committee on increasing the number of EV Charging Stations in our downtown and include how the City will recover costs, how users will pay for current and future facilities and the current plus future demand levels;

(b) That staff contact the Province of Ontario in an effort to capitalize on the current EVCO Grant Program to assist Hamilton in providing more of this infrastructure;

(c) That staff from the Parking Division monitor the use at the existing 2 EV Charger Stations at the York Parkade to ensure greater turn-over

(d) That the City Hall location be included in any future expansions of EV Charging Stations.

CARRIED

8. The Downtown Secondary Plan and Above-Grade or Below-Grade Parking Structures (Item 9.3)

(Farr/Collins)
WHEREAS there is merit in shifting more of the city’s overall downtown parking supply from less land efficient surface parking lots to more land efficient above-grade or below-grade parking structures;

WHEREAS, some existing downtown developments may have above-grade or below-grade parking structures that are surplus to their needs; and

WHEREAS, future development that incorporates above-grade or below-grade parking may have parking that is surplus to its needs;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:
That, as part of the Downtown Secondary Plan, Planning staff provide recommendations with respect to commercial parking being permitted as-of-right within above-grade or below-grade parking structures associated with new or existing residential, commercial or mixed use developments.

CARRIED

9. Scottish Rite Parkland Dedication Fees (Item 9.4)

(A. Johnson/Farr)

(a) That The Scottish Rite Charitable Foundation Learning Centre for Hamilton be exempt from the City of Hamilton Parkland Dedication By-law because they are a charitable non-profit use;

(b) That the Director of Planning be directed and authorized to exempt The Scottish Rite Charitable Foundation Learning Centre for Hamilton from the parkland dedication requirements for the conversion of a portion of the existing building at 148 George St for an educational program for The Scottish Rite Charitable Foundation Learning Centre for Hamilton, in accordance with the City of Hamilton Parkland Dedication By-law; and

(c) That the costs of the exemption from the parkland dedication requirements of approximately $11,400, be funded through the Unallocated Capital Reserve.

CARRIED

10. Modifications to Special Provision 640 (Added 12.2)

(Collins/A. Johnson)

That the direction to staff respecting Modifications to Special Provision 640 be approved and remain Private and Confidential.

CARRIED

FOR INFORMATION:

(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (Item 1)

The Committee Clerk advised of the following changes to the agenda:

1. CORRECTION TO APPENDIX “A” of ITEM 7.1, INCREASE TO PERMIT FEES UNDER THE BUILDING BY-LAW (PED17200) (CITY WIDE)

The following corrections have been made to page 9 of Appendix “A”:

- The title “Conditional Permit Agreement/Undertaking” has been changed to “Conditional Permit Fee”.
The title “Fire Watch/Fire Plan Review” has been changed to “Fire Watch/Fire Plan”.

2. **ADDED DELEGATION REQUEST**

4.1 Donald Thorton, The Scottish Rite Charitable Foundation, Learning Centre for Hamilton, respecting Item 9.4, Scottish Rite Parkland Dedication Fees (for today’s meeting)

3. **ADDED CORRESPONDENCE ITEM**

6.1(i) Marilyn Daniels regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(ii) Joe Gauthier, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(iii) Heather Simpson, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(iv) Kathleen Hutcheson, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(v) Solomon Ngan, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(vi) Christine Nash, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(vii) Dennis and Cleo Ripa, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(viii) Andre Van Heerden, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster
Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(ix) Paul Bihun, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(x) Sat Varma, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(xi) Laura Brie Dundas, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(xii) Chris and Sonia Newhouse, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(xiii) Elaine and Barrington Simon, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(xiv) Sandra Burgess, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(xv) Warner and Roselyn Burwell, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(xvi) Mike Sherrard, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(xvii) Domenica and Joe Ciallella, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)
4. ADDED PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL ITEM

12.2 Modifications to Special Provision 640 (to be distributed under separate cover)

*Pursuant to Section 8.1, Sub-sections (e) and (f) of the City’s Procedural By-law 14-300, and Section 239(2), Sub-sections (e) and (f) of the Municipal Act, 2001, as amended, as the subject matter pertains to litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the City and the receiving of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose.*

5. PRESENTATION FOR DISTRIBUTION

6.1 Shannex Inc., Applicant, Presentation respecting Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

(B. Johnson/Green)
That the agenda for the December 5, 2017 meeting be approved, as amended. CARRIED

(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 2)

There were none declared.

(c) APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING (Item 3)

(i) November 14, 2017 (Item 3.1)

(B. Johnson/Skelly)
That the Minutes of the November 14, 2017 meeting be approved. CARRIED

(d) DELEGATION REQUESTS (Item 4)

(i) Donald Thorton, The Scottish Rite Charitable Foundation, Learning Centre for Hamilton, respecting Item 9.4, Scottish Rite Parkland Dedication Fees (Added 4.1)

(Skelly/B. Johnson)
That the delegation request from Donald Thorton of The Scottish Rite Charitable Foundation, Learning Centre for Hamilton, respecting Item 9.4, Scottish Rite Parkland Dedication Fees be approved to address Committee at today’s meeting. CARRIED
(e) DELEGATIONS/PUBLIC HEARING (Item 6)

(i) Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226) (Item 6.1)

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act, Chair Pearson advised those in attendance that if a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the Council of the City of Hamilton before Council makes a decision regarding the Official Plan and Zoning By-law amendments the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of the Council of the City of Hamilton to the Ontario Municipal Board and the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Ontario Municipal Board unless, in the opinion of the Board, there are reasonable grounds to do so.

Written Comments

6.1(i) Marilyn Daniels regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(ii) Joe Gauthier, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(iii) Heather Simpson, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(iv) Kathleen Hutcheson, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(v) Solomon Ngan, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(vi) Christine Nash, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)
6.1(vii) Dennis and Cleo Ripa, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(viii) Andre Van Heerden, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(ix) Paul Bihun, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(x) Sat Varma, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(xi) Laura Brie Dundas, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(xii) Chris and Sonia Newhouse, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(xiii) Elaine and Barrington Simon, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(xiv) Sandra Burgess, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(xv) Warner and Roselyn Burwell, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)
6.1(xvi) Mike Sherrard, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

6.1(xvii) Domenica and Joe Ciallella, regarding concern with Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 558 Golf Links Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED17226)

(Skelly/Collins)
That the added written comments, Items 6.1(i) to 6.1(xvii) be received.  
CARRIED

Melanie Schneider, Planner, addressed Committee with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and provided an overview of the staff report. A copy is available for viewing on the City’s website.

(Conley/A. Johnson)
That the staff presentation be received.  
CARRIED

Terri Johns of T. Johns Consulting Group, representing the applicant addressed Committee with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and provided an overview of the proposed development. Copies were distributed and a copy is available for viewing on the City’s website.

Jason Shannon of Shannex Ontario Limited, the applicant, also addressed Committee regarding the proposal.

(Farr/Conley)
That the agent’s presentation and the applicant’s comments be received.  
CARRIED

Speakers

1. Louise Lachowsky, 600 Tomahawk Crescent, Ancaster

Louise Lachowsky addressed Committee and indicated that she does not support the development.

2. Henny McNobb, 66 Seneca Drive, Ancaster

Henny McNobb addressed Committee and indicated that she does not support the development.
3. Laura Dundas, 14 Southcote Road, Ancaster

Laura Dundas addressed Committee and expressed her concerns with the process and with the proposal.

4. Leslie Rothenburger, 30 McNiven Road, Ancaster

Leslie Rothenburger addressed Committee and expressed her concerns with the proposal.

5. Heather Simpson, 607 Tomahawk Crescent, Ancaster

Heather Simpson addressed Committee and expressed her concerns with the process and the proposal.

6. Joe Gauthier, 7 McNiven Road, Ancaster

Joe Gauthier addressed Committee and suggested installing an on/off ramp coming off of Golf Links Road to Highway 403 to mitigate traffic congestion.

7. Renata Zavadil, 76 Seneca Drive, Ancaster

Renata Zavadil addressed Committee and asked how the increased noise will be mitigated.

(Conley/A. Johnson)
That the delegations be received.
CARRIED

(Partridge/Conley)
That the public meeting be closed.
CARRIED

The Ward Councillor was in attendance and expressed why he was in support of the proposal.

(Partridge/Farr)
That the recommendations be amended by adding the following subsection (c):

(c) That staff be directed to schedule the Site Plan meeting according to the availability of the Ward Councillor.
Amendment CARRIED
(Farr/Partridge)
That the recommendations be amended by adding the following subsection (d):

(d) That the public submissions received regarding this matter did not affect the decision.

Amendment CARRIED

For disposition of this matter refer to Item 5.

(f) PUBLIC NOTICE (Item 7)

(i) Increase to Permit Fees under the Building By-law (PED17200) (City Wide) (Item 7.1)

No members of the public came forward regarding this issue.

For disposition of this matter refer to Item 6.

(g) MOTIONS (Item 9)

(i) Community Improvement Plan Incentives (Item 9.1)

(Partridge/Conley)
That the motion regarding Community Improvement Plan Incentives be TABLED to the next meeting.

CARRIED

(ii) Scottish Rite Parkland Dedication Fees (Item 9.4)

Delegation

(i) Donald Thorton, The Scottish Rite Charitable Foundation, Learning Centre for Hamilton

Donald Thornton of The Scottish Rite Charitable Foundation, Learning Centre for Hamilton addressed Committee and read from a prepared statement copies of which were distributed. A copy is available for viewing on the City’s website.

Franz Kloibhofer of A.J. Clarke and Associates also addressed Committee and asked that the correct name of the foundation (The Scottish Rite Charitable Foundation, Learning Centre for Hamilton) be reflected in the motion.

For disposition of this matter refer to Item 9.
(h) NOTICES OF MOTION (Item 10)

Councillor A. Johnson introduced the following Notice of Motion:

(i) Exemption of Affordable Housing Projects from Application Fees
(Added Item 10.1)

WHEREAS, the City has exempted affordable housing projects from the payment of parkland dedication fees;

WHEREAS, the City has exempted affordable housing projects from the payment of development charges;

WHEREAS, in 2016 Council approved the waiving of several planning fees for affordable housing projects including application fees for re-zonings, Official Plan Amendments, Site Plans, and a portion of fees for Plans of Subdivision and Plans of Condominium; and

WHEREAS, for the purposes of this motion, affordable housing includes any project that either has been approved to receive funding from the Government of Canada or the Province of Ontario under an affordable housing program or has been approved by the City of Hamilton or the CityHousing Hamilton Corporation through an affordable housing program;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That staff report back on significant fees and securities related to development approvals that are typically incurred by affordable housing projects, the estimated cost to the City of waiving or reimbursing these fees, and the potential funding sources for offsetting any lost City revenues.

(i) GENERAL INFORMATION/OTHER BUSINESS (Item 11)

(i) Outstanding Business List (Item 11.1)

(Partridge/B. Johnson)
That the following new due dates be approved:

Item “D” – (OMB) Decision re: 121 Augusta Street, Staff to review the RCF’s in the context of the Prov. Policy, as it relates to special needs, and the Human Rights Code and report back.
Due date: December 5, 2017
New due date: February 20, 2018

Item “H” – The Feasibility of Establishing a City Animal Adoption Service in Partnership with the HBSPCA.
Due date: December 5, 2017
New due date: February 20, 2018

Item “K” - Staff to report back with recommendations to update Discharge of Firearms By-law
Due date: December 5, 2017
New due date: March 20, 2018

Item “M” - Staff to report back with periodic updates re: progress on capturing illegal businesses and increase in licensed businesses
Due date: December 5, 2017
New due date: January 16, 2018

Due date: December 5, 2017
New due date: March 20, 2018

Item “O” - That staff be directed to present to the Planning Committee an updated digital sign by-law
Due date: December 5, 2017
New due date: February 20, 2018

Item “R” - That staff report back on the number of Minor Variance applications in the AEGD with an assessment as to whether or not the refund program should be continued in December, 2017
Due date: December 5, 2017
New due date: February 20, 2018

Item “S” - That staff report to the Planning Committee on a proposed scope and terms of reference for a consultant assignment to undertake the Kirkendall Neighbourhood Strategy in collaboration with the Kirkendall Neighbourhood Association
Due date: December 5, 2017
New due date: April 17, 2018

Item “T”- That Planning Staff report back to the Planning Committee following consultation with the Alleyway Management Strategy Working Group on a process for including appropriate permissions for laneway housing as part of the review and update of the City’s Residential Zoning By-law planned for 2017-2018.
Due date: December 5, 2017
New due date: April 17, 2018

Item “U” - That staff report back before the end of the 12 month pilot program for enforcement of yard maintenance related by-laws in the McMaster neighbourhoods with the results and recommendations for permanent by-law enforcement resource requirements for the McMaster neighbourhoods
Due date: December 5, 2017
New due date: February 20, 2018

Item “CC” - That Planning staff be directed to report to the Planning Committee about the City’s policies respecting Boulevard Standards and that the report outline the options & alternatives that are available for future designs.
Due date: December 5, 2017
New due date: May 15, 2018

That the following Item to be removed:

Item “HH” – Staff to report back on implementation of APS (Addressed as 8.1, Administrative Penalty System Applied to the Responsible Animal Ownership By-Law 12-031 and the Feeding of Wildlife By-Law 12-130 (PED17165(a)), October 31, 2017)

CARRIED

(j) PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL (Item 12)

Committee approved the following without moving into Closed Session:

(i) Closed Session Minutes - November 14, 2017 (Item 12.1)

(Farr/Skelly)
That the Closed Session Minutes of the November 14, 2017 meeting be approved.

CARRIED

(ii) Modifications to Special Provision 640 (Item 12.2)

For disposition of the matter refer to Item 10.

(k) ADJOURNMENT (Item 13)

(Collins/Pasuta)
That, there being no further business, the Planning Committee be adjourned at 12:29 p.m.

CARRIED

Respectfully submitted,

Councillor M. Pearson
Chair, Planning Committee

Ida Bedioui
Legislative Co-ordinator
Office of the City Clerk
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Council Direction:

At the June 16, 2015 Planning Committee, staff were “directed to report back to the  
Planning Committee with a reporting tool that seeks to monitor applications where the  
120 or the 180 day statutory timeframe applies”.

This report provides a status of all active Zoning By-law Amendment, Official Plan  
Amendment and Plan of Subdivision applications relative to the 120 or the 180 day  
statutory timeframe provisions of the Planning Act for non-decision appeals.

Policy Implications and Legislative Requirements

Land use planning is guided by the Planning Act, which sets out how land use decisions  
are made and how and when they can be appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board  
(OMB). The Planning Act prescribes the situations in which an applicant may file an  
appeal for Official Plan Amendments, Zoning By-law Amendments and Plans of  
Subdivision for lack of a decision by Council.

For Zoning By-law Amendments, Section 34 (11) of the Planning Act states that:

“Where an application to the council for an amendment to a by-law passed under  
this section or a predecessor of this section is refused or the council refuses or  
neglects to make a decision on it within 120 days after the receipt by the clerk of  
the application, any of the following may appeal to the Municipal Board by filing

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.
OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.
OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.
with the clerk of the municipality a notice of appeal, accompanied by the fee prescribed under the *Ontario Municipal Board Act*:

1. The applicant.”

For Official Plan Amendments, Section 17(40) of the *Planning Act* states that:

“If the approval authority fails to give notice of a decision in respect of all or part of a plan within 180 days after the day the plan is received by the approval authority, or within the longer period determined under subsection (40.1), any person or public body may appeal to the Municipal Board with respect to all or any part of the plan in respect of which no notice of a decision was given by filing a notice of appeal with the approval authority, subject to subsection (41.1).”

In accordance with Section 17 (40.1) of the *Planning Act*, the City of Hamilton has extended the approval period of Official Plan Amendment applications from 180 days to 270 days.

For Plans of Subdivision, Section 51(34) of the *Planning Act* states that:

“If an application is made for approval of a plan of subdivision and the approval authority fails to make a decision under subsection (31) on it within 180 days after the day the application is received by the approval authority, the applicant may appeal to the Municipal Board with respect to the proposed subdivision by filing a notice with the approval authority, accompanied by the fee prescribed under the *Ontario Municipal Board Act*."

It is noted that Bill 139 (“OMB Reform”) proposes to reverse the non-decision appeal provisions of the *Planning Act* to provide municipalities with additional review time before an appeal can be made.

**Information:**

Staff were directed to report back to Planning Committee with a reporting tool that seeks to monitor applications where the applicable 120 day and 180 day statutory timeframe applies. This reporting tool would be used to track the status of all active Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision Applications. Staff are currently working with the AMANDA Implementation Team to add enhancements that will allow for the creation of more detailed reporting. As a result, future tables will include the extended statutory 270 day timeframe for Official Plan Amendments and a qualitative analysis of the status of active applications. It is anticipated that these enhancements will be available in Q2 of 2018.
Attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED18002 is a table outlining the active applications, sorted by Ward, from oldest application to newest. As of November 6, 2017 there were:

- 37 active Official Plan Amendment Applications (including 25 applications submitted after July 1, 2016);
- 70 active Zoning By-law Amendment Applications; and,
- 15 active Plan of Subdivision Applications.

Combined to reflect property addresses, this results in 70 active development proposals. Forty-one proposals are 2017 files, while 16 proposals are 2016 files and 13 proposals are pre-2016 files.

Within 60 to 90 days of January 16, 2018, 9 applications will be approaching the 120 or the 180 day statutory timeframe and will be eligible for appeal. Sixty-one applications have passed the 120 or 180 day statutory timeframe. However, for those twenty-five (25) Official Plan Amendment Applications received after July 1, 2016, a non-decision appeal cannot be made until 270 days have lapsed (these applications are marked with an asterisk on Appendix “A” to Report PED18002).

**Appendices and Schedules Attached:**

Appendix “A”: List of Active Development Applications

JG:jp
## Active Development Applications
(Effective November 6, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Date¹ Deemed Incomplete</th>
<th>Date¹ Deemed Complete</th>
<th>120 day cut off (Zoning Application)</th>
<th>180 day cut off (OPA and/or Subdivision Application)</th>
<th>Applicant/Agent</th>
<th>Days since Received and/or Deemed Complete as of Jan. 16, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-16-11</td>
<td>925 Main St. W. &amp; 150 Longwood Rd. S., Hamilton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19-Apr-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>28-Apr-16</td>
<td>17-Aug-16</td>
<td>16-Oct-16</td>
<td>Urban Solutions Planning &amp; Land Development</td>
<td>637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-16-029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-07*</td>
<td>347 Charlton Ave. W., Hamilton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16-Jan-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>31-Jan-17</td>
<td>16-May-17</td>
<td>05-Jul-17*</td>
<td>GSP Group</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-18*</td>
<td>644 Main St. W., Hamilton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31-Mar-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>28-Apr-17</td>
<td>29-Jul-17</td>
<td>27-Sep-17*</td>
<td>Urban Solutions Planning &amp; Land Development</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAR-17-040</td>
<td>412 Aberdeen Ave., Hamilton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27-Apr-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>26-May-17</td>
<td>25-Aug-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Susana Da Silva &amp; Mario Neves</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-28*</td>
<td>1190 Main St. W. + 103 &amp; 111 Traymore Ave., Hamilton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15-Aug-17</td>
<td>21-Aug-17</td>
<td>10-Oct-17</td>
<td>13-Dec-17</td>
<td>11-Feb-18*</td>
<td>Bousfields Inc.</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-14-003</td>
<td>195 Wellington St. S., Hamilton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>03-Feb-14</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>28-Feb-14</td>
<td>03-Jun-14</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Bousfields Inc.</td>
<td>1443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Date¹ Deemed Incomplete</td>
<td>Date¹ Deemed Complete</td>
<td>120 day cut off (Zoning Application)</td>
<td>180 day cut off (OPA and/or Subdivision Application)</td>
<td>Applicant/Agent</td>
<td>Days since Received and/or Deemed Complete as of Jan. 16, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-008</td>
<td>117 Forest Ave. &amp; 175 Catharine St. S., Hamilton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23-Dec-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>05-Jan-17</td>
<td>22-Apr-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Urban Solutions Planning &amp; Land Development</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-08*</td>
<td>41 Stuart St., Hamilton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20-Jan-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>06-Feb-17</td>
<td>20-May-17</td>
<td>19-Jul-17*</td>
<td>King Stuart Developments Inc.</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-046</td>
<td>206-208 King St. W., Hamilton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15-May-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>19-May-17</td>
<td>12-Sep-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A.J. Clarke &amp; Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAR-17-047</td>
<td>43 King St. E., Hamilton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>02-Jun-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>16-Jun-17</td>
<td>30-Sep-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Urban Solutions Planning &amp; Land Development</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-23*</td>
<td>71 Rebecca St, Hamilton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15-Jun-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14-Jul-17</td>
<td>13-Oct-17</td>
<td>12-Dec-17*</td>
<td>Wellings Planning Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-27*</td>
<td>163 Jackson St. W.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>08-Aug-17</td>
<td>21-Aug-17</td>
<td>12-Sep-17</td>
<td>06-Dec-17</td>
<td>11-Mar-18*</td>
<td>Bousfields Inc.</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPA-13-01</td>
<td>100 Cumberland Ave., Hamilton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12-Apr-13</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>03-May-13</td>
<td>10-Aug-13</td>
<td>09-Oct-13</td>
<td>MHBC Planning Limited</td>
<td>1740</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ZAC and UHOPA refer to different types of development applications.
## Active Development Applications
(Effective November 6, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Date¹ Deemed Incomplete</th>
<th>Date¹ Deemed Complete</th>
<th>120 day cut off (Zoning Application)</th>
<th>180 day cut off (OPA and/or Subdivision Application)</th>
<th>Applicant/Agent</th>
<th>Days since Received and/or Deemed Complete as of Jan. 16, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-024</td>
<td>119-123 Princess St., Hamilton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>08-Feb-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>27-Mar-17</td>
<td>08-Jun-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Armstrong Planning &amp; Project Management</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-17*</td>
<td>157 Gibson Ave., Hamilton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23-Mar-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>05-May-17</td>
<td>21-Jul-17</td>
<td>17-Sep-17*</td>
<td>A.J. Clarke &amp; Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAR-16-046</td>
<td>121 Vansitmart Ave., Hamilton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19-Jul-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>29-Jul-16</td>
<td>16-Nov-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Liam Doherty</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-031</td>
<td>575 Woodward Ave., Hamilton</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14-Mar-17</td>
<td>31-Mar-17</td>
<td>05-Jul-17</td>
<td>12-Jul-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>MHBC Planning Limited</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25T-201707</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-16-002</td>
<td>154 &amp; 166 Mount Albion Rd., Stoney Creek</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>04-Dec-15</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15-Dec-15</td>
<td>13-Apr-16</td>
<td>01-Jun-16</td>
<td>GSP Group</td>
<td>774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25T-201612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-16-035</td>
<td>865-867 Beach Blvd., Hamilton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28-Jun-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>04-Aug-16</td>
<td>02-Dec-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>MHBC Planning Limited</td>
<td>567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAR-16-044</td>
<td>398-402 Nash Rd. N. &amp; 30-54 Bancroft St., Hamilton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12-Jul-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>04-Aug-16</td>
<td>02-Dec-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Urban Solutions Planning &amp; Land Development</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAR-16-034</td>
<td>119-123 Princess St., Hamilton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>08-Feb-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>27-Mar-17</td>
<td>08-Jun-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Armstrong Planning &amp; Project Management</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Active Development Applications
(Effective November 6, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Date¹ Deemed Incomplete</th>
<th>Date¹ Deemed Complete</th>
<th>120 day cut off (Zoning Application)</th>
<th>180 day cut off (OPA and/or Subdivision Application)</th>
<th>Applicant/Agent</th>
<th>Days since Received and/or Deemed Complete as of Jan. 16, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-050</td>
<td>2782 Barton St. E., Hamilton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>02-Jun-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>30-Jun-17</td>
<td>28-Oct-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A.J. Clarke &amp; Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAR-16-063</td>
<td>1011 Fennell Ave. E., Hamilton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>07-Oct-16</td>
<td>17-Nov-16</td>
<td>14-Aug-17</td>
<td>04-Feb-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>btM Drafting &amp; Design</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-057</td>
<td>1221 Limeridge Rd. E., Hamilton</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>07-Jul-17</td>
<td>17-Jul-17</td>
<td>24-Oct-17</td>
<td>04-Nov-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>IBI Group</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-31 ZAC-17-071</td>
<td>1625 -1655 Upper James St., Hamilton</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27-Sep-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>02-Oct-17</td>
<td>25-Jan-18</td>
<td>26-Mar-18*</td>
<td>MB1 Development Consulting Inc.</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-16-075</td>
<td>393 Rymal Rd. W., Hamilton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15-Nov-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>01-Dec-16</td>
<td>15-Mar-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>GSP Group</td>
<td>427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-030</td>
<td>567 Scenic Dr., Hamilton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10-Mar-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>28-Mar-17</td>
<td>08-Jul-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A.J. Clarke &amp; Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-061</td>
<td>500 Upper Wellington Street</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19-Jul-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>25-Jul-17</td>
<td>16-Nov-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A.J. Clarke &amp; Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-16-13 ZAC-16-033</td>
<td>15 Picardy Dr., Stoney Creek</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13-May-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>27-May-16</td>
<td>10-Sep-16</td>
<td>09-Nov-16</td>
<td>IBI Group</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Active Development Applications
### (Effective November 6, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Date¹ Deemed Incomplete</th>
<th>Date¹ Deemed Complete</th>
<th>120 day cut off (Zoning Application)</th>
<th>180 day cut off (OPA and/or Subdivision Application)</th>
<th>Applicant/Agent</th>
<th>Days since Received and/or Deemed Complete as of Jan. 16, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-16-25*</td>
<td>1809, 1817, &amp; 1821 Rymal Rd. E., Stoney Creek</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>07-Oct-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>23-Nov-16</td>
<td>04-Feb-17</td>
<td>5-Apr-17*</td>
<td>WEBB Planning Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-16-064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25T-201609</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-16-26*</td>
<td>478 &amp; 490 First Rd. W., Stoney Creek</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12-Oct-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>02-Nov-16</td>
<td>09-Feb-17</td>
<td>10-Apr-17*</td>
<td>T. Johns Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-16-065</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25T-201611</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-16-27*</td>
<td>464 First Rd. W., Stoney Creek,</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12-Oct-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>02-Nov-16</td>
<td>09-Feb-17</td>
<td>10-Apr-17*</td>
<td>T. Johns Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-16-066</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25T-201612</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-01*</td>
<td>15 Ridgeview Dr., Stoney Creek</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>02-Dec-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>16-Dec-16</td>
<td>01-Apr-17</td>
<td>31-May-17*</td>
<td>A.J. Clarke &amp; Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25T-201701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-044</td>
<td>16 King St. W., Stoney Creek</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12-May-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>07-Jun-17</td>
<td>09-Sep-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A.J. Clarke &amp; Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-20*</td>
<td>928 Queenston Rd., Stoney Creek</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>01-Jun-17</td>
<td>30-Jun-17</td>
<td>28-Jul-17</td>
<td>29-Sep-17</td>
<td>28-Nov-17*</td>
<td>Fothergill Planning and Development Inc.</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-049</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHOPA-17-24*</td>
<td>138 Upper Centennial Pkwy, Stoney Creek</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27-Jun-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15-Aug-17</td>
<td>25-Oct-17</td>
<td>24-Dec-17*</td>
<td>Brouwer Architecture</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-055</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Active Development Applications
**(Effective November 6, 2017)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Date¹ Deemed Incomplete</th>
<th>Date¹ Deemed Complete</th>
<th>120 day cut off (Zoning Application)</th>
<th>180 day cut off (OPA and/or Subdivision Application)</th>
<th>Applicant/Agent</th>
<th>Days since Received and/or Deemed Complete as of Jan. 16, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-15-040</td>
<td>9 Glencrest Ave., Stoney Creek</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>02-Jul-15</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10-Aug-15</td>
<td>30-Oct-15</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>WEBB Planning Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-16-28*</td>
<td>261 King St. E., Stoney Creek</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24-Oct-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>04-Nov-16</td>
<td>21-Feb-17</td>
<td>22-Apr-17*</td>
<td>GSP Group</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-09*</td>
<td>84-96 Lakeview Dr., Stoney Creek</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19-Jan-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>08-Feb-17</td>
<td>19-May-17</td>
<td>18-Jul-17*</td>
<td>IBI Group</td>
<td>362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-15*</td>
<td>417 - 423 Highway No. 8,</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>07-Mar-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>23-Mar-17</td>
<td>05-Jul-17</td>
<td>03-Sep-17*</td>
<td>IBI Group</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-028</td>
<td>175 Margaret Ave., &amp; 176 Millen Rd., Stoney Creek</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>07-Mar-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>23-Mar-17</td>
<td>05-Jul-17</td>
<td>03-Sep-17*</td>
<td>IBI Group</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-15-03(R)</td>
<td>9255 Airport Rd. W, Mount Hope</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19-Dec-14</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>21-Jan-15</td>
<td>18-Apr-15</td>
<td>17-Jun-15</td>
<td>WEBB Planning Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>1124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-07-111(R)</td>
<td>9388 Twenty Rd. W., Glanbrook</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20-Dec-12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>18-Jan-13</td>
<td>19-Apr-13</td>
<td>18-Jun-13</td>
<td>A.J. Clarke &amp; Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>1853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Ward</td>
<td>Date Received</td>
<td>Date¹ Deemed Incomplete</td>
<td>Date¹ Deemed Complete</td>
<td>120 day cut off (Zoning Application)</td>
<td>180 day cut off (OPA and/or Subdivision Application)</td>
<td>Applicant/Agent</td>
<td>Days since Received and/or Deemed Complete as of Jan. 16, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-15-052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-16-016</td>
<td>1313 BASELINE RD., STONEY CREEK</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15-Jan-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15-Feb-16</td>
<td>14-May-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A.J. Clarke &amp; Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-009</td>
<td>1215 BARTON ST., STONEY CREEK</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23-Dec-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>06-Jan-17</td>
<td>22-Apr-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>WEBB Planning Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-025</td>
<td>235 TANGLEWOOD DR., GLANBROOK</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16-Feb-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>24-Feb-17</td>
<td>16-Jun-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A.J. Clarke &amp; Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-05*</td>
<td>1, 19, 20, 21, 23, 27 &amp; 30 LAKESIDE DR. &amp; 81 WATERFORD CRES., STONEY CREEK</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23-Dec-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>17-Jan-17</td>
<td>22-Apr-17</td>
<td>21-Jun-17*</td>
<td>IBI GROUP</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25T-201703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-027</td>
<td>2341 &amp; 2365 TO 2431 REGIONAL RD. 56 &amp; TANGLEWOOD DR., GLANBROOK</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23-Feb-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>06-Mar-17</td>
<td>23-Jun-17</td>
<td>02-Sep-17*</td>
<td>A.J. Clarke &amp; Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25T-210706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Active Development Applications
*(Effective November 6, 2017)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th><strong>Date¹ Deemed Incomplete</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date¹ Deemed Complete</strong></th>
<th>120 day cut off (Zoning Application)</th>
<th>180 day cut off (OPA and/or Subdivision Application)</th>
<th>Applicant/Agent</th>
<th>Days since Received and/or Deemed Complete as of Jan. 16, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZAR-17-033</td>
<td>90 Creanona Blvd., Stoney Creek</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27-Mar-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>28-Apr-17</td>
<td>25-Jul-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A.J. Clarke &amp; Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-29*</td>
<td>1288 Baseline Rd., Stoney Creek</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21-Aug-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14-Sep-17</td>
<td>19-Dec-17</td>
<td>13-Mar-18*</td>
<td>IBI Group</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPA-12-23</td>
<td>491 Springbrook Ave, 851 &amp; 875</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21-Dec-12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>18-Jan-13</td>
<td>20-Apr-13</td>
<td>19-Jun-13</td>
<td>Wellings Planning Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>1852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25T-201206</td>
<td>Ancaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25T-201206</td>
<td>Ancaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-16-07*</td>
<td>503-518 Garner Rd. W., Ancaster</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10-Feb-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>26-Feb-16</td>
<td>09-Jun-16</td>
<td>08-Aug-16</td>
<td>Fothergill Planning and Development Inc.</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-16-017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-02*</td>
<td>558 Golf Links Rd., Ancaster</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13-Dec-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>15-Dec-16</td>
<td>12-Apr-17</td>
<td>11-Jun-17*</td>
<td>T. Johns Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Footnotes:

¹ Deemed Incomplete
² Deemed Complete
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Date¹ Deemed Incomplete</th>
<th>Date¹ Deemed Complete</th>
<th>120 day cut off (Zoning Application)</th>
<th>180 day cut off (OPA and/or Subdivision Application)</th>
<th>Applicant/Agent</th>
<th>Days since Received and/or Deemed Complete as of Jan. 16, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-014</td>
<td>941 Old Mohawk Rd, Ancaster</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23-Dec-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>19-Jan-17</td>
<td>22-Apr-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Urban Solutions Planning &amp; Land Development</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-051</td>
<td>280 Wilson St. E., Ancaster</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>05-Jun-17</td>
<td>22-Jun-17</td>
<td>23-Aug-17</td>
<td>03-Oct-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Brenda Khes</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-25*</td>
<td>305 Garner Rd. W., Ancaster</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11-Jul-17</td>
<td>17-Jul-17</td>
<td>08-Aug-17</td>
<td>08-Nov-17</td>
<td>07-Jan-18*</td>
<td>MHBC Planning Limited</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-062</td>
<td>45 Secinaro Avenue</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28-Jul-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>01-Aug-17</td>
<td>25-Nov-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>T. Johns Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-066</td>
<td>1274 Mohawk Rd., Ancaster</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17-Aug-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>06-Sep-17</td>
<td>15-Dec-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>T. Johns Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-30*</td>
<td>70 Garner Rd. E., Ancaster</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>08-Sep-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>19-Sep-17</td>
<td>06-Jan-18</td>
<td>07-Mar-18*</td>
<td>Fothergill Planning and Development Inc.</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-32*</td>
<td>35 Londonderry Dr., Ancaster</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>06-Oct-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>01-Nov-17</td>
<td>03-Feb-18</td>
<td>04-Apr-18*</td>
<td>A.J. Clarke &amp; Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Active Development Applications

(Effective November 6, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Date¹ Deemed Incomplete</th>
<th>Date¹ Deemed Complete</th>
<th>120 day cut off (Zoning Application)</th>
<th>180 day cut off (OPA and/or Subdivision Application)</th>
<th>Applicant/Agent</th>
<th>Days since Received and/or Deemed Complete as of Jan. 16, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-060</td>
<td>211 York Road, Dundas</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14-Jul-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>02-Aug-17</td>
<td>11-Nov-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Wellings Planning Consultants Inc.</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPA-13-15</td>
<td>Dundas South Quarry Extension - Part of Lots 7,8,9,10 Concession 3, Flamborough</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11-Nov-13</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>06-Dec-13</td>
<td>11-Mar-14</td>
<td>10-May-14</td>
<td>MHBC Planning Limited</td>
<td>1527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAC-17-064</td>
<td>655 Cramer Rd., Flamborough</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>09-Aug-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>17-Aug-17</td>
<td>07-Dec-17</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>A.J. Clarke &amp; Associates Ltd.</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZAR-11-018</td>
<td>136 &amp; 156 Concession 5 Rd. E., Flamborough</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15-Mar-11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>08-Apr-11</td>
<td>13-Jul-11</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Fothergill Planning and Development Inc.</td>
<td>2499</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Active Development Applications
(Effective November 6, 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>File</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Ward</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
<th>Date¹ Deemed Incomplete</th>
<th>Date¹ Deemed Complete</th>
<th>120 day cut off (Zoning Application)</th>
<th>180 day cut off (OPA and/or Subdivision Application)</th>
<th>Applicant/Agent</th>
<th>Days since Received and/or Deemed Complete as of Jan. 16, 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UHOPA-17-06*</td>
<td>157 Parkside Dr., Flamborough</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23-Dec-16</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>17-Jan-17</td>
<td>22-Apr-17</td>
<td>21-Jun-17*</td>
<td>MHBC Planning Limited</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Active Development Applications

1. When an application is deemed incomplete, the new deemed complete date is the day the new materials are submitted. In these situations, the 120, 180 & 270 day timeframe commences on the date the new materials were submitted. In all other situations, the 120, 180 & 270 day timeframe commences the day the application was received.

* In accordance with Section 17 (40.1) of the Planning Act, the City of Hamilton has extended the approval period of Official Plan Amendment applications from 180 days to 270 days (applicable to applications received on or after July 1, 2016).
TO: Chair and Members Planning Committee

COMMITTEE DATE: January 16, 2018

SUBJECT/REPORT NO: Responsible Animal Ownership By-law 12-031 be Amended to Include the Offence of Barking Dog (PED18003) (City Wide)

WARD(S) AFFECTED: City Wide

PREPARED BY: Luis Ferreira (905) 546-2424 Ext. 3087
Dawn Johnson (905) 546-2424 Ext. 5809

SUBMITTED BY: Ken Leendertse
Director, Licensing and By-law Services
Planning and Economic Development Department

SIGNATURE: Ken Leendertse
Director, Licensing and By-law Services
Planning and Economic Development Department

RECOMMENDATION

(a) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED18003, which amends the Responsible Animal Ownership By-law No. 12-031, by establishing offences of noise made by animals (barking dog, etc.), and which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be approved;

(b) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18003, which amends the By-law to Establish a System of Administrative Penalties By-law No. 17-225, by amending Table 8 to include offences of noise made by animals (barking dogs, etc.), which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be approved.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Staff has identified that the current Responsible Animal Ownership By-law No. 12-031 does not address the offence of barking dogs which is a source of numerous complaints. Current investigations of barking dog offences are addressed through City of Hamilton Noise By-law 11-285. Staff is requesting to amend the Responsible Animal Ownership By-law to also include this offence. This change provides Animal Services Officers the ability to address all animal-related offences in one convenient By-law.
The primary objective of including this offence in By-law 12-031 is to provide Animal Services Officers the tools necessary to address this offence in a By-law that they are familiar with as well as including it into the Administrative Penalty System (APS) By-law process.

This addition will also provide, to those who wish to educate themselves on responsible animal ownership, a by-law containing all regulations and prohibitions concerning pet ownership.

This proposed recommendation will increase clarity and ease of understanding; clarify intent; improve overall readability and, most importantly, contained within the appropriate By-law.

**Alternatives for Consideration – Not Applicable**

**FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Financial / Staffing / Legal: N/A

**HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

Barking dog incidents have historically been investigated by both Municipal Law Enforcement Officers and Animal Services Officers under the Noise By-law. The offence of barking dog and the subsequent investigations have been transferred to Animal Services Officers solely, who desire the ability to address the offence of barking dogs through the Responsible Animal Ownership By-law.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS**

N/A

**RELEVANT CONSULTATION**

Legal Services was consulted in the preparation of this Report.

**ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION**

Implementing the recommendations will provide Animal Services Officers with a single By-law containing all regulations and prohibitions concerning responsible animal ownership. It is a familiar By-law that has been recently added under APS which provides a host of enhancements and benefits as outlined in the Administrative Penalty System Applied to Responsible Animal Ownership By-law 12-031 and the Feeding of Wildlife By-law 12-130 (Report PED17165(a)).
This recommendation will have no negative impact on enforcement activities by the Animal Services Officers as they have been addressing this issue solely for the past 18 months. There is no financial implication or staffing concerns with this recommendation and it will also provide the public a single By-law to educate themselves with responsible pet ownership.

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION

N/A

ALIGNMENT TO THE 2016 – 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN

Community Engagement & Participation

*Hamilton has* an open, transparent and accessible approach to City government that engages with and empowers all citizens to be involved in their community.

Healthy and Safe Communities

*Hamilton is* a safe and supportive city where people are active, healthy, and have a high quality of life.

Our People and Performance

*Hamiltonians have* a high level of trust and confidence in their City government.

APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED

Appendix “A”: By-Law amending the Responsible Animal Ownership By-law No. 12-031

Appendix “B”: By-Law amending the By-law to Establish a System of Administrative Penalties By-law No. 17-225

KL/LF/DJ/st
CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW NO.

To Amend By-Law No. 12-031
For Responsible Animal Ownership in the City of Hamilton

WHEREAS Council enacted By-law No. 12-031 being the by-law for Responsible Animal Ownership in the City of Hamilton;

AND WHEREAS this By-law amends Part 7.0 - Prohibiting Animals at Large, etc. of By-law 12-031 by adding subsection 7.12 with respect to unreasonable animal noise;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:

1. Section 7 is amended by adding the following new subsection 7.12:

   7.12 No person who is the owner of an animal shall permit the animal to make noise that is:
   (a) unreasonably loud; or
   (b) likely to disturb the inhabitants of the City of Hamilton; or
   (c) both,
      (i) persistent in nature; and
      (ii) clearly audible at a point of reception.

This section does not apply to noise from an animal on a farm.

PASSED this day of , 2018.

__________________________________________  __________________________________________
Fred Eisenberger                        Rose Caterini
Mayor                                 City Clerk
To Amend By-Law No. 12-031  
For Responsible Animal Ownership in the City of Hamilton

For Office Use Only, this doesn't appear in the by-law - Clerk's will use this information in the Authority Section of the by-law

Is this by-law derived from the approval of a Committee Report? Yes

Committee: Planning  
Report No.: PED18003  
Date: 16/01/2018  
Ward(s) or City Wide: City Wide  
(MM/DD/YYYY)

Prepared by: Luis Ferreira  
Phone No: Ext. 3087

For Office Use Only, this doesn't appear in the by-law
CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW NO.

To Amend By-Law 17-225
Being a By-law to Establish a System of Administrative Penalties

WHEREAS Council enacted a by-law to establish a system of Administrative Penalties, being By-Law No. 17-225;

AND WHEREAS this By-law amends By-law No. 17-225;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:

1. The amendments in this By-law include any necessary grammatical, numbering and lettering changes.

2. Schedule A of By-law No. 17-225 is amended by adding the following new subsection after Item 72 to Table 8 and correcting the Item numbers proceeding Item 75

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>COLUMN 1 DESIGNATED BY-LAW &amp; SECTION</th>
<th>COLUMN 2 SHORT FORM WORDING</th>
<th>COLUMN 3 EARLY PAYMENT</th>
<th>COLUMN 4 SET PENALTY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>12-031 7.12(a)</td>
<td>Owner permit animal to make noise that is unreasonably loud</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>12-031 7.12(b)</td>
<td>Owner permit animal to make noise that is likely to disturb</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>12-031 7.12(c)</td>
<td>Owner permit animal to make noise that is both persistent in nature and clearly audible</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PASSED this day of , 2018.

Fred Eisenberger
Mayor

Rose Caterini
City Clerk
To Amend By-Law 17-225
Being the By-law to Establish a System of Administrative Penalties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Office Use Only, this doesn't appear in the by-law - Clerk's will use this information in the Authority Section of the by-law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is this by-law derived from the approval of a Committee Report? Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee: Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward(s) or City Wide: City Wide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepared by: Luis Ferreira</th>
<th>Phone No: Ext. 3087</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Office Use Only, this doesn't appear in the by-law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**INFORMATION REPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO:</th>
<th>Chair and Members Planning Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DATE:</td>
<td>January 16, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT/REPORT NO:</td>
<td>Review of Problems Associated with Increased Visitors to Waterfalls (PED18011) (Wards 6, 9, 13, 14 and 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD(S) AFFECTED:</td>
<td>(Wards 6, 9, 13, 14 and 15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARED BY:</td>
<td>Marty Hazell (905) 546-2424 Ext. 4588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED BY:</td>
<td>Marty Hazell Director, Strategic Initiatives Planning and Economic Development Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Direction:**

On April 12, 2017, City Council approved General Issues Committee Report 17-008, resulting in approval of the following:

“WHEREAS, Hamilton has been promoted as “The Waterfall Capital of the World” and annual visitors to Webster and Tew Falls and the Dundas Peak continue to increase (84K in 2016, not including annual pass holders or unpaid visitors);

WHEREAS, the increased visitors to Webster and Tew Falls and the Dundas Peak are wreaking havoc on Greensville and Dundas neighbourhoods with serious negative impacts including, but not limited to:

- traffic and parking issues for local residents such as gridlock on local streets, visitors blocking roadways and blocking resident’s driveways;
- nuisance issues such as littering and picnicking on resident’s lawns;
- emergency vehicle access impacts for residents

WHEREAS, measures to combat overcrowding such as the installation of “No Parking” signs, extra staff and proactive by-law enforcement on weekends, and the implementation of fees for visitors to Webster and Tew Falls and the Dundas Peak have had no deterrent effect whatsoever;

WHEREAS, increased visitors to Webster and Tew Falls and the Dundas Peak are also having negative effects on the environment including damage from littering and trampled ecosystems, as well as safety issues for people on the narrow trails; and
WHEREAS, regular rescue calls for “risk takers” at Webster and Tew Falls and the Dundas Peak is a concern for emergency service providers (i.e. fire, police and paramedics).

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

(a) That City staff be directed to form a multi-disciplinary working group to conduct a comprehensive, multi-faceted investigation of public safety and the negative impacts to the Greensville and Dundas neighbourhoods associated with the increase in visitors to Webster and Tew Falls and the Dundas Peak;

(b) That the Hamilton Conservation Authority, the Hamilton Police Service, EMS, Traffic, Parking, By-law Services, and CN Railway and any other required staff / agency be requested to participate in the review;

(c) That staff be directed to report back to the three area Councillors and the General Issues Committee, no later than September 2017, with potential solutions to the problems associated with the increase in visitors to Webster and Tew Falls.”

Information:

As directed, a multi-disciplinary working group was formed, consisting of representatives from Planning and Economic Development (General Manager’s Office, Tourism and Culture, Licensing and By-Law Services), Public Works, Legal Services, the Hamilton Conservation Authority (HCA), CN Railway, and the Hamilton Police Service.

The working group met 11 times, from May 1, 2017 to September 11, 2017, to discuss the many issues and concerns associated with increased visitors to Webster and Tew Falls and the Dundas Peak. Since the closure of the decades-old trail on private property in September 2016, which connected Webster and Tew Falls, new safety concerns have arisen as visitors are forced onto narrow municipal streets with no sidewalks to use to access the two waterfalls. Webster Falls, Tew Falls and the Dundas Peak are maintained by the HCA. This working group also liaised with Councillor Tom Jackson, who formed a group to address safety issues at Albion Falls, which is owned by the City of Hamilton. Councillor Conley met with Public Works staff on-site at Devils Punchbowl, which is maintained by the City of Hamilton and the HCA, to assess safety issues and signage.

Attached as Appendix “A” to this report is a listing of the many items discussed and addressed by the working group. One of the most frequently discussed issues was parking violations / enforcement around the various waterfalls. To address parking violations in the neighbourhoods around the various waterfalls, Parking Control Officers were scheduled to work in this area every weekend throughout the spring, summer and early fall of 2017. Approximately 3,580 parking violation tags were issued and the
associated revenue more than off-set the cost of the staff overtime. In addition, the effectiveness of parking regulations was reviewed and changes to the regulations were made and/or additional signage was installed where deemed necessary. Also, the HPS assisted by parking a service decoy vehicle in strategic areas to deter people from parking illegally. Press releases were also used, on several occasions, to reinforce key messaging of safety for visitors reminding them to remain on trails and that By-law staff will be enforcing no parking/stopping areas on residential streets.

While many minor changes associated with the items listed in Appendix “A” were addressed by the working group in consultation with the affected Ward Councillors, the most significant and impactful change was the HCA initiative to pilot a weekend shuttle bus operation. The shuttle bus operation transported people from Misener’s on Highway 5 to the Spencer Gorge Conservation Area, to Webster and Tew Falls and the Dundas Peak, in an effort to decrease on-street parking, reduce traffic congestion and improve safety in the areas around the falls. The shuttle ran from May 13, 2017 until October 29, 2017. While the HCA is currently evaluating the pilot, it is known that the shuttle operation was successful in diverting over 16K vehicles away from the residential neighbourhoods, with the enforcement of no parking/stopping within the area being key to deter visitors from parking on streets in the immediate area. By-law enforcement of unauthorized “pop-up” parking lots was also fundamental to move people and vehicles out of the area. Staff will be able to report back on this matter further, in early 2018, once the HCA has completed a comprehensive pilot evaluation and has reported to their Board on a possible future operation. HCA staff noted that they have received several emails from residents thanking them for returning their area back to a more peaceful and liveable place on weekends with the shuttle operations and HCA parking lots closed.

Staff have apprised Councillors Vanderbeek, Partridge and Pasuta of the information contained in this report and will continue to consult with them as necessary in preparation for next spring.

APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED

Appendix “A” – Waterfall Working Group Outstanding Business List

MH:lem
## Waterfall Motion Working Group
### Outstanding Business List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SHUTTLE Operation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenced May 6, 2017</td>
<td>Lisa Burnside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOCIAL MEDIA:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow up with Communications regarding the “Google” search for ‘Dundas Peak’</td>
<td>Ann Lamanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare and distribute a media release ahead of the May 13/14 weekend</td>
<td>Ann Lamanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism &amp; Culture to promote enforcement and shuttle on City sites</td>
<td>Carrie Brooks-Joiner/Ann Lamanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate a social media plan of ‘friendly reminders’</td>
<td>Ann Lamanes/Dana Borcea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach out to “City of Waterfalls” website to discuss website content</td>
<td>Ann Lamanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous media releases regarding safety and parking (ongoing throughout season)</td>
<td>Ann Lamanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review the HCA entry gates signage for consistency</td>
<td>Lisa Burnside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ENFORCEMENT INFO:</strong></td>
<td>Pam Carver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft a perimeter enforcement area for future enforcement</td>
<td>Pam Carver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm HPS towing contract/procedures</td>
<td>Pam Carver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with HPS regarding the possibility of utilizing dispatch staff to release towed vehicles</td>
<td>Peter Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Responsible Party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate towing proposal for Brock and Melville</td>
<td>Pam Carver, HPS, Councillor Vanderbeek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review current signage in the areas of the Falls</td>
<td>James Buffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once signage reviewed – provide recommendations for amendment/additional signage</td>
<td>James Buffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate additional / larger NO TRESPASSING signage at the end of Melville Street to stop pedestrians from crossing the tracks</td>
<td>Matthew Davidson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request enforcement of nuisance by-law by HPS</td>
<td>Marty Hazell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with Legal Services to Appoint HCA Provincial Offences Officers to issue parking tickets on City streets</td>
<td>James Buffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review proposed ‘perimeter area’ with the affected Ward Councillors before the next meeting</td>
<td>Pam Carver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with Councillor Conley to see if he wishes enforcement on Ridge Road (Devil’s Punch Bowl area)</td>
<td>James Buffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule extra parking enforcement shift for weekend of May 13/14</td>
<td>James Buffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permission to use an HPS vehicle as decoy</td>
<td>Dave Calvert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider/Implement Enforcement of Wilson Street bike lane</td>
<td>James Buffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with Kim Coombs enforcement/non-enforcement at 31 Fallsview – 8ft fence on City road allowance</td>
<td>James Buffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with Kim Coombs regarding short form wording for weekend shifts</td>
<td>James Buffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propose trail wayfinding signage to HCA to assist lost visitors/emergency services staff</td>
<td>Gord Costie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with Parking Enforcement Officers for input of their experience/enforcement</td>
<td>James Buffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm current signage and review possibility of changing signage to “NPA April to November”</td>
<td>Kerry Davren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consult with Lynne/Councillor Pasuta regarding proposed signage and locations for signage</td>
<td>James Buffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review records for complaints for Cramer Road</td>
<td>Lynne Cecchetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run report for request for parking enforcement on Cramer Road</td>
<td>James Buffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Councillor Pasuta’s office with Paid Duty Officer price list</td>
<td>Peter Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advise Councillor Pasuta of proposal to pay for off duty officers</td>
<td>Lynne Cecchetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request that HPS dispatch staff try to keep a record of weekend nuisance calls</td>
<td>Peter Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appoint HCA Provincial Offences Officers to issue parking tickets</td>
<td>John McLennan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put together a list of potential locations for the HPS decoy vehicle</td>
<td>Scott, Lisa, James</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE to ensure zoning enforcement on unauthorized paid parking area violations on private property in area of the Falls</td>
<td>Kim Coombs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks Dept. to review/discuss enforcement of unauthorized paid parking area violations on</td>
<td>James Buffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private property in area of the Falls</td>
<td>James Buffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate Councillor Partidge’s request for parking enforcement in area of Grindstone Falls</td>
<td>James Buffett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLE staff proactively enforce Albion Falls-charge offenders under the Parks Trespass By-law</td>
<td>Kim Coombs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OTHER:**

| Albion Falls Meeting Updates                          | Kelly Barnett                  |
| Contact CN Rail for name of a representative to attend regularly | Laura McDavid                  |
| Attend the next HCA Board meeting to assist Canada Day planning | Peter Hall                     |
| Prepare an HCA ‘wish list’ of ideas requiring Budget    | Lisa Burnside                   |
INFORMATION REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO:</th>
<th>Chair and Members Planning Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMITTEE DATE:</td>
<td>January 16, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT/REPORT NO:</td>
<td>Quality Index for Rental Units (PED18026) (City Wide) (Outstanding Business List Item)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD(S) AFFECTED:</td>
<td>City Wide</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PREPARED BY: | Ken Leendertse  
(905) 546-2424 Ext. 3059 |
| SUBMITTED BY: | Ken Leendertse  
Director, Licensing and By-law Services  
Planning and Economic Development Department |
| SIGNATURE: |                                      |

Council Direction:

At its meeting of September 10, 2014, City Council directed staff to report back on the feasibility of conducting a Quality Index for rental unit in the City of Hamilton.

Information:

Quality Index for rental units can take on many forms. It could be the cost of renting an apartment in Hamilton based on the Rental Market Report from the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC). It could be reflective of the vacancy rates for specific areas and types of living accommodation. Quality Index could also be the total number of rental units in relation to households. However, in the context of the request from the Council, quality index for rental units is the quality of the housing stock in relation to Property Standards.

Property Standards By-laws, passed under the Building Code Act (BCA), provides the framework for municipalities to require that buildings, structures, surrounding lands and vacant property be maintained and improved, on an ongoing basis (retrospectively), to minimum standards set out in the by-law. There is an obvious difference between the maintenance of buildings and the construction of buildings. Property standards do not relate to the construction of new buildings or renovations or repairs to them, rather these standards relate to existing building structures and the property in which they are situated, regardless of whether they pre-existed the by-law. The Property Standards By-law must confine itself to the standards of maintenance established by Council, and for the most part adopting a much lower benchmark than what is found in the BCA.
In order to improve the quality of rental units in the City, Council approved the Proactive By-law Enforcement Program in 2010. Dubbed “Project Compliance” the program focus was to advance the City’s strategic goals related to a safe and healthy community by identifying property standards defects and maintenance issues in rental units and seeking compliance by property owners.

The Proactive Enforcement Team was made permanent in 2013 and continues to investigate and focus on the standards of living of rental units in Hamilton. Team members meet with the tenants during inspection of the rental property to ensure that the minimum property standards are being met. The following chart provides a high level summary of the efforts from 2015 and 2016:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Standards By-Law</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Properties Attended (includes apartment buildings)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Investigations</td>
<td>1,876</td>
<td>1,796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Orders Issued</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Properties Attended</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Orders Issued</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fee For Service</td>
<td>$17,662</td>
<td>$7,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contractor Charges</td>
<td>$18,691</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The concept of a Quality Index is based on a subjective scale relating to location and price that is driven by the market and vacancy rate. Staff research found no model in relation to quality standards for rental properties. Property Standards By-laws determine if the property is either compliant or non-compliant. It would not be practical to rate the quality of the entire rental stock without inspecting each unit and rating it on a subjective scale.

Staff concludes the current tools in place with the Proactive Enforcement Team targeting rental residential properties meets the City’s strategic goal related to a safe and healthy community.

The item respecting Quality Index for rental units be identified as complete and removed from the Planning Committee Outstanding Business List.

**Appendices and Schedules Attached**

N/A

KL:st
TO: Chair and Members
Planning Committee

COMMITTEE DATE: January 16, 2018

SUBJECT/REPORT NO: Application for Approval of Draft Plan of Condominium (Common Element), for lands located at 1890 Rymal Road East (Glanbrook) (Ward 11) (PED18006)

WARD(S) AFFECTED: Ward 11

PREPARED BY: Michael Fiorino
(905) 546 2424 Ext. 4424

SUBMITTED BY: Steve Robichaud
Director, Planning and Chief Planner
Planning and Economic Development Department

SIGNATURE:

RECOMMENDATION

That Draft Plan of Condominium Application 25CDM-201711, by Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc., on behalf of Branthaven Dakota Inc., Owner, to establish a Draft Plan of Condominium (Common Element) to create a condominium road network, sidewalks, landscaped areas, 51 visitor parking spaces and centralized mailboxes, on lands located at 1890 Rymal Road East (Glanbrook), as shown on Appendix “A” attached to Report PED18006, be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

(a) That the approval for Draft Plan of Condominium (Common Element) application 25CDM-201711 applies to the plan prepared by A.T. McLaren Limited, certified by S. D. McLaren, and dated August 31, 2017, consisting of a condominium road network, sidewalks, landscaped areas, 51 visitor parking spaces and centralized mailboxes, in favour of 194 townhouse dwelling units, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18006; and,

(b) That the conditions of Draft Plan of Condominium Approval 25CDM-201711, attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED18006, be received and endorsed by City Council.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the application is to establish a Draft Plan of Condominium (Common Element) to create the following common elements: a condominium road network,
sidewalks, landscaped areas, 51 visitor parking spaces and centralized mailboxes. The condominium road will provide access to Rymal Road East and Dakota Boulevard. The subject lands are to be developed for 194 townhouse dwelling units, fronting onto a private condominium road, by way of Part Lot Control Application PLC-17-028.

The proposed Draft Plan of Condominium has merit and can be supported as it is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS), conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and complies with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP).

The proposed Draft Plan of Condominium conforms to the Township of Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464, as amended by By-law No. 05-374 and Minor Variance Application GL/A-16:199. Further, it is consistent with and will implement the final approved Site Plan Control Application DA-16-059.

Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 11

FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial:  N/A

Staffing:  N/A

Legal:  As required by the Planning Act, Council shall hold at least one Public Meeting to consider an application for a Draft Plan of Condominium (Common Element).

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Proposal:

The purpose of the application is to establish a Draft Plan of Condominium (Common Element) to create the following common elements: a condominium road, sidewalks, landscaped areas, 51 visitor parking spaces and centralized mailboxes, as approved under final approved Site Plan Control Application DA-16-059, attached as Appendix “D” to Report PED18006. The private condominium road will provide access to Rymal Road East and Dakota Boulevard and will be tied to 194 townhouse dwelling units.

Chronology:

September 15, 2017:  Condominium Application 25CDM-201711 “Block 112 – Summit Park – Phase 2” is received.
October 5, 2017: Condominium Application 25CDM-201711 “Block 112 – Summit Park – Phase 2” is deemed complete.

October 16, 2017: Circulation of Notice of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation for Condominium Application 25CDM-201711 sent to 192 property owners within 120 m of the subject lands.


December 6, 2017: Public Notice Sign updated to indicate Public Meeting date.

December 15, 2017: Notice of Public Meeting circulated to 192 property owners within 120 m of the subject lands.

Details of Submitted Application:

Location: 1890 Rymal Road East (Glanbrook) (See Appendix “A” to Report PED18006)

Owner / Applicant: Branthaven Dakota Inc.,

Agent: Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.

Property Description:
- Lot Frontage: ± 272.50 m (Rymal Road East)
- Lot Depth: ± 155.74 m (North to South)
- Lot Area: 1.051 ha

Servicing: Full Municipal Services

EXISTING LAND USE AND ZONING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Lands</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse dwellings under construction</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Commercial (C1-205) Zone, Modified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surrounding Lands:

North: Single detached dwellings and Personal Service Commercial Residential “R1” Zone
**POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS**

**Provincial Policy Statement (PPS 2014):**

The Provincial planning policy framework is established through the *Planning Act* (Section 3) and the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS 2014). The *Planning Act* requires that all municipal land use decisions affecting planning matters be consistent with the PPS.

The mechanism for the implementation of the Provincial plans and policies is through the Official Plan. Through the preparation, adoption and subsequent Ontario Municipal Board approval of the City of Hamilton Official Plans, the City of Hamilton has established the local policy framework for the implementation of the Provincial planning policy framework. As such, matters of provincial interest (e.g. efficiency of land use, balanced growth and environmental protection) are reviewed and discussed in the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) analysis that follows.

As the application for a Draft Plan of Condominium complies with the UHOP, it is staff’s opinion that the application is:

- consistent with Section 3 of the *Planning Act*; and,
- consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South</th>
<th>Townhouses</th>
<th>Residential Multiple “RM2-173” Zone, Modified,</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling</td>
<td>Residential “R4-173(B)” Zone, Modified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| East  | Single Detached Dwellings | General Agricultural “A1” Zone, and Single Residential “R4-173(B)” Zone, Modified |

| West  | Hamilton Wentworth Catholic District School Board Secondary School | Major Institutional (I3) Zone |
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Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017)

The following policies, amongst others, from the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe are applicable to the proposal:

“2.2.1.2 Forecasted growth to the horizon of this Plan will be allocated based on the following:

a) the vast majority of growth will be directed to settlement areas that:

i. have a delineated built boundary;

ii. have existing or planned municipal water and wastewater systems; and,

iii. can support the achievement of complete communities.

b) within settlement areas, growth will be focused in:

iii. locations with existing or planned transit, with a priority on higher order transit where it exists or is planned; and,

iv. areas with existing or planned public service facilities.”

The subject lands are located within a settlement area, outside of the built boundary, as shown on Appendix “G” – Boundaries Map of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP). The lands are located on the south side of Rymal Road East, beside an existing secondary school and located less than 500 metres from existing commercial uses, in order to contribute to a complete community and an area with existing public service facilities. The lands are also located along the S Line of the BLAST network, which is serviced by HSR Route #44, ensuring that the location is serviced by planned and existing transit. As part of the Draft Plan of Subdivision Application 25T-200207 and Site Plan Control Application DA-16-059, planned municipal water and wastewater systems were reviewed to ensure that sufficient municipal systems were in place to support the proposal. Accordingly, the proposal conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017).

Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP):

The subject lands are identified as a “Secondary Corridor” on Schedule “E” – Urban Structure, and designated “District Commercial” on Schedule “E-1” – Urban Land Use Designations in the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP). The subject lands are also

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.
OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.
OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.
designated “District Commercial” on Map B.5.2-1 – Land Use Plan of the Rymal Road Secondary Plan.

Through Site Plan Control Application DA-16-059, it was identified that the subject lands contain a Core Area (part of the Eramosa Karst Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI)). A Karst is a landscape commonly developed on limestone, characterized by sink holes, sinking streams, closed depressions, subterranean drainage and caves. Within the UHOP, Volume 3 policy USC-1 1.0 c) indicates that no development shall occur within the Feeder Area unless it can be shown that development may occur through technical studies to the satisfaction of the City, the Province and the Conservation Authority. To satisfy this policy, a Karst Assessment was prepared by Terra-Dynamics Consulting Inc. through the review of the Site Plan Control Application process (DA-16-059). Based on this assessment, it was identified that there were no natural hazards (sinkholes or other karst features) observed on the property.

**Rymal Road Secondary Plan:**

The subject lands are designated “District Commercial” on Map B.5.2-1 – Rymal Road Secondary Plan.

“5.2.3.3 District Commercial Designation

Notwithstanding Policies E.4.7 – District Commercial Designation of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply to the lands designated District Commercial on Map B.5.2-1 – Rymal Road – Land Use Plan:

b) Permitted uses shall include a range of retail stores including a supermarket (but excluding a department store) as well as service commercial uses, restaurants, and community and institutional uses. Medium Density Residential 2c uses may also be permitted in a co-ordinated development format.”

Policy 5.2.3.3 b) of the Rymal Road Secondary Plan states that “Medium Density Residential 2c” uses may also be permitted in a co-ordinated development format within the “District Commercial” designation. Policy 5.2.2.4 b) of the “Medium Density Residential 2c” designation states that “permitted uses shall be apartments, townhouses, stacked townhouse dwellings and other forms of multiple attached dwellings as a single form or mixed form development in a mid-rise housing form (up to nine storeys).” As multiple townhouse forms are permitted within the designation, and as the proposal is for a block townhouse development, the proposal complies with the intent of the above policy of the UHOP.
As identified above, policy 5.2.3.3 of the District Commercial Designation permits “Medium Density Residential 2c” designation uses within the designation.

The subject property is located along the periphery of a residential area, and has been developed consistent with the surrounding built form to enhance compatibility. Townhouses are permitted within the “Medium Density Residential 2c” designation, and as the proposal is for a block townhouse development, the proposed use complies with the intent of the above policies of the UHOP. Furthermore, Minor Variance Application GL/A-16:199 approved the increase in the number of dwelling units from a maximum of 80 dwelling units to a maximum of 194 dwelling units. The Minor Variance was required as there were discrepancies between applicable provisions, including density requirements and real number unit requirements. As the UHOP permits townhouses on the subject site, and as the density requirement of 50 units per hectare (embedded in the implementing Zoning By-law) pre-dates the minimum of 60 units per hectare density requirement of the Rymal Road Secondary Plan, the proposal is considered legal non-complying.

Based on the foregoing, staff are of the opinion that the proposal complies with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.

**Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464:**

The subject lands are zoned Neighbourhood Commercial “C1-205”, Zone, Modified, in the Town of Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464. The Neighbourhood Commercial “C1-205”, Zone, Modified permits residential uses in accordance with the provisions of the Residential Multiple "RM3-175" Zone, Modified which permits various forms of multiple dwellings including block townhouse dwellings. A Minor Variance Application (GL/A-16:199), was required as a result of the development proposal units. The Minor Variance Application permits the following:

- The boundary of part of Block 112 according to the Registered Plan of Subdivision 62M-1050 being Part 2 on Reference Plan 62R-20295 shall be deemed to be the lot lines for this purpose and the regulations of the “RM3-175” Zone;
- That individual dwelling unit lots within a block townhouse development may be created by registration of a condominium plan or created by Part Lot Control and shall be permitted to front on a private condominium road rather than a street;
- A maximum of one hundred and ninety-four (194) dwelling units;
- A reduction for minimum front yard setback from 4.5 metres to 2.4 metres;
• A minimum privacy area of 9.4 square metres be provided for dwelling units 7 to 13, 93 to 99 and 183 to 218 (Blocks 1, 2 and 15 to 18) instead of a minimum privacy area of 30 square metres per townhouse dwelling unit;

• A parking space size of 2.6m wide x 5.5m long shall be provided for the visitor parking; and,

• A minimum parking space size of 3.9m wide x 5.5m long shall be provided for accessible parking.

The proposal has been developed in accordance with approved Site Plan Control Application DA-16-059, granted final approval on December 23, 2016, and conforms with the applicable provisions and requirements of By-law No. 464 and the site specific Neighbourhood Commercial “C1-205” Zone, Modified, as further amended by Minor Variance Application GL/A-16:199. Conditions 1 and 2 of Appendix “C” to Report PED18006 have been included to ensure the proposal is developed in accordance with these approvals.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION

The following departments and agencies had no comments or objections:

• Forestry and Horticulture Section, Public Works Department;
• Hamilton Conservation Authority; and,
• Hydro One.

Recycling & Waste Disposal Section (Public Works Department) have advised and requested that the following note be added to the plan:

“This property is eligible for weekly collection of garbage, recycling, organics and leaf and yard waste through the City of Hamilton subject to compliance with specifications indicated by the Public Works Department and subject to compliance with the City’s Solid Waste Management By-law 09-067, as amended.”

Staff note that this notation was addressed through the approval of Site Plan Control Application DA-16-059. Condition 5 to Appendix “C” Report PED18006 has been included as the service for the collection of waste on private property requires an “Agreement for on-site Collection of Municipal Solid Waste” prior to the commencement of Municipal collection.

Transit Planning (Public Works Department) have advised that the subject lands are served by HSR route #44 operating daily and along the future S Line rapid transit corridor. Pedestrian access from the subject land to Rymal Road has been provided.
through the common element sidewalks throughout the site which will provide opportunity for residents to utilize planned public transportation along Rymal Road.

**Transportation Management (Public Works Department)** have advised that the development must consider the needs of pedestrians with disabilities, ensure sidewalks are a minimum of 1.5 metres and that the Transit Oriented Development (TOD) guidelines be implemented. Staff note that these comments and the Transportation Demand Management Options Report were addressed through Site Plan Control Application DA-16-059 which was granted final approval on December 23, 2016.

**ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION**

1. The proposal has merit and can be supported for the following reasons:

   (i) It is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Places to Grow);

   (ii) It complies with the policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan; and,

   (iii) The proposal establishes condominium tenure for a form of development permitted under the Town of Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464 and the site specific Neighbourhood Commercial “C1-205” Zone, Modified, as further amended as amended by Minor Variance Application GL/A-16:059. It will implement the approved Site Plan Control Application DA-16-059, which provides for a form of development that is compatible with surrounding land uses.

2. The proposed Draft Plan of Condominium (Common Element) is comprised of the following common elements: a condominium road, sidewalks, landscaped areas, 51 visitor parking spaces and centralized mailboxes as shown on the attached plan, marked as Appendix “B” to Report PED18006. The condominium road will provide access to Rymal Road East and Dakota Boulevard. All units will hold an interest in the Condominium Corporation to benefit from the common visitor parking spaces and landscaped areas. One hundred and ninety-four townhouse dwelling units will have access from the private condominium road and will hold an interest in the common element condominium corporation.

3. The applicant must ensure that the final Plan of Condominium complies with the final approved Site Plan Control Application DA-16-059, approved on December 23, 2016, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner (Condition 2 of Appendix “C” to Report PED18006).
4. The land proposed for the common element condominium and the lots for all of the townhouse dwelling units will be created through Part Lot Control Application PLC-17-028. In this regard, final approval and registration of the Common Element Condominium cannot occur until such time as the Part Lot Control Application is approved and the By-law removing the lands from Part Lot Control has been passed by Council (Condition 3 of Appendix “C” to Report PED18006). The applicant has submitted a Part Lot Control Application, PLC-17-028 which is currently under review.

5. The applicant must also enter into a Development Agreement with the City of Hamilton as a condition of Draft Plan of Condominium approval. This Agreement will ensure that the tenure of the proposed common elements (as shown on the Draft Plan of Condominium included in Appendix “B” to Report PED18006) becomes “tied” to the proposed Draft Plan of Condominium. This will have the effect of ensuring that individual townhouse lots are not sold until the condominium has been registered as a Common Elements Condominium under the Condominium Act (Condition 4 of Appendix “C” to Report PED18006).

6. The proposed condominium road will be privately owned and maintained. As a condition of approval, the applicant must include warning clauses in the Development Agreement and all purchase and sale agreements and rental or lease agreements to advise perspective purchasers that the City of Hamilton will not provide maintenance or snow removal and that the provided garages are for parking (including that on-street, overflow parking may not be available and cannot be guaranteed in perpetuity) (Conditions 6 (i) and (iii) of Appendix “C” to Report PED18006).

7. As a private underground Cultec stormwater Chamber (281.8 m3) has been shown on the servicing drawing for this property prepared by Urbantech West, Development Engineering has advised that the tank manufacturer’s maintenance recommendations must be adhered to. This has been addressed through Condition 13 of Appendix “C” to Report PED18006.

8. Development Engineering has advised that all issues pertaining to the grading, drainage and servicing have been reviewed as per approved Site Plan Control Application DA-16-059 and are subject to the terms and conditions therein. Furthermore, Development Engineering has advised that it is the responsibility of the Condominium Corporation to ensure that the maintenance and repair of all utilities within the Common Elements be maintained at the Corporations own expense. The above comments have been included as Conditions 2, 6 (ii) and 12 of Appendix “C” to Report PED18006.
9. Canada Post has reviewed the development through Site Plan Control Application DA-16-059 and advised that this development will receive mail service through a Centralized Community Mail Box (CMB). Furthermore, the Developer / Owner shall consult with Canada Post for suitable permanent locations for the CMB and identify on appropriate servicing plans. As such, the standard Canada Post conditions have been included as Conditions 6 (iv), 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.

10. The owner shall satisfy all conditions, financial or otherwise, of the City of Hamilton (Condition 14 in Appendix “C” to Report PED18006).

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION

Should the proposed Plan of Condominium (Common Element) not be approved, the applicant / owner could develop the lands as a standard block condominium development or as a rental development. A change in tenure from the proposed common element condominium to a standard form condominium would require a new Draft Plan of Condominium application.

ALIGNMENT TO THE 2016 – 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN

Healthy and Safe Communities

Hamilton is a safe and supportive city where people are active, healthy, and have a high quality of life.

Built Environment and Infrastructure

Hamilton is supported by state of the art infrastructure, transportation options, buildings and public spaces that create a dynamic City.

APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED

- Appendix “A”: Location Map
- Appendix “B”: Proposed Draft Plan of Condominium
- Appendix “C”: Recommended Conditions of Approval
- Appendix “D”: Approved Site Plan Control Application DA-16-059
Recommended Conditions of Draft Plan of Condominium Approval

That this approval for the Draft Plan of Condominium Application 25CDM-201711, by Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc., on behalf of Branthaven Dakota Inc., Owner, to establish a Draft Plan of Condominium (Common Element) to create a condominium road, sidewalks, landscaped areas, 51 visitor parking spaces and centralized mailboxes, on lands located at 1890 Rymal Road East (Glanbrook), be received and endorsed by City Council with the following special conditions:

1. That the final Plan of Condominium shall comply with all of the applicable provisions of the Town of Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464, as amended by By-law No. 05-374 and Minor Variance Application GL/A-16:199, or in the event the City of Hamilton has repealed and replaced the Town of Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464 with By-law No. 05-200, the final Plan of Condominium shall comply with all of the applicable provisions of the Zoning By-law in force and effect at the time of registration of the Draft Plan of Condominium.

2. That the subject lands be developed in accordance with the final approved Site Plan Application DA-16-059 and that the final Plan of Condominium complies with the approved Site Plan, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner.

3. That the owner shall receive final approval of Part Lot Control Application PLC-17-028, including the enactment and registration on title of the associated Part Lot Control Exemption By-law, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner.

4. That the owner shall enter into a Development Agreement to ensure that the tenure of each of the proposed townhouse dwelling having frontage on the condominium road has legal interest, in common, to the common elements condominium, to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor.

5. That the owner shall agree to, prior to the commencement of collection service on private property, an “Agreement for on-site Collection of Municipal Solid Waste” must be completed and submitted to the City. A certificate of insurance naming the City as additional insured (in relation to waste collection services) must also be submitted prior to the start of service to the satisfaction of the Manager of Public Works Department (Operations Division).

6. That the owner shall agree to include the following in all Purchase and Sale Agreements and Rental or Lease Agreements and in the Development Agreement, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management:

   (i) Purchasers are advised that the City of Hamilton will not be providing maintenance or snow removal service for the private condominium road. In addition, City Waste Management services may not be available to residents
and that the provision of such services may require agreements with private contractors.

(ii) Purchaser are advised that there is an approved grading plan and that the purchaser agrees not to alter the approved grading plan without approval from the City of Hamilton. Additionally, no grade alteration within 0.45 metres of the property line will be permitted including retaining walls, walkways, curbs, etc.

(iii) Garages are provided for the purpose of parking a vehicle. It is the responsibility of the owner / tenant to ensure that their parking needs (including those of visitors) can be accommodated onsite. On-street, overflow parking may not be available and cannot be guaranteed in perpetuity.

(iv) The home mail delivery will be from a Community Mail Box.

7. That the owner will be responsible for officially notifying the purchasers of the exact Community Mail Box locations, to the satisfaction of Senior Director of Growth Management and Canada Post prior to the closing of any home sales.

8. That the owner work with Canada Post to determine and provide temporary suitable Community Mail Box locations, which may be utilized by Canada Post, until the curbs, boulevards, and sidewalks are in place in the remainder of the subdivision, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

9. That the owner install a concrete pad in accordance with the requirements of, and in locations to be approved by the Senior Director of Growth Management and Canada Post, to facilitate the placement of Community Mail Boxes.

10. That the owner identify the concrete pads for the Community Mail Boxes on the engineering / servicing drawings. Said pads are to be poured at the time of the sidewalk and / or curb installation within each phase, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

11. That the owner determine the location of all mail receiving facilities in co-operation with the Senior Director of Growth Management and Canada Post, and to indicate the location of mail facilities on appropriate maps, information boards, and plans. Maps are also to be prominently displayed in the sales office(s), showing specific mail facility locations.

12. That the owner / developer ensure the following wording is included in the associated Condominium Declaration to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management:

   The Corporation shall maintain and repair the Common Elements at its own expense. The Corporation shall also maintain and repair all utilities
(including without limitation, water mains, storm and sanitary sewers, catch basins, and fire hydrants) which services more than one Parcel of Tied Land (POTL), whether located within the Common Elements or wholly or partly within the POTL and the Corporation and its designated agents shall have full access to a POTL to carry out its obligation pursuant to this paragraph. If the Corporation is required to maintain or repair any utility or service on a POTL, the Corporation shall only be responsible to return the POTL to its original stage and shall not be responsible to repair or replace, or to correct any upgrade or improvement performed or added to the POTL by the POTL owner.

13. That the owner / developer ensure the following condition be adhered to in the associated Condominium Declaration to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management:

   NOTICE REGARDING MAINTENANCE OF THE STORMWATER MANAGEMENT TANK

   A private underground Cultec stormwater Chamber (281.8 m3) has been shown on the servicing drawing for this property prepared by Urbantech West. The Owner is advised to follow the tank manufacturer's maintenance recommendations.

14. The Owner shall dedicate a minimum 6.0 m wide easement to the City for a suitable storm drainage outlet on private properties, municipal properties 1889 & 1893 Rymal Road East downstream of the existing 750 mm diameter culvert to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Engineering Approvals.

15. That the owner shall satisfy all conditions, financial or otherwise, of the City of Hamilton.

NOTES TO DRAFT PLAN APPROVAL

1) Pursuant to Section 51(32) of the Planning Act, draft approval shall lapse if the plan is not given final approval within three years. However, extensions will be considered if a written request is received before the draft approval lapses.
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**RECOMMENDATION**

(a) That the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, for the area shown on Appendix “A” of PED18007, attached as Official Plan Amendment (OPA) No.XX to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) be APPROVED, and that:

(i) The By-law of adoption for the Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18007 which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by Council;
(ii) The Kentley Neighbourhood Plan and the Riverdale West Neighbourhood Plan be repealed in their entirety; and,

(iii) The portions of the Riverdale East and Greenford Neighbourhood Plans which are located within the boundary of the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan be repealed.

(b) That the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan, attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED18007, be endorsed, and that:

(i) The General Manager of the Public Works Department be authorized and directed to file the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan, attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED18007, with the Municipal Clerk for a minimum thirty day public review period.

(ii) Upon the completion of the thirty day public review, the General Manager of the Public Works Department be authorized and directed to program and include the recommended Schedule A, A+ and B projects in the future Capital Budget submissions, provided no comments or “Part II Order” requests (applicable to Schedule B projects only) are received that cannot be resolved.

(iii) That the recommended projects, attached as Appendix “D” to Report PED18007, be received and approved.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan:

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan area consists of land bounded to the west by the Red Hill Valley Parkway, to the east by Lake Avenue, to the north by the QEW, and to the south by local streets just south of Queenston Road, as shown on the Location Map attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED18007. The total study area is approximately 388 gross hectares in area.

The secondary plan study area includes the Eastgate Sub-Regional Service Node, portions of the Queenston Road Primary Corridor and the Centennial Parkway Secondary Corridor, all of which are elements of the City’s Urban Structure as identified on Schedule E in Volume 1 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP). The area also includes the location of a new GO Station on Centennial Parkway North just south of the QEW (Confederation Station) which is planned to open in 2019 and the planned eastern terminus of the Light Rail Transit (LRT) line at Eastgate Square Mall. It is an important...
area in the City as it is a major centre of retail activity for the east end of the City and a strategic entryway into the City. It is one of the City’s two major commercial nodes outside of the downtown. It is anticipated that the area is about to undergo considerable change with the introduction of rapid transit and inter-regional transit, which will both support and stimulate renewal, redevelopment and intensification.

The purpose of the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan is to create a new long term land use plan which capitalizes on planned major transit improvements and provides guidance for built form and public infrastructure improvements. The Secondary Plan provides a detailed land use plan and related policies for the regulation of land use and development within the Secondary Plan area. In order to implement the plan, an amendment to the UHOP is required (attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18007) to add the Secondary Plan to the UHOP.

The Secondary Plan process was divided into four main phases, as follows:

- Phase 1: included the background report and project launch;
- Phase 2: examined a series of alternative land use options and streetscape/public realm improvements;
- Phase 3: developed the preferred land use option; and,
- Phase 4: included the policy development and finalization of the proposed Secondary Plan document.

The Study process involved extensive consultation with various internal City departments, external agencies and the public at numerous points throughout the project.

As part of the planning process, a range of key principles were identified and a number of issues were discussed that contributed to shaping the final plan and policies. A summary of these items is described in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Summary Report (see Appendix “E” to Report PED18007).

To support the Secondary Plan process, two main studies were conducted, as follows:

- Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study (Dillon Consulting), for Phases 2 and 3 of the project (see Appendix “E” to Report PED18007). The recommendations from the Study were used as the basis for the detailed Secondary Plan policies and land use plan; and,
Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan Study (see Appendix “C” to Report PED18007).

As part of the Secondary Plan the need to complete two further studies has been identified; a Streetscape and Public Realm Design Study and a Municipal Servicing Study. The Streetscape and Public Realm Design Study aligns with the policies of Volume 1 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan which direct Secondary Plans to create urban design guidelines for mixed use areas in Sub-Regional Service Nodes. The Municipal Servicing study will confirm stormwater and sewer service capacities and identify minor gaps in servicing infrastructure and upgrades that may be needed to facilitate intensification opportunities.

**Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan:**

Public Works Department has completed the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (TMP). The purpose of the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan Study was to develop a comprehensive transportation plan that will:

(a) Follow the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process;

(b) Support the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan study;

(c) Identify future transportation needs and address existing transportation issues; and,

(d) Identify and evaluate transportation options and recommend solutions.

The Transportation Management study area extends beyond the Secondary Plan study area as illustrated in Appendix “A” to Report PED18007. It is bounded by the QEW on the north, King Street on the south, Red Hill Valley Parkway on the west and Lake Avenue on the east. The Transportation Management Plan addresses the existing transportation problems in the area, identifies the future transportation needs and supports the Secondary Plan study, the Hamilton Transportation Master Plan study and the rapid transit plans. The study followed the requirements of the latest Municipal Class Environmental Assessment document and completed Phases 1 and 2 of the study process.

The Problem/Opportunity statement provides the justification of the need for improvements to the transportation system. During the Phase 1 study process, the following Problems/Opportunities were identified:
OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.
OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.
OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.

- Accommodate transportation needs of future land use;
- Take advantage of investment from development opportunities;
- Support access to major transportation services such as the QEW, Red Hill Valley Parkway, HSR and the Eastgate Transit Hub, future Rapid Transit, and GO Transit and future Confederation GO Station;
- Support alternative transportation choices including walking and cycling; and,
- Create livable neighbourhoods, complete communities and Complete Livable Better Streets.

The recommended solutions support the city wide Transportation Master Plan policies and programs.

**Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 38**

**FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

**Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan:**

Financial: N/A
Staffing: There are no staffing implications.
Legal: As required by the *Planning Act*, Council shall hold at least one Public Meeting to consider an application for an Official Plan Amendment.

**Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan:**

Financial: The study recommended several transportation improvement projects and funding will be required in future years to implement the recommendations. The estimated project costs that can be identified at this stage are indicated in Appendix “D” to Report PED18007. For the proposed Rapid Transit project (Eastgate to Confederation GO Station) funding will be required to undertake the “Transit Project Assessment Process” (TPAP).

Staffing: There are no staffing implications.
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan:

Chronology:

April 2006 to June 2009: The Eastgate Sub-Regional Service Node was identified for this area through the Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (GRIDS) that recommended a nodes and corridors approach to growth and intensification (2006). This approach was advanced in the development of the UHOP where specific policy direction to guide future development of Nodes and Corridors was established (2009). Through the Urban Structure (Volume 1, Schedule E), a shaded oval was used to indicate the general location of the Sub-Regional Service Node. The policies contained in the UHOP (Policy E.2.3.2.11) require specific policy direction be developed and delineation of a node boundary for intensification be established through a Secondary Plan process for the Sub-Regional Nodes.

September 2009: The City Wide Secondary Plan Review was approved by Council, identifying the “Eastgate Sub-Regional Service Node” area (Schedule E, Urban Structure, UHOP) as one of the immediate priorities for development of new Secondary Plans (PED08017(a)).

Fall 2014: Study area boundary for the Secondary Plan developed by staff.

February 2015: Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Background Report (PED15015) received by Planning Committee.

April, 2015: Circulation of notice of study commencement for the Secondary Plan and the Transportation Management Plan studies and
notice of first public consultation event to all property owners in the study area or within 120 metres of the study area.

May 26, 2015: Funding for Light Rail Transit (LRT) and GO Transit infrastructure improvements announced by Provincial government. Funding commitment includes B-line LRT project extending to Queenston Circle and a new GO Rail and Bus Station (Confederation Station) in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study area (in operation by 2019).

June 2015: Industrial area around GO station identified as a potential extension to the Secondary Plan study area.

Spring 2015 to Summer 2016: Extensive consultation undertaken with the public, internal staff, and external agencies for Phases 2 and 3 of project (Details included in Relevant Consultation Section of Report and Appendices “E and F” to Report PED18007). Secondary Plan study area expanded to include industrial lands around GO Station.

Fall 2016 to Spring 2017: Draft Secondary Plan policies and maps developed.


April 13, 2017: Draft Secondary Plan materials circulated to the public and various staff and agencies.

April 26, 2017: Council votes to file an updated Environmental Assessment for the proposed LRT which includes the extension of the LRT to Eastgate Square Mall.

May 2017 to August 2017: Various modifications and refinements made to the draft Secondary Plan based on comments received. Extension of LRT to Centennial Parkway confirmed. Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017) was released. Further modifications to the draft secondary plan were made.

September 15, 2017: Revised draft of Secondary Plan circulated to the public and various staff and agencies.

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.
OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.
OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.
Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan:

The Centennial Neighbourhood Transportation Management Plan (CNTMP) study was initiated in early 2015 to support the secondary plan study, to identify and address the existing transportation problems and to plan for the future requirements based on the planned intensification and rapid transit projects. The study followed the Phases 1 and 2 of the Municipal Engineers Association’s Municipal Class EA (October 2000, as amended in 2007 and 2011) process.

Several transportation challenges currently exist in the study area. Through field investigations and public consultations, the project identified the problems faced by the residents and commuters. The identified problems include safety concerns, speeding, cut through traffic, lack of transit connectivity and services, unsafe biking and pedestrian facilities. Several solutions were considered for evaluation. The evaluation criteria and preferred solutions were presented to the public and stakeholders. The top four criteria identified are Capacity, Safety, Urban design and Mobility choices. The study was completed and the Project File Report was finalized in October 2016.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS

Provincial Policy Statement (2014)

The Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) provides policy direction on matters of Provincial interest related to land use planning and development. The Planning Act requires that, in exercising any authority that affects planning matters, planning authorities shall be consistent with policy statements issued under this Act. The following policies, amongst others, are applicable to the Secondary Plan.

The PPS recognizes that long term prosperity, environmental health and social well-being depend on wisely managing change and promoting efficient land use and development patterns (Policy 1.0). Settlement areas are intended to be the focus of growth and their vitality and regeneration promoted (Policy 1.1.3.1). Land use patterns within settlement areas must be based on densities and a mix of land uses which efficiently use land and resources, are appropriate for the infrastructure and public services facilities which are planned or available, which minimize negative impacts to air quality and climate change and promote energy efficiency, which support active transportation, and which are transit-supportive and freight-supportive (Policy 1.1.3.2). Cities must provide a range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment, and planning authorities are directed to identify appropriate locations.
and promote opportunities for this, taking into account existing building stock, and the availability of infrastructure required to meet projected needs (Policy 1.1.3.3). The Secondary Plan provides for a variety of intensification and redevelopment opportunities, which is an efficient use of land and is transit-supportive and supportive of active transportation.

The PPS states that appropriate development standards should be promoted which facilitate intensification, redevelopment and compact form, while avoiding or mitigating risks to public health and safety (Policy 1.1.3.4). Planning authorities are also required to establish minimum targets for intensification and redevelopment within built-up areas (Policy 1.1.3.5). The Secondary Plan sets out a number of development standards to ensure that potential effects of development are considered and mitigated or avoided. The Plan also implements the density targets set out in the UHOP for the Sub-Regional Node area.

The Secondary Plan is also consistent with other policies in the PPS which address:

- Providing an appropriate mix and range of employment uses (Policy 1.3.1);
- The preservation of employment lands (Policy 1.3.2.1);
- The potential conversion of employment lands through a comprehensive review (Policy 1.3.2.2);
- Accommodating residential growth through intensification and redevelopment (Policy 1.4.1a));
- Permitting all forms of housing required to meet the social, health and well-being requirements of current and future residents (Policy 1.4.3b));
- Establishing development standards for residential intensification, redevelopment and new residential development which minimize the cost of housing and facilitate compact form, while maintaining appropriate levels of public health and safety (Policy 1.4.3e));
- Planning public streets, spaces and facilities to be safe, meet the needs of pedestrians, foster social interaction and facilitate active transportation and community connectivity (Policy 1.5.1a));
- Planning and providing for a full range and equitable distribution of publicly-accessible built and natural setting for recreation (Policy 1.5.1b));
• Providing efficient and appropriate levels of infrastructure (Policies 1.6.1 to 1.6.6); and,

• Ensuring compatibility between rail facilities and sensitive land uses (Policy 1.6.9.1b)).

The PPS requires that transportation and land use considerations shall be integrated at all stages of the planning process (Policy 1.6.7.5). The Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan has been completed concurrently with the Secondary Plan to inform the Secondary Plan and ensure that transportation has been considered throughout the process. This ensures that the transportation policies of the PPS contained in Sections 1.6.7 and 1.6.8 are being met.

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan conforms to the PPS.


The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (the Growth Plan) provides high level policy direction for municipalities within the Greater Golden Horseshoe to build healthy, balanced, and complete communities. The Growth Plan guides decisions on a wide range of issues, including: economic development; land use planning; urban form; housing; natural heritage and natural resource protection; and, provincial infrastructure planning. The Places to Grow Act requires that all decisions under the Planning Act conform to the Growth Plan.

The Growth Plan provides direction to municipalities on managing growth and emphasizes the importance of intensification and its ability to provide a diverse and compatible mix of land uses, including residential and employment uses to support vibrant neighbourhoods, active transportation goals and enhanced transit opportunities. The components of the Secondary Plan support the Growth Plan policies, through the provision of public transit, the efficient use of land, the efficient use of infrastructure, and the provision of high quality public spaces that support and create attractive and vibrant communities.

Concurrent with the preparation of the Secondary Plan, the Province undertook a comprehensive review of the Growth Plan. A new Growth Plan was approved in 2017. All decisions made on or after July 1, 2017 must conform to the updated Plan. There are a number of changes which were made to the Growth Plan which have implications for the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan. The key relevant changesto the Growth Plan include:

• Growth forecasts are projected to 2041 instead of 2031;
Population forecasts for 2031 have been adjusted from 660,000 to 680,000 for the entire City of Hamilton. A forecast of 780,000 for 2041 has been established;

Employment forecasts for 2031 have been adjusted from 300,000 to 310,000. A forecast of 350,000 for 2041 has been established;

By 2031, 60% of residential development must take place within the City’s built up area, instead of 40%. The Growth Plan allows for current Official Plan intensification targets to remain in effect until each municipality completes their next municipal comprehensive review;

A minimum density target of 160 residents and jobs per hectare has been established for transit station areas on priority transit corridors served by LRT. For the Secondary Plan, this target would apply generally to a 500 metre area around the proposed Nash and Queenston LRT stop and the Eastgate Square Mall LRT stop; and,

Municipalities are permitted to delineate exact transit station areas where density targets will be applied through more detailed review.

These changes have been reviewed during the final phase of the development of the Secondary Plan to ensure conformity to the current Growth Plan. A boundary has been delineated for the major transit station areas in the Secondary Plan and is shown on Appendix H of the Secondary Plan attached as Appendix “B” to PED18007. Within the major transit station areas, the density of the total possible build-out was estimated based on the proposed Secondary Plan policies and zoning requirements (see Table 1). The total possible density over the long term exceeds the minimum 160 residents and jobs per hectare. This review confirms that the proposed Secondary Plan designations are appropriate for meeting the target densities around the major transit station areas, required by the current policies of the Growth Plan.

Table 1: Estimated Major Transit Station Area Densities (residents and jobs per hectare) (rj/ha)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Transit Station Area</th>
<th>Existing Density (rj/ha)</th>
<th>Potential Density (Built-Out) (rj/ha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nash and Queenston Road intersection LRT stop</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastgate Square Mall LRT stop</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Urban Hamilton Official Plan (2013)**

The UHOP came into force and effect in August, 2013. The goal of the UHOP is to establish compact, complete communities where citizens can live, work, shop, play, and learn. One component of achieving this goal is through the development of Secondary Plans for smaller geographic areas within the City to provide more detailed direction for the evolution of land use and promotion of intensification. Once a Secondary Plan is completed, it is adopted as an amendment to the UHOP. The UHOP contains policy direction on strategic areas where Secondary Plans should be prepared, and what elements must be part of a Secondary Plan.

The UHOP is based on nodes and corridors structure. That structure directs the majority of intensification to occur along major roads and in commercial nodes or activity centres. The general area around the intersection of Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road is identified as a Sub-Regional Service Node within this Urban Structure (Schedule E of the UHOP). In addition, Queenston Road is identified as a Primary Corridor west of Centennial Parkway, and as a Secondary Corridor east of Centennial Parkway. Centennial Parkway is also identified as a Secondary Corridor.

Node and corridor urban structure elements are recognized in the Official Plan as being important to the function of the City. They are identified as strategic areas for investment in the transportation and infrastructure network. As a principle, urban structure elements are to be the focus for population growth and public and private redevelopment. The UHOP directs the preparation of detailed secondary plans for sub-regional nodes to provide greater direction on mix of uses, heights, densities, built forms and design.

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan establishes permitted land uses, densities, development forms and development standards within the area. A detailed boundary for the Sub-Regional Service Node is identified as part of the Secondary Plan, along with policy directions to achieve a more compact, mixed use area. The plan also provides guidance on changes to the public realm, urban design, transportation and infrastructure.

The following land use designations in the UHOP apply to the Secondary Plan area, as shown on Schedule E-1 - Urban Land Use Designations of Volume 1:

- Neighbourhoods;
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- Mixed Use - Medium Density and Mixed Use - High Density;
- District Commercial and Arterial Commercial;
- Open Space;
- Institutional;
- Industrial Land and Business Park; and,
- Utilities.

The proposed designations and policies of the Secondary Plan take their direction from the policies of the UHOP, and are consistent with the general intent and purpose of the plan. However, an amendment is required to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan in order for the Secondary Plan to be implemented. The purpose of the Official Plan Amendment is to:

- Incorporate the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan into Volume 2 of the UHOP;
- Define the Sub-Regional Service Node Boundary;
- Change the majority of the lands designated Arterial Commercial and District Commercial on Centennial Parkway North, near Barton Street East and the proposed GO Station, to a Mixed Use designation to reflect the extension of the node area to the proposed GO Station;
- Refine the locations of the Mixed Use – Medium Density and Mixed Use – High Density Designations;
- Remove certain lands from the Old Town Secondary Plan and add them to the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan;
- Implement policy to promote and encourage intensification and support higher order transit;
- Implement the recommendations of the Transportation Management Plan;
- Amend existing Maps and Schedules in the Official Plan to reflect the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan area;
• Remove site specific and area specific policies from Volume 3 that apply to the Secondary Plan area; and,

• Make minor text changes to references in Volume 1 to ensure correct references to areas in the Secondary Plan.

The proposed Official Plan amendment is attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18007.

Transportation Management Plan

For the transportation management plan study several City documents provide guidance in assessing future transportation needs, in addition to Provincial policy directions. These include the City-wide Hamilton Transportation Master Plan, transportation policy papers, GRIDS study (2006), Rapid Transit study, Recreational Trails Master Plan, Cycling Master Plan, and Goods Movement study.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION

Staff/Agency Consultation:

Technical Advisory Committee Meetings

At key intervals of the Secondary Plan process, Planning staff, with support from Dillon Consulting (where required), presented key findings to the City’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). The TAC is comprised of City staff who meetto provide the expertise of a multi-disciplinary team to assist with the development and refinement of the Secondary Plan. Members assisted in identifying issues, reviewing alternative solutions, and providing comments on the land use plan, policies and related studies. TAC includes representatives from the following departments and sections:

• Community and Emergency Services Department
  - Housing Services
  - Recreation
  - Neighbourhood and Community Initiatives
  - Hamilton Fire Department
• Planning and Economic Development Department
  - Community Planning and GIS
  - Policy Planning and Zoning By-Law Reform
  - Development Planning, Heritage and Design
  - Business Development
  - Urban Renewal
  - Tourism and Culture
  - Parking Operations and Maintenance
  - Building Engineering and Zoning
  - LRT Office

• Public Health Services Department
  - Healthy Environments

• Public Works Department
  - Energy Fleet and Facilities
  - Landscape Architectural Services
  - Recycling and Waste Disposal
  - Transportation Planning Services
  - Traffic Operations and Engineering
  - Transit Planning and Customer Service
  - Infrastructure Planning and Systems Design
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The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan project has been presented and discussed at the City’s TAC five times:

- TAC 1: Background for project, September 30, 2014;
- TAC 2 Phase 1: Existing issues and opportunities, February 11, 2015;
- TAC 3: Phase 2: Land use options, September 28, 2015;
- TAC 4: Phase 3: Recommended land use plan, February 23, 2016; and,

In addition to the Secondary Plan information, the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan was also presented and discussed concurrently at TAC. After each of these meetings, information was circulated to TAC members for additional comment.

The original draft Secondary Plan and policies were circulated to staff in February 2017 for review. After a significant number of changes, a revised version was circulated on September 15, 2017. This resulted in a number of minor corrections to formatting, spelling and policy references in the document, but no additional substantive changes.

External Agency Consultation

A list of external agencies that were contacted regarding the project is included in Appendix “F” to Report PED18007. No substantive comments were submitted by these agencies regarding the final plan.

Public Consultation:

Focus Group

The City formed a Focus Group comprised of representatives from the Secondary Plan area. Members of the Focus Group included residents, business owners and commercial land owners/developers. The Secondary Plan team met with the Focus Group at three intervals, approximately two to three weeks before each major public event. The Focus Group provided valuable input on how to engage the public at large and also on a variety of the aspects of the Secondary Plan and Transportation Management Plan:

- Focus Group Meeting 1: Issues and opportunities workshop, April 8, 2015;
Focus Group Meeting 2: Land use and public realm options workshop, November 10, 2015; and,

Focus Group Meeting 3: Workshop on recommended land use and public realm improvements, April 7, 2016.

Public Information Centres

Prior to the first Public Information Centre (PIC), postcard notifications were sent to every property owner and tenant in the Secondary Plan and Transportation Management Plan Study areas, and within 120 metres of the Secondary Plan study area. Notices for all three PICs were also posted in the Hamilton Spectator and the Stoney Creek Community News twice before the PIC dates. For the second and third PICs, postcards were also distributed to local businesses, placed at the customer service desk at Eastgate Square Mall, provided to high density apartment buildings and placed in community facilities such as the library and the Domenic Agostino Riverdale Community Centre.

Centennial Neighbourhoods has a diverse, multi-cultural population. To ensure that all residents felt comfortable participating, staff consulted with the Community Developer for the Riverdale Neighbourhoods area (Social Planning and Research Council) and arranged for translation services to be offered at all PICs in Urdu, Punjabi, Arabic and Hindi. Posters advertising the PIC events were also posted in area apartment buildings and community facilities, in English, Urdu, Punjabi, Arabic and Hindi.

Public comments were received at the PICs as well as for a period of time (generally 3 weeks) following the PICs. These comments were reviewed and incorporated into the next phases of the project as required.

PUBLIC EVENT #1: PHASE 1, ISSUES, OPPORTUNITIES AND VISION

The event occurred on Tuesday April 30th, 2015 at St. Gregorythe Great Church. There were 85 people in attendance. The project was introduced to the public through presentations of background information and the public’s feedback was collected through an interactive activity providing participants with the chance to add their notes to large scale maps. The session focused on two key elements – confirming key issues and opportunities and discussing the key principles for the Secondary Plan.

PUBLIC EVENT #2: PHASE 2, LAND USE OPTIONS WORKSHOP
The second workshop occurred on Tuesday December 1st, 2015 between 6:30pm and 9pm at Lake Avenue Public Elementary School. There were 35 people in attendance. The consultant team explained the purpose of the event and provided an update. Different options for the area were presented, broken down into four districts. Participants were asked to provide their feedback on the options, identifying what they liked about the options, what they wanted to change and also any potential additional options which should be considered.

PUBLIC EVENT #3: PHASE 3, RECOMMENDED OPTION

The third public event occurred on Thursday April 28th, 2016 at Lake Avenue Public Elementary School. There were 43 people in attendance. The consultant team presented the purpose of the meeting, feedback from previous events, the rationale for the recommendations as well as elements of the Secondary Plan including draft schedules. Participants had the opportunity to provide their comments on the map schedules which were posted in the room for comment.

Tactical Consultation

Staff undertook several pop-up consultation opportunities to gather additional input from the local community. These efforts were meant reach out to groups or individuals that may not necessarily attend a public information centre.

Sam Manson Park – August 5, 2015

Planning staff visited the park in the evening of August 5, 2015 to talk to park participants about their community. Staff asked children and their parents what they liked about the community and what changes they would like to see in the area. Freezies were handed out to children who stopped to talk and share their thoughts.

Riverdale Fall Fest – September 2015 and 2016

Planning staff set up a booth at the Riverdale Fallfest held in September of both 2015 and 2016. A number of residents came by to chat about issues in their community, things they enjoyed about their community, and improvements they would like to see, and provide input/thoughts on the Secondary Plan process.

Riverdale Neighbourhood Association – Planning Team Meetings – February 2015 and January and May 2016
Planning staff attended the Riverdale Neighbourhood Association meetings at key intervals through the Secondary Planning process. There is a Neighbourhood Action Plan for the Riverdale area and Planning consulted with this group to ensure that any actions that could be accommodated through the Secondary Plan policies were considered.

**Eastgate Square Mall Community Booth – April 29, 2016 and May 3, 2017**

In an effort to connect with the greater community following the third PIC and following the release of the draft policies, Planning staff set up panels and provided handouts of the Secondary Plan information at the Eastgate Square Mall community booth. Staff were available during the full extent of the mall hours, spoke with a number of people throughout the day and solicited comments from passer-by.

**Neighbourhood Walking Tour – August 2015**

Planning staff and Traffic staff met with two Hamilton Police Officers familiar with the area, to do a walk-about and discuss issues and complaints regarding traffic, speeding and crime that had been heard at the first April PIC.

**Housing and Homelessness Community Feedback Session – April 17, 2015**

An evening trade show style event with booths from different City services and non-profit organizations was organized by the Housing Services Section of the City of Hamilton. The event took place in the Secondary Plan study area, in the Domenic Agostino Community Centre. Planning staff set up a booth and handed out information and discussed the secondary plan project with attendees. Attendees were asked to write observations and comments on a large aerial map of the study area.

**Individual Interviews and Councillor Updates**

City staff held one-on-one meetings with interested stakeholders, upon request. Staff also provided updates to the Ward Councillors at various points throughout the process.

**Comments on Final draft Secondary Plan**

Fourteen public comment submissions were received in response to the final circulation of the draft Secondary Plan. A table is attached as Appendix “G” to Report PED18007 describing the comments received and staff’s response to the comments, including changes which staff made to the Plan to address the comments. A number of the issues noted are reflected in the Analysis and Rationale Section of this Report, and in the policy discussion on pages 31 to 34.
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Project website

A project website (www.hamilton.ca/centennialneighbourhoods) was set up to provide ongoing updates and information to the public on the project. The website was updated regularly after each community event and during critical points in the Secondary Plan process. An online survey was posted on the website at the launch of the study to obtain information on how people use the area, travel patterns to from and within the area, identification of transportation issues, and thoughts on future vision for the area. Eleven responses to the survey were received.

Transportation Management Plan / EA requirements:

The Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process requires public and stakeholder consultations. Consultation plans were developed and followed throughout the study process. As noted above, a joint public consultation program with the Secondary Plan study was undertaken including joint focus group meetings, PICs, and public notices. Transportation information, issues, evaluation methods and solutions were presented at the PICs and focus groups to gain input.

Project information was made available to the public throughout the study period by email, the project website (www.hamilton.ca/centennialNTMP), and telephone conversations. Agency consultations included the Conservation Authority, MOE, Metrolinx and the City’s internal departments/sections including HSR. Agency, public, internal, and external stakeholder comments were received and addressed, as appropriate. Ward Councillors were consulted and updated on the project during various stages of the study process.

ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

1. Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan

The Secondary Plan provides clear direction for development throughout the plan area with particular focus on the Centennial Node. Land use guidance for residential uses, commercial and mixed-use development, parks and open space areas and institutional uses, as well as urban design considerations are provided through the policies. As part of the Secondary Plan process, a number of issues were identified, both through public consultation and as a result of internal staff consultation. The main themes of the issues include the following:

- Ensuring adequate amounts of housing and quality affordable housing options;
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- Ensuring that transit-supportive densities are provided around LRT stops and the proposed GO station;
- Needing clear guidance for intensification along the major corridors;
- Ensuring appropriate and sensitive transitions from high to low density and between commercial and residential uses;
- Preservation of stable residential neighbourhoods and neighbourhood parks and natural areas;
- Transportation movement through the neighbourhood, including management of traffic impacts associated with development;
- Maintaining a commercial focus in the Node and providing flexibility for commercial sites to evolve over the long term into more compact, mixed use areas;
- Desire for more public spaces for gathering and socializing, and appropriate design of existing public spaces;
- Significant improvements needed to streetscapes and the public realm to improve the pedestrian environment and active transportation opportunities, and create safer and more attractive streetscapes; and,
- Ensuring quality urban design, particularly for gateway areas, and for transition areas between densities and different types of uses.

The “Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Summary Report” (see Appendix “E” to PED18007) provides a summary of the issues that were raised throughout the process and how they were addressed through the Secondary Plan recommendations. Transportation related issues were reviewed as part of the Transportation Management Plan process.

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan is a built up area, with a number of important elements that are reflected in the Secondary Plan:

- Sub-Regional Node - Eastgate Square Mall, as well as a number of other nearby commercial sites, provide a concentration of commercial activity that serves the daily and weekly shopping needs of surrounding neighbourhoods and creates a regional shopping draw.
- Commercial Corridors - Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road are the primary commercial corridors of the neighbourhood. Planning for the health, vitality and
continued commercial success of these corridors played a significant role in the Secondary Plan process.

- **Stable Residential Areas** - Much of the surrounding neighbourhood around the Sub-Regional Service Node is characterized by stable residential forms ranging from low density to high density. The maintenance of these stable residential areas was an important consideration of the Secondary Plan.

- **Location** - Centennial Neighbourhoods is a primary gateway into the eastern part of the City with an entrance off the Queen Elizabeth Way and two entrances from the RedHill Valley Parkway. Well served by highway access, it makes an attractive location for businesses to locate and an attractive community for people to live in.

- **Higher Order Transit** - Planned transit improvements for the area, including the GO bus/rail interregional transportation station (Confederation Station) to open in 2019, and the Light Rail Transit planned on Queenston Road connecting to Eastgate Square Mall, offer strategic benefits for new investment. Policy direction is required to ensure that transit-supportive densities and built form are achieved in the secondary plan area.

1.1 Plan Vision

The vision for the Plan was developed in consultation with the community. It aligns with the vision for the City as well as the vision of the community for this area. The vision is included in the Secondary Plan as noted below:

“The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan area is home to some of the City’s most vibrant shopping, recreation, living and mixed use spaces. The Centennial Node will feature a higher order transit corridor and two major transit hubs, which are supported by compact, mixed use development along the Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway corridors.

The Secondary Plan area’s existing residential neighbourhoods are safe, well connected and affordable. The area’s attractive and accessible public spaces, green spaces and streetscapes, along with its strong network of transportation infrastructure provide a unique sense of place that makes the Centennial Neighbourhoods an interesting, dynamic and exciting place.”

1.2 Sub-Regional Service Node
The main focal point of the Secondary Plan is the Centennial Node, which is the Sub-Regional Service Node. The Node forms a central part of the Plan, as the basis for establishing the Secondary Plan comes from policies in the Official Plan that direct the City to prepare a Secondary Plan for Sub-Regional Service Nodes. The Secondary Plan establishes a detailed boundary for the Node.

Consistent with the Official Plan policies for Sub-Regional Service Nodes, the Centennial Node is planned to achieve a density range of 100 to 150 units per hectare by the year 2031. The calculations for density estimates are described in greater detail in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study Summary Report on pages 82-83. The density estimates are calculated to 2031 since this is the current planning timeframe of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.

Proposed policies for the Centennial Node focus the majority of redevelopment and intensification within this area. The intent of the policies is to create a more compact, mixed use form of development in the area over the long term while protecting the commercial function of the sub-regional node. Sub-regional nodes are directed by the Official Plan to plan for an excess of 100,000 square metres of retail floor area.

A “Pedestrian Focus Street” overlay has been applied to the majority of the mixed use designated properties in the Node. Additional policy direction is applied to properties on Pedestrian Focus Streets to ensure built forms and developments create comfortable, active and visually stimulating walking environments. The Pedestrian Focus Street policies establish a minimum building height of 2 storeys, require commercial uses on the ground floor of buildings, require new buildings to be built up to the street line, and direct parking areas to the side or rear of a development.

A unique characteristic of the Centennial Node is that it contains a concentration of numerous large commercial plazas. There are six large commercial plazas in the Node, the largest of which is the Eastgate Square mall. Based on feedback from several of these landowners, a number of policies have been established for the node which recognize that the intended built form for the area will be established on a gradual basis over time, and in the interim, some smaller scale development on these sites is appropriate and will help the area transition over time to its ultimate vision of a pedestrian focused area.

1.3 Supporting Studies

Two supporting studies were carried out which provided support and direction for the Secondary Plan.

1.3.1 Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study
A Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study was undertaken by Dillon Consulting in coordination with the City, for Phases 2 and 3 of the project, which included developing various alternatives for the plan and determining a recommended option. The recommendations from the Study were used as the basis for the detailed Secondary Plan policies and land use plan. Dillon’s Summary Report is attached as Appendix “E” to Report PED18007.

The Secondary Plan policies refine and provide additional detail on Dillon’s policy directions for the various elements of the Plan. A number of minor refinements to the recommended plan and policies were also made on the basis of additional detailed review and comments and consultations with various internal and external persons.

Refinements to the recommendations in Dillon’s Summary Report include:

- Identifying additional lands as “Light Industrial” instead of “General Industrial” which currently permits heavier industrial uses. This change was made to prevent new heavy industrial uses from locating near the Mixed Use areas around the GO station, which could affect compatibility between industrial and new residential uses. A detailed review of existing uses in the industrial area was completed which identified that existing uses in the proposed “Light Industrial” area are light to moderate intensity uses and already conform to this designation.

- Applying the Pedestrian Focus Streets overlay to a more focused area on Queenston Road, instead of for the entire length of the Node.

- Simplifying the Building Heights map to reflect just the height permissions within the Centennial Node area.

- Allowing limited additional intensification on existing High Density sites in the neighbourhood, subject to a public Zoning By-law Amendment process.

- Eliminating minimum residential densities on Mixed Use – Medium Density sites, to allow for more flexibility in building uses and design.

- Allowing limited additional heights on Mixed Use – High Density sites, subject to a public Zoning By-law amendment process and meeting a number of additional requirements.

- Changes to Site Specific Policy Areas, including:
  - Refinement of Site Specific Policy Area 5, an area to be reviewed in the next Municipal Comprehensive review (see page 112 of Appendix “F”) to just
include industrial lands abutting Barton Street East on the boundary of existing employment areas. All industrial areas City-wide, including those in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, will be reviewed during the Municipal comprehensive review process. However, the site specific requires the properties fronting on Barton to be considered for conversion to an alternate designation (i.e. commercial) based on a number of specific factors unique to the Secondary Plan area.

- Elimination of Site Specific Policy Area 9 (see page 112 of Appendix “E”), as general policies and Secondary Plan directions eliminate the need for a site specific policy area.

- Addition of new Special Policy Areas J, K, and L (see Appendix “I” of the Official Plan Amendment attached as Appendix “B”). Area J references a site which is under appeal at the Ontario Municipal Board for a development proposal. Area K carries over a permission for a commercial recreation facility approved by Planning Committee in July 2017. Area L provides development direction for a large commercial site at the south east corner of Nash Road and Queenston Road.

1.3.2 Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan Study

The purpose of the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan Study was to support the Secondary Plan process. The study assessed existing transportation conditions in the Secondary Plan area and abutting areas and also assessed future transportation needs based on the recommended Secondary Plan option. The Study evaluated various transportation options to address existing and future needs, and recommended a number of solutions summarized in Appendix “D” to Report PED18007. Policy recommendations were incorporated into the Secondary Plan’s transportation policies.

1.4 Land Use Designations

The proposed land use map for the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan is attached to Appendix “B” to Report PED18007 (Official Plan Amendment) as Map B.6.7-1 (see Appendix “F” to the OPA). Tables 2 to 5 provide a summary of the general details for the residential, commercial, industrial and parks and open space designations, including permitted uses, densities, building heights, and general location of where the designations have been applied.

Table 2: Residential Designations
Residential designations generally recognize existing housing types and densities within the Secondary Plan. Where lands are being relocated from the Old Town Secondary Plan into the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, similar residential designations have been applied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted Uses</th>
<th>Density (Units / Net Hectare)</th>
<th>Maximum Building Height</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reason for Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential 2</td>
<td>Singles, Semis, Duplex</td>
<td>0 to 40</td>
<td>Max. 3 storeys</td>
<td>Existing - interior to the neighbourhood, existing residential uses, where desired density is lower than full range in Volume 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential 3</td>
<td>Singles, Semis, Duplex, Triplex, all forms of Townhouses, Fourplex</td>
<td>41 to 60</td>
<td>Max. 3 storeys</td>
<td>Existing - interior to the neighbourhood and on the periphery of neighbourhood, existing residential uses, where the minimum density is higher than Volume 1 and should be maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential 2</td>
<td>Multiple Dwellings, except Street Townhouses, Local Commercial permitted on the ground floor</td>
<td>60 to 75</td>
<td>Max. 6 storeys</td>
<td>Existing - mainly on the periphery of the neighbourhood, areas where density is intended to be less than the full range in Volume 1 for Medium Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential 3</td>
<td>Multiple Dwellings, except Street Townhouses, Local Commercial permitted on the ground floor</td>
<td>75 to 100</td>
<td>Max. 6 storeys</td>
<td>Existing - mainly on the periphery of the neighbourhood, areas where intended minimum density is higher than the full range in Volume 1 for Medium Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>100 to</td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Existing High, recognizes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.
OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.
### Residential 1

| Dwellings, Local Commercial permitted on the ground floor | 200 Provision to increase to 300 subject to specific criteria and public process | existing heights (existing building heights range from 6 – 16 storeys) | Density sites, mostly on periphery of residential neighbourhoods | existing High Density buildings and applies Volume 1 permissions. Permits limited infill |

---

**Table 3: Commercial and Mixed Use Designations**

Mixed Use – Medium Density and Mixed Use – High Density designations have been applied to commercial lands throughout the Centennial Node, allowing for a wide range of uses. Outside of the Node, commercial designations generally recognize the function of existing commercial uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted Uses</th>
<th>Maximum Building Height</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reason for Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use - Medium Density</strong></td>
<td>Permits a range of retail, service commercial, institutional, office, cultural, arts, recreation, entertainment, hotels and residential at a moderate scale</td>
<td>6 storeys, may increase to 8 subject to criteria</td>
<td>Within the Centennial Node – Applied to smaller and/or shallower lots, as well as some larger lots on the exterior edges of the node</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mixed Use – High Density</strong></td>
<td>Permits a range of retail, service commercial, institutional, office, cultural, arts, recreation, entertainment, hotels and convention centres, and high</td>
<td>As per the Maximum Building Heights in the Node Plan. Heights range from 6 to 20 storeys depending on location</td>
<td>Within the Centennial Node – Applied to key sites in major transit station areas large lots with large scale redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residential density uses. Minimum residential density of 100 units per hectare</td>
<td>potential, and locations which abut other high density uses</td>
<td>Local Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial uses that cater to the daily and weekly needs of the surrounding neighbourhood, residential uses above the ground floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>District Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As per Site Specific Policy Area D – based on OMB decision (see Site Specific Description in Section 1.5 below)</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>Applied to Walmart commercial plaza site abutting the QEW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial uses catering to the travelling or drive-by consumer, including automotive uses, commercial entertainment and recreation, industrial supply and contractor uses, enclosed storage. Offices also permitted.</td>
<td>None.</td>
<td>One existing location as southwest corner of Centennial Parkway North and the QEW</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Industrial Designations**
All existing designated industrial lands have been maintained as industrial. Some General Industrial lands in close proximity to the Centennial Node have been changed to Light Industrial to reduce the risk of land use conflict between industrial lands and potential future residential uses in the Node.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted Uses</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Light Industrial</strong></td>
<td>A broad range of industrial uses, excluding heavy industrial uses which result in significant potential for frequent noise, vibration, odours, dust, or other emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Industrial</strong></td>
<td>Full range of industrial uses, including heavy industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Park</strong></td>
<td>A broad range of industrial uses compatible with the design policies for business parks and limited ancillary commercial and office uses. Generally low to medium intensity uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5: Parks and Open Space Designations**

All existing parks and open spaces are recognized and maintained in the Secondary Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Park</strong></td>
<td>Caters to the recreational needs and interests of the residents living in the general vicinity. Generally contain a mix of active and passive parkland, sports facilities, informal and formal play areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Park</strong></td>
<td>Provides recreational activities that are more intense than those located within a neighbourhood park. They are intended to serve more than one neighbourhood, and typically contain sports fields and/or recreational facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Open Space</strong></td>
<td>Includes opportunities for active and passive recreation, such as golf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.

| Natural Open Space | Provides important biological and ecological functions, and may include passive recreation opportunities | Red Hill Valley, lands adjacent to Henry and Beatrice Warden Park |

### Table 6: Other Designations

All existing Institutional and Utility uses are recognized and maintained in the Secondary Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permitted Uses</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Reason for Designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>Educational facilities, religious facilities, cultural facilities, health care facilities, long term care facilities, and day care facilities.</td>
<td>Place of worship on Barton Street and three existing schools, Lake Avenue Public Elementary School, St. David’s Catholic Elementary School, and the St. Charles Adult and Continuing Education Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility</strong></td>
<td>Major facilities, corridors and rights-of-way for utilities and services; municipal works yards; parking lots; open space uses; transportation yards; heavy rail corridors and main lines; waste management</td>
<td>Hydro transmission property on Barton Street East and associated hydro lands</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pedestrian Focus Street Overlay

Pedestrian focus streets are commercial streets intended to cater to the pedestrian by creating a comfortable, active and visually stimulating walking environment. Areas identified as Pedestrian Focus Streets in the City are required to have buildings close to the street, a significant building block face along the street, active commercial uses at grade and a minimum height of 2 storeys. A Pedestrian Focus Street overlay has been applied to lands in the Centennial Node along the frontage of Centennial Parkway, and on Queenston Road from Nash Road to Centennial Parkway. These are key commercial corridor sections which are proposed for future higher order transit.

1.5 Area and Site Specific Policies:

A number of Area and Site Specific policies have been added to the Secondary Plan to recognize unique situations or existing site specific permissions that encompass specific properties or multiple properties within the study area. These policies provide more detailed direction for land use, built form, or urban design beyond the framework of the Secondary Plan policies. The following is a description of these Area and Site Specific policies.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA A (CONFEDERATION GO STATION)

Special Policy Area A applies to the planned Confederation GO Rail and Bus Station. These lands will be designed to support an integrated approach to mobility. The City will work with Metrolinx to monitor travel demands and implement the long term land use and transportation vision for the site. The policies address providing a high quality design that enhances user experience and appropriately connects the station to the surrounding lands, including those lands along Centennial which have been designated for Mixed Use High Density.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA B (71 – 85 CENTENNIAL PARKWAY SOUTH)

Special Policy Area B will permit housing with supports and retirement homes in addition to other residential uses, to allow for a retirement homeuse with various types of supportive living arrangements. The Special Policy area also allows up to an additional 2 storeys in building height to a maximum height of 8 storeys. A small amount of additional density is permitted to account for the potential additional height.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA C (460 KENORA AVENUE – WASTE TRANSFER FACILITY)
Special Policy Area C applies to the City of Hamilton’s existing waste transfer facility. An existing site specific policy in Volume 3 permits this facility (UCW-1C). This site specific is being carried over to the Secondary Plan but is being amended to direct the consideration of re-locating the transfer facility. The relocation of the facility would assist in enabling development to support and take advantage of the transit hub to maximize development opportunities in and around the Confederation GO station and avoid potential land use conflict. If the waste transfer facility ceases to operate on this site, Goderich Road is proposed to be extended westerly through the site to connect to Kenora Avenue.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA D (502 TO 560 CENTENNIAL PARKWAY NORTH)

Special Policy Area D applies to the Smart Centres lands adjacent to the QEW, commonly known as the “Walmart” site. There is an existing site specific policy for this site within Volume 3 of the Official Plan that was implemented through an Ontario Municipal Board decision (UHC-4). These current site specific policies should be maintained to recognize the permissions/requirements for the development which were approved by the Ontario Municipal Board.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA E (505 TO 537 QUEENSTON ROAD)

Special Policy E applies to a row of small properties which front onto Queenston Road, which also have existing site specific policies within Volume 3 (UHN-10). The existing permissions allow for a limited selection of commercial uses within existing buildings, in addition to the uses permitted by the Medium Density Residential 2 designation.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA F (EASTGATE MALL)

Special Policy Area F applies to Eastgate Square Mall. The expectation is that Eastgate Square Mall will continue to be a major, regional-scale shopping destination and a key anchor for the Centennial Node. The site specific outlines the general future vision and development approach for the site. The future intensification of lands in and around the shopping centre and the inclusion of mixed-use development is encouraged. Where major redevelopment is proposed, a concept plan and a public realm and built form plan is required to address design and identify how the proposed redevelopment fits within the site and aligns with the vision and policies of the Secondary Plan.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA G (ST. DAVID’S CATHOLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL)
Special Policy Area G applies to St. David’s Catholic Elementary School. The purpose of this policy is to recognize previously existing site specific policies/permissions within the Old Town Secondary Plan which allow for medium density redevelopment on the current school site if the school use ceases.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA H (BARTON ST. INDUSTRIAL LANDS)

Special Policy Area H applies to the lands which are designated for employment uses along the periphery of the employment area, along Barton Street East. These lands will be maintained as employment uses until the completion of the next City-wide Municipal Comprehensive Review. At this time, the City should undertake a detailed assessment of the lands to assess the appropriateness of these lands as employment lands. The assessment will consider the existing function of the lands, the proximity to major transportation routes, opportunities to introduce transitional lands uses along the edge of the industrial area, and consideration of the potential need for arterial commercial lands City-wide.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA I (45 GODERICH ROAD)

Special Policy Area I applies to the only Arterial Commercial site in the Secondary Plan, located just north of the proposed GO Station. This special policy area permits offices in addition to arterial commercial uses. Offices are limited in size.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA J (860 QUEENSTON ROAD)

Special Policy Area J applies to the property located at 860 Queenston Road. The policy advises that the lands are part of an ongoing appeal at the Ontario Municipal Board. The appeal is discussed in greater detail in Section 1.6.3 of Report PED18007 below.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA K (398, 400, AND 402 NASH ROAD NORTH AND 30, 50, AND 54 BANCROFT STREET)

Special Policy Area K applies to a single property with multiple addresses, designated Light Industrial in the Secondary Plan. Council approved a motion on June 14, 2017 directing staff to recognize an existing Commercial Recreation use on this site in the Zoning By-law. An Official Plan amendment to allow this use was also required to implement this direction. The Official Plan amendment became final and binding on August 17, 2017. The site specific, allowing Commercial Recreation in addition to other permitted Industrial uses, is being carried over from Volume 3 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA L (670, 674, 686, 692 AND 700 QUEENSTON ROAD)
Special Policy Area L applies to a single commercial property with multiple addresses, designated Mixed Use – High Density in the Secondary Plan. Originally, two designations were applied to this property, a Mixed Use – High Density designation with a Pedestrian Focus Street overlay on the north half of the property, abutting Queenston Road, and a Mixed Use – Medium Density Designation on the south half of the property, which is located more internal to the surrounding residential neighbourhood. A concern was raised in comments submitted for this property about potential difficulties in applying policy with two designations being applied to a single property. After further review and discussions with the land owner, the dual designation was removed by changing the southerly lands to a Mixed Use – High Density designation. A Site Specific Policy Area was applied which provides direction for transitioning to a lower height and scale of development on the southerly portion of the lands that is sensitive to the site context and maintains the original intent of the policies.

1.6 Additional Secondary Plan policies:

1.6.1 Light Rail Transit:

The Council-endorsed Hamilton Light Rail Transit (LRT) Environmental Project Report (EPR) Addendum for the B-Line included an extension of the project from the Queenston Traffic Circle to Eastgate Square. Previously, Phase 1 of the LRT was planned to terminate at the Queenston Traffic Circle. To support transit-supportive development along the corridor, the City has implemented Transited Oriented Corridor (TOC) Zoning. This zoning is now being implemented for the Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square corridor section, and the Zoning within the Secondary Plan area has been coordinated to be implemented at the same time as the Secondary Plan approval. Several policies of the Secondary Plan reflect standards that have already been implemented along the other portions of the LRT corridor, including a minimum 3 storey height requirement for new development along the corridor, and a restriction on auto-oriented uses such as drive-throughs, gas bars and car washes.

1.6.2 Stoney Creek Old Town Secondary Plan

A portion of the lands in the south east corner of the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan are currently located within the Old Town Secondary Plan for Stoney Creek. The boundary of the Old Town Secondary Plan follows the previous boundary between Hamilton and Stoney Creek. The Sub - Regional Service Node Urban Structure element overlaps this former geographical boundary. To comprehensively plan for the Node, all of the lands which are part of the Node should be part of a single Secondary Plan. Therefore, a portion of the Old Town Secondary Plan will be removed and added to the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan as part of the proposed
1.6.3860 Queenston Road Development Application Appeals

The lands located at 860 Queenston Road are currently subject to an Ontario Municipal Board Appeal for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment. The applications would permit the development of a 19 storey residential apartment building with 219 units. The applications were denied by Council on February 8, 2017. These lands are currently identified as “Open Space” and “Neighbourhood Shopping Centre” in the Old Town Neighbourhood Plan, and are designated “Open Space” in the Old Town Secondary Plan and “Mixed Use – Medium Density” in Schedule E-1 – Urban Land Use Designations of the Official Plan. The lands are being removed from the Old Town Secondary Plan and included in the new Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan through the Official Plan Amendment attached as Appendix “B”. The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan designates these lands as “Mixed Use – Medium Density”, which is consistent with Schedule E-1 of the Official Plan. This designation permits a residential apartment building, but has a maximum height limit of six to eight storeys.

1.6.4 Streetscape and Public Realm Design Study

There are no associated Urban Design Guidelines accompanying this Secondary Plan. Given the approved Corridor Planning Principles and Design Guidelines which apply to the main corridors in the Plan, it was decided sufficient guidance on design is provided in existing design guidelines and policies of the UHOP and proposed in the Secondary Plan to move forward with the Secondary Plan and incorporate general design direction in policy while relying on the already approved guidelines to implement urban design.

However, as part of the Secondary Plan process, improvements needed to public realm and streetscape design were an important theme heard during the public consultations. It was identified that there was a need to provide more design guidance on streetscapes, the public realm, and the interface between private development and the public realm, for certain key corridors in the Centennial Neighbourhoods area. Therefore, an additional study is recommended in the Secondary Plan Summary Report (see Appendix “E” to Report PED18007) as part of the implementation of the Secondary Plan, to provide more detailed design guidance for these areas. The study requirement is included in the implementation policies of the Secondary Plan. There are no restrictions on development in the interim prior to the study’s completion.
1.6.5 Infrastructure

Through the Secondary Plan process, a high level infrastructure review was completed. This review showed that there are no significant restrictions that would prevent the target densities of the plan from being achieved. However, more detailed local modelling and study is needed to plan for upgrades within the area based on future development projections. A Municipal Servicing Study is recommended in the Secondary Plan to identify where there might be gaps in servicing levels, and where upgrades may be needed to address these gaps.

1.6.6 Existing Car Dealerships

During the review of the Secondary Plan policies, a concern was raised by several existing car dealerships located within the boundary of the Centennial Node that the policies do not support continued operation and investment in their businesses. There are 5 existing car dealerships located within the Centennial Node. Car dealerships do not meet the policies of the Official Plan for Mixed Use areas, or for areas identified as Pedestrian Focus Streets, and as such, are not permitted uses in the Centennial Node. However, it is acknowledged that these uses have existed for some time in the area, as the area has historically contained a large number of car oriented uses. It is also acknowledged that change in the area will take time, and will occur incrementally. As such, policies have been included in the Secondary Plan which allow existing car dealerships to be recognized and permitted in the Zoning By-law. Design requirements have been applied to allow changes to these uses and sites that bring the built forms into greater conformity with the objectives of the Secondary Plan.

1.6.7 Transitioning of Large Commercial Sites

A significant number of comments received regarding the Secondary Plan relate to large commercial sites with shopping centre type plazas that have multiple commercial tenants. In addition to Eastgate Square Mall, a 17 hectare site which is the largest commercial site in the Node and the only site with an enclosed shopping centre, there are 5 other commercial shopping centre sites within the Node that are larger than 2 hectares. Additionally, the Walmart shopping complex outside the Node boundary, at the south east corner of Centennial Parkway North and the QEW is also greater than 2 hectares in size. The main concern raised by several of these sites was ensuring that the policies provide enough language and flexibility to protect existing commercial functions while allowing gradual transitions to greater densities and mixes of uses over the long term. The policy wording has been updated to better articulate the goal of protecting the commercial focus in the Node. Several policies have been included which permit transitional types of development such as additions and expansions to existing buildings and single storey commercial pads on these sites. The policies acknowledge
that change will occur incrementally as the market evolves to support the type of higher density mixed use forms envisioned for the long term.

1.6.8 Building Heights

In neighbourhood areas with existing pockets of high density residential development, building heights are limited to 8 storeys or to existing building heights where buildings are taller. The goal of this approach is to limit the opportunity for redevelopment to ensure that an adequate supply of rental housing is maintained in the area. Additional density is permitted generally through infill buildings and additions or alterations to existing buildings.

Within the Node, maximum building heights were developed based on the following considerations:

- The future planned land use and proximity to planned major transit station areas;
- The potential for negative sun/shadow impacts on surrounding land uses;
- Site specific considerations, such as property size, lot depth, lot width and potential for lot consolidation;
- Existing building heights within the surrounding area and the potential for context sensitive transitions; and,
- Public and stakeholder feedback received during various consultation and engagement sessions.

The Eastgate Square Mall site is permitted the greatest heights, up to 20 storeys if meeting appropriate design criteria. This site is identified as the main focal point of the Node. Within areas identified as Mixed Use – Medium Density, heights are limited to 6-8 storeys. Within areas identified Mixed Use – High Density, permitted heights range from 12 to 15 storeys. The Mixed Use – High Density locations are also permitted up to 5 additional storeys in height through a Zoning By-law Amendment, if a proposal can show that they are meeting all of the design policies of the Plan and transitioning appropriately to adjacent land uses.

2. Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (TMP) has been prepared in conjunction with the Secondary Plan. The TMP notes that there has already been significant road improvements done on both Centennial Parkway and...
Queenston Road and therefore it is unlikely that there will be major change along these corridors until such time as the rapid transit corridor is completed to the Eastgate Square Mall terminus. Many of the recommendations relate to improving active transportation opportunities throughout the Secondary Plan area. The policies of the Secondary Plan support the recommendations of the TMP.

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION

Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan:

Alternative 1:

Council could choose not to approve the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan. This alternative would not implement the requirement for Secondary Planning for Sub-Regional Nodes required in Volume 1 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. Rejecting the Secondary Plan may also jeopardize appropriate comprehensive development standards and design for the area, and may not address the vision established for the neighbourhood and endorsed by the community. Consistency with Provincial direction respecting intensification, the development of complete communities, and meeting density targets for Major Transit Station Areas may not be achieved.

Alternative 2:

Council could choose to approve the Plan, with modifications. This alternative would establish comprehensive development standards for the Secondary Plan area. The intent of the Plan is to guide future growth and development to the year 2031 and beyond in a comprehensive manner. The policies accommodate this direction in a comprehensive, clear manner. Modification of the Plan may lead to development that is not consistent with the vision established for the area, and may not achieve the objectives of the plan. Modifications may potentially result in a plan that does not conform to Provincial policy requirements or other approved City policies, such as the policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.

Transportation Management Study

There are two alternatives to the recommendations of the Transportation Management Plan for Council to consider:

Alternative 1:

Do not endorse the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan. This alternative would not promote comprehensive development or design of the
neighbourhoods, and may not support the first and last mile trips associated with the planned “BLAST” Rapid Transit projects and Metrolinx’s planned Confederation GO Station. Consistency with Provincial direction respecting intensification and the development of complete communities may not be achieved.

Alternative 2:

Approve with modifications and/or deletion of the recommendations listed in Appendix D attached to this Report. It is important that the modified recommendations be consistent and supportive of the future transportation needs, citywide transportation policies, sustainability and that minimises the environmental impacts.

ALIGNMENT TO THE 2016 – 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN

Community Engagement & Participation
*Hamilton has* an open, transparent and accessible approach to City government that engages with and empowers all citizens to be involved in their community.

Economic Prosperity and Growth
*Hamilton has* a prosperous and diverse local economy where people have opportunities to grow and develop.

Healthy and Safe Communities
*Hamilton is* a safe and supportive city where people are active, healthy, and have a high quality of life.

Clean and Green
*Hamilton is* environmentally sustainable with a healthy balance of natural and urban spaces.

Built Environment and Infrastructure
*Hamilton is* supported by state of the art infrastructure, transportation options, buildings and public spaces that create a dynamic City.

Culture and Diversity
*Hamilton is* a thriving, vibrant place for arts, culture, and heritage where diversity and inclusivity are embraced and celebrated.

Our People and Performance
*Hamiltonians have* a high level of trust and confidence in their City government.
OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.
OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.
OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.

APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED

- Appendix “A” Location Map
- Appendix “B” Official Plan Amendment No. ___ to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan)
- Appendix “C” Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan: Project File
- Appendix “D” Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan Preferred Solutions/ Recommended Projects
- Appendix “E” Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study Summary Report
- Appendix “F” List of External Agencies and Groups Circulated
- Appendix “G” Public Comments received on Final Plan
- Appendix “H” Table of Official Plan Changes
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Draft Urban Hamilton Official Plan
Amendment No. XX

The following text, together with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix “A”</th>
<th>Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix “B”</td>
<td>Volume 1, Schedule E-1 – Urban Land Use Designations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix “C”</td>
<td>Volume 1, Appendix A – Parks Classification Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix “D”</td>
<td>Volume 1, Appendix B – Major Transportation Facilities and Routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix “E”</td>
<td>Volume 2, Appendix A – Secondary Plans Index Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix “F”</td>
<td>Volume 2, Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan – Map B.6.7-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix “G”</td>
<td>Volume 2, Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Maximum Building Heights in the Node – Map B.6.7-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix “H”</td>
<td>Volume 2, Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Transportation and Connections – Map B.6.7-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix “I”</td>
<td>Volume 2, Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Site Specific Policy Areas – Map B.6.7-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix “J”</td>
<td>Volume 2, Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Transition Areas – Appendix A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix “K”</td>
<td>Volume 2, Old Town Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan – Map B.7.2-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix “L”</td>
<td>Volume 3, Map 1 – Area Specific Policies Key Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix “M”</td>
<td>Volume 3, Map H-4 – Area Specific Policies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix “N”</td>
<td>Volume 3, Map 2 – Urban Site Specific Key Map</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

attached hereto, constitutes Official Plan Amendment XX to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.

1.0 Purpose and Effect:

The purpose of this amendment is to:

- Incorporate the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan into the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, identifying land uses, densities, development forms, development standards and site specific policies;

- Amend various policies, schedules and appendices of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan to reflect the principles, policies, land use designations and land use features in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan; and,
• Make minor housekeeping updates to an Appendix in the Official Plan.

The effect of this amendment to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan is to establish a detailed policy framework to guide the development of lands within the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan.

2.0 Location:

The lands affected by this Amendment are generally bounded by the Red Hill Valley Parkway to the west, Lake Avenue to the east, the Queen Elizabeth Way (QEW) to the north, and by the properties just south of Queenston Road to the south, as illustrated on Appendix “F” to this amendment.

3.0 Basis:

The basis for this Amendment is as follows:

• The proposed amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

• The proposed Secondary Plan helps to achieve the overall vision, goals and objectives of the Provincial Policy Statement, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, and the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.

• Changes to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan allow for consistency between the policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and the policies proposed in the new Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan;

4.0 Actual Text and Schedule/Map/Appendix Changes:

4.1 Volume 1 – Parent Plan

4.1.1 Chapter E – Urban Systems and Designations

Section E.4.2 – Commercial and Mixed Use Designations – General Policies

a) That Policy 4.2.9 be amended by:

i) Adding the phrase “Volume 2 or” before the words “Volume 3” so the policy reads as follows:

“4.2.9 Notwithstanding Policies E.4.2.3 and E.4.2.6, four major commercial areas currently exist in the City of Hamilton that
exceed 25,000 square metres of retail and commercial service space, but are not anticipated to evolve into mixed use areas during the life of this Plan. These four areas are not identified as Urban Nodes or Urban Corridors, are within the Neighbourhood element of the Urban Structure on Schedule E - Urban Structure, are designated District Commercial on Schedule E-1 - Urban Land Use Designations and have area or site specific requirements contained in Volume 2 or Volume 3. The amount or type of retail uses in these locations shall not be expanded without an amendment to the Urban Structure. The four major commercial areas are located:

ii) Changing the address in part d) of Policy 4.2.9 to “502 to 560 Centennial Parkway North” so the policy reads as follows:

“4.2.9d) at 502 to 560 Centennial Parkway North.”

Section E.4.3 - Pedestrian Focus Streets

a) That Table 4.3.1 in Policy 4.3.1 be amended by:

i) Adding two new table lines in the Hamilton portion of the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>Nash Road</td>
<td>East side of Centennial Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>South side of Queenston Road</td>
<td>Railway line north of Bancroft Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

so the table reads as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>Nash Road</td>
<td>East side of Centennial Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>South side of Queenston Road</td>
<td>Railway line north of Bancroft Street</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.1.2 Volume 1 – Schedules and Appendices

a) That Schedule E-1 be amended by:

i) redesignating the lands located in the general area of Centennial
Parkway North, south of the railway line from “Arterial Commercial” to “Industrial Land”, as shown on Appendix “B” of this amendment.

ii) redesignating the lands located in the general area of Centennial Parkway North, north of Barton Street East from “Arterial Commercial” to “Mixed Use – High Density”, as shown on Appendix “B” of this amendment.

iii) redesignating the lands located in the general area southwest of Centennial Parkway North and Barton Street East from “District Commercial” to “Mixed Use – Medium Density”, as shown on Appendix “B” of this amendment.

iv) redesignating the following lands from “Mixed Use – Medium Density” to “Mixed Use – High Density”, as shown on Appendix “B” of this amendment:

1) lands located in the general area of Queenston Road just east of Nash Road;

2) lands generally located on the north east corner of Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway; and

3) lands located in the general area of the east side of Centennial Parkway North, near Delawana Drive.

v) redesignating the lands in the general area of Eastgate Court and lands on the south side of Barton Street East, between Kenora Avenue and Centennial Parkway North from “District Commercial” to “Neighbourhoods”, as shown on Appendix “B” of this amendment.

vi) redesignating the following lands from “Mixed Use – Medium Density” to “Neighbourhoods”, as shown on Appendix “B” of this amendment:

1) lands located in the general area on the north side of Queenston Road, between Woodman Drive North and Nash Road;

2) lands located at 23 Delawana Drive;

3) lands located at 31-37 Delawana Drive; and,

4) lands located in the general area of Queenston Road and Riverdale Drive.
vii) making a minor boundary adjustment between the “District Commercial” designation and the “Business Park” designation on lands located in the general area of Centennial Parkway North just south of the Queen Elizabeth Way, as shown on Appendix “B” of this amendment, to recognize existing property boundaries.

viii) redesignating the lands located in the general area just west of Henry and Beatrice Warden Park from “Mixed Use – Medium Density” to “Open Space”, as shown on Appendix “B” of this amendment.

ix) redesignating the lands located in the general area of the Red Hill Valley Parkway, north of the railway line from “Industrial Land” to “Open Space”, as shown on Appendix “B” of this amendment.

x) redesignating the lands located in the general area southeast of Centennial Parkway North and Barton Street East from “District Commercial” to “Mixed Use – High Density”, as shown on Appendix “B” of this amendment.

b) That Appendix A be amended by adding the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, as shown on Appendix “C” attached to this amendment.

c) That Appendix B be amended by:

i) extending the “Potential Rapid Transit Line” on Centennial Parkway north to the Railway line, as shown on Appendix “D” of this amendment.

ii) changing the “HSR Terminal” at Eastgate Square to a “Future Multi-Modal Hub” as shown on Appendix “D” of this amendment.

iii) changing the text “Proposed New GO Centre (LIUNA Station)” in the legend to “Proposed GO Station”, as shown in Appendix “D” of this amendment.

iv) Adding a new “Proposed GO Station” at the southwest corner of Centennial Parkway and the Railway north of Barton Street East, as shown on Appendix “D” of this amendment.

4.2 Volume 2 – Secondary Plans

4.2.1 Chapter B, Secondary Plans

a) That Chapter B, Secondary Plans be amended by adding a new Section
6.7 – Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, as shown on Appendix “A” attached to this amendment.

Section B.7.2 – Old Town Secondary Plan

b) That Chapter B, Secondary Plans be amended by:

   i) adding the word “generally” after “The Old Town Secondary Plan area is”, changing the word “lines” to “boundaries” and deleting the phrase “south of King Street” in the first sentence, so that it reads as follows:

   “The Old Town Secondary Plan area is generally bounded by the rear lot lines of the properties fronting on the north side of Queenston Road, Gray Road to the East, the Niagara Escarpment to the South, to the west by the western property boundaries in line with Alpine Avenue just East of Centennial Parkway North, north of King Street East, as well as Centennial Parkway North.”;

   ii) deleting Policy 7.2.4.3 Mixed Use – High Density Designation;

   iii) renumbering Policy 7.2.4.4 District Commercial Designation to Policy 7.2.4.3; and,

   iv) deleting Policy 7.2.8.3 Site Specific Policy – Area C.

4.2.2 Secondary Plan Maps

   a) That Appendix A be amended by adding the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, as shown on Appendix “E”, attached to this amendment.

   b) That the Old Town Secondary Plan Land Use Plan Map B.7.2-1 be amended by removing lands located in the general area of Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway, as shown on Appendix “K”, attached to this amendment.

   c) That Map B.6.7-1 Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan be added, as shown on Appendix “F”, attached to this amendment.

   d) That Map B.6.7-2 Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Maximum Building Heights in the Node be added, as shown on Appendix “G”, attached to this amendment.

   e) That Map B.6.7-3 Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Transportation and Connections be added, as shown on Appendix “H”,
4.3 Volume 3 – Special Policy Areas, Area Specific Policies and Site Specific Policies

4.3.1 Chapter B – Urban Area Specific Policies

a) That Policy UH-1, 1.0 be amended by deleting Policy 1.0 f) in its entirety.

4.3.2 Chapter C – Urban Site Specific Policies

a) That Chapter C – Urban Site Specific Policies, be amended by deleting the following site specific areas in their entirety:

i) UHN-10 – Lands located at 505 to 537 Queenston Road, former City of Hamilton;

ii) UHC-4 – Lands located at 480 and 500 Centennial Parkway North and 20 Warrington Street, former City of Hamilton; and,

iii) UHE-7 – Lands located at 398, 400, 402 Nash Road North and 30, 50, 54 Bancroft Street.

b) That Chapter C – Urban Site Specific Policies be amended by deleting the words “and 460 Kenora Avenue” from the title of Urban Site Specific UCW-1C, and replacing the comma with the word “and” so that it reads as follows:

“UCW-1C Lands located at 27 Olympic Drive and 37 Kilbride Road”

c) That Chapter C – Urban Site Specific Policies be amended by deleting policy 3.0, in its entirety, of Urban Site Specific UCW-1C.

4.3.3 Volume 3 Maps

a) That Map 1 – Area Specific Policies Key Map be amended by deleting
“UH-1f”, as shown on Appendix “L”, attached to this amendment.

b) That Map H-4 – Area Specific Policies Map be deleted, as shown on Appendix “M”, to this amendment.

c) That Map 2 – Urban Site Specific Key Map be amended by deleting UHC-4, UCW-1C, UHN-10 and UHE-7, as shown on Appendix “N” to this attachment.

5.0 Implementation:

Implementing Zoning By-law Amendments and site plans will give effect to this Amendment.

This is Schedule “1” to By-law No. XX-XXX passed on the XX day of XXX, 2018.

The
City of Hamilton

[Signatures]
Fred Eisenberger
MAYOR

Rose Caterini
CITY CLERK
6.7 Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan area is generally bounded by the Red Hill Valley Parkway to the west, Lake Avenue to the east, the Queen Elizabeth Way (QEW) to the north, and by local streets and properties just south of Queenston Road to the south. The area contains a wide variety of land uses and residential densities.

The focal point of the Secondary Plan is the Centennial Sub-Regional Service Node, or the “Centennial Node”, which is a major centre of retail activity for the City with a regional function. The Centennial Node is centred on the intersection of Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway and extends north of this intersection along Centennial Parkway North and west along Queenston Road. The major anchor for the Node is a shopping mall (Eastgate Square Mall) located on the northwest corner of Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway.

The Centennial Node plays an important role in the future transit network of the City, as it is planned as a terminus point for Light Rail Transit services and is also serviced by interregional transit. The Centennial Node also has an important function as part of the City’s urban structure by connecting different areas of the City. It connects to other existing and planned nodes in the City via a primary corridor on Queenston Road west of Centennial Parkway and secondary corridors on Centennial Parkway and on Queenston Road east of Centennial Parkway.

The Urban Hamilton Official Plan vision for Sub-Regional Service Nodes is that these areas are to be planned to achieve a mix of uses and significant densities which are supportive of higher order transit. Commercial uses are an important component of Sub-Regional Service Nodes. Sub-Regional Service Nodes will also accommodate a significant proportion of City-wide residential intensification. The planning framework for the Centennial Node supports provincial policy directions regarding the efficient use of land, intensifying within existing built-up areas, and creating transit-supportive densities around major transit station areas and along priority transit corridors.

Surrounding the Centennial Node are residential neighbourhoods with a variety of residential densities and other community uses, such as parks, open spaces and institutional uses. The residential uses and other associated uses work together to form a complete community where people have opportunities to live, work, learn, and play. The neighbourhoods supply a variety of different housing types which support
urban various household needs and incomes. These neighbourhoods may accommodate some residential intensification over time, primarily along arterial roads or on larger sites where changes are comprehensively reviewed; however they are generally regarded as stable.

North of Barton Street East, a large employment area provides an important employment function, by contributing to the provision of jobs in close proximity to where people live, and by contributing to the City’s overall supply of employment lands. The employment area benefits from valuable transportation connections, as the area is also a key entryway into the City, with access points from the Red Hill Valley Parkway and the QEW, and abuts the future Confederation GO station.

The primary purpose of the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan is to guide redevelopment and intensification within the Centennial Node to achieve more transit-supportive densities and an appropriate mix of uses, while maintaining the regional commercial function of the Node. This is balanced with the need to ensure that the Node is appropriately integrated with surrounding neighbourhoods in the community and existing employment areas. As such, the Secondary Plan provides direction for both the Centennial Node and adjacent neighbourhoods and employment areas.


6.7.1 Vision

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan area is home to some of the City’s most vibrant shopping, recreation, living and mixed use spaces. The Centennial Node will feature a higher order transit corridor and two major transit hubs, which are supported by compact, mixed use development along the Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway corridors.

The Secondary Plan area’s existing residential neighbourhoods are safe, well connected and affordable. The area’s attractive and accessible public spaces, green spaces and streetscapes, along with its strong network of
transportation infrastructure provide a unique sense of place that makes the Centennial Neighbourhoods an interesting, dynamic and exciting place.

### 6.7.2 Principles

Eleven planning principles represent the foundation of the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan. The principles provide direction for accommodating development, promoting compatible intensification, preserving the area’s green spaces and promoting opportunities for active transportation.

#### 6.7.2.1 The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan is based on the following principles:

- a) Protect and enhance parks and natural areas;
- b) Create safe, connected, vibrant streetscapes;
- c) Provide more opportunities and spaces for people to meet, relax and socialize;
- d) Promote active transportation throughout the community;
- e) Provide opportunities for mixed use development and intensification in strategic locations;
- f) Promote transit-oriented development;
- g) Provide a variety of housing choices;
- h) Protect existing residential neighbourhoods from incompatible development;
- i) Provide sustainable infrastructure;
- j) Improve the appearance and function of the public realm; and,
- k) Provide opportunities for a greater variety of recreational choices.

### 6.7.3 Policy Goals
In addition to the policy goals in Volume 1, Chapters B, C, and E, the following policy goals shall provide direction for planning and development in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan:

### 6.7.3.1 Land Use

a) Support and implement the planned function of the Sub - Regional Service Node identified on Map B.6.7-1 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Land Use Plan;

b) Protect and enhance existing residential areas;

c) Support the provision and maintenance of a mix of housing types and tenures that meet the housing needs of residents throughout their life cycle and provide opportunities for residents to remain within the community;

d) Ensure compatibility between areas of different land uses, densities and heights;

e) Promote development that fosters a healthy, safe, efficient, connected and visually pleasing urban environment;

f) Encourage and foster a healthy balance of housing, employment, community services and recreation opportunities that are connected, accessible and people-oriented;

g) Direct the majority of intensification to the Sub – Regional Service Node;

h) Encourage residential infill development within existing residential neighbourhoods;

i) Promote and encourage appropriate development in proximity to major transit station areas in support of and to take advantage of investment in public transit;

j) Support Eastgate Square Mall as a regional commercial shopping centre while providing direction and opportunity for mixed use redevelopment of the site over the planning horizon of this plan;

k) Provide appropriate community facilities and amenities to serve current and future residents; and,
l) Support the transition of the Centennial Node from low density, auto-dependent lands uses and built form to a more compact, transit supportive environment.

6.7.3.2 Urban Design

a) Provide high quality urban design and a consistent, identifiable neighbourhood image;

b) Ensure design promotes pedestrian walkability, cycling, physical activity, social interaction and public gathering spaces;

c) Encourage innovative building and site development and green infrastructure which contributes to the physical environment of the community, is forward looking in response to climate change, and enhances desirability as a place to live, learn, work and play;

d) Promote design variety within streetscapes and identified Streetscape Improvement Areas;

e) Promote interesting gateway and design features at Gateway Improvement Areas and Prominent Intersections identified on Map B.6.7-3 – Centennial Neighbourhoods - Transportation and Connections;

f) Encourage public space enhancements at major transit station areas to support opportunities for gathering and social interaction; and,

g) Ensure appropriate transitions between different building heights and uses.

6.7.3.3 Active Transportation, Transit and Transportation Linkages

a) Enhance the neighbourhood’s primary corridors as places for all modes of transportation and users of all ages, abilities, and incomes in an equitable manner, including pedestrians, cyclists, transit riders and drivers;
b) Support the public transit system, future rapid transit corridors and connections to the GO transit station to decrease reliance on the private automobile;

c) Promote, enhance and support a safe, healthy, attractive, accessible and efficient active transportation network through the application of a complete streets approach that supports all modes of transportation;

d) Encourage an integrated transportation network throughout the Secondary Plan area; and,

e) Minimize and encourage consolidation of access driveways along primary corridors for improved safety.

6.7.3.4 Municipal Services and Utilities

a) Provide adequate services, public facilities and infrastructure to support development.

6.7.3.5 Open Space and Parks

a) Provide an integrated and interconnected system of parks and open spaces that are accessible to all residents, to serve a wide range of active and passive recreational needs;

b) Maintain and enhance existing neighbourhood and community parkland, and strategically review opportunities to acquire additional parkland when and where appropriate;

c) Provide appropriate programming and facilities within existing parks to serve the surrounding neighbourhoods;

d) Preserve and protect significant natural heritage features; and,

e) Maintain and enhance the urban tree canopy.

6.7.4 General Policies

6.7.4.1 The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan shall guide development within the Secondary Plan area. The following policies apply to the Secondary Plan area:
a) The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan area shall include a range of housing forms and tenures and a mix of employment, commercial, institutional and open space uses.

b) The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan contains 3 major transit station areas, which are shown on Map B.6.7-3 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Transportation and Connections around the following locations:

i) the planned Light Rail Transit stop at the intersection of Queenston Road and Nash Road;

ii) the planned Light Rail Transit stop on Queenston Road south of Eastgate Square Mall; and,

iii) the planned GO bus and rail station at the southwest corner of Centennial Parkway North and Goderich Road.

c) Major transit station areas include lands within the Sub-Regional Service Node as well as commercial areas, employment areas and a variety of high density and medium density residential uses in stable neighbourhoods outside the Node. Together, population and employment growth in these areas contribute to achieving transit-supportive densities around the major transit stations.

d) The major transit station areas around the 2 proposed Light Rail Transit stops are planned to achieve a minimum density of 160 residents and jobs per hectare in the long term.

e) There are lands designated High Density Residential and Mixed Use – High Density which are not located within a major transit station area, but are important contributors to the function of a major transit station area.

f) Reductions in parking requirements for development proposals may be considered where Transportation Demand Management measures are implemented and a Parking Justification Study has been submitted which demonstrates that parking can be adequately accommodated on site, to the satisfaction of the City.

g) The City may require consultation with the Design Review Panel prior to any public or private development approvals, to ensure that the design objectives and policies of this Plan are reflected in all
projects. Applications for an Official Plan Amendment or Zoning By-law Amendment which may alter the planned function and vision of the Secondary Plan shall be referred to the Design Review Panel.

6.7.5 Centennial Sub-Regional Service Node (Centennial Node)

The Centennial Sub-Regional Service Node is generally identified by the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) on Schedule E - Urban Structure of Volume 1. The detailed boundary of the Node is identified on Map B.6.7-1 Centennial Neighbourhoods – Land Use Plan. For the purposes of this Plan, the Sub-Regional Service Node is referred to as the Centennial Node.

The Centennial Node has historically been characterized by predominantly single storey auto-oriented development. The Centennial Node is planned to transform over time to a multi-storey built form, through infilling, additions to existing buildings and redevelopment. This transformation will include the introduction of additional medium and high density residential uses in the Node.

The transformation of the Centennial Node will facilitate a more pedestrian focused and transit-supportive environment, contributing to a unique sense of place within the Secondary Plan area.

It is recognized that this transformation will take time, and may continue beyond the planning period of this Plan. Some auto oriented uses and built forms will continue to exist in the area in the interim. It is expected that change to built form and land uses will occur incrementally as other changes occur in the area, such as the introduction of GO transit services and light rail transit to the Centennial Node.

6.7.5.1 In addition to Section E.2.3.2 Sub-Regional Service Nodes of Volume 1, within the area identified as the Sub-Regional Service Node shown on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan, the following policies shall apply:

a) The Centennial Node shall function as a mixed use area with retail uses, residential uses and other population serving employment uses such as but not limited to offices, personal services and local institutions. Retail shall be an important part of the Node, providing a regional function serving the needs of residents across the City and surrounding area as well as serving the weekly and daily...
shopping needs of residents within the Centennial Node and in surrounding neighbourhoods.

b) The regional retail function of the Centennial Node is an essential part of the Node’s function, and is dependent on maintaining a significant amount of retail floor space in the Node. There are a number of large sites in the Centennial Node which contribute significantly to the existing overall retail floor space amount. Accordingly, where redevelopment is proposed on sites larger than 2 hectares which will reduce the amount of existing retail commercial uses, a retail impact study may be required which demonstrates to the satisfaction of the City that the planned retail function of the Centennial Node is not being negatively impacted.

c) The Centennial Node shall be the focus for commercial, residential and mixed use growth, development and intensification within the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan. The majority of new development, particularly commercial and mixed use development, shall be directed to locate within the Node boundary.

d) The Centennial Node shall be connected to the active transportation network, the City’s public transportation network, future rapid transit and interregional public transportation services and shall have a strong pedestrian focus.

e) Automobile access will continue to be important to the Centennial Node; however, it shall be balanced with the need to improve transit access and opportunities for active transportation.

f) The Centennial Node is planned to achieve a minimum density target of 100 people and jobs per hectare by the year 2031. It is anticipated that the Node will achieve a density between 100 and 150 persons and jobs per hectare by 2031. The Centennial Node may continue to increase in density beyond 150 persons and jobs per hectare after 2031 provided adequate infrastructure is available and the transportation network is functioning adequately to accommodate additional density.

g) The minimum building height for all lands with frontage on Queenston Road shall be 3 storeys.

h) Large scale commercial sites, including Eastgate Square Mall, are important to the retail function of the Centennial Node. The
continued maintenance and function of large scale commercial sites is desirable. It is recognized that large commercial sites may need to transition gradually over the long term to the more mixed use form of development envisioned by the Secondary Plan.

i) Notwithstanding Policy E.4.3.4 a) and b) of Volume 1, Policy B.6.7.5.1 g) and Policies B.6.7.7.5 a) and b), to support the continued use and gradual transition of commercial sites, for properties designated Mixed Use – Medium Density or Mixed Use – High Density, the following requirements shall apply:

   i) For sites with an area greater than 2 hectares, small scale new buildings for commercial uses may be permitted which do not meet the minimum building heights.

   ii) For all sites, limited small scale additions or expansions to buildings existing on the date of approval of this Plan may be permitted which do not meet the minimum building heights and which are not built directly up to the street line.

k) Lands designated High Density Residential 1 within the Centennial Node identified on Map B.6.7-1 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Land Use Plan shall be subject to Section E. 3.6 – High Density Residential of Volume 1, Policy B.6.7.6.2 and Policy B.6.7.6.7.

l) Where there is a Transition Area shown on all or a portion of a property shown on Appendix A – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Transition Areas, Policy B.6.7.13 shall apply.

6.7.6 Residential Designations

Outside of the Centennial Node, the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan area has stable residential neighbourhoods with a mix of housing types, densities and housing forms. The residential policies define the location and scale of each type of residential use, and shall help ensure that a variety of residential housing types are provided to meet the housing needs of area residents.

6.7.6.1 The residential areas within the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan are designated Low Density Residential 2, Low Density Residential
3, Medium Density Residential 2, Medium Density Residential 3 and High Density Residential 1 as identified on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan. Generally the residential designations recognize existing residential land uses within the Secondary Plan area.

6.7.6.2 General Residential Policies

In addition to Section E.3.0 – Neighbourhoods Designation of Volume 1, the following policies shall also apply:

a) Development shall provide a mix of housing opportunities in terms of built form, style and tenure that are suitable for residents of different age groups, income levels and household sizes.

b) Reverse frontage lotting patterns shall not be permitted, and new multiple dwelling residential development shall be oriented to the street.

c) The existing character of established residential neighbourhoods shall be respected. Residential intensification within these areas shall comply with Section B.2.4 – Residential Intensification of Volume 1 and other applicable policies of this Plan.

d) Existing rental housing is an important asset to the Centennial Neighbourhoods area and contributes significantly to the supply of affordable housing. The preservation and proper maintenance of the supply of rental housing is strongly encouraged. Conversions of rental housing to condominium ownership shall comply with Policy B.3.2.5 of Volume 1.

6.7.6.3 Low Density Residential 2 Designation

In addition to Section E.3.4 – Low Density Residential of Volume 1, for lands designated Low Density Residential 2 on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan, the following policies shall apply:

a) Notwithstanding Policy E.3.4.3 of Volume 1, for lands designated Low Density Residential 2, only single detached, semi-detached, and duplex dwellings shall be permitted.

b) Notwithstanding Policy E.3.4.4 of Volume 1, the maximum net residential density shall be 40 units per hectare.
6.7.6.4 Low Density Residential 3 Designation

In addition to Section E.3.4 – Low Density Residential of Volume 1, for lands designated Low Density Residential 3 on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan, the following policies shall apply:

a) In addition to Policy E.3.4.3 of Volume 1, the following additional residential uses shall be permitted:
   i) fourplex dwellings; and,
   ii) all forms of townhouses.

b) The net residential density shall be 40 units or greater per hectare and not greater than 60 units per hectare.

6.7.6.5 Medium Density Residential 2 Designation

Notwithstanding Policy E.3.5.7 of Volume 1, for lands designated Medium Density Residential 2 on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan the net residential density shall be 60 units or greater per hectare and not greater than 75 units per hectare.

6.7.6.6 Medium Density Residential 3 Designation

Notwithstanding Policy E.3.5.7 of Volume 1, for lands designated Medium Density Residential 3 on Map B.6.7-1 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Land Use Plan, the net residential density shall 75 units or greater per hectare and not greater than 100 units per hectare.

6.7.6.7 High Density Residential 1 Designation

In addition to Section E.3.6 – High Density Residential of Volume 1, for lands designated High Density Residential 1 on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan, the following policies shall apply:

a) Notwithstanding Policy E.3.6.6 b) of Volume 1, additional density may be permitted up to 300 units per hectare without amendment to this Plan, subject to Policy B.6.7.6.7e).
b) Outside of the Centennial Node, the maximum building height shall be 8 storeys or the existing building height as recognized on the date of the adoption of this Plan, whichever is greater.

c) For lands within the boundary of the Centennial Node, the maximum building height shall be in accordance with the heights shown on Map B.6.7-2 - Centennial Neighbourhoods – Maximum Building Heights in the Node.

d) Where development abuts an area designated Low Density Residential or Medium Density Residential, as identified on Appendix A – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Transition Areas, development shall provide an appropriate transition in accordance with Policy B.6.7.13.

e) A development application with a density that is greater than 200 units per hectare shall require a Zoning By-law Amendment to permit the increase in density, except where the density is already permitted by the Zoning By-law regulations existing as of the time of adoption of the Secondary Plan.

6.7.7 Commercial and Mixed Use Designations

The mixed use designations of the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan area are generally focused within the Centennial Node along the primary corridors of Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road. District Commercial, Arterial Commercial and Local Commercial uses are located outside of the Node. The commercial and mixed use areas provide an important regional retail function, as well as meeting the daily and weekly retail needs of the surrounding neighbourhoods. The mixed use areas within the Centennial Node are intended to transition over time to a more compact, pedestrian focused and transit-supportive environment that supports higher order transit and major transit station areas within the Secondary Plan.

6.7.7.1 The commercial areas within the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan are designated Mixed Use – Medium Density, Mixed Use – High Density, Local Commercial, District Commercial and Arterial Commercial, as identified on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan.

6.7.7.2 General Commercial Policies
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a) Existing commercial areas shall evolve over time through infilling, additions to existing buildings and redevelopment into mixed use, pedestrian-oriented places.

b) Development shall be consistent with the policies of Section 6.7.15 – Transportation and Connections.

c) Adequate internal traffic circulation, parking, loading and manoeuvring facilities shall be accommodated on-site.

d) The redevelopment of commercial areas is encouraged in a coordinated and comprehensive manner.

e) New development shall balance the needs for improved pedestrian access, opportunities for active forms of transportation and accommodation of public transportation, including rapid transit, with existing automobile use and access.

f) Development within the mixed use designations shall contribute to vibrant people places with increased day and night activity through the introduction of residential uses.

g) As part of a mixed use building containing both residential and commercial uses, amenity space shall be provided exclusively for the residential component and shall be functionally separated from public areas associated with the commercial component.

h) When major redevelopment occurs on a site larger than 2.5 hectares existing as of the date of approval of this Plan, the redevelopment shall include an appropriate mix of uses, in accordance with Policy E.2.3.2.14 of Volume 1. The Zoning By-law shall define the proportion of commercial and non-commercial uses to be provided on a site.

i) Notwithstanding Policy E.2.3.2.14 of Volume 1 and Policy B.6.7.7.2 h), a mix of commercial and other uses shall not be required for major redevelopment on lands greater than 2.5 hectares abutting industrial designations or uses, if it is determined that the uses:

i) are not compatible with the industrial uses, having regard for provincial guidelines concerning compatibility between industrial facilities and sensitive land uses; or,
ii) due to other adverse impacts caused by the industrial uses.

j) In addition to Policies E.4.5.5 b), E.4.5.21, E.4.6.6 b) and E.4.6.29 of Volume 1, applications to amend this Plan or the Zoning By-law to permit a drive-through facility, gas bar, motor vehicle service station or car wash shall require demonstration that the proposed facility:

i) cannot be located in other potential locations in the Local Commercial, Mixed Use – Medium Density or Mixed Use - High Density designations which are not part of the Light Rail Transit corridor;

ii) shall not change the planned streetscape character;

iii) enhances the pedestrian environment;

iv) shall not compromise the safe, efficient and comfortable movement of pedestrians;

v) shall not preclude the planned function and design intent for the Light Rail Transit corridor including:

   1) a comfortable, active and visually stimulating walking and shopping environment;

   2) a streetscape with buildings and storefronts oriented to the street; and,

   3) the operation of the Light Rail Transit and the associated traffic movements in the Light Rail Transit corridor.

vi) shall not have an adverse impact on surrounding residential neighbourhoods, including but not limited to potential noise and traffic impacts; and,

vii) addresses the General Policies and Principles of Section B.3.3.2, the Built Form policies of Section B.3.3.3, and the Access and Circulation policies of Section B.3.3.9 of Volume 1.

Existing Motor Vehicle Dealerships in the Centennial Node
k) Several *existing* motor vehicle dealerships are located within the boundary of the Centennial Node. These are transitional uses that pre-date the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan and are legal non-complying. It is the intent of the Plan that these uses will cease to exist within the Centennial Node over time. Many of the *existing* motor vehicle dealerships have existed in the area for a significant period of time and may have achieved an acceptable level of tolerance that can be continued in the interim. The following policies shall apply to these uses:

i) Legal non-complying motor vehicle dealerships may be recognized as an *existing* use in the Zoning By-law in accordance with Policy F.1.12.8 of Volume 1.

ii) Notwithstanding Policy F.1.12.9 of Volume 1, *existing* motor vehicle dealerships shall not expand beyond the boundary of legally zoned sites *existing* as of the date of approval of this Plan.

iii) All additions or alterations to buildings *existing* at the date of the approval of this Plan shall enhance the pedestrian environment by providing distinctive high quality landscape elements and a high level of streetscape design at grade along the street.

iv) New buildings or the demolition of existing buildings and replacement with new buildings shall only be permitted if the proposal complies with Policy E.4.3.4 of Volume 1 and Policies B.6.7.7.5 and B.6.7.12.1.

### 6.7.7.3 Mixed Use – Medium Density Designation

In addition to Section E.4.6 - Mixed Use – Medium Density Designation of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply to the Mixed Use – Medium Density Designation, as identified on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan:

a) Maximum building heights shall be in accordance with Schedule B.6.7-2 Centennial Neighbourhoods - Maximum Building Heights in the Node.
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b) Minimum building heights shall be in accordance with Policy B.6.7.5.1 g) and Policy B.6.7.7.5 a), as applicable.

c) Any development with a proposed height of 7 or 8 storeys shall meet the requirements of Policy E.4.6.8 of Volume 1.

d) Where a Transition Area is located on any portion of a property, as identified on Appendix F – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Transition Areas, the development shall demonstrate an appropriate transition to adjacent uses and is subject to Policy B.6.7.13.

e) Notwithstanding Policy E.4.6.5 a) of Volume 1 and in addition to Policy E.4.6.6 of Volume 1, the following uses shall be prohibited, even as an accessory use, along Queenston Road, west of Nash Road:

   i) drive through facilities; and,

   ii) gas bars and car washes.

6.7.7.4 Mixed Use – High Density Designation

In addition to Section E.4.5 - Mixed Use – High Density Designation of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply to the Mixed Use – High Density Designation, as identified on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan:

a) Maximum building heights shall be in accordance with Schedule B.6.7-2 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Maximum Building Heights in the Node.

b) Minimum building heights shall be in accordance with Policy B.6.7.5.1 g) and Policy B.6.7.7.5 a), as applicable.

c) Where residential development is proposed, the intent is that the form of development shall be high density building(s), where each building, if considered as a free-standing solely residential building, achieves a density of approximately 100 units per hectare or greater. For large sites, where only a portion of a site is being redeveloped, the intent is that this target density be achieved for that portion of the site affected by the redevelopment proposal, including building areas, parking and landscaping areas and internal driveway aisles and accesses, not the entire site.
Notwithstanding Policy B.6.7.7.4 a) and in addition to Policy B.6.7.12.1 c), additional height may be permitted above the heights noted on Map B.6.7-2 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Maximum Building Heights in the Node without amendment to the Secondary Plan, subject to the following requirements:

i) The additional height shall be limited to a maximum of 5 additional storeys;

ii) The increase in height is authorized through a Zoning By-law amendment;

iii) Development shall have frontage on a Major Arterial or Minor Arterial road; and,

iv) Development shall not preclude the ability of other properties in the Centennial Node to develop in accordance with the heights permitted on Map B.6.7-2 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Maximum Building Heights, in terms of infrastructure and transportation network capacity. An infrastructure and servicing study and traffic impact study may be required to demonstrate conformity with this policy.

e) Where a Transition Area is located on any portion of a property, as identified on Appendix F – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Transition Areas, development shall demonstrate an appropriate transition to adjacent uses and is subject to Policy B.6.7.13.

6.7.7.5 Pedestrian Focus Streets

In addition to Section E.4.3 – Pedestrian Focus Streets - of Volume 1 the following policies shall apply to all lands identified as pedestrian focus streets on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan:

a) All lands designated Mixed Use – Medium Density and Mixed Use – High Density identified as pedestrian focus streets shall have a minimum height of 2 storeys.

b) Notwithstanding Policy B.6.7.7.5 a), for properties adjacent to Queenston Road, the minimum height shall be 3 storeys, in accordance with Policy B.6.7.5.1 g).
c) *Pedestrian focus streets* shall be a focus for retail activity and shall provide pedestrian oriented design at grade along the street.

d) Street design that invites all forms of *active transportation* while accommodating automobiles and *transit* vehicles is commonly referred to as complete streets. *Development* shall provide a high level of streetscape design to assist in the creation of complete streets.

e) New buildings shall be built close to the street to provide street presence and enclosure.

f) Building entrances shall be emphasized as a focal point of a building’s façade and be placed in highly visible locations where they provide opportunity to animate the street.

g) Minor setbacks of portions of a building from the primary building face in order to enhance the public realm and accommodate public amenity space shall be permitted.

h) Notwithstanding Policy E.4.3.4 b) of Volume 1, where multiple buildings are located on a single site, buildings may be located in the interior of the site as long as the development provides an adequate block face along the *pedestrian focus street*, in accordance with Policy E.4.3.4 a) of Volume 1 and the Zoning By-law.

### 6.7.7.6 Local Commercial Designation

Section E.3.8 - Local Commercial of Volume 1 shall apply to lands designated Local Commercial on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan.

#### 6.7.7.6.1 Notwithstanding Policy E.3.8.2 a) of Volume 1, the following uses shall be prohibited on lands designated Local Commercial along Queenston Road, even as accessory uses:

- drive through facilities; and,
- motor vehicle service stations.

### 6.7.7.7 District Commercial Designation
Section E.4.7 – District Commercial of Volume 1 shall apply to lands designated District Commercial on Map B.6.7-1 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Land Use Plan.

6.7.7.8 Arterial Commercial Designation

Section E.4.8 – Arterial Commercial Designation of Volume 1 shall apply to lands designated Arterial Commercial on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan.

6.7.8 Employment Area Designations

Employment areas in the Secondary Plan are located north of Barton Street East. East of Centennial Parkway North, employment uses are generally located along Barton Street East. West of Centennial Parkway North is a large area of industrial uses located adjacent to the planned GO transit rail and bus facility, a major transit station area. The continued functioning of employment areas is supported. Heavier industrial uses are directed to the northwest corner of the industrial area, to promote compatibility between industrial uses and planned mixed use intensification along Centennial Parkway North.

6.7.8.1 Employment Areas are designated General Industrial, Light Industrial and Business Park on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan.

6.7.8.2 Section E.5.3 – Employment Area – Industrial Land Use Designation of Volume 1 shall apply to lands designated General Industrial and Light Industrial.

6.7.8.3 Section E.5.4 – Employment Area – Business Park Designation of Volume 1 shall apply to lands designated Business Park.

6.7.8.4 In addition to Policy E.5.3.5 of Volume 1, for sites designated General Industrial or Light Industrial on Map B.6.7-1 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Land Use Plan which are visible from the Red Hill Valley Parkway, enhanced landscaping, tree planting and higher quality building design shall be provided in the areas visible from the Red Hill Valley Parkway to improve both the City’s and the employment area’s image.

6.7.8.5 Notwithstanding the permitted uses in Policy E.5.3.2 of Volume 1, for lands designated Light Industrial on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan - Land Use Plan, new industrial uses
which result in significant potential for frequent noise, vibration, odours, dust, or other emissions shall be prohibited.

6.7.8.6 In addition to Policies E.5.3.5 and E.5.4.7 of Volume 1, development of lands designated General Industrial, Light Industrial or Business Park on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan shall be subject to the industrial design requirements in Policy B.6.7.12.5.

6.7.9 Parks and Open Space Designations

The parks and open space areas of the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan contribute to the character of the neighbourhood and are an essential component in the day to day life of residents, by providing green space opportunities to meet both active and passive recreational needs.

6.7.9.1 Parks and Open Space Designations

In addition to Section B.3.5.3 – Parkland Policies – and Section C.3.3 – Open Space Designations of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply to lands designated Neighbourhood Park, Community Park, General Open Space and Natural Open Space on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan:

a) All existing parks in the Secondary Plan area shall be retained for use as parks and shall not be developed for other uses.

b) Significant natural features shall be preserved and maintained.

c) Where future opportunities exist, the provision of additional Neighbourhood Parkland shall be encouraged.

d) The provision of additional trails and multi-use pathways on lands designated as Parks or Open Space is encouraged.

6.7.9.2 Natural Open Space

In addition to Policy B.3.5.3.5 b) – Parkland Policies and Section C.3.3 – Open Space Designations of Volume 1, on lands designated Natural Open Space on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan, natural features and ecological functions shall be protected and enhanced.

6.7.10 Institutional Designation
Institutional uses such as schools, places of worship, cultural facilities and long term care facilities are important to quality of life for residents. Existing institutional uses are recognized throughout the Secondary Plan area.

6.7.10.1 In addition to Policy E.6.2.6 of Volume 1, on lands designated institutional on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan which are no longer required for institutional uses, Medium Density Residential 2 development may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan, subject to Policies B.6.7.6.2 and B.6.7.6.5.

6.7.11 Utility Designation

6.7.11.1 In addition to Section C.3.4 – Utility Designation, and Section B.3.3.6 – Urban Services and Utilities of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply to lands designated Utility on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan:

a) A major hydroelectric operation owned by Hydro One (2549 Barton Street East) is designated utilities on Map B.6.7-1 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Land Use Plan and connects to utility corridors outside of the Secondary Plan. Grading and drainage of land within or adjacent to the hydroelectric site shall have regard for comments from Hydro One or its successor.

b) Where feasible, urban services, utilities and overhead wires should be buried underground as part of future planned road reconstruction, streetscape installation projects or development.

c) Utilities shall be planned for and installed on a coordinated and integrated basis in order to be more efficient and cost effective and to minimize disruptions.

6.7.12 Urban Design

As redevelopment and intensification occur within the Secondary Plan, urban design plays an important role in fostering an attractive, liveable and functional community. High quality building and site design creates a sense of place and can provide other significant community benefits, such as encouraging physical activity and social interaction, reducing crime and mitigating impacts on climate change.
The intent of the Urban Design policies is to promote human-scaled design, improve the pedestrian and cyclist experience, and ensure built form respects the neighbourhood’s character and contributes to sustainable development.

6.7.12.1 General Urban Design Policies

In addition to Section B.3.3 – Urban Design Policies of Volume 1, the following policies shall also apply to lands within the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan area:

a) Policies B.6.7.12.1 b) to n) shall apply to commercial and mixed use areas, institutional uses, townhouses and multiple dwelling developments. They shall not apply to employment areas and single detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings.

b) For any development application with a proposed height greater than 6 storeys, and for properties in the area of a gateway or prominent intersection, an Urban Design Report and a Sun/Shadow Study shall be required which demonstrate the following design elements:

i) How the proposed building and site design relate to the existing and planned context of the area, including taking into account the relationship of the site to other existing or planned buildings in the area;

ii) That potential adverse impacts on adjacent uses have been mitigated, including that proposed buildings or structures do not unduly overshadow, block light, or result in loss of privacy for adjacent buildings;

iii) That buildings are oriented and massed to minimize shadow impacts on the public realm and on private amenity areas both on adjacent lands and within the development; and,

iv) That buildings are progressively stepped back from adjacent areas designated for low and medium density residential uses, institutional uses, open space, or other sensitive land uses.

c) Development shall be consistent with the City-Wide Corridor Planning Principles and Design Guidelines.
d) The City shall consider recommendations in the Streetscape and Public Realm Design Study described in Policy B.6.7.17 a) when evaluating development proposals.

e) Connections to existing active transportation features of the neighbourhood shall be provided through the provision of sidewalks and other amenities such as street furniture and short and long-term bicycle parking.

f) Landscaping shall form an integral part of all developments. Distinctive, high-quality landscape elements shall be provided.

g) Sites shall incorporate a mix of hard and soft-scaping treatments to ensure a comfortable transition between public and private realm.

h) Development fronting on Queenston Road or Centennial Parkway shall have a high quality design, promote pedestrian activity, be transit-supportive, and create accessible public spaces. Public transportation access, cycling infrastructure and pedestrian amenities shall be integrated with existing and new development.

i) Private and public parking areas shall be subject to the following:

i) Parking areas shall be buffered from the street through the use of building placement or where this is not possible, with enhanced landscaping; and,

ii) The location of parking areas shall not negatively affect the pedestrian and cycling environment or access to buildings.

iii) New development is encouraged to provide electric vehicle (EV) charging stations.

iv) The provision of additional surface parking areas in excess of Zoning By-law requirements is discouraged.

v) The construction or reconstruction of large surface parking areas shall incorporate landscaping, including landscaped islands, into the design of parking areas.

6.7.12.2 Gateway Improvement Areas and Prominent Intersections
Section B.3.3.4 - Gateways of Volume 1 shall apply to Gateway Improvement Areas and Prominent Intersections shown on Map B.6.7-3 – Centennial Neighbourhoods - Transportation and Connections. In addition to Section B.3.3.4 - Gateways of Volume 1, the following policies shall also apply:

a) Gateway Improvement Areas have been identified in the following general areas and are intended to promote a sense of arrival into the Centennial Neighbourhoods. These locations include:

i) Centennial Parkway North, at Goderich Road;

ii) Queenston Road, just east of the Red Hill Valley Parkway;

iii) Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road intersection; and,

iv) Barton Street East and Nash Road North intersection.

b) A Prominent Intersection has been identified at the intersection of Barton Street East and Centennial Parkway North. A Prominent Intersection is not intended to portray a sense of arrival into the neighbourhood but is a visually prominent area which also requires special design considerations.

c) Gateway and Prominent Intersection design shall be consistent with any design directions adopted by Council pursuant to Policy B.6.7.17 a), and with the recommendations of the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan.

6.7.12.3 Streetscape and Public Realm

a) Proposed Major Transit Station Areas have been conceptually identified on Map B.6.7-3 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Transportation Connections. The design of development in these areas is encouraged to provide publicly accessible spaces connected to the public realm to create a vibrant streetscape and provide more opportunities for social interaction.

b) The development of corner sites around existing and proposed major transit stations presents an opportunity for publicly accessible corner plazas to be created as part of development. Plaza type public spaces can animate the street, make development human scale and pedestrian friendly and provide places for people to relax
and socialize. These types of public spaces are encouraged as part of the design of new development at corner sites.

c) Pedestrian and cycling connections between the public realm and the private realm shall be encouraged wherever possible to improve pedestrian and cycling access to properties.

d) Streetscape design shall provide for ease and continuity of pedestrian movement and a comfortable, barrier-free pedestrian environment. Streetscape elements may include, but are not limited to, street furniture, pavement markings, wayfinding signage, planters or gardens, tree planting, and public art.

e) The design, style and choice of pavement materials, street furniture and landscape treatments within the public realm should be consistent and coordinated.

6.7.12.4 Streetscape Improvement Areas

a) Streetscape Improvement areas are identified on Map B.6.7-3 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Transportation and Connections. Along streets which are identified as streetscape improvement areas, the following policies shall apply:

i) In the public realm, the City shall implement streetscape improvements in accordance with Policy B.6.7.17 b).

ii) Streetscape improvements within the private realm shall be provided as part of development, subject to Section B.6.7.12 – Urban Design, Section B.6.7.15 – Transportation, and shall be guided by any design direction established in accordance with Policy B.6.7.17 a).

6.7.12.5 Industrial Design

In addition to Policy E.5.3.5 and Policy E.5.4.7 of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply within the Light Industrial and Business Park designations shown on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Land Use Plan:

a) Development shall be consistent with any streetscape design guidelines adopted by Council for the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan area pursuant to Policy B.6.7.17 a).
b) Building design is encouraged to incorporate sustainable design measures including but not limited to Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED).

c) Buildings that incorporate sustainable design measures shall be encouraged to have orientation, massing, material selection and landscaping as a visible representation of their sustainable design.

d) Buildings shall front onto the street to help shape the public realm. Where a plant or warehouse component is proposed, the principal entrance and office area should be located closer to the street, and pedestrian connections provided throughout the site to the street, for visibility and street presence, where feasible.

e) Pedestrian connections shall be provided to buildings and public sidewalks.

f) Buildings shall have architectural variation in form and materials.

g) Appropriate screening of storage, service and loading areas shall be required.

6.7.13 Transition Areas

Transition areas are areas within the Centennial Node where a Mixed Use or High Density Residential designation abuts areas outside the Node which are a different use and/or intensity. There are two types of transition areas within the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, neighbourhood transition areas and industrial transition areas. Neighbourhood transition areas are areas that abut low or medium density residential uses or other sensitive land uses in adjacent stable neighbourhoods. Industrial transition areas are areas which abut industrial uses. The intent of the transition areas policies is to ensure that development within the Node transitions appropriately to the existing land uses and densities outside the Node. Transition areas are shown conceptually on Appendix A – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Transition Areas.

Neighbourhood Transition Areas

a) Where lands within the Centennial Node designated High Density Residential 1, Mixed Use–High Density or Mixed Use–Medium
Density abut low or medium density residential uses or other sensitive land uses, **development** shall respect the character and existing built form of these areas by providing an appropriate transition in scale and heights between the proposed development and the adjacent neighbourhood.

b) Proposals for **development** shall demonstrate the transition to **existing** residential, open space or institutional uses.

c) **Development** shall use various transition elements, including landscaped buffers, fencing, trees, setbacks, massing, scale or other built form considerations, or a combination thereof to minimize the impact of new high density or **mixed use development** on adjacent **existing** uses.

d) All **developments** shall provide appropriate screening between **existing** sensitive land uses and commercial uses, mixed uses, and parking areas.

**Industrial Transition Areas**

e) Proponents of new **sensitive land uses** within 300 metres of lands designated General Industrial, Light Industrial or Business Park shall demonstrate **compatibility** with existing industrial uses and shall be responsible for addressing and implementing necessary mitigation measures to the satisfaction of the City and in accordance with all applicable provincial and municipal guidelines and standards. The City may require the submission of a land use compatibility study or other studies deemed appropriate with an application for **development** to identify potential adverse impacts including but not limited to noise, vibration, odours, dust or other emissions, and to determine appropriate mitigation measures.

f) Any new **sensitive land uses** north of Barton Street shall be located a minimum of 70 metres from lands designated Light Industrial or Business Park. This separation distance shall not include parking areas **ancillary** to a **sensitive land use**.

g) Notwithstanding Policy B.6.7.13 f), the minimum setback requirement shall not apply to the lands directly to the east of the GO Transit Rail and Bus Station lands, designated Light Industrial and identified as Site Specific Policy – Area A on Map B.6.7-4 – Centennial Neighbourhoods - Site Specific Policy Areas.
h) Proponents of new sensitive land uses within 400 metres of the railway that crosses Centennial Parkway North shall complete a Noise Study, and shall implement any control measures necessary to meet provincial sound level criteria and the criteria contained in Section B.3.6.3 of Volume 1.

6.7.14 Cultural Heritage Policies

In addition to Section B.3.4 of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply:

6.7.14.1 Cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved and protected with the intent of retaining major characteristics through the review of Planning Act applications. The Red Hill Valley, as shown on Appendix F – Cultural Heritage Resources of Volume 1, is a cultural heritage landscape.

6.7.14.2 As part of the City-wide inventory of cultural heritage landscapes, the extent of the Red Hill Valley cultural heritage landscape identified in Policy B.6.7.14.1 shall be confirmed.

6.7.15 Transportation and Connections

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (CNTMP) provides direction for the transportation network in the Centennial Neighbourhoods. The policies of this Plan are intended to support the recommendations of the CNTMP and other transportation master plans prepared for the overall City and adjacent neighbourhoods. The transportation system within the Secondary Plan area is intended to accommodate all users and modes of transportation, with a priority placed on developing complete streets through the promotion of active transportation, improving pedestrian and cycling connections, enhancing public transportation and balancing the needs of automobile and truck users with those of active transportation modes.

Transportation is one of the leading sources of greenhouse gas emissions in Hamilton. In addition to providing public health benefits, increasing opportunities for active transportation and transit use is an important way to reduce our contribution to emissions to mitigate our impacts on climate change.
6.7.15.1 General Transportation Policies

In addition to Section C.4.0 – Integrated Transportation Network of Volume 1, the following transportation policies shall also apply:

a) The integrated transportation network for the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan area shall consist of public roads, public laneways, pedestrian sidewalks, multi-use pathways, cycling routes, public transit routes, the planned accommodation of rapid transit along Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway, interregional transit, truck routes and railway lines. The transportation system is detailed on Map B.6.7-3 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Transportation and Connections Plan.

b) All transportation improvements shall be in accordance with the recommendations of relevant City approved plans, including but not limited to:

i) Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan;

ii) Hamilton Transportation Master Plan;

iii) Hamilton’s Cycling Master Plan;

iv) City-wide Truck Route Master Plan;

v) Pedestrian Mobility Master Plan; and,

vi) Hamilton Recreational Trails Master Plan.

c) Development of the transportation system in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan area shall proceed on the basis of the recommendations of the CNTMP, and in accordance with the documents listed in Policy B.6.7.15.1 b).

d) Transportation improvements shall support the direction of this plan to encourage active transportation and transit trips in daily living.

e) All major intersections should be designed to support safe pedestrian crossing points and connections to public walkways. Where warranted, and in accordance with the CNTMP, pedestrian
crossings shall be enhanced in order to facilitate the movement of pedestrians throughout the Secondary Plan area.

f) In the vicinity of intersections, boulevard tree plantings should be closely spaced in order to enhance the pedestrian environment.

g) Consideration shall be given to incorporating Urban Braille along Major and Minor Arterial Roads within the Centennial Node Boundary in order to enhance the accessible sidewalk network.

h) The City shall plan for and protect corridors and rights-of-way for all modes of transportation and infrastructure facilities to meet current and projected needs.

i) Where feasible, access points along major arterial and minor arterial roads shall be consolidated to reduce driveways for improved safety.

6.7.15.2 Active Transportation Network

a) The City shall promote active transportation through the application of the Pedestrian Mobility Plan, Cycling Master Plan, Recreational Trails Master Plan and the Complete Liveable Better streets framework in the Hamilton Transportation Master Plan to enhance walkability and bikeability throughout the Secondary Plan area.

b) Trails, cycling facilities and pedestrian pathways shall be encouraged to connect people to prominent destinations, such as parks, open spaces, institutional uses and commercial areas.

c) Where lands shown as locations for proposed trails and connections on Map B.6.7-3 - Centennial Neighbourhoods - Transportation Connections are privately owned, the trails and connections shall be achieved through land dedications, easements, or any other measures deemed appropriate.

d) An active transportation connection shall be encouraged over the Red Hill Valley Parkway as shown on Schedule B-6.7-3 Transportation and Connections Plan to provide an additional connection for walking and cycling.
e) When development occurs on properties fronting on Major or Minor Arterial Roads, on-site pedestrian and cycling amenities shall be required in order to encourage active transportation.

f) Any missing sidewalks adjacent to developments, as identified in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan, shall be constructed as part of the development.

g) The pedestrian and bicycle network shall be implemented in accordance with the Hamilton Cycling Master Plan, the Hamilton Recreational Trails Master Plan and the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan. Proposed trails, sidewalks, connections, cycling infrastructure and greenways are shown on Map B.6.7-3 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Transportation and Connections in accordance with the recommendations of these plans.

h) Additional pedestrian trails and bicycle lanes may be provided on public street rights-of-way and public open space lands without amendment to this Plan.

i) Generally, Neighbourhood Greenways are residential streets where pedestrians and cyclists are given priority over other forms of transportation. Proposed Neighbourhood Greenways are identified on Map B.6.7-3 – Centennial Neighbourhoods - Transportation and Connections.

j) Neighbourhood Greenways shall be established in accordance with the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan to calm traffic and improve walking and cycling connections. Public realm improvements may include, but are not limited to:

   i) Street furniture and amenities (e.g. seating, planters or gardens, public art, bicycle racks, pedestrian-scale lighting, water fountains, tree or shade canopies);
   
   ii) Way-finding signage and pavement markings;
   
   iii) Traffic speed and volume management (e.g. traffic calming, signs and pavement markings);
   
   iv) Bike lanes to narrow road width;
APPENDIX “A”
Volume 2, Chapter B – Hamilton Secondary Plans
Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan

6.7.15.3 Public Transit Network and Rapid Transit

a) Development along public transit routes shall incorporate access to public transit and public transit infrastructure, where feasible.

b) Proposed major transit stations and major transit station areas are identified on Map B.6.7-3 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Transportation and Connections. Minor changes to the location of major transit stations associated with planned rapid transit on Queenston Road may be permitted without amendment to this plan.

c) The major transit station on Queenston Road near Centennial Parkway may continue to be used as a hub for bus transit as well as rapid transit.

d) Where feasible, public transit stops should be designed to maximize transit use and access.

e) A rapid transit corridor is proposed along Queenston Road west of Centennial Parkway through the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan area.

f) Any lands required for rapid transit corridors and transit facilities shall be dedicated to the City, to the satisfaction of the City, in accordance with Section C.4.5.6 of Volume 1.

g) The extension of Goderich Road to Kenora Ave is shown on Map B.6.7-3 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Transportation and Connections. This extension will improve road network connectivity and provide pedestrian and cycling access to the GO Transit Rail and Bus station from Kenora Avenue. This extension may be established at the time of redevelopment of the lands directly to the west of the GO Station lands, or through other means.

h) Cycling connections shall be provided between the Light Rail Transit stop adjacent to Eastgate Square Mall and the wider cycling infrastructure network in the area.

6.7.16 Infrastructure, Energy and Sustainability Policies
Municipal services, such as sewers, water, stormwater systems and public/private utilities shall be provided, maintained and upgraded, as may be required, to accommodate the needs of existing and future development in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan area.

6.7.16.1 In addition to with Section C.5.0 – Infrastructure of Volume 1, the following policies shall also apply:

a) The City shall monitor the capacity and reassess the need to manage stormwater runoff, as may be required.

b) To increase energy efficiency and reduce the environmental impact of buildings, all commercial, institutional, mixed use and multiple dwelling buildings will be encouraged to:
   i) Build to higher energy efficient standards as outlined in the Ontario Building Code;
   ii) Have green roofs and cool roofing materials;
   iii) Provide solar capture equipment;
   iv) Utilize grey water recycling;
   v) Plant trees and other vegetation to provide shade and additional tree canopy; or,
   vi) Any combination of the above.

c) The approval of development applications shall be contingent on the availability of water and wastewater capacity.

d) Low Impact Development (LID) is a design technique which contributes to aquatic habitat protection, can help regulate water runoff, improve water quality and reduce the flooding risks associated with extreme weather events. Redevelopment, including the redevelopment or creation of parking lots, shall utilize Low Impact Development (LID) measures in site design where feasible to reduce water runoff and improve water quality.
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a) The City shall undertake a Streetscape and Public Realm Design Study of the Streetscape Improvement areas identified conceptually on Map B.6.7-3 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Transportation and Connections. The study shall provide recommendations for the design of the public realm and the interface between private development and the public realm.

b) The study may provide recommendations for, but is not limited to, any of the following elements:

i) Streetscape improvements for the public realm that establish a unique sense of place for each street;

ii) Public realm treatments for Gateway Improvement Areas and Prominent Intersections identified on Map B.6.7-3 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Transportation and Connections;

iii) Proposed signage in accordance with the City’s Wayfinding Strategy;

iv) Design direction for the interface between the private realm and streetscapes and other public realm elements;

v) Design direction for development around Gateway Improvement Areas and Prominent Intersections;

vi) Detailed guidance for the design, size and location of new privately owned public spaces within developments; and,

vii) Identification of cost estimates for capital improvements, to allow for incorporation into the capital budget planning process and growth related development charges.

c) There will be a long-term need to upgrade and improve the area’s three major public open spaces to ensure that they have the diversity of amenities and programming needed to accommodate additional residents moving into the areas as a result of intensification. These public spaces are Sam Manson Park, Henry and Beatrice Warden Park and the Domenic Agostino Community Centre lands. The City will periodically review the facilities, amenities and programs offered in these spaces and plan for
appropriate upgrades on an incremental basis as *intensification* occurs.

d) A Municipal Servicing Study shall be undertaken by the City to confirm network capacity and determine if there are any specific water, sanitary and stormwater *infrastructure* gaps within the area, as well as verify downstream and upstream impacts through system modelling. The City shall ensure that the cost of any growth-related improvements needed are incorporated into the capital budget planning process.

e) *Development* proposals shall consider the City’s *Transportation Demand Management* Land Development Guidelines. A proposal for *development* may be required to submit a *Transportation Demand Management* Options Report, at the discretion of the City, to review measures that can be taken to encourage sustainable travel choices.

f) During the next municipal review of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan the City shall consider amending Schedule E - Urban Structure of Volume 1 to extend the Secondary Corridor on Centennial Parkway north to the GO transit station.

g) For the purposes of this Plan, the term *development* shall also include the term *redevelopment*.

h) Notwithstanding Policy E.4.5.16 of Volume 1, the Zoning By-law shall establish provisions to implement the policies of this Plan, including but not limited to minimum and maximum setbacks, requirements for heights, densities, permitted uses, and other specific directions on built form.

i) *Development* proposals may include infrastructure for drainage control located on private lands. Where deemed necessary, the City may require the registration of Site Plan agreements on title of a property, to give the City legal authority to ensure that these controls continue to function appropriately in the future.

### 6.7.18 Site Specific Policies

Site Specific Policy Areas have been identified on Map B.6.7-4 – Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Site Specific Policy Areas.
6.7.18.1 Site Specific Policy – Area A (395 and 397 Centennial Parkway North, 25 Arrowsmith Road and 185 Bancroft Street)

For the lands located at 395 and 397 Centennial Parkway North, 25 Arrowsmith Road and 185 Bancroft Street, designated Light Industrial and shown as Area A on Map B.6.7-4 - Centennial Neighbourhoods – Site Specific Policy Areas, the following policies shall apply:

a) Notwithstanding the permitted uses in Policy E.5.3.2 of Volume 1, these lands shall only be used for an interregional bus and rail transportation facility.

b) The site shall be designed to accommodate a seamless integration of various modes of transportation including rail, bus, future rapid transit, vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists.

c) The site shall provide a safe, interesting, and engaging public realm. Over the long term, a public space shall be incorporated into the site design adjacent to Centennial Parkway North to provide opportunities for gathering and socialization.

d) The transit station shall be well-designed for a high quality user experience that encourages appropriate connections via walking or cycling and makes the transit system more attractive to potential users. The design of the station shall be consistent with the urban design policies of Section B.6.7.12.

e) The site shall be designed to minimize its ecological footprint through measures such as low impact design, the use of sustainable energy, and innovative water, landscape and waste management practices, where feasible.

f) Enhanced landscaping shall be provided along the edges of the property and throughout the site.

6.7.18.2 Site Specific Policy – Area B (71, 83 and 85 Centennial Parkway South)

For the lands located at 71, 83 and 85 Centennial Parkway South, designated Medium Density Residential 3 and shown as Area B on Map B.6.7-4 - Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Site Specific Policy Areas, the following policies shall apply:
a) In addition to Policy E.3.5.2 of Volume 1, *housing with supports* shall also be permitted.

b) A retirement home shall be considered a *multiple dwelling*.

c) Notwithstanding Policy E.3.5.8 of Volume 1, additional building height to a maximum of 8 storeys may be permitted.

d) Notwithstanding Policy E.3.5.7 of Volume 1 and Policy 6.7.6.6, the maximum *net residential density* shall be 135 units per hectare.

e) For the purpose of density requirements, two retirement home dwelling units may be considered as one dwelling unit, where units do not contain full kitchens.

### 6.7.18.3 Site Specific Policy – Area C (460 Kenora Avenue)

For the lands located at 460 Kenora Avenue, designated Light Industrial and shown as Area C on Map B.6.7-4 - Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan - Site Specific Policy Areas, the following additional policies shall apply:

a) Notwithstanding Policy E.5.3.8 – Hazardous Waste Management Facilities and in addition to Policy E.5.3.2 Employment Area – Industrial Land Designation of Volume 1, the existing *waste management facility* shall be permitted.

b) To reduce the potential for negative impacts such as odors on the mixed use areas along Centennial Parkway north, consideration shall be given to re-locating this facility to a new location in the east Hamilton or Stoney Creek area if a suitable alternative site can be located.

c) Any proposal to expand the *existing waste management facility* at this location shall be required to consider the adjacent lands designated mixed use and any impacts to the potential for future residential *development*.

d) If the *existing waste management facility* use ceases at this location, only light industrial uses shall be permitted, in accordance with Policy B.6.7.8.5.
e) The future extension of Goderich Road to Kenora Avenue through these lands is shown on Map B.6.7-3 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Transportation and Connections. At such time as the existing use as a waste management facility ceases on these lands, the City will extend Goderich Road to Kenora Avenue to provide improved road, pedestrian and cycling connectivity to the GO station.

6.7.18.4 Site Specific Policy – Area D (502 to 560 Centennial Parkway North)

For the lands located at 502 to 560 Centennial Parkway North, designated District Commercial and Business Park and shown as Area D on Map B.6.7-1 - Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan - Land Use Plan, the following policies shall apply:

a) The lands shall be developed with a mix of retail and non-retail uses and serve as a mixed use gateway into the City.

b) On the lands designated District Commercial, the following policies shall apply:

i) In addition to the uses permitted in Policy E.4.7.2 – District Commercial of Volume 1, the following uses shall also be permitted:

1. one department store;
2. hotel and convention centre;
3. entertainment uses; and
4. arts and cultural uses.

ii) Notwithstanding Policies E.4.7.2 b) and E.4.7.8 – District Commercial of Volume 1, main floor offices and stand-alone office buildings shall be permitted in accordance with the Zoning By-law.

iii) Notwithstanding Policy E.4.7.2 c) - District Commercial of Volume 1, no residential uses shall be permitted.

iv) Notwithstanding Policies E.4.7.3 c) and E.4.7.7 of Volume 1, the maximum amount of gross floor area for one department store shall not exceed 18,581 square metres.
c) On the lands designated Business Park, the following policies shall apply:

i) Notwithstanding the uses permitted in Policy E.5.4.3 of Volume 1, the following uses shall not be permitted:

1. retail establishments as ancillary uses, except as provided in policy 6.7.18.4 c) ii);

2. waste processing facilities and waste transfer facilities.

ii) Notwithstanding Policies E.5.4.5 and E.5.4.6 of Volume 1, the following uses shall be permitted:

1. office buildings with a minimum gross floor area of 2,000 square metres and a maximum gross floor area of 9,999 square metres; and

2. limited ancillary uses and convenience retail, as defined in the Zoning By-law, on the ground floor of an office building with a minimum gross floor area of 2,000 square metres and a maximum gross floor area of 9,999 square metres.

d) Notwithstanding Policies E.4.7.3 c) and E.4.7.7 – District Commercial and Section E.5.4.6 and E.5.4.7 – Employment Area – Business Park Designation of Volume 1, the following provisions shall apply:

i) The maximum gross floor area for all development shall not exceed 45,058 square metres.

ii) Development of the site shall be completed in a phased manner consisting of an initial permitted development of 23,226 square metres of retail and service uses. An additional 1 square metre of retail and service uses shall be permitted for every 1 square metre of non-retail, employment and service uses, as identified in the Zoning By-law, for which construction has substantially commenced on the site.
e) Prior to development the proponent shall complete urban design guidelines for the development of the site, to the satisfaction of the City.

f) Urban design guidelines shall be in accordance with the Design Principles and Policies in Policies B.6.7.18.4 g) and h). In the event that conditions and/or restrictions arise as a result of the Record of Site Condition, specific design solutions shall be incorporated in consultation with the City through the Site Plan approvals process.

g) The following Design Principles shall apply:

i) The Centennial Parkway North site is a gateway location in the City of Hamilton, arriving from the Queen Elizabeth Way along Centennial Parkway North. The site shall evolve as a mixed use area with a physical form that is human-scaled, pedestrian-friendly, cycle friendly, and transit-supportive.

ii) Notwithstanding Section B.3.3 – Urban Design and Policies E.4.7.11 to E.4.7.17 – District Commercial Design of Volume 1, the site shall:

1. Support a high quality form of urban design including streetscapes, views and vistas, gateways, walkways, and amenity spaces;

2. Be a “gateway” location into the City that promotes a sense of arrival;

3. Be a mixed use area with a range of commercial uses, employment uses, and amenity spaces;

4. Concentrate the arrangement of uses and buildings such that it encourages comfortable pedestrian and cycling activity on and surrounding the site, and which facilitates public transit ridership;

5. Have a connected circulation system internally that comfortably and efficiently links all buildings, transit facilities, parking areas, and amenity spaces to the bounding public streets;
6. Have a prominent multi-storey building, or buildings, of high quality architectural design at the intersection of Centennial Parkway North and the South Service Road;

7. Have a strong edge and frame facing the bounding public streets, including the placement and design of buildings and high quality landscaping;

8. Incorporate framing views and vistas within the site by aligning buildings and building elements to create terminus views; and

9. Appropriately transition to surrounding properties in terms of buffering and screening.

h) The lands shall be developed in accordance with the following urban design policies:

i) Entrance Gateways

1. Entrance Gateways are access points to a site, and provide a sense of arrival to a development. Two types of Entrance Gateways shall be provided at the site: Primary Entrance Gateways, and Secondary Entrance Gateways.

2. Primary Entrance Gateways identify the principal vehicular and pedestrian entry point to the site, and may include information signage for traffic circulation through the site. There should be one Primary Entrance Gateway to the site, from Centennial Parkway North.

3. Secondary Entrance Gateways serve as secondary vehicular and pedestrian entry points to the site. There could be multiple Secondary Entrance Gateways to the site, from South Service Road and Warrington Street.

4. All Entrance Gateways should be given special built form and landscape treatment, including the consideration of appropriate positioning of buildings, adequate sight lines, and the inclusion of both vertical and horizontal elements, including signage and landscape features. Given their principal function, the Primary Entrance
Gateway should be more visually prominent than the Secondary Entrance Gateway(s) in terms of scale and design.

ii) For all buildings on the site, the following built form policies apply:

1. Buildings shall be sited and designed to enhance the public nature of streets, amenity spaces, and pedestrian realm.

2. Buildings should generally be sited parallel to the public street.

3. The principal building façade shall contain the primary building entrance. The principal building façade shall be varied and articulated, through the use of elements such as bay projections, canopies and/or varied roof lines, colours and other elements in order to provide visual interest and to break up long walls to create the impression of smaller building units.

4. Principal building entrances shall be located at grade, and shall be easily accessed from the public sidewalk on the adjacent public streets and the internal pedestrian walkways.

5. Principal building entrances shall be emphasized on the building’s façade through architectural treatments.

6. Other building façades shall be designed in a similar fashion to the principal building façade, with respect to colour, material, and articulation.

7. All building signage shall be designed in a manner integral to the building design in terms of size, form, material, and colour.

8. Roof-top mechanical equipment shall be enclosed or screened, particularly in a manner integral with the overall building design in terms of form, material, and colour.
9. Canopies over doorways, arcades and other treatments are encouraged in the design of a building façade, particularly along pedestrian routes, to provide a comfortable pedestrian environment for walking.

10. Stacking lanes and order stations for drive-through facilities shall not be located between a building wall and the road allowance of a bounding public street.

iii) For buildings that are located abutting Centennial Parkway North and South Service Road, the following additional policies apply:

1. Buildings along Centennial Parkway North shall be located close to the edge of the respective road allowance so as to frame the streetscape.

2. Buildings along the South Service Road may be located further from the street edge with landscape treatment to define the street edge, which may contain a tiered design of lawn, low hedges, trees, masonry, and decorative metal fences and gates culminating in taller plantings.

3. The streetscape shall create a positive community image, which may include the coordinated use of high quality paving materials, wide sidewalks, street furniture, pedestrian-scale lighting and signage, and enhanced landscaping.

iv) For buildings abutting Warrington Street, the rail line, and the hydro corridor, the following additional policies apply:

1. Loading and service areas shall be adequately screened with the use of a landscaped buffer, which may contain landscape berms, evergreen and deciduous trees and shrubs, and fencing.

2. Façades that face a loading area or service area shall be finished with material and architectural features consistent with the principal façade of the building.
For the prominent buildings at the Centennial Parkway North and South Service Road intersection, the following policies shall apply:

1. Buildings shall be placed so the tallest buildings are at the corner of Centennial Parkway North and the South Service Road.

2. Buildings shall have a distinct architectural appearance, including a high level of architectural detailing, given their prominence on the site. Detailing may include varied rooflines, canopies, decorative elements, and projecting bays. Large blank walls and a continuous, repetitive facade shall not be permitted.

3. Buildings shall have articulated facades facing both the bounding public streets and the interior of the site.

4. A high quality of landscape design along the edges of the property and within the interior shall provide a setting that is pedestrian-friendly and visually attractive.

5. Design of the buildings shall complement the landscape design between the building wall and the road allowances at the corner, in order to promote a sense of entry into the site and into the City from the Queen Elizabeth Way.

6. Loading areas and service areas shall not be located between a building’s wall and the road allowance of Centennial Parkway North or South Service Road.

7. Buildings and their landscape features are encouraged to have feature lighting to signify and highlight these buildings during night-time.

vi) Pedestrian Realm

1. Pedestrian routes that connect to buildings, transit stops or facilities, and pedestrian routes in the surrounding community shall be provided. Internal walkways and linkages shall be designed as a condition of Site Plan Approval.
2. Pedestrian walkways that connect parking areas to building entrances shall be provided. These walkways shall be designed to contribute to the safety and visual continuity of the entire pedestrian system, and may include such elements as special paving materials, trees, and lighting.

3. Barrier-free design of buildings, streets, and publicly accessible exterior spaces shall be implemented.

4. Crosswalks and differentiated paving materials and patterns shall be constructed at primary crossings of principal internal streets to provide connectivity between the site’s different areas.

5. Parking areas, servicing lanes, utility and mechanical equipment, and drop off and loading zones shall be designed and located in a manner that has minimal physical impact on public sidewalks and accessible exterior spaces. Shared driveways and service lanes at the side and rear of buildings are to be provided for these functions.

vi) Landscaped Areas

1. Landscaping shall be used to enhance the overall aesthetic qualities of the development. Landscape treatment may include a range of different hard and soft landscape elements and features to create provide outdoor amenity spaces, pedestrian comfort, soften the site’s edges, highlight entrance gateways, prominent buildings, screen loading and service areas, and buffer the site from neighbouring uses, as necessary.

2. Landscaped areas shall be provided as a screen or buffer to address the interface with the publicly accessible or visual areas of the site.

3. Landscaped buffers and/or visual barriers shall be provided to screen loading and service areas from users using the bounding public streets or internal drive aisles.
4. Landscaped islands shall be provided throughout parking lots to identify, reinforce and connect pedestrian routes, separate roads from parking areas, define edges, and to visually and physically divide large parking areas into smaller sections.

viii) Parking Entrances, Loading Zones and Service Lanes

1. The location of entrances to parking areas, loading zones, and service lanes shall be coordinated with the location of pedestrian and cycling routes to limit vehicular and pedestrian/cycling movement conflicts on the site.

2. A landscaped strip shall be provided between any surface parking area that abuts a public street to define the street edge and screen the parking area. The minimum width of the landscaped strip shall be set out in the implementing Zoning By-law.

3. All loading zones and service lanes shall be screened and landscaped. Screens shall be designed to complement the materials and details of the associated building facades.

4. Wherever possible, on-site loading zones and service lanes shall be consolidated and shared at the rear or side of buildings.

5. On-street parking along internal drive aisles is encouraged to provide the ‘look and feel’ of a public street. This shall not occur on the main drive aisle into the site.

iv) Vehicular Access

1. The number and location of vehicular access points shall be limited so as to minimize disruption to traffic flow and to minimize the impact on local streets.
6.7.18.5 **Area/Site Specific Policy – Area E (505 to 537 Queenston Road)**

For lands located at 505 to 537 Queenston Road, designated Medium Density Residential 2 and shown as Area Specific Policy – Area E on Map B.6.7-4 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Site Specific Policy Areas, the following policies shall apply:

a) In addition to Policy E.3.5.2 of Volume 1, limited commercial uses shall also be permitted within existing buildings.

b) Commercial uses shall be restricted to low impact uses such as offices, service uses and small scale retail uses. High traffic generating uses such as restaurants and commercial entertainment shall not be permitted.

c) Appropriate buffering shall be provided between commercial uses and adjacent residential uses to mitigate potential adverse impacts, such as negative visual impacts, reduced privacy, increased noise, and light from parking areas. In this regard, measures such as setbacks, landscape strips and visual barriers may be used.

d) Enlargements or additions to existing buildings may be permitted only if they are in keeping with the established built form and residential character of the area.

e) *Development* shall be sympathetic to and shall ensure *compatibility* with the low profile residential character of the area, and shall provide streetscape features and enhancements consistent with the residential character of the area, including the provision of landscaping along Queenston Road and Woodman Drive.

6.7.18.6 **Site Specific Policy – Area F (75 Centennial Parkway North (Eastgate Square Mall))**

For the lands located at 75 Centennial Parkway North (Eastgate Square Mall), designated Mixed Use – High Density and shown as Site Specific Policy - Area F on Map B.6.7-4 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Site Specific Policy Areas, the following policies shall apply:

a) Special Policy Area F (Eastgate Square Mall) is the largest commercial site in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, and is the focal point of the Centennial Node. It is essential to the function of the area as a Sub-Regional Node, providing a regional
retail function as well as meeting the weekly and daily shopping needs of surrounding areas. This commercial function shall be maintained and supported.

b) The lands are encouraged to evolve over the long term to a more compact, pedestrian friendly form that accommodates a mix of uses in addition to retail, such as but not limited to service commercial, residential, office and entertainment uses.

c) The lands are intended to be an important location for access to public transit, including higher order transit. A major transit station shall be located adjacent to the site which shall provide the site with access to higher order transit. The site may also continue to have a transit terminal function for bus transit.

d) All development shall have a minimum height of 3 storeys in accordance with Policies B.6.7.5.1 g) and B.6.7.7.5 b), except as permitted by Policy B.6.7.5.1 i).

e) Notwithstanding Policy B.6.7.18.6 d), and Policies B.6.7.5.1 g) and B.6.7.7.5 b), for the area with a maximum height of 3 storeys, shown on Map B.6.7-2 – Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Maximum Building Heights in the Node, the minimum height shall be 2 storeys.

f) Development along the westerly and northerly edges of the site, adjacent to a residential designation, shall be a maximum of 3 storeys in height, as shown on Map B.6.7-2 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Maximum Building Heights in the Node.

g) Minor changes to the limits of the area with a maximum height of 3 storeys, identified on Map B.6.7-2 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Maximum Building Heights in the Node may be permitted without amendment to this plan.

h) New development is intended to have a gradation of building heights across the site, with the lowest heights along the westerly and northerly edges of the site, transitioning to higher heights along Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway, and towards the intersection of Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway. The implementing Zoning By-law shall establish requirements for heights to ensure that this gradation is achieved, to provide an
appropriate transition between taller buildings and existing low density residential areas.

i) The area generally near the intersection of Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway is intended to be a focal point for the site, where the greatest amount of activity is taking place. Accordingly, the following policies shall apply to this area:

i) The tallest buildings on the site should be located within or near this area.

ii) Redevelopment in this area shall be integrated with and supportive of any transit facilities on or adjacent to the site.

iii) Public spaces which are located in prominent areas and are integrated with the streetscape environment contribute to a vibrant, active streetscape and provide opportunities for people to meet, relax and socialize, which is consistent with the goals of this plan. Major redevelopment shall include a publicly accessible open space or plaza area which provides opportunities for gathering and social interaction. This shall be located within the pedestrian focus area of the site, as identified on Map B.6.7-1 – Land Use Plan.

iv) Redevelopment shall include gateway design elements in accordance with Policy B.6.7.12.2.

j) When redevelopment occurs, elements of the pedestrian focus streets are encouraged to be extended throughout the site through the provision of visible, attractive pedestrian linkages.

k) Lower intensity uses are encouraged along Kenora Avenue and Delawana Drive.

l) Bike parking shall be required for any redevelopment on the site.

m) The site shall be considered for future bike share program facilities.

n) Nothing in the policies of this Plan is intended to prevent the potential future subdivision of the site into smaller parcels of land.
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o) The reconstruction of any portion of the existing shopping mall, which does not result in significant changes to the commercial built form, shall not be considered major redevelopment.

p) If the current use, form or function of the lands as a shopping mall is proposed to be changed, by adding residential uses or by significant changes to the commercial built form, a public realm and built form plan shall be submitted with a development application, which shall demonstrate how the development achieves the following design elements:

i) A high quality public realm design including streetscapes, views and vistas, gateways, walkways, and amenity spaces;

ii) An arrangement of uses and buildings that encourages comfortable pedestrian activity on and surrounding the site, and which facilitates public transit ridership;

iii) A well-connected internal circulation system that comfortably and efficiently links all buildings, transit facilities, parking areas, and amenity spaces within the site to the bounding public streets;

iv) A strong edge of high quality landscaping;

v) Framing of views and vistas within the site by aligning buildings and building elements to create terminus views; and,

vi) Appropriate transitions to surrounding properties in terms of buffering and screening.

q) If redevelopment is proposed for a portion of the site, and the current use, form or function of the lands as a shopping mall is proposed to be changed by adding residential uses or by significant changes to the commercial built form, a concept plan of the entire site shall be submitted with a development application identifying:

i) How the area can be developed in accordance with the vision and direction described in this Plan and particularly in Policy B.6.7.18.6; and,
ii) That the proposed development will achieve the vision and directions of this Plan.

r) The concept plan shall not be considered an approved development plan. The concept plan may be amended from time to time in response to changes in the market or other considerations.

6.7.18.7 Site Specific Policy – Area G (33 Cromwell Crescent)

For the lands located at 33 Cromwell Crescent, designated Institutional and shown as Site Specific Policy - Area G on Map B.6.7-4 – Centennial Neighbourhoods – Site Specific Policy Areas, the following policies shall apply:

a) In addition to Policy E.6.2.6 of Volume 1, multiple dwellings and all forms of townhouses shall also be permitted.

b) At such time as the institutional use on the lands ceases, the lands are intended to be comprehensively redeveloped for residential purposes in accordance with the following policies:

i) Any redevelopment shall not provide vehicular access to Cromwell Crescent, with the exception of single detached dwellings with individual driveway accesses.

ii) Development shall be compatible with adjacent existing residential dwellings. Notwithstanding that the site is designated Institutional, Transition Areas policies B.6.7.13 a) to d) shall apply to development on site specific policy area G.

iii) The maximum building height shall be 6 storeys.

6.7.18.8 Area Specific Policy – Area H (north side of Barton Street)

For the lands located on the north side of Barton Street East, designated Light Industrial and Business Park, shown as Area H on Map B.6.7-4 - Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Site Specific Policy Areas, the City shall assess of the appropriateness of these lands as employment lands during the next municipal comprehensive review, and may consider a conversion to other uses. The assessment shall consider, but is not limited to the following factors:
a) the existing function of the lands;

b) the proximity of the lands to major transportation routes;

c) opportunities to introduce transitional land uses along the edge of
   the industrial area; and,

d) consideration of the potential need for arterial commercial lands
   City-wide.

6.7.18.9 Area Specific Policy – Area I (45 Goderich Road)

For the lands located at 45 Goderich Road, designated Arterial
Commercial and shown as Area I on Map B.6.7-4 - Centennial
Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Site Specific Policy Areas, the
following policies shall apply:

a) In addition to Policy E.4.8.2 of Volume 1, office uses shall also be
   permitted, except a medical clinic.

b) Offices shall not exceed 4,000 square metres of gross floor area for
   each free standing building.

6.7.18.10 Area Specific Policy – Area J (860 Queenston Road)

For the lands located at 860 Queenston Road, designated Mixed Use –
Medium Density and shown as Area J on Map B.6.7-4 - Centennial
Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Site Specific Policy Areas, an Ontario
Municipal Board appeal is in progress.

6.7.18.11 Area Specific Policy – Area K (398, 400, and 402 Nash Road North
and 30, 50, and 54 Bancroft Street)

For the lands located at 398, 400, 402 Nash Road North and 30, 50, 54
Bancroft Street, designated Light Industrial and shown as Area K on Map
B.6.7-4 – Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Site Specific
Policy Areas, Commercial Recreation shall also be permitted in addition to
the uses permitted in Policy E.5.3.2 – Industrial Land Designation of
Volume 1.

6.7.18.12 Area Specific Policy – Area L (670, 674, 686 and 692 Queenston
Road)
For the lands located at 670, 674, 686 and 692 Queenston Road, designated Mixed Use – High Density and shown as Area L on Map B.6.7-4 – Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Site Specific Policy Areas, the following policies shall apply:

a) New development is intended to have a gradation of building heights across the site, with the highest heights in the pedestrian focus street area, and lower heights on the southern portion of the site, outside of the pedestrian focus street area.

b) Redevelopment in the pedestrian focus street area shall be integrated with and supportive of any transit facilities adjacent to the site.

c) The reconstruction of any portion of existing buildings on the site, which does not result in significant changes to the commercial built form, shall not be considered major redevelopment.

d) Notwithstanding Policy B.6.7.7.4 c), residential uses proposed in the southern portion of the lands outside of the pedestrian focus street area may have densities in the range of 60 to 100 units per hectare.
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Executive Summary

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (TMP) is to develop a comprehensive transportation plan that will:

a) Follow the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process
b) Support the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan study (2016)
c) Identify future transportation needs and address existing transportation issues
d) Identify and evaluate transportation options and recommend solutions

The study area for the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan is illustrated below in Exhibit 1.

Exhibit 1: Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan Study Area
Opportunity Statement

The Centennial Neighbourhoods TMP is being undertaken by the City of Hamilton to plan for improved mobility to:

- Accommodate transportation needs of future land use
- Take advantage of investment from development opportunities
- Support access to major transportation services such as the QEW, Red Hill Valley Parkway, HSR and the Eastgate Transit Hub, future Rapid Transit, and GO Transit and future Confederation GO Station
- Support alternative transportation choices including walking and cycling
- Create livable neighbourhoods, complete communities and Complete Livable Better Streets

The goals of the improvements are to create safe, efficient, and sustainable transportation that limits impacts to the environment, and supports healthy living.

Consultation

The agency, stakeholder and public consultation for the Centennial Neighbourhoods TMP and Secondary Plan consisted of the following meetings and communications:

- Technical Advisory Committee—three meetings involving representatives from various City of Hamilton departments: Planning & Economic Development, Public Health, Public Works, and Transit
- Focus Group—three meetings involving representatives from the community: residents, business owners, developers and Ward Councillors
- Public Open Houses—three open houses with displays, presentation and workshop activities
- Ministry of Transportation, Ontario (MTO)
- The Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation (MNCFN)
- Metrolinx
- Project web site—www.hamilton.ca/CentennialNTMP

Transportation Issues Identified

Our analysis of the Secondary Plan land-use options in the four districts under study (see Exhibit 2) show that 900 to 1,400 peak hour trips will be added to / from the study area – equivalent to two additional travel lanes on arterials to serve the area.
Exhibit 2: Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Districts Under Study

In 2031, it is estimated that:

- The road network will operate reasonably well with a few “hot spot” intersections. Traffic at these intersections will experience long delays of more than 55 sec per vehicle and queues waiting at the signals up to 180 m in length during the PM peak hour. These intersections include Barton Street and Lake Avenue, Queenston Road and Nash Road, and King Street and Centennial Parkway.

- Barton Street and Queenston Road west of Centennial Parkway will experience higher levels of congestion during peak periods due to the increase in traffic accessing the Red Hill Valley Parkway.

- Other roads approach but do not exceed their capacity to move traffic.

With the recent construction of Barton Street, Centennial Parkway and King Street, and the planned LRT on Queenston Road, future travel demand cannot be accommodated by adding lanes to the existing roads. A few intersections, as noted above, will operate with long delays and queues if the roads are not widened. A wider range of mode choices is required to address travel demand.

Through consultation, other issues were identified, such as:

- **Roadways:** Speeding on residential streets; congestion on Red Hill Valley Parkway causing traffic to seek alternate routes in neighbourhoods; and heavy, noisy truck traffic on Centennial Parkway and Barton Street that is unsafe.

- **Regional Transit:** The existing GO Transit Park n Ride well liked; and concerns about how people access the new Confederation GO Station by car, on foot and by bicycle.

- **Local Transit:** Mixed opinions on potential for rapid transit expansion; lack of service between major destinations within the neighbourhoods; connect existing...
routes to Eastgate Square (Route 4 & 5); lack of transit service to Riverdale Community Centre

- **Walking:** Recognized as important for healthy active living; unsafe and/or uncomfortable to walk; streetscaping improvements needed; major streets crossing times are inadequate; sidewalks are adjacent to traffic on Nash Road; missing sidewalks along portions of Lake Avenue, Centennial Parkway and Warrington Street; pedestrian access to Eastgate Square / Transit Terminal is easy from west but need better connections east to Riverdale

- **Bicycling:** Recognized as important for healthy active living; uncomfortable due to lack of safe facilities, fast traffic and large trucks; expand Hamilton Bike Share (SoBi) to the area; need safe connection on Centennial Parkway to Confederation Park; new bikeways suggested for Nash Road, Delawana Drive, Owen Place, Kenora Avenue, Kentley Drive, to new Confederation GO Station, and Red Hill Library; and extend King Street bike lanes

**The Preferred Transportation Solutions**

The alternative transportation solutions were identified and evaluated based on their impact on transportation, public health, physical environment and cost. The recommended transportation solutions based on this evaluation were presented to stakeholders and the public for feedback. The combination of the evaluation and the public support has resulted in the following preferred transportation solutions to address the opportunities in the Centennial Neighbourhoods.
### Exhibit 3: Preferred Transportation Solutions including Approximate Costs, MCEA Schedule and Implementation Timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</th>
<th>APPROX. COST (if known)</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FOR STREETS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City-wide Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Support future designs of streets to reflect desirable operating speeds through the City-wide Transportation Master Plan (2016) <strong>Complete Livable Better Streets</strong> policy (see Section 5.1.1 for a description of Complete Livable Better Streets)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Project right-of-way (no cost) as per Urban Official Plan, Schedule C-30 – Future Road Widening (October 2015) for Complete Livable Better Streets on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for increased capacity, on Centennial for future LRT, and on all arterials for HOV, transit-only lanes, cycle tracks or bike lanes, wider pedestrian sidewalks and amenities, and/or enhanced streetscaping</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Improve traffic signal co-ordination and timings, including pedestrian walk times. Review the Implementation of Recommendations from the Traffic Signal Operations Study (2012) and determine if additional adjustments are required.</td>
<td>Existing activities / programs</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Implement traffic calming on local streets where speeding, cut-through traffic volumes, collisions and safety concerns are ascertained; future studies are required. Implement with community and Councillor's support.</td>
<td>Costs vary from about $2 K to $10 K per traffic calming device</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Continue to promote travel options to employers and schools through the Smart Commute program and Active and Sustainable School Transportation (ASST) initiatives (Transportation Demand Management).</td>
<td>Existing City activities / programs</td>
<td>schedule A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Co-ordinate communication of travel options available for new residents in various languages aligned with settlement activities (Transportation Demand Management).</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>years 2017 to 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (if known)</td>
<td>APPROX. COST (if known)</td>
<td>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Determine appropriate transit priority measures and funding. A transit priority study is recommended for Centennial Neighbourhoods following adoption of a potential new transit priority policy under the City-wide Transportation Master Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>New guidelines are being developed for bus stop placement and design, including installing passenger amenity features. More transit shelters throughout the HSR bus route system is a key element for improving the customer experience, helping to grow transit ridership. Apply these guidelines to the study area routes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Through the City-wide Annual Transit Service Plans, consider extending or modifying HSR bus routes in the study area. Review the potential for improving connections between the LRT terminus and the new Confederation GO Station until rapid transit is extended to this destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Extend the B-line LRT from Queenston Traffic Circle to Eastgate Hub. Subsequent to the consultation and preparation of this report, the LRT extension from the Queenston Traffic Circle to Eastgate was endorsed by council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Extend rapid transit from the Eastgate Transit Hub to the Confederation GO Station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Timeframe for Implementation (see Note 1)</td>
<td>Approx. Timeframe for Implementation (see Note 1)</td>
<td>Approx. Timeframe for Implementation (see Note 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Timeframe for Implementation (see Note 1)</td>
<td>Approx. Timeframe for Implementation (see Note 1)</td>
<td>Approx. Timeframe for Implementation (see Note 1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION (SEE NOTES 2 AND 3)</th>
<th>APPROX. COST (if known)</th>
<th>MCEA SCHEDULE (see Note 1)</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City-wide Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Implement Projects in the City of Hamilton’s Recreational Trails Master Plan (2016):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project 5-4: multi-use trail in Bow Valley Open Space and Lawrence Avenue Park just west of Lake Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project 5-9: multi-use trail and bridge connecting Pottruff Road near Eugene Street across the RHVP to the Red Hill Valley Trails</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project 5-10: multi-use trail access to Confederation Park along Centennial Parkway and across the QEW to Goderich Road (see Recommended Solutions by Other Proponents).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational Trails Master Plan does not include any estimated construction costs (to be determined)</td>
<td>Trail projects under $3.5 M are exempt from the MCEA</td>
<td>The Recreational Trails Master Plan is intended for phased implementation of trail initiatives. Implementation timeframes for Projects 5-4 and 5-9 not identified. Project 5-10: see Recommended Solutions by Other Proponents No. 29 – implement as part of QEW / Centennial Parkway bridge rehabilitation scheduled by MTO anticipated for 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project 5-10 approx. value $2 M</td>
<td>Those that cost between $3.5 M and 9.5 M are Schedule B Those over $9.5 M are Schedule C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centennial Neighbourhoods Specific Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic and improve walking and cycling connections to create Complete Livable Better Streets. Improvements may consist of street furniture and amenities (e.g. seating, planters or gardens, public art, bicycle racks, pedestrian-scale lighting, water fountains, tree or shade canopies), way-finding signage and pavement markings, traffic speed and volume management (e.g. traffic calming, signs and pavement markings), bike lanes to narrow road width, and green stormwater infrastructure. A description of neighbourhood greenways is provided in Section 5.1.2 and the Glossary.</td>
<td>There are about 7 km of greenways recommended at a cost of about $75 K per kilometre to implement.</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>Co-ordinate with traffic calming initiatives (see Preferred Solutions for Streets No. 4 and Preferred Transportation Solutions to include in the Secondary Plan No. 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Construct missing sections of sidewalk along Lake Avenue, Centennial Parkway and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas and schools.</td>
<td>There are about a total of 6 km of new sidewalks required at a cost of about $300 K per kilometre to construct</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>Phase in with road resurfacing / reconstruction projects or through development applications (see Secondary Plan Policies No. 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</td>
<td>APPROX. COST (if known)</td>
<td>MCEA SCHEDULE (see Note 1)</td>
<td>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Provide cycling facilities on Nash Road, Lake Avenue, Warrington Street and a section of the South Service Road in the future. Options to consider for cycling facilities are as follows:</td>
<td>Nash Road: Approximately $80 K Lake Avenue: Approximately $90 K Warrington Street: Approximately $600 K</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td>Consider implementing with future development to provide cycling infrastructure in response to growth in travel. Although wider rights-of-way for the arterial streets will be protected for potential cycle tracks in the long term (see Preferred Solutions for Streets No. 2), retrofitting these bikeways are an opportunity to develop a viable cycling network in the shorter term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nash Road—Re-stripe with bike lanes north of Barton Street in conjunction with permanent on-street parking along the west curb as well as auxiliary left-turn lanes at Kentley Drive to eliminate the 3-phase traffic signal design. Re-stripe with bike lanes south of Barton Street in conjunction with a centre two-way left-turn lane.</td>
<td>The cost of extending Goderich Road to be determined</td>
<td>Pedestrian / cycling route along Bancroft Street Schedule A+</td>
<td>Implement with Phase 2 development of the Confederation GO Station by Metrolinx (see Preferred Solutions by Other Proponents No. 30) Timeframe to implement Goderich Road extension depends on further studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lake Avenue—Re-stripe with bike lanes in conjunction with a centre two-way left-turn lane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Warrington Street and a section of the South Service Road—Construct a multi-use trail on the south side from Lake Avenue to Centennial Parkway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Improve the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the Red Hill Valley Parkway. A design study is recommended to determine issues and appropriate treatments.</td>
<td>The cost to improve signage, pavement markings and ramp crossings is estimated to be about $100 K per interchange</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>Year 2017 to 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Provide a pedestrian / cycling route to the Confederation GO Station (see Preferred Transportation Solutions by Other Proponents No. 30). Potential non-auto routing to be investigated includes:</td>
<td>The cost of a pedestrian / cycling route along Bancroft Street is approximately $300 K Cost of extending Goderich Road to be determined</td>
<td>Pedestrian / cycling route along Bancroft Street Schedule A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A connection south of the railway along Bancroft Street to the Confederation GO Station, with access across the railway to the north side</td>
<td></td>
<td>Further studies needed to identify class of EA for Goderich Road extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Incorporating active transportation facilities on the potential extension of Goderich Road through the City’s Transfer Station lands to Kenora Avenue (see Preferred Transportation Solutions to include in the Secondary Plan No. 27)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 18. Develop a pedestrian / cycling route between Confederation Park and Battlefield House Museum and Park. Signage should be consistent with the City of Hamilton's City-wide Wayfinding project including pedestrian and cyclist oriented signage. There are two routes that can be explored:  
- Centennial Parkway multi-use trail over the QEW, future Goderich Road connection to Kenora Avenue (sidewalks and future bike lanes), Kenora Avenue / Greenfield Drive / Owen Place (future greenway), and King Street (sidewalks and bike lanes)  
- Centennial Parkway multi-use trail over the QEW, South Service Road (future multi-use trail), Warrington Street (future multi-use trail), Lake Avenue (sidewalks and future bike lanes), and King Street (sidewalks)  
Approximate cost for signage of existing and future routes is $10 K. | Developer funded | NA | NA |
<p>| Implement following implementation of Preferred Transportation Solution for Active Transportation No. 12 (Recreational Trails Master Plan Project 5-10), No. 13 and No. 15. | Developer funded | NA | NA |
| | Address implementation in the Secondary Plan. | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (if known)</th>
<th>APPROX. COST (if known)</th>
<th>MCEA SCHEDULE (see Note 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23. Support live/work/play development to encourage trips by active transportation and transit through the Secondary Plan land-use recommendations.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Facilitate car sharing through a City-wide initiative to consider policies required to support car-sharing and then apply to Centennial Neighbourhoods area. Identify opportunities for car-sharing when applying the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Land Use Guidelines to development applications.</td>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Identify traffic calming measures to reduce cut-through traffic, speeding, collisions or safety concerns as part of development applications. Implement with community and Councillor support.</td>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Require missing sidewalks adjacent to new developments to be constructed as part of the development.</td>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Through future re-development of adjacent lands that support the Confederation GO Transit mobility hub, extend Goderich Road (with bikeway and sidewalks) to Kenora Avenue to support direct access to the area and Confederation GO Station and to provide improved road, pedestrian and cycling network connectivity. This solution would require relocating the City of Hamilton’s Transfer Station.</td>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondary Plan Policy
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</th>
<th>APPROX. COST (if known)</th>
<th>MCEA SCHEDULE (see Note 1)</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY OTHER PROPONENTS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sobi Hamilton</td>
<td>28. City to approach SoBiHamilton bike share to undertake a study to determine the feasibility of serving the Centennial Neighbourhoods study area.</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Transportation, Ontario</td>
<td>29. City to request that MTO include the multi-use trail (Project 5-10 of the Recreational Trails Master Plan) through the QEW / Centennial Parkway interchange as part of MTO’s initiative for rehabilitation of the bridge. The multi-use trail is recommended to be a minimum of 3.0 m wide plus appropriate offsets to railings and hazards.</td>
<td>$315,000 for the construction of the MUP on the deck</td>
<td>MTO is proponent (Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrolinx</td>
<td>30. City to request that Metrolinx create non-auto (walking and cycling) “last mile” access to the Confederation GO Station, and provide bicycle parking and right-sized Park N’ Ride at the Confederation GO Station (see Preferred Solutions for Active Transportation No. 17).</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Metrolinx is proponent (GO Transit Class Environmental Assessment)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. **Schedule A and A+ Projects:** Consultation for these projects has been completed through the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (CNTMP). These may proceed to implementation.
   **Schedule B Projects:** Issue Notice of Completion to review agencies and public. The Project File (this document) is made available for review. If no Part II Order requests are received within 30 days of the Notice of Completion, projects may proceed to implementation.
   **Schedule C Projects:** Additional study and mandatory consultation required for these projects.
2. These recommendations will be guided by the City of Hamilton’s Pedestrian Mobility Plan (2012) and Cycling Master Plan (2009), and associated updates to these plans.
3. Refer also to Preferred Solutions for Streets No. 2 to protect rights-of-way as per Urban Official Plan for Complete Livable Better Streets. This includes allowing for the provision of cycle tracks, pedestrian facilities and amenities on arterial roads such as Barton Street, Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road at such time that these roads are reconstructed.
4. These recommendations will be guided by the City of Hamilton’s Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Guide for Development (2015).
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1 Introduction

The purpose of this Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (TMP) is to develop a comprehensive transportation plan that will:

a) Follow the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process
b) Support the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan study
c) Identify future transportation needs and address existing transportation issues
d) Identify and evaluate transportation options and recommend solutions

1.1.1 Study Area

The study area for the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (CNTMP) is illustrated in Exhibit 1-1. To the north, it is bounded by the Queen Elizabeth Way (QEW) and to the south by King Street East. The west boundary is the Red Hill Valley Parkway and the east is Lake Avenue. The study area is larger than the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan study area in order to consider the transportation network that serves the area but lies outside the Secondary Plan boundaries.

1.1.2 Project Team

The City of Hamilton retained IBI Group to undertake the study. The Project Team members are as follows:

**City of Hamilton**
- **Transportation Management:**
  - Mohan Philip, Project Manager, Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan
  - Bart Brosseau
  - Steve Molloy
  - Lorissa Skrypniak

**Planning & Economic Development:**
- Melanie Pham and Kirsten McCauley, Project Managers, Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan
- Melissa Kiddie
- Christine Newbold
- Catherine Parsons

**Traffic Engineering:**
- Daryl Bender
- Steve Cooper
- Leanne Cunliffe

**Transit Strategy and Infrastructure:**
- Danielle Bury
- Andy McLaughlin
- Christie Meleskie

**IBI Group**
- Brian Hollingworth, Director
- Norma Moores, Project Manager
- Scott Johnston, Traffic Engineer
1.2 Background

The Centennial Neighbourhoods TMP is in support of the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan study. Stakeholder and public meetings were coordinated between the two studies to efficiently reach out for input and feedback as the two studies progressed. The Secondary Plan is described below, along with other transportation-related projects.

1.2.1 Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan (2016)

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan (2016) was initiated as a result of being identified in the City Wide Secondary Plan Review as a priority area for Secondary Plan development. The area is important as it is the main focal point for the east end of the City, and
is one of the City’s two major nodes outside of the downtown. It is a terminus point for future higher order transit and a centre for commercial activity.

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan study area consists of lands bounded to the west by the Red Hill Valley Parkway, to the east by Lake Avenue, to the north by the QEW, and to the south by lands just south of Queenston Road, as illustrated on Exhibit 1. The study area is approximately 325 hectares (803 acres) in size. The boundary of the study area is intended to encompass the Eastgate Sub-Regional Service Node identified in the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, as well as the location of a new planned GO Station on Centennial Parkway North, south of the QEW. It is the only major node in the north-easterly portion of the City, and it is the easterly terminus point for the City’s main transportation corridor, the Main-King-Queenston corridor. The area also functions as a gateway area into the City, linked closely with the QEW and the Red Hill Expressway, and has been identified as the location for a new GO Transit bus station. The area provides a central commercial function for the region, and has been identified as a focus area for future intensification opportunities and the development of a mix of uses.

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan will provide a land use plan and policies for the next 25 years to:

• Guide change and redevelopment to achieve the future vision for the neighbourhood
• Promote positive improvements
• Promote change that meets the community’s needs

The preparation of a Secondary Plan will help create a more sustainable, complete community by promoting an appropriate mix of uses and densities and improving the design of the neighbourhood.

The Secondary Plan was carried out in the following stages:

1. Background Review—provides detailed information used to provide baseline information to inform the development of the Secondary Plan
2. Information Analysis and Concept Development—following the review of background information and related studies, and the identification of issues, opportunities and constraints in the area, a vision and guiding principles were developed for the Plan. Various land use options were generated and analysed, and preliminary policies were developed.
3. Development of Preferred Land Use Concept and Refinement of Policies—with a preferred land use concept established, policies that reflect the land-use direction were refined.
4. Approval and Implementation—the last stage of the process involves finalizing the Secondary Plan policies and land use concept. An amendment to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan will bring the policies and land use concept into effect.

The public and stakeholder meetings for the Centennial Neighbourhoods TMP and the Secondary Plan were held together.
1.2.2 Other Related Projects

A number of polices and strategies at the City-wide level will affect the Centennial Neighbourhoods.

City-wide Transportation Master Plan Update

The City is undertaking a review of the City-wide Transportation Master Plan (TMP) to guide the future of transportation programs and investment to accommodate future growth for 2031 and beyond.

The City-wide Transportation Master Plan vision (draft)\(^1\) is as follows:

- The key objective of the Transportation Master Plan is to provide a comprehensive and attainable transportation blueprint for Hamilton as a whole that balances all modes of transportation to become a healthier city. The success of the plan will be based on specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and programmed results.

The ultimate goals of the TMP are to:

- Reduce dependence on single occupancy vehicles;
- Promote accessibility;
- Improve options for walking, cycling and transit; and,
- Maintain and improve the efficiency of goods movement.

Through the City-wide TMP Update, the City is identifying policy and decision-making process for adopting a Complete Livable Better Streets design approach. Hamilton's version of Complete Streets, the Complete Livable Better Streets approach recognizes that no one-size-fits-all solution is appropriate for street design as different streets can have different priorities. Complete Livable Better Streets recognizes that the primary function of a road may range from goods movement to a local road to a higher order rapid transit corridor; however, within all of these contexts a sensitive approach to balancing the needs of multiple users can be taken. More information on the Complete Livable Better Streets design approach is provided in Section 5.1.1.

Cycling Master Plan

The City of Hamilton's Cycling Master Plan (2009) is intended to guide the development and operation of its cycling infrastructure for the next twenty years. It is primarily focused on developing new on-road facilities, connecting wherever possible to existing or planned off-road facilities, as identified in the Recreational Trails Master Plan. The focus is on commuter, utilitarian, and recreational cycling, recognizing that recreational cycling is often the first step toward commuting or utilitarian use. The cycling network is being updated in-house to identify new opportunities, aligning with the City-wide Transportation Master Plan and the Recreational Trails Master Plan. Existing and planned bikeways are presented in Section 2.2.

\(^1\) From Hamilton Transportation Master Plan Review and Update, PIC 4 Information Panels, April 2016.
Rapid Transit and Light Rail Transit (LRT)

The City of Hamilton identified a long-term Rapid Transit System. It includes five rapid transit corridors (B, L, A, S, and T lines) as shown in Exhibit 1-2. As part of Metrolinx’s “Moving Ontario Forward Plan,” the Ontario government is investing up to $1 billion covering 100% of the capital cost of building LRT scheduled for 2019 to 2024. While this report was being prepared, the first phase of the B-line was planned to extend LRT service from McMaster University, through downtown Hamilton, to the Queenston Traffic Circle. Subsequent to the consultation and report for this study, the Environmental Project Report (EPR) for the B-Line LRT was amended to include the segment from the Queenston Traffic Circle to Eastgate Square. The revised LRT project is illustrated in Exhibit 1-3.

Numerous reports have been prepared by the City of Hamilton and Metrolinx in support of the LRT. The amendment to the Hamilton Rapid Transit Preliminary Design and Feasibility Study B-line Environmental Project Report was submitted to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change on May 29, 2017, with amendments completed on July 10, 2017. A 35-day Minister review period was completed on August 2, 2017. The LRT Office received official correspondence that the Hamilton B-Line LRT project can proceed as amended on July 10, 2017.

Exhibit 1-2: City of Hamilton Long-term Rapid Transit System
Exhibit 1-3: Hamilton’s LRT Project

Recreational Trails Master Plan

The Recreational Trails Master Plan (2016) seeks to plan for the development and operation of a trail system within the City of Hamilton that provides for a wide range of recreational opportunities. This system links to on-road commuter systems and will be fully integrated into a larger regional, provincial, and national network of trails. The City completed a comprehensive review of the Recreational Trails Master Plan document and its proposed trail initiatives for every area of Hamilton. It reviewed missing links in the trail network and updated the trails maps, including those in and around the Centennial Neighborhoods study area. Existing and planned trails are presented in Sections 2.1 and 2.2.

Pedestrian Mobility Plan

The City of Hamilton’s Pedestrian Mobility Plan (2012) focuses on rebalancing pedestrian and vehicular mobility on Hamilton’s streets by providing for pedestrians needs, while accommodating vehicular traffic within the streetscape. The plan identifies the need to further improve pedestrian safety and the number of walking trips in order to achieve the City-Wide Transportation Master Plan targets. The Pedestrian Mobility Plan embeds within City decision making a process called “Routine Accommodation”. Infrastructure development and renewal will address improved pedestrian environments by using appropriate toolbox solutions, together with education, encouragement and enforcement programs. This will be accomplished by focusing decision making through a series of legislative, planning, operational, communications and infrastructure considerations.

TDM for Development

This guideline was created as a tool for developers and City of Hamilton staff to include Transportation Demand Management (TDM) initiatives into the development approvals process. It contains information about ways to integrate TDM into new development, redevelopment and existing buildings. It also provides a framework for documenting these efforts.
Traffic Signal Operations Study

A study was completed in 2012 for the approximately 100 signalized intersections in the east end of the lower city from Kenilworth Avenue to Fifty Road. The purpose of the study was to provide improved signal timings that minimize overall road transportation sourced Green House Gas (GHG) emissions and improve road safety through fewer motor vehicle collisions at traffic signals. Recommendations to traffic signal cycle lengths were made. Some longer cycle lengths were implemented and then removed due to complaints from drivers and pedestrians of long delays on the side streets.

Truck Route Master Plan

The City of Hamilton’s Truck Route Master Plan (2014) is intended to recommend a truck route network, and the policies and implementation strategy that will assist the City in managing the truck route network over the next five years. It provides recommendations for future action, policies for truck route signage, and a methodology for dealing with truck route network issues in the future.

1.3 Study Process

Municipal transportation projects must meet the requirements of the Ontario Environmental Assessment Act. The Municipal Class Environmental Assessment, approved under the EA Act in October 2000, as amended in 2007, and 2011, applies to a group or “class” of municipal projects which occur frequently and have relatively minor and predictable environmental impacts. These projects are approved under the EA Act as long as they are planned, designed and constructed according to the requirements of the Class EA document.

A Master Plan is a long-range plan that examines the whole infrastructure system and recommends a series of projects to be implemented over an extended period of time. Master Plans are not prepared to address site-specific problems such as traffic operations at individual intersections or in specific neighbourhoods. This Class EA will fulfill the requirements of a Master Plan, Approach #2, in the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment planning process. Integrating infrastructure needs with environmental planning principles, a Master Plan follows Phases 1 and 2 of the Class EA process.

Phase 1, “Problem/Opportunity” provides the justification of the need for improvements to the transportation network. Phase 2, “Alternative Solutions”, consists of identifying and evaluating alternatives to solve the problems identified in Phase 1. At the end of Phase 2, preferred solutions are combined to form the Master Plan. The Centennial Neighbourhoods TMP study will identify projects that will get carried through Phases 3 to 5. Once a specific transportation project is identified and approved, it will go through a capital project delivery process, subject to an approved budget by Council.

The study process, including the MCEA and Capital Project Delivery Process is illustrated in Exhibit 1-4.
1.3.1 Opportunity Statement

The opportunity statement defines why a municipality is undertaking this study. In simple terms, the opportunity statement is defining, “Why transportation improvements are needed in these neighbourhoods to the year 2031.” The Centennial Neighbourhoods TMP is being undertaken by the City of Hamilton to plan for improved mobility to:

- Accommodate transportation needs of future land use
- Take advantage of investment from development opportunities
- Support access to major transportation services such as the QEW, Red Hill Valley Parkway, Hamilton Street Railway (HSR), and the Eastgate Transit Hub, future Rapid Transit, and GO Transit and future Confederation GO Station
- Support alternative transportation choices including walking and cycling
- Create livable neighbourhoods, complete communities and Complete Livable Better Streets
The goals of the improvements are to create safe, efficient, and sustainable transportation that limits impacts to the environment, and supports healthy living.

1.4 Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP)

In June 2008, Ontario’s Ministry of the Environment established a streamlined environmental assessment process to expedite the development of transit projects. Rather than requiring a full Environmental Assessment – which can be very time-consuming – the Ministry created the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), enabling assessment of potential environmental impacts to be completed within six months. The TPAP is documented in an Environmental Project Report (EDR).

Integral to the TPAP is detailed public and stakeholder consultation. The TPAP regulation sets out a structured consultation process to both provide information about the proposed transit project and to gather feedback from stakeholders and the public. During the TPAP, information on the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed LRT system, as well as commitments to mitigation and monitoring, will be documented in an Environmental Project Report (EPR) that will be made available for review by the public and the Minister of the Environment.

The amendment to the Hamilton Rapid Transit Preliminary Design and Feasibility Study B-line Environmental Project Report was submitted to the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change on May 29, 2017, with amendments completed on July 10, 2017. A 35-day Minister review period was completed on August 2, 2017. The LRT Office received official correspondence that the Hamilton B-Line LRT project can proceed as amended on July 10, 2017.
2 Existing Conditions

The existing conditions in the Centennial Neighbourhoods study area with respect to the various modes of travel are described below.

2.1 Walking

The Centennial Neighbourhoods TMP study area has a number of facilities to accommodate pedestrians. As shown on Exhibit 2-1, a number of major destinations are within 1 km walking distance of the residential areas. These include Smart Centres, Dominic Agostino Riverdale Community Centre, Eastgate Square, Red Hill Public Library, and the future GO Transit station. The schools are located within residential neighbourhoods and generally well-served by the sidewalks on local streets surrounding them.

The existing walking conditions and trails are illustrated on Exhibit 2-1 and consist of the following:

- There are sidewalks on both sides of the streets generally throughout the study area with the following exceptions on arterial and collector roads:
  - Sidewalks are missing on sections of Lake Avenue, east and west sides, between Barton Street East and King Street East, and near the South Service Road
  - A sidewalk is missing on Nash Road on the west side north of Bancroft Street
  - A sidewalk is missing on Kenora Avenue on the west side north of Barton Street East
  - Sidewalks are missing on Centennial Parkway between Goderich Road and the QEW ramp / South Service Road
  - Sections of sidewalks are missing on one side of the local streets in employment and commercial areas including Keefer Crescent, Goderich Road, Arrowsmith Road, Covington Street, Cascade Street, Warrington Street, Lanark Street, and a section of Bancroft Street. It is important to provide sidewalk in employment and commercial areas so employees and customers can walk to these destinations and they are better served by transit that requires walking from the bus stop.
  - The study area is bisected east-west and north-south by a number of arterial roads that can be difficult to cross when walking. Exhibit 2-1 illustrates the location of signalized crossings along the arterials. The most widely spaced signals are 700 m on Nash Road. Generally they are spaced about 160 to 500 m, providing connectivity across these busy streets.
Multi-use recreational trails exist in Henry and Beatrice Warden Park and Green Acres Park. Nearby are the Red Hill Creek Valley recreational trails to the west and the Waterfront Trail to the south. Both of these trails are accessed from the Centennial Neighbourhoods study area only by walking on major arterial roads and through interchanges (Red Hill Valley Parkway and QEW).

Given the well-developed sidewalk network and street crossings and the number of destinations in the neighbourhoods, Centennial Neighbourhoods could support many trips by walking for work, school, shopping, errands and social. However, the pedestrian environment / public realm along the major streets lacks buffers from traffic volumes, speeds and noise; interesting landscaping and urban design; tree and canopy shelter from sun, wind, rain and snow; and rest areas.
Exhibit 2-1: Walking Conditions and Trails
2.2 Cycling

Destinations within the Centennial Neighbourhoods TMP study area are all within a distance that is easy to cover by bicycle, i.e. less than 5 km (the study area is 3 km long by 2.6 km wide). It has a few existing facilities to accommodate cyclists, but some facilities are planned for future implementation.

The existing cycling conditions are illustrated on Exhibit 2-2 and consist of the following:

- Bike lanes exist on King Street East from Barton Street East to Battlefield Drive; shared lane markings (sharrows) were installed after reconstruction of the road from Battlefield Drive to Lake Avenue Drive. Note that the traffic volumes on King Street East (18,000 to 24,000 vehicles per day) exceed the threshold for shared lane use set out in the Ontario Traffic Book 18 Cycling Facilities (4,000 vehicles per day operating at 50 km/h on four lanes), so shared lane markings are considered inadequate for this street.

- Lake Avenue Drive is a designated cycling route with shared lane markings (sharrows) from King Street East to Queenston Road. It is a two-lane road with 40 km/h posted speed and about 6,000 vehicles per day. The daily traffic volumes are a little high for shared use, set out in the Ontario Traffic Book 18 Cycling Facilities (3,000 vehicles per day operating at 40 km/h on two lanes), so shared lane markings are considered inadequate for this street.

- Unsigned cycling routes include King Street East and Queenston Road west of Potruff Road, King Street East east of Battlefield Drive, Lake Avenue north of Queenston Road, Potruff Road, Ede Street / Nugent Drive and Sandlyn Court, Kentley Drive, Delawana Drive, Owen Place, Greenford Drive, and Kenora Avenue Drive south of Delawana Drive. These are shown on the City of Hamilton’s Bike Routes, Trails & Parks map as “cautionary unsigned bike route (on streets with low to moderate traffic volumes)”. High-volume sections of these unsigned route are also noted on the map, consisting of sections of King Street East, Queenston Road, and Lake Avenue.

- Bike lanes are planned for Nash Road from King Street East to Bancroft Street, and on Barton Street East from Nash Road to Lake Avenue. However, their implementation on Nash Road from King Street East to Barton Street East, and on Barton Street East from Nash Road to Centennial Parkway is not currently planned to proceed due to past lack of community support and impacts on travel lanes.

- The cycling network also includes the multi-use recreational trails that exist in Henry and Beatrice Warden Park and Green Acres Park. Nearby are the Red Hill Creek Valley recreational trails to the west and the Waterfront Trail to the north. Both of these trails are accessed from the Centennial Neighbourhoods study area only by cycling on arterial roads and through interchanges (Red Hill Valley Parkway and QEW), or via Greys Road a kilometre to the east.
SoBi Hamilton operates the Hamilton Bike Share system. They maintain a fleet of 825 bicycles and over 100 hubs available to the public to ride through membership or rental pricing. The service area is currently centred on downtown Hamilton and extends as far east as Ottawa Street; it does not currently serve the Centennial Neighbourhoods study area. The benefits of the bike share system is that it provides a bicycle in good working condition 24 hours a day for a small fee or membership along with secure locking at parking hubs available throughout their service area. Grants allow the program to extend memberships to lower-income people. In May 2016, the following usage was reported (http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/hamilton/news/sobi-hamilton-the-city-s-popular-bike-share-turns-1-1.3499753, accessed August 2016)

- Current active members: 7,678 active users
- Trips per day: between 300 and 750 trips per day
- Trip duration: 17 minutes per trip on average

Given the number of destinations in the neighbourhoods and nearby, Centennial Neighbourhoods could support many trips by cycling for work, school, shopping, errands, social and recreation. However, with the exception of a portion of King Street East, the major streets lack suitable cycling facilities, and the local street network is not very visible as a cycling network connecting to destinations. The multi-use recreational trails along the Red Hill Creek and Lake Ontario Waterfront are important corridors in the City-wide trail network, however, there are no comfortable routes connecting to them from the Centennial Neighbourhoods.
Exhibit 2-2: Existing and Planned Cycling Facilities and Trails

(existing map and key explaining existing and planned infrastructure, with notes such as "Sharrow planned in 2015 as part of road construction.")

- Existing Infrastructure:
  - Bike Lane
  - Multi-Use Trail (Off-Road)
  - Signed Bike Route (On-Road)
  - Unsigned Bike Route (On-Road)

- Planned Infrastructure:
  - Bike Lane
  - Multi-Use Trail (Off-Road)
  - Signed Bike Route (On-Road)
  - Projects with past impediment to implementation

5 km is considered a bicycle-friendly trip distance if comfortable routes are available.
2.3 Public Transit

The transit services in the Centennial Neighbourhoods study area are illustrated on Exhibit 2-4 and described below.

- There are ten local HSR bus routes operating in the study area: Routes 1 King, 2 Barton Street East, 4 Bayfront, 5/52 Delaware, 10 B-Line Express, 11 Parkdale, 44 Rymal, 55 Stoney Creek Central, 56 Centennial, and 58 Stoney Creek Local.

- HSR operates a bus terminal at Eastgate Square. Some, but not all, bus routes in the study area terminate or transfer at this terminal. Bus shelters, benches and bicycle parking racks are provided at the Eastgate Transit Hub.

- Metrolinx is planning on improving and expanding regional transit services to Centennial Neighbourhoods. GO Transit bus service currently stops at a Park & Ride lot at Barton Street East and Nash. This service will be transferred to the new Confederation GO Station being constructed at Goderich Road and Centennial Parkway. Future GO Transit train service will also be provided out of this station.

- The City of Hamilton long-term rapid transit plans include the B-line and S-line that connect into the Centennial Neighbourhoods study area on Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway. These are illustrated on Exhibit 2-3. The first phase of the B-line will extend LRT service from McMaster University, through downtown Hamilton, to Eastgate Square and is planned to be constructed from 2019 to 2024. The Transit Project Assessment Process Environmental Project Report (TPAP EPR) has been completed for the B-line LRT to Eastgate Square and an addendum to the Environmental Project Report (EPR) was submitted to the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change on May 29, 2017, with amendments completed on July 10, 2017. The Hamilton Long Term Rapid Transit System initially showed the S-line terminating at Eastgate Square. Prior to this report being finalized, the Hamilton Long Term Rapid Transit System was updated to include the extension of rapid transit to Confederation GO Station, a recommendation of this study.

About 90% of the residential areas in the Centennial Neighbourhoods study area are within 400 m of a local HSR bus route.
Exhibit 2-3: City of Hamilton Long-term Rapid Transit System (B.L.A.S.T.)
Exhibit 2-4: Existing and Planned Public Transit Services
2.4 Roads and Traffic

The road and traffic conditions are illustrated Exhibit 2-5 and Exhibit 2-6. The Centennial Neighbourhoods study area is served by the following major road corridors:

- The QEW Provincial Highway is on the north side of the study area with an interchange at Centennial Parkway. It carries more than 150,000 vehicles per day.

- Red Hill Valley Parkway is on the west side of the study area with interchanges at King Street East, Queenston Road and Barton Street East. It carries more than 50,000 vehicles per day.

- The study area is traversed by one east-west major arterial, Queenston Road; one north-south major arterial, Centennial Parkway; and two east-west minor arterials, King Street East and Barton Street East. The South and North Service Roads are also a minor arterial parallel to the QEW. The major and minor arterials generally carry around 20,000 vehicles per day, although Queenston Road carries about 15,000 vehicles per day east of Centennial Parkway.

- Collector roads in the study area include: Potruff Road from King Street East to Queenston Road, Nash Road from King Street East to Barton Street East, Kenora Avenue / Delawana Drive connecting Centennial Parkway to Lake Avenue, and Lake Avenue / Lake Avenue Drive from King Street East to the South Service Road. The collector roads carry a range of traffic from around 3,000 to 12,000 vehicles per day.

This immediate access with four interchanges from the neighbourhoods to the QEW and Red Hill Valley Parkway freeway provides exceptional mobility to the regional and provincial highway systems. However, it also increases the car and truck volumes in the study area as motorists drive through it to access the regional and provincial road networks.

The following roads were recently reconstructed:

- Centennial Parkway from the Goderich Road to Barton Street East (railway grade separation, 2016), and Barton Street East to King Street East (2014)
- Barton Street East from Nash Road to Centennial Parkway (2014)
- Nash Road from Barton Street East to Queenston Road (2012)
- King Street East from Nash Road to Centennial Parkway (2010) and from Centennial Parkway to Lake Avenue Drive (2016)
Exhibit 2-5: Road Network
Exhibit 2-6: Existing 24-hour Traffic Volumes

Traffic counts conducted between 2009 and 2014.
2.5 Goods Movement

There are a number of full-time, designated truck routes in the study area, as illustrated on Exhibit 2-7 (from City of Hamilton’s Highways Designated for Use by Heavy Trucks map, 2014). These include:

- Local streets that service the employment and industrial uses on Nash Road and Kenora Avenue north of Barton Street East, Bancroft Street and Arrowsmith Street, Warrington Street, Lanark Street, Covington Street and Cascade Street. These streets may carry a couple of hundred trucks a day.
- Barton Street East carries around 500 trucks a day and over 700 a day at the Red Hill Valley Parkway interchange
- Queenston Road carries around 250 to 450 trucks a day
- King Street East west of Centennial Parkway carries less than 200 trucks a day
- Lake Avenue north of Barton Street East carries almost 400 trucks a day
- Centennial Parkway carries 200 to 500 trucks a day
- Red Hill Valley Parkway (trucks volumes not available)
- QEW and the North and South Service Roads (trucks volumes not available)

Trucks also travel on streets that are not truck routes in order to access local businesses. For example, Nash Road carries around 80 trucks a day, Lake Avenue south of Barton Street East carries 40 trucks a day, and Delawana Drive carries 20 trucks a day.
Exhibit 2-7: Truck Routes and Existing 24-hour Truck Volumes

Source: Hamilton Highways Designated for Use by Heavy Trucks map (2014); traffic counts conducted between 2009 and 2014
3 Consultation

The stakeholder and public consultation for the Centennial Neighbourhoods TMP and Secondary Plan consisted of the following meetings and communications:

- Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)—three meetings involving representatives from various City of Hamilton departments: Planning & Economic Development, Public Health, Public Works, and Transit. A list of participants in the TAC meetings is provided in Appendix A.

- Focus Group—three meetings involving representatives from the community: residents, business owners, developers and Ward Councillors

- Public Open Houses—three open houses with displays, presentation and workshop activities

- Project web site—www.hamilton.ca/CentennialNTMP

In addition to the above-noted scheduled events, which were advertised on the City’s social media, twitter, project website, and in newspapers. City Staff also conducted two pop-up events. The first event was held during the summer of 2015 on August 5th at Sam Manson Park with a focus on the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan study. The second event was held on April 29th, 2016 at Eastgate Square and included information on both studies. People also had the opportunity to fill out a comment form on the City’s project website.

A summary of the consultation during each phase of the study is provided below. More detailed summaries are provided in Appendix B.

3.1 Phase 1 Consultation

The objective of Phase 1 of the CNTMP is to identify issues or opportunities related to transportation. This summary provides an overview of stakeholder and public consultation events undertaken to understand existing conditions and issues. The events include:

- Stakeholder focus group (April 8, 2015)—12 people attended from the public
- Public information centre (PIC) (April 30, 2015)—86 people signed the sign-in sheet
- Comments from City of Hamilton staff—Public Works, HSR, Planning & Economic Development, and Public Health
- Public opinion survey posted on the City of Hamilton website—14 people filled it out on-line; two people submitted hard copies
- Direct submissions from the public—11 comment forms, one written submission and 10 emails

3.1.1 Overview of Issues

An overview of the issues and opportunities identified through the above consultation is provided below. The issues presented are “as heard”. While many are directly related to the scope of the CNTMP, others may be subject to other processes and City Divisions. In particular, many of the transit-related issues are of an operational nature and need to be considered in the context of
HSR's overall transit plans. However, the CNTMP will continue to highlight these issues and articulate broader strategies to address them. The timing of transit improvements also influences the success of TDM programs and other initiatives aimed at increasing transit modal shares.

Local Transit Service

High-level local transit comments:

- **Connectivity to major destinations** within and outside of the community was an issue for many individuals. Within the area, a number of major destinations lacked direct connections to one another, such as the GO Park n’ Ride, St. Joseph’s UCC, Walmart Plaza, Eastgate Square, and the Riverdale Community Centre. Of particular concern was the lack of a direct connection between Eastgate Square and the current GO Transit Park n’ Ride. Similarly, a connection to the future GO Station from the neighbourhoods was a longer-term concern.

- **Supporting expansion of rapid transit** (both LRT and BRT were suggested) along the B-Line corridor received mixed reviews. Some considered it a top priority while others were opposed to it. Some implied that it would be a good way to solve congestion in the area while others said taking lanes away would increase traffic.

- A resident indicated that **connecting existing routes with Eastgate Square**, specifically Route 4 Bayfront, and the Route 5 Delaware branches that operate south of King, would make it easier to connect to other routes by transit and to get to the mall.

- **Riverdale Community Centre needs direct transit service** for the youth, women, and recent immigrants who access its services

Issues to be addressed outside the CNTMP:

- **Doubling the size of the Eastgate Square terminal** is part of the HSR’s long-term plans for the area and they encourage the study to identify where this could take place. Along the same lines, many residents indicated that an indoor waiting area at Eastgate Square, with washrooms and real-time departure information, would improve the experience and make long-transfers between vehicles more comfortable.

- **Low-frequency, community bus routes** that enter local neighbourhoods were suggested for areas with lower densities.

- **Frequency of routes** needing improvement was the transit issue identified by most people. The Queenston Road Corridor (from Downtown to Eastgate Square) and Barton Street East (from Downtown to Bell Manor Loop) were seen as being well served. However, other routes were viewed as needing to operate more frequently to improve their usefulness, particularly for seniors, children/youth, women, new immigrants, and low income residents. The HSR did indicate that improvements would be coming to the Route 56 Centennial route within the next three years as part of their 10-year strategy.

- **Daily operating hours** were viewed as needing improvement by many people. Comments identified that service started too late in the morning and ended too early. Some routes were cited as not operating for the full service span of the destinations they serve, particularly the Route 56 Centennial bus that started operating later and ending earlier than the hours of the Walmart it primarily serves.
• Many comments were received that **Route 56 Centennial does not operate frequently or long enough.** Its hours should align with the Walmart Plaza to provide safe access for workers.

• Many indicated that **one bus should operate the full length of Centennial Parkway.** Currently, Route 56 Centennial operates on the section north of Eastgate Square, while Route 44 Rymal operates on the section south of Eastgate Square and continues to Upper Centennial Parkway for mountain access.

• **Providing more transit stop amenities** like shelters, benches and waste containers was cited as an opportunity for improvement.

• **Garbage bins are not being emptied** at some bus stops, primarily along Queenston Road and Barton Street East.

**Regional Transit**

• The existing **GO Transit Park n Ride/carpool lot** is well liked.

• There is an opportunity to **increase non-auto access to the new GO bus station** by improving the cycling and pedestrian infrastructure in the vicinity and providing more frequent and direct HSR service to it.

• Concerns were raised with **how the new GO Train station will be accessed.** Individuals supported options such as transit, pedestrian, cycling and driving in order to provide multi-modal access for residents.

• **GO buses connecting to Burlington GO should still operate after the new GO Train Station** opens. The train will take too long to get to Burlington as it has to go through Downtown Hamilton.

• Concerns were raised that the new GO Train station will make the community a suburb of Toronto.

**Pedestrians**

*High-level pedestrian comments:*

• While many of the destinations in the area are a “walkable” distance, most considered it **unsafe and/or uncomfortable to walk** due to an unattractive pedestrian realm, lack of infrastructure and very short crossing times at major intersections. This was cited most frequently for any trip that required crossing an arterial road like Centennial Parkway, Barton Street East or Queenston Road.

• Encouraging and facilitating **walking is important to encourage healthy active living** in the area. Residents should be able to access major destinations in the community by foot to incorporate healthy living by design into their everyday lives.

• **Streetscaping improvements,** such as benches and trees, were requested to be added to improve the area. Generally, Queenston Road was viewed as “attractive” because of the sidewalk setback from the road and trees along the boulevard, while Centennial Parkway, King Street East and Barton Street East were not attractive due to the sidewalk adjacent to the roadway and a lack of amenities and trees along it.

• Mixed comments were received about installing new sidewalks along low-volume residential roads that were built without them.

*Location-specific pedestrian comments:*
• **Pedestrian access to Eastgate Square** received mixed reviews:
  • Individuals west of Centennial Parkway North between Barton Street East and Queenston Road generally said access by foot was easy, though speeding traffic was a concern.
  • Individuals east of Centennial Parkway North cited the need for a pedestrian crossing on the eastern side of the mall in the vicinity of Vineyard Road. This was of particular concern for people from the Riverdale area who walk to the mall and transit terminal.

• **Narrow sidewalks on Nash Road** make it uncomfortable to walk along.

• **Missing sidewalks along portions of Lake Avenue and Centennial Parkway** make it difficult for individuals to travel by foot. Access to the Walmart Plaza and Confederation Park was cited as being difficult because of this.

**Issues to be addressed outside the CNTMP:**

• Current **crossing times were considered inadequate** across major roads, even for abled-bodied people. Intersections that received a large volume of comments about this were Centennial Parkway at Queenston Road, Centennial Parkway North at Delawana Drive, and Centennial Parkway North at Barton Street East.

• **New ladder-style pedestrian crossings** were recommended for Kenora Avenue at Kentley Drive, Kentley Drive at Oakland Drive, and Kentley Drive at Nash Road.

**Cycling**

**High-level cycling comments:**

• Many individuals stated they **do not feel comfortable cycling** in most parts of the community due to the **lack of safe facilities, fast traffic and the large volumes of trucks**. While many of the destinations in the area are a “bikeable” distance, it is not safe and/or comfortable to bike.

• **Expanding Hamilton Bike Share to the area** was cited multiple times as an opportunity.

• **Encouraging cycling is important for healthy active living** in the area. Accessing major destinations in the community by bike should be encouraged to incorporate healthy living by design into residents’ everyday lives.

**Location-specific cycling comments:**

• Many cited the need for a **safe active transportation connection on Centennial Parkway in order to reach Confederation Park**. The City and MTO are currently working on a multi-use path connection on the Centennial Parkway structure over the QEW that will accomplish this, however the timing is currently unknown.

• **New bikeways** were suggested for Nash Road, Delawana Drive, Owen Place, Kenora Avenue and Kentley Drive, as was continuing the lanes on King Street East. As well, adding new facilities to reach the new GO Station and Queenston Library were suggested.

**Roadways**

**High-level roadway comments:**
• **Speeding is perceived as happening on many residential streets.** Some mention the need for better enforcement or a 40 km/hr blanket speed limit in the area.

• **The Red Hill Valley Parkway congestion causes traffic to seek alternate routes** in study area arterial roads, especially on Centennial Parkway up to the mountain.

• Heavy truck traffic uses Centennial Parkway and Barton Street East and is often noisy, especially at night. Individuals indicated that the large volume poses a perceived safety risk.

*Specific level roadways comments:*

• The left-turn only movement onto Kenora Avenue and right-turn only movement onto Delawana Drive from Eastgate Square were viewed as an inconvenience by some residents. Many indicated they drive around the mall in order to get home from shopping. These traffic movement restrictions are from an OMB ruling issued September 22, 2000.

*Issues to be addressed outside the CNTMP:*

• There were concerns that the traffic signals along arterial routes have too short of a green phase. This needs to be extended in order to allow cars and goods movement vehicles to travel efficiently.

• The split-phase traffic signal at Nash Road North and Kentley Drive is well liked. Suggestions were given to improve the signage to help people understand it better.

• Many comments requested an advanced left turn signal at Centennial Parkway North and Delawana Drive for traffic turning onto Delawana Drive (both directions).

• Concerns were raised about the queue that forms to make a left-turn into St. Joseph’s UCC on King Street East.

• Concerns were raised about construction-related cut-through traffic from recent / on-going projects on Barton Street East and Centennial Parkway. Roads that were mentioned include Irene Avenue and Kenora Avenue.

### 3.1.2 Evaluation Criteria

As part of the focus group and PIC, individuals were asked to select the five most important factors to them from a list of criterion for evaluating transportation options. The results are shown in **Exhibit 3-1**. Pedestrians and transit were select as important by the most people (17). Urban Design was the most important factor for stakeholders attending the focus group meeting; drivers was the most important to members of the public who participated in this activity at the PIC.
Exhibit 3-1: Evaluation Criteria Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>NO. OF PEOPLE WHO SELECTED THE CRITERIA AS ONE OF THEIR TOP FIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity of the transportation network</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for all users</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Heritage</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Vehicles Access</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Phase 2 Consultation

The objective of Phase 2 of the CNTMP is to develop alternative solutions to the identified transportation issues and opportunities. This summary provides an overview of stakeholder and public consultation events undertaken to understand people’s opinions about the alternatives. The events include:

- Technical Advisory Committee consisting of City of Hamilton staff (October 29, 2015)—Public Works, Transit, HSR, Planning & Economic Development, and Public Health
- Stakeholder focus group (November 10, 2015)—7 people attended from the public
- Public information centre (December 1, 2015)—24 people signed the sign-in sheet
- Direct submissions from the public—7 submissions provide comments related to the Transportation Management Plan

3.2.1 Discussion of Alternative Transportation Solutions

The transportation solutions were categorized by the main issue or opportunity they address:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Mobility Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

At the Focus Group and PIC, attendees working in groups were asked to consider and identify the alternatives as follows:

- **Advantages** – what makes sense
- **Best ideas** – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood
- **Concerns** – what might not work
- **What Else** – add your ideas
The results are shown in **Exhibit 3-2**, i.e. the number of groups that sorted each alternative according to the above categories.

Based on ideas raised by the groups and comments submitted by individuals, the following modifications to the alternatives are recommended:

- Modify "protect right-of-way on Barton Street East from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic lanes (beyond year 2041)" to include considering HOV / transit-only lanes
- Include reviewing pedestrian walk times as part of “improve traffic signal timing”
- Add the multi-use recreational trails from the **Recreational Trails Master Plan**:
  - Project 5-4 in Bow Valley Open Space and Lawrence Avenue Park just west of Lake Avenue
  - Project 5-9 connecting Pottruff Road near Eugene Street across the Red Hill Valley Parkway to the Red Hill Valley Recreational Trail
- Add a new alternative to improve the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the Red Hill Valley Parkway

Participants at the Focus Group and PIC were asked to select what they thought were their priorities by placing four plastic coins in jars marked Capacity, Safety, Urban Design and Mobility Choices. The results of this prioritization are shown in **Exhibit 3-3**.
### Exhibit 3-2: Summary of Working Groups Evaluation of Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of groups that commented on each alternative</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Best ideas</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extend the B-line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (within 15 years west of Centennial &amp; beyond 25 years east of Centennial)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve traffic signal timings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement 3-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic lanes (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50% of Secondary Plan streetscape options</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement cycle tracks on Centennial, and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape options</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian connections through new developments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streetscape Options</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N' Ride</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add local HSR circulator route</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate car sharing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend and modify HSR routes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exhibit 3-3: Results of Prioritization of Groups of Transportation Solutions (PIC and Focus Group)

- **Capacity**: 30%
- **Safety**: 27%
- **Urban Design**: 22%
- **Mobility Choice**: 21%
3.3 Consultation on the TMP Recommendations

This summary provides an overview of stakeholder and public consultation events undertaken to understand people’s opinions about the recommended transportation solutions. The events include:

- Technical Advisory Committee consisting of City of Hamilton staff (February 23, 2016)—Public Works, Transit, HSR, Planning & Economic Development, and Public Health
- Stakeholder focus group (April 7, 2016)—7 people attended from the public
- Public information centre (April 28, 2016)—43 people signed the sign-in sheet
- Drop-in location with displays at Eastgate Square (April 29, 2016)—about 62 people discussed the studies with City staff
- Direct submissions from the public—21 written submissions were received (comment form, email or web site form)

3.3.1 Comments on the Recommended Transportation Solutions

The recommended transportation solutions were presented through a series of maps:

- Recommended solutions for streets including City-wide policies, City-wide activities and programs, and Centennial Neighbourhoods specific initiatives
- Recommended solutions for transit including City-wide policies, City-wide activities and programs, and City-wide projects
- Recommended solutions for active transportation including City-wide projects and Centennial Neighbourhoods specific initiatives
- Recommended solutions for Secondary Plan Policies
- Recommended solutions for other proponents including SoBi Hamilton, Ministry of Transportation, Ontario and Metrolinx

Members of the focus group expressed concerns regarding the CNTMP around cycling, walking, and the QEW interchanges. They would like to promote green space along the frontage of buildings on Centennial and Queenston similar to the green space that is present along some properties today, instead of having building fronts adjacent a hardscaped pedestrian area. There was concern regarding who rides bicycles in the area, since there are a large number of senior residents. They also wanted to know if there was a new interchange planned for the QEW at Grays Road, which is under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Transportation, Ontario.

Transportation recommendations received from the public by way of a comment form or email that members of the public liked are summarized below. Some people generally support improved transportation, while others remarked generally that not enough is being done:

- The CNTMP “does not address an increase in traffic to an area that already has traffic issues”
- “There needs to be a careful and considerate review of the traffic issues in all of Stoney Creek, and real and doable options made available to ratepayers to consider. I support cleaner and leaner transportation, as long as there are no
negative impacts on existing residential home owners, businesses, and this community.’

- “This is a great plan. It should help reduce car dependency, increase active lifestyles, and result in greater economic opportunities for the neighbourhood.”

- “The traffic is TERRIBLE in this area. I believe the issue is due to poor planning, by allowing the Walmart development to proceed before having a proper transportation infrastructure plan designed, approved, and put in place… This seems to be an ongoing issue in our City, and one that can be easily corrected by putting the interests of the ratepayers and people that reside and work in the community first.”

Specific comments and suggestions are divided into three categories, and summarized in Exhibit 3-4:

- Support for recommended transportation solutions
- Suggested changes regarding the recommendations or new ideas to consider
- Comments that are outside the scope of the CNTMP and should be referred to other City departments or agencies

Exhibit 3-4: Summary of Comments Received on the Recommended Transportation Solutions

### SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended solutions for <strong>streets</strong>:</th>
<th>Recommended solutions for <strong>transit</strong>:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Support better traffic flow and signal timing (2 people)</td>
<td>- Support connections to transit hubs, more bus routes, stops and shelters, and feeder bus routes to the Queenston LRT station (6 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support traffic calming (2 people), Specific streets mentioned are Cromwell Crescent, Owen Place, Kentley Drive, and streets used to access Eastgate Mall from Nash Road</td>
<td>- Support connections to public transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Support LRT to Eastgate Square (not BRT) (5 people), including extending the first phase to Eastgate Transit Hub from Queenston Circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended solutions for <strong>active transportation</strong>:</th>
<th>Recommended solutions for <strong>other proponents</strong>:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Support active transportation with new and enhanced infrastructure</td>
<td>- Support the GO train station at Centennial Parkway North (4 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support increase in walkability</td>
<td>- Support for multi-use trail link over the QEW as part of the MTO bridge rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support more bike lanes (2 people), specifically on Lake Avenue connecting Confederation Park entrance (2 people)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support improving east-west active transportation connections in the study area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Support improving the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the Red Hill Valley Parkway and make it a top priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUGGESTIONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended solutions for <strong>streets</strong>:</th>
<th>Recommended solutions for <strong>transit</strong>:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- For Complete Livable Better Streets, wider sidewalks (2 people). Specific streets mentioned are Nash Road, Queenston Road, Centennial Parkway, and Barton Street East</td>
<td>- Locate the LRT on Barton Street East closer to the Confederation GO Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Open Kenora Avenue from Barton Street East to Queenston Road to ease congestion along Nash and Centennial once the Confederation GO Station is in full use</td>
<td>- With the bus service review, consider extending bus service to Confederation Park, and looping Routes 4 and 44 around St. Joseph's Hospital and Eastgate Transit Hub</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommended solutions for active transportation:

- Project 5-9 connecting Pottruff Road near Eugene Street across the Red Hill Valley Parkway to the Red Hill Valley Trails requires more study regarding costs. It may be more effective to invest in pedestrian and cyclist improvements on Queenston Road and Barton Street East.

- For the neighbourhood greenways, include bike lanes on Delawana Drive, Kenora Avenue, and Kentley Drive along with 40 km/h posted speed limit.

- Provide high visibility crosswalks (‘ladder’ markings) throughout the neighbourhoods.

- Connect Battlefield Park to Confederation Park for tourists.

- Provide protected bike lanes or cycle tracks (4 people). Specific streets mentioned are Nash Road, Queenston Road, and Centennial Parkway.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMENTS OUTSIDE THE CNTMP SCOPE</th>
<th>REFERRAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need a direct, faster bus route to Mohawk College on Barton Street East; stopover / transfer at Bell Manor Loop is too long</td>
<td>HSR, City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars making U-turns from Vineyard Road to Centennial Parkway south are very dangerous for pedestrians</td>
<td>Traffic, City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce speed limit on Queenston Road - 60 km/hr is too fast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is too much truck traffic on Centennial Parkway; it should be using the Red Hill Valley Parkway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more lighting, trees and pathways for people with strollers or wheelchairs to enjoy in Sam Manson Park</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation, City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Hill Library should have direct connection / access to Sam Manson Park (3 people)</td>
<td>Hamilton Public Library and Parks &amp; Recreation, City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better traffic markings for QEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend the HOV lanes on the QEW through Hamilton / Stoney Creek</td>
<td>Ministry of Transportation, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more train services throughout the GTA and Niagara region interconnected along the lakeshore/ QEW and with more bus stops</td>
<td>Metrolinx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more parking space and parking garage and bike cage at Confederation GO Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.3.2 Modifications to the Recommended Transportation Solutions

Based on the public consultation on the recommended transportation solutions, the following modifications were made:

- Support for cycle tracks on Centennial and Queenston and other arterials in the study area will be noted in the Centennial Neighbourhoods TMP. However, they are not included in the City of Hamilton’s Cycling Master Plan. As previously noted, opportunities to implement cycle tracks are very long term, beyond the horizon year of the Secondary Plan. Centennial Parkway was recently reconstructed. Options to incorporate cycle tracks into Queenston Road corridor east of Centennial Parkway can be explored as part of the B-line LRT extension; west of Centennial Parkway the approved LRT EA study did not include them. In the meantime, other cycling facilities recommended in the Centennial Neighbourhoods TMP can be pursued. Right-of-way widths are being protected in the Urban Official Plan to create Complete Livable Better Streets in the longer term that may incorporate cycle tracks.

- Providing a linkage between Battlefield Park and Confederation Park will be noted as a concept to pursue in future Recreational Trails Master Plans.

3.4 Others Consulted

As part of the Municipal Class EA, government ministries, agencies and First Nations and Aboriginal Peoples are contacted to determine their interest and obtain input on the study. Correspondence is summarized below.
3.4.1 Ministry of Transportation, Ontario

The Ministry of Transportation, Ontario (MTO) were notified by the City of Hamilton of the public meetings. They requested to be notified of the projects as the study area includes the QEW, the Ministry’s right-of-way, and any potential impact on the highway network is of importance to them.

The City of Hamilton has met with the MTO regarding the QEW/Centennial Parkway Structure Rehabilitation project and continues to correspond with them regarding incorporating a multi-use trail on the structure. The MTO is planning on rehabilitating the bridge in 2017.

3.4.2 The Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation (MNCFN)

The Mississaugas of the New Credit First Nation (MNCFN) were notified by the City of Hamilton of the public meetings. Their letter dated June 17, 2016, noted that they have various treaty rights across its traditional territory, including the Centennial Neighbourhoods study area. The MNCFN exercises treaty rights that include, but are not limited to, rights to harvest, fish, trap and gather species of plants, animals and insects for any purpose including food, social, ceremonial, trade and exchange purposes. The MNCFN also has the right to use the water and resources from the rivers, creeks and lands across the MCNFN traditional territory. They indicated that they do not have a high level of concern regarding the proposed project at this time. They requested to be notified regarding the following:

- The status of the project
- If there are any changes to the project that may impact MNCFN’s interests
- Provide an electronic copy of all associated environmental and archaeology reports

3.4.3 Metrolinx

Metrolinx is an agency of the Government of Ontario that champions, develops and implements an integrated transportation system in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area. Metrolinx provided the following information on regional transportation in the Centennial Neighbourhoods study area:

- **Rapid Transit**—planning is underway for the approved B Line from McMaster University to Eastgate Square and the A Line along James Street North. A rapid connection from Eastgate Mall to Ancaster is currently identified as a 25-year rapid transit corridor in the current Regional Transportation Plan.

- **Confederation GO Station**—this future station is located at Goderich Road and Centennial Parkway. Phase 1 is an interim GO Transit park-and-ride lot on the north side of the railway. Phase 2 consists of the station building, tunnels, platforms and additional parking south of the railway. Timelines for these phases were not provided by Metrolinx. Metrolinx confirmed that they are comfortable with the preferred transportation solutions for station access by rapid transit and walking and cycling to the south; it is consistent with the anticipated volume and expected transit user market at the station.
4 Transportation Issues

4.1 Road Network and Capacity Analysis

A traffic analysis was undertaken to determine the effect of traffic generated by future developments proposed in the Secondary Plan on the adjacent street network to determine any operation deficiencies. Two approaches were used:

- Capacity analysis with defined “screenlines” to determine the overall traffic operations based on the ratio of volume of traffic to capacity of lanes across each screenline. The analysis was completed on four major screenlines: south of the QEW, east of Lake Avenue, east of the Red Hill Valley Expressway, and north of King Street East.

- An intersection analysis focused on nine major intersections, analyzing the overall intersection operations and individual movement performance.

Traffic forecasts were developed for the years 2021 and 2031 with the additional of traffic expected to be generated by the land use options proposed in the Secondary Plan study. The full Road Network and Capacity Analysis report is provided in Appendix C.

4.1.1 Secondary Plan Traffic Forecasts

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan divided the study area into four districts: Regional Gateway, Eastgate Square and Centennial Parkway, Queenston Road (east), and Queenston Road (west). Exhibit 4-1 shows the boundaries of the four districts. Each district has three land use options, consisting of:

- Land Use Option 1 – Current Official Plan: 1,750 new residents, 177,000 ft² Gross Floor Area (GFA) general office and 118,000 ft² GFA shopping centre

- Land Use Option 2 – Medium Density Mixed Use Development: 3,950 new residents, 177,000 ft² Gross Floor Area (GFA) general office and 118,000 ft² GFA shopping centre

- Land Use Option 3 – Medium and High Density Mixed Use Development: 5,200 new residents, 228,000 ft² Gross Floor Area (GFA) general office and 152,000 ft² GFA shopping centre

The Secondary Plan land-use options will add 900 to 1,400 peak hour trips will be added to / from the study area – equivalent to two additional travel lanes on arterials to serve the area.
4.1.2 Future Traffic Operations

In 2031, it is estimated that:

- The road network will operate reasonably well with a few "hot spot" intersections. Traffic at these intersections will experience long delays of more than 55 seconds per vehicle and queues waiting at the signals up to 180 meters in length during the PM peak hour. These intersections include Barton Street East and Lake Avenue (northbound left-turn), Queenston Road and Nash Road (northbound left turn and southbound through / right turn), and King Street East and Centennial Parkway (eastbound left turn, eastbound through / right turn, westbound left turn, northbound left turn, and southbound through).

- Barton Street East and Queenston Road west of Centennial Parkway will experience higher levels of congestion during peak periods due to the increase in traffic accessing the Red Hill Valley Parkway.

- Other roads approach but do not exceed their capacity to move traffic.

With the recent reconstruction of Barton Street East, Centennial Parkway and King Street East, and the planned LRT on Queenston Road, future travel demand cannot be accommodated by adding lanes to the existing roads. A few intersections, as noted above, will operate with long delays and queues if the roads are not widened. A wider range of mode choices is required to address travel demand.

4.2 Issues Identified Through Consultation

An overview of the issues and opportunities identified through the consultation is provided in Exhibit 4-2. They represent the comments from 12 members of the Focus Group, 86 people who attended the first Public Open House, and 12 written submission.
Exhibit 4-2: Issues Identified in Phase 1 Consultation

**Roadways:**
- Speeding on residential streets
- Congestion on Red Hill Valley Parkway causes traffic to seek alternate routes in neighbourhoods
- Heavy, noisy truck traffic on Centennial and Barton is unsafe

**Regional Transit:**
- GO Transit Park n Ride well liked
- How will people access the new GO Station
- Increase non-auto access to new GO Station

**Local Transit:**
- Mixed opinions on potential for rapid transit expansion
- Lack of service between major destinations within the neighbourhoods
- Connect existing routes to Eastgate Square (Route 4 & 5)
- Lack of transit service to Riverdale Community Centre

**Walking:**
- Important for healthy active living
- Unsafe and/or uncomfortable to walk
- Streetscaping improvements needed
- Major streets crossing times inadequate
- Existing sidewalks adjacent to traffic on Nash
- Missing sidewalks along portions of Lake, Centennial and Warrington
- Pedestrian access to Eastgate Square / Transit Terminal: easy from west; need better connections east to Riverdale

**Bicycling:**
- Important for healthy active living
- Uncomfortable due to lack of safe facilities, fast traffic and large trucks
- Expand Hamilton Bike Share (SoBi) to the area
- Need safe connection on Centennial Parkway to Confederation Park
- New bikeways suggested for Nash, Delawana, Owen Place, Kenora, Kentley; to new GO Station and Red Hill Library; and extend King Street bike lanes
5 Alternative Transportation Solutions

The transportation solutions were categorized by the main issue or opportunity they address:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Mobility Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Extend the B-line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (within 15 years west of Centennial &amp; beyond 25 years east of Centennial)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SAFETY | | | |
| A | Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds | B | Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue |
| C | Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas | D | Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections |
| E | Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety | F | Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park |

The transportation solutions are listed in Exhibit 5-1. Additional information on Complete Livable Better Streets and neighbourhood greenways, two new approaches to street design in Hamilton, are provide in the subsequent sections.

Exhibit 5-1: Alternative Transportation Solutions
5.1.1 Complete Livable Better Streets

The City of Hamilton’s approach to street design has been evolving to better recognize the needs of all users. The City’s Official Plan and supporting policy documents call for streets that are more supportive of walking, cycling and transit. The City-wide TMP considers planned land uses and built form intensities to ensure that the transportation network supports and facilitates the City’s vision for growth.

Streets in Hamilton today are identified by their transportation function as arterial, collector and local roads. Streets will continue to be identified via this classification, however, as part of the City-wide TMP Update the City is identifying policy and a decision making process for adopting a Complete Livable Better Streets design approach.

Complete Livable Better Streets is an approach to street design that balances the needs of all users. While design does not always provide equal accommodation, it is a context sensitive approach that considers both the transportation and place-making function of the road. A Complete Livable Better Streets approach to design will include place-making and land-use sensitive roadway typologies, and a standards toolkit that will help rationalize and guide road and streetscape decisions. The proposed Complete Livable Better Streets typologies include Main Streets, Urban Avenues, Transitioning Avenues, Connectors, Neighbourhood Streets, Rural Roads, and Rural Villages.

---

The proposed Complete Livable Better Streets policy shown below; the associated decision-making process is illustrated in **Exhibit 5-2**.

Promote a network of Complete Livable Better Streets that recognizes both the transportation and place-making function of the road. These streets are context sensitive, balance the needs of all users and are efficient, accessible, safe and sustainable. This network will be achieved through:

- Applying the City-wide TMP policies to the design, planning, maintenance and operations of all street projects
- Designing streets with consideration for the context of surrounding land uses
- Balancing user needs based on the vision and differing purposes of each streets
- Incorporating green infrastructure
- Improving the public realm to encourage interaction between all of its users
- Considering economic well-being

The Complete Livable Better Streets policy will be implemented as follows:

- Implement the Complete Livable Better Streets decision-making process (see Appendix "C" to Report PED18007 Part 2 of 3 Page 47 of 75
- Develop design guidelines
- Develop a program to monitor the implementation and success of Complete Livable Better Streets
- Review current design standards to ensure reflection of Complete Livable
5.1.2 Neighbourhood Greenways

Neighbourhood greenways are local residential streets where pedestrians, cyclists, and neighbours are given priority, linking them to parks, schools, natural areas, amenities, and commercial streets. The elements that make up a neighbourhood greenway help slow traffic, discourage through traffic, and make the street safer and more comfortable for residents. A network of neighbourhood greenways can promote access by active transportation to areas that were seen only accessible by busy arterial roads or by car. The network provides opportunities for physical activity, and strengthens the sense of community. In the latest Hamilton Transportation Master Plan draft report this term is renamed Bicycle Boulevard.

These local, traffic calmed streets have been implemented for example in Vancouver, British Columbia, and Portland, Oregon, and are very popular.

Neighbourhood greenways are created by planning routes on quiet streets and adding traffic calming, public amenities, and signs and pavement markings to create an inviting street for walking, cycling and interaction among neighbours. The design of each street requires residents to help identify what needs to be improved. Design treatments are typically a mix of the following:

- Route Planning: Direct access to destinations such as schools, parks, community centres, and nearby shops
- Signs and Pavement Markings: Easy to find and to follow
- Speed Management: Slow motor vehicle speeds
• Volume Management: Low or reduced motor vehicle volumes
• Minor Street Crossings: Minimal bicyclist delay
• Major Street Crossings: Safe and convenient crossings
• Offset Crossings: Clear and safe navigation
• Green Infrastructure: Enhancing environments

The route planning and design treatments of neighbourhood greenways are illustrated in Exhibit 5-3. See also Glossary, page 65.
Exhibit 5-3: Neighbourhood Greenways: Route Planning and Design Elements

- Links to local business districts
- Safe crossings at key intersections
- Consistent wayfinding
- Streets have less than 1,000 cars a day and an average speed of less than 30 mph
- Routes that parallel arterial roads
- Frequent places to stop and linger
- Route respect existing topography
- Direct connections to libraries, schools, parks, and local destinations
- Abundant trees and vegetation
- Variety of natural systems to manage stormwater
- Links with bike and pedestrian paths, trails, and networks
- Connects to public transit
- Protects existing areas and vegetation
- Street and sidewalk lighting
- Appropriately placed and pedestrian-scaled signage
- Opportunities for physical activity and play
- Sense of ownership
- Retains service and emergency vehicle access
- Travel lanes wide enough for bicyclists to travel comfortably
- Integrated vehicle flow and parking
- Natural systems to manage stormwater
- Continuous sidewalks
- Attention at all cross streets
- Residents living in adjoining houses provide "eyes on the street" at all times of the day
- Seating and public places to stop
- More people interacting on the streets
5.2 Modifications to the Alternatives

The following modifications to the alternatives were introduced following Phase 2 consultation, based on suggestions from stakeholders and members of the public:

- Modify "protect right-of-way on Barton Street East for additional traffic lanes" to include HOV / transit-only lanes
- Include reviewing pedestrian walk times in "improve traffic signal timing"
- Add from Recreational Trails Master Plan:
  - Project 5-4: Bow Valley Open Space and Lawrence Avenue Park just west of Lake Avenue
  - Project 5-9: Pottruff Road near Eugene Street across the Red Hill Valley Parkway to the Red Hill Valley Recreational Trail
- Add improve safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through Red Hill Valley Parkway interchanges

5.3 Evaluation

The alternative transportation solutions were evaluated based on their impact on the environment described in terms of transportation, public health, physical environment and cost. The initial evaluation criteria were presented to the public for review and then additional criteria were added as described in Exhibit 5-4.

Exhibit 5-4: Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRANSPORTATION: network, access, comfort and delay:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods movement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PUBLIC HEALTH:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation equity and access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collision reduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Initial evaluation criteria presented to stakeholders / public:
- Transit
- Pedestrians
- Cyclists
- Drivers
- Connectivity
- Accessibility

Additional evaluation criteria added following consultation:
- Comfort
- Delay
- Emergency Services
- Goods Movement

Initial evaluation criteria presented to stakeholders / public:
- Safety
- Public health

Additional evaluation criteria added following consultation:
- Transportation equity and access (includes physical activity)
- Social interaction
- Air quality
Initial evaluation criteria presented to stakeholders / public:
- Urban design
- Natural environment
- Built heritage
- Archaeology

Initial evaluation criteria presented to stakeholders / public:
- Cost

Additional evaluation criteria added following consultation:
- Economic benefits

A detailed evaluation was undertaken; the results are provided in Appendix D. A summary of the evaluation is provided Exhibit 5-5.

Exhibit 5-5: Summary of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Public health</th>
<th>Physical Environment</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Recommended Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue / Opportunity: Capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Extend the B-line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (within 15 years west of Centennial &amp; beyond 25 years east of Centennial)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic, HOV or transit-only lanes (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Improve traffic signal timings including pedestrian walk times</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Solution</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Public health</td>
<td>Physical Environment</td>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>Recommended Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue / Opportunity: Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>See Urban Design Option F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue / Opportunity: Urban Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50%</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian connections through new developments</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement cycle tracks on Centennial, and Queenston east of Centennial as per</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>See Urban Design Option F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Plan streetscape options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Based on the evaluation, the following alternative transportation solutions are **NOT** recommended:

- Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections: Based on traffic analysis, additional turn lanes recommended at Barton Street East and Nash, Barton Street East and Lake, Queenston and Nash, and Queenston and Centennial. Significant physical constraints may preclude the ability to widen intersections for additional turn lanes. Centennial Parkway and sections of Barton Street East and King Street East were recently reconstructed so the opportunity would be longer term, maybe beyond the horizon year of the Secondary Plan.

- Add local HSR circulator route: About 90% of the residential areas are within 400 m of a bus routes. A local circulator route would be expensive (both capital and operating costs). It is recommended that effort focus on monitoring and adjusting existing routes instead of adding a new route; HSR reviews bus routes annually.

Constructing cycle tracks on Centennial Parkway, and on Queenston Road east of Centennial Parkway are considered not viable in the short term. Centennial Parkway was recently reconstructed so the cost of constructing cycle tracks would be very high. Cycle tracks on Queenston Road need to be considered as part of the longer-term B-line LRT extension. Therefore, the opportunity to provide cycle tracks is very long term, beyond the horizon year of the Secondary Plan. This alternative transportation solution is captured, however, by the alternatives to protect the rights-of-way of these arterials and support future designs to reflect the Complete Livable Better Streets policy.
5.4 Preferences Identified Through Consultation

During the Phase 2 Focus Group and Public Open House, attendees worked in five groups to identify alternatives with advantages that made sense, were the best ideas for them and their neighbourhoods, and those that they had concerns about or might not work. The outcomes are summarized in Section 3.2. The top alternatives that were clearly supported included:

- Extend the B-Line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (within 15 years) and east of Centennial Parkway (beyond year 2041)
- Improve traffic signal timings
- Implement the S-Line Rapid Transit on Centennial Parkway
- Extend rapid transit along Centennial Parkway to the GO Transit station (beyond year 2041)
- Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park
- Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue

The recommended alternative transportation solutions were presented at the third Focus Group meeting and Public Open House. Comments received in support of the recommended alternatives are summarized in Exhibit 5-6.

Exhibit 5-6: Summary of Comments Received Supporting Recommended Transportation Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS FOR STREETS:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS FOR TRANSIT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ Support better traffic flow and signal timing (2 people)</td>
<td>▶ Support connections to transit hubs, more bus routes, stops and shelters, and feeder bus routes to the Queenston LRT station (6 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Support traffic calming (2 people), Specific streets mentioned are Cromwell Crescent, Owen Place, Kentley Drive, and streets used to access Eastgate Mall from Nash Road</td>
<td>▶ Support connections to public transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Support LRT to Eastgate Square (not BRT) (5 people)</td>
<td>▶ Support LRT to Eastgate Square (not BRT) (5 people)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION:</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED SOLUTIONS FOR OTHER PROPOLENTS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▶ Support active transportation with new and enhanced infrastructure</td>
<td>▶ Support the GO train station at Centennial Parkway (4 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Support increase in walkability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Support more bike lanes (2 people), specifically on Lake Avenue connecting Confederation Park entrance (2 people)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Support improving east-west active transportation connections in the study area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▶ Support improving the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the Red Hill Valley Parkway and make it a top priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following suggestions were added to the recommended transportation solutions based on comments received:

- **For Complete Livable Better Streets**, wider sidewalks. Specific streets mentioned are Nash Road, Queenston Road, Centennial Parkway, and Barton Street East.

- **With the bus service review**, consider extending bus service to Confederation Park, and looping Routes 4 and 44 around St. Joseph’s Hospital and Eastgate Transit Hub.

- **For the neighbourhood greenways**, include bike lanes on Delawana Drive, Kenora Avenue, and Kentley Drive along with 40 km/h posted speed limit.

- **Provide high visibility crosswalks** (‘ladder’ markings) throughout the neighbourhoods.

- **Connect Battlefield Park to Confederation Park** for tourists.

- **Provide protected bike lanes or cycle tracks** on Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway to support direct access to Battlefield Park, Eastgate Transit Hub, Confederation GO Station, and the many commercial and employment establishments on these corridors.

In addition, the Secondary Plan area was extended to include the industrial / employment area north of Barton Street East and west of the future Confederation GO Station. Land use in the area may change to be supportive of the transit hub. Considering direct access to the area and the GO station and to provide improved road, pedestrian and cycling network connectivity – the study recommends extending Goderich Road to Kenora Avenue. It would require relocating the City of Hamilton’s Transfer Station.
6 Preferred Transportation Solutions

The preferred transportation solutions are those that:

- Meet the goals of the opportunity statement
- Result in net benefits with respect to the evaluation of their transportation, public health, physical environment and cost impacts
- Generally have the support of the stakeholders and members of the public who participated in the consultation

They are described in Sections 6.2 to 6.6 in terms of City-wide policies, City-wide activities and programs, City-wide projects, Centennial Neighbourhoods specific initiatives, Secondary Plan policies, and preferred solutions by other proponents.

6.1 Municipal Class EA Schedules

Some of the preferred transportation solutions will require additional study and consultation under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process (MCEA). The specific requirements of the MCEA for a particular project depend on the type of project, its complexity and the significance of environmental impacts. According to the project classifications included in the Class EA document, the projects included in this Master Plan are a combination of the following schedules:

- Schedule “A” projects are limited in scale and have minimal adverse environmental impacts. These projects are considered pre-approved under the Class EA and may proceed directly to construction without following the Class EA process. An example of a Schedule “A” project is normal or emergency operations and maintenance of a roadway. Consultation for these projects has been completed through the CNTMP. These may proceed to implementation.

- Schedule “A+” projects are similar to Schedule “A” projects and are considered preapproved under the Class EA, however public notification is required prior to construction. An example of such a project includes the construction of localized operational improvements, such as a turning lane at an intersection, where the construction cost is less than $2.3 M. Consultation for these projects has been completed through the CNTMP. These may proceed to implementation.

- Schedule “B” projects have the potential for some adverse impacts and are approved under the EA Act provided they follow Phases 1 and 2 of the Class EA process and are “screened”. An example of a Schedule “B” project is the widening of a roadway, where the construction cost is less than $2.3 M. Consultation for these projects has been completed through the CNTMP. The proponent (City of Hamilton) must issue a Notice of Completion to review agencies and public. The Project File (this document) is made available for review. If no Part II Order
requests are received within 30 days of the Notice of Completion, projects may proceed to implementation.

- Schedule “C” projects have the potential for significant adverse environmental impacts and must follow all five phases of the Class EA process. An example of a Schedule “C” project includes the construction of a new road, where the construction value is greater than $2.3 M. Phases 1 and 2 of the planning and design process are completed through the CNTMP. Phases 3 and 4 of the Class EA must be completed prior to construction of any Schedule “C” projects. Additional study and mandatory consultation required for these projects.

Since a Master Plan covers Phases 1 and 2 of the Class EA process, projects that must follow all five phases of the process, such as widening an existing road where the construction value is greater than $2.3 M, can proceed directly to Phases 3 and 4 of the Class EA process. Phase 3 includes the identification, evaluation and selection of the preferred design and Phase 4 consists of the documentation of Phases 1, 2 (including any required updates to this Master Plan) and 3 in an Environmental Study Report.

6.2 Preferred Solutions for Streets

Preferred transportation solutions that affect streets in the Centennial Neighbourhoods TMP study area are listed in Exhibit 6-1. The referenced excerpt from the Urban Official Plan indicating the right-of-way to be protected along the arterials is provided in Exhibit 6-2. The preferred solutions for streets are also illustrated on a map in Exhibit 6-3.

Exhibit 6-1: Preferred Solutions for Streets including Approximate Cost, MCEA Schedule and Implementation Timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</th>
<th>APPROX. COST (if known)</th>
<th>MCEA SCHEDULE (see Note 1)</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City-wide Policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Support future designs of streets to reflect desirable operating speeds through the City-wide Transportation Master Plan (2016) Complete Livable Better Streets policy (See Section 5.1.1 for a description of Complete Livable Better Streets)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>As streets in the study area are reconstructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Protect right-of-way (no cost) as per Urban Official Plan, Schedule C-2 – Future Road Widenings (October 2015) – see Exhibit 6-2 – for Complete Livable Better Streets on Barton Street East from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial Parkway for increased capacity, on Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road for future LRT, and on all arterials for HOV, transit-only lanes, cycle tracks or bike lanes, wider pedestrian sidewalks and amenities, and / or enhanced streetscaping</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>As streets in the study area are reconstructed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City-wide Activities & Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</th>
<th>APPROX. COST (if known)</th>
<th>MCEA SCHEDULE (see Note 1)</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Improve traffic signal co-ordination and timings, including pedestrian walk times. Review the implementation of recommendations from the Traffic Signal Operations Study (2012) and determine if additional adjustments are required.</td>
<td>Existing activities / programs</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Implement traffic calming on local streets where speeding, cut-through traffic volumes, collisions and safety concerns are ascertained; future studies are required. Implement with community and Councillor’s support.</td>
<td>Costs vary from about $2 K to $10 K per traffic calming device</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>On-going Speed studies on Owen Place have identified speeding as an issue; Owen Place has been recommended to be included in the City of Hamilton’s traffic calming program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Continue to promote travel options to employers and schools through the Smart Commute program and Active and Sustainable School Transportation (ASST) initiatives (Transportation Demand Management).</td>
<td>Existing City activities / programs</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Centennial Neighbourhoods Specific Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</th>
<th>APPROX. COST (if known)</th>
<th>MCEA SCHEDULE (see Note 1)</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Co-ordinate communication of travel options available for new residents in various languages aligned with settlement activities (Transportation Demand Management).</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Years 2017 to 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

1. **Schedule A and A+ Projects**: Consultation for these projects has been completed through the CNTMP. These may proceed to implementation.

   **Schedule B Projects**: Issue Notice of Completion to review agencies and public. The Project File (this document) is made available for review. If no Part II Order requests are received within 30 days of the Notice of Completion, projects may proceed to implementation.

   **Schedule C Projects**: Additional study and mandatory consultation required for these projects.
### Exhibit 6-2: Excerpt from Urban Official Plan Schedule C-2 – Future Road Widenings (October 2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Future Right-of-way Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barton Street</td>
<td>Woodward Avenue</td>
<td>Nash Road</td>
<td>42.672 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nash Road</td>
<td>Fifty Road</td>
<td>36.576 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>North Service Road</td>
<td>36.576 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street East</td>
<td>Redhill Creek</td>
<td>Battlefield Drive</td>
<td>36.576 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Battlefield Drive</td>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>26.213 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Avenue N</td>
<td>North City Limit</td>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>26.213 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Avenue Drive</td>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>20.117 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash Road</td>
<td>End</td>
<td>Barton Street</td>
<td>26.213 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>Redhill Valley Parkway</td>
<td>Donn Avenue</td>
<td>36.576 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 6-3: Map of Preferred Solutions for Streets

No. 2 Protect right-of-way (no cost) as per Urban Official Plan for Complete Livable Better Streets
No. 3 Improve traffic signal co-ordination and timings

Through the TMP Update, the City is identifying policy and a decision-making process for adopting a Complete Livable Better Streets design approach. It balances the needs of all users yet is sensitive to local context that considers both the transportation and place-making function of the street.
6.3 Preferred Solutions for Transit

Preferred transportation solutions that affect transit in the Centennial Neighbourhoods TMP study area are listed in Exhibit 6-4. The preferred solutions for transit are also illustrated on a map in Exhibit 6-5.

Exhibit 6-4: Preferred Solutions for Transit including Approximate Cost, MCEA Schedule and Implementation Timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</th>
<th>APPROX. COST (if known)</th>
<th>MCEA SCHEDULE (see Note 1)</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City-wide Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Determine appropriate transit priority measures and funding. A transit priority study is recommended for Centennial Neighbourhoods following adoption of a potential new transit priority policy under the City-wide Transportation Master Plan.</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Schedules A+ or B, (depending on potential for environmental effects)</td>
<td>Years 2017 to 2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-wide Activities &amp; Programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. New guidelines are being developed for bus stop placement and design, including installing passenger amenity features. More transit shelters throughout the HSR bus route system is a key element for improving the customer experience, helping to grow transit ridership. Apply these guidelines to the study area routes.</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td>Years 2017 to 2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Through the City-wide Annual Transit Service Plans, consider extending or modifying HSR bus routes in the study area. Review the potential for improving connections between the LRT terminus and the new Confederation GO Station until rapid transit is extended to this destination.</td>
<td>Modification or extension of local bus routes generally require purchase of additional buses and increases in operating budget</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City-wide Projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extend the B-line LRT from Queenston Traffic Circle to Eastgate Transit Hub. Subsequent to the consultation and preparation of this report, the LRT extension from the Queenston Traffic Circle to Eastgate was included in the Environmental Project Report addendum, and endorsed by council.</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Transit Project Assessment Process</td>
<td>As per City’s B line implementation plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Extend rapid transit from the Eastgate Transit Hub to the Confederation GO Station.</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Transit Project Assessment Process</td>
<td>As per City’s Rapid Transit expansion Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</td>
<td>APPROX. COST (if known)</td>
<td>MCEA SCHEDULE (see Note 1)</td>
<td>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. **Schedule A and A+ Projects**: Consultation for these projects has been completed through the CNTMP. These may proceed to implementation.

   **Schedule B Projects**: Issue Notice of Completion to review agencies and public. The Project File (this document) is made available for review. If no Part II Order requests are received within 30 days of the Notice of Completion, projects may proceed to implementation.

   **Schedule C Projects**: Additional study and mandatory consultation required for these projects.
No. 9 Through the City-wide Annual Transit Service Plans, consider extending or modifying HSR bus routes in the study area.
No. 10 Extend the B-line LRT from Queenston Traffic Circle to Eastgate Transit Hub.
No. 11 Implement rapid transit on Centennial to extend to the Confederation GO Station.
6.4 Preferred Solutions for Active Transportation

Preferred transportation solutions that affect active transportation (walking and cycling) in the Centennial Neighbourhoods TMP study area are listed in Exhibit 6-6. The preferred solutions for active transportation are also illustrated on a map in Exhibit 6-7.

These recommendations will be guided by the City of Hamilton’s’ Pedestrian Mobility Plan (2012) and Cycling Master Plan (2009), and associated updates to these plans.

Also see Preferred Solutions for Streets No. 2 to protect rights-of-way as per Urban Official Plan for Complete Livable Better Streets. This includes allowing for the provision of cycle tracks, pedestrian facilities and amenities on arterial roads such as Barton Street East, Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road at such time that these roads are reconstructed.

Exhibit 6-6: Preferred Solutions for Active Transportation including Approximate Cost, MCEA Schedule and Implementation Timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</th>
<th>APPROX. COST (if known)</th>
<th>MCEA SCHEDULE (see Note 1)</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Citywide Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Implement Projects in the City of Hamilton’s Recreational Trails Master Plan (2016):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project 5-4: multi-use trail in Bow Valley Open Space and Lawrence Avenue Park just west of Lake Avenue</td>
<td>Recreational Trails Master Plan does not include any estimated construction costs (to be determined)</td>
<td>Trail projects under $3.5 M are exempt from the MCEA</td>
<td>The Recreational Trails Master Plan is intended for phased implementation of trail initiatives. Implementation timeframes for Projects 5-4 and 5-9 not identified. Project 5-10: see Recommended Solutions by Other Proponents No. 29 – implement as part of QEW / Centennial Parkway bridge rehabilitation scheduled by MTO anticipated for 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project 5-9: multi-use trail and bridge connecting Pottorff Road near Eugene Street across the Red Hill Valley Parkway to the Red Hill Valley Trails</td>
<td>Project 5-10 approx. value $2 M</td>
<td>Those that cost between $3.5 M and 9.5 M are Schedule B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Project 5-10: multi-use trail access to Confederation Park along Centennial Parkway and across the QEW to Goderich Road (see Recommended Solutions by Other Proponents).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Those over $9.5 M are Schedule C</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centennial Neighbourhoods Specific Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic and improve walking and cycling connections to create Complete Livable Better Streets. Improvements may consist of street furniture and amenities (e.g. seating, planters or gardens, public art, bicycle racks, pedestrian-scale lighting, water fountains, tree or shade canopies), way-finding signage and pavement markings, traffic speed and volume management (e.g. traffic calming, signs and pavement markings), bike lanes to narrow road width, and green stormwater infrastructure. A description of neighbourhood greenways is provided in Section 5.1.2 and the Glossary.</td>
<td>There are about 7 km of greenways recommended at a cost of about $75 K per kilometre to implement.</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>Co-ordinate with traffic calming initiatives (see Preferred Solutions for Streets No. 4 and Preferred Transportation Solutions to include in the Secondary Plan No. 24)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</th>
<th>APPROX. COST (if known)</th>
<th>MCEA SCHEDULE (see Note 1)</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Construct missing sections of sidewalk along Lake Avenue, Centennial Parkway and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas and schools.</td>
<td>There are about a total of 6 km of new sidewalks required at a cost of about $300 K per kilometre to construct</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>Phase in with road resurfacing / reconstruction projects or through development applications (see Secondary Plan Policies No. 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Provide cycling facilities on Nash Road, Lake Avenue, Warrington Street and a section of the South Service Road in the future. Options to consider for cycling facilities are as follows:</td>
<td>Nash Road: Approximately $80 K Lake Avenue: Approximately $90 K Warrington Street: Approximately $600 K</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td>Consider implementing with future development to provide cycling infrastructure in response to growth in travel. Although wider rights-of-way for the arterial streets will be protected for potential cycle tracks in the long term (see Preferred Solutions for Streets No. 2), retrofitting these bikeways are an opportunity to develop a viable cycling network in the shorter term.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Nash Road—Re-stripe with bike lanes north of Barton Street East in conjunction with permanent on-street parking along the west curb as well as auxiliary left-turn lanes at Kentley Drive to eliminate the 3-phase traffic signal design. Re-stripe with bike lanes south of Barton Street East in conjunction with a centre two-way left-turn lane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Lake Avenue— Re-stripe with bike lanes in conjunction with a centre two-way left-turn lane.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Warrington Street and a section of the South Service Road—Construct a multi-use trail on the south side from Lake Avenue to Centennial Parkway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Improve the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the Red Hill Valley Parkway. A design study is recommended to determine issues and appropriate treatments.</td>
<td>The cost to improve signage, pavement markings and ramp crossings is estimated to be about $100 K per interchange</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>Year 2017 to 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</td>
<td>APPROX. COST (if known)</td>
<td>MCEA SCHEDULE (see Note 1)</td>
<td>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 17. Provide a pedestrian / cycling route to the Confederation GO Station (see Preferred Transportation Solutions by Other Proponents No. 30). Potential non-auto routing to be investigated includes:  
  - A connection south of the railway along Bancroft Street to the Confederation GO Station, with access across the railway to the north side  
  - Incorporating active transportation facilities on the potential extension of Goderich Road through the City’s Transfer Station lands to Kenora Avenue (see Preferred Transportation Solutions to include in the Secondary Plan No. 27) | The cost of a pedestrian / cycling route along Bancroft Street is approximately $300 K  
Cost of extending Goderich Road to be determined | Pedestrian / cycling route along Bancroft Street  
Schedule A+  
Further studies needed to identify class of EA for Goderich Road extension | Implement with Phase 2 development of the Confederation GO Station by Metrolinx (see Preferred Solutions by Other Proponents No. 30)  
Timeframe to implement Goderich Road extension depends on further studies |
| 18. Develop a pedestrian / cycling route between Confederation Park and Battlefield House Museum and Park. Signage should be consistent with the City of Hamilton’s City-wide Wayfinding project including pedestrian and cyclist oriented signage. There are two routes that can be explored:  
  - Centennial Parkway multi-use trail over the QEW, future Goderich Road connection to Kenora Avenue (sidewalks and future bike lanes), Kenora Avenue / Greenfield Drive / Owen Place (future neighbourhood greenways), and King Street East (sidewalks and bike lanes)  
  - Centennial Parkway multi-use trail over the QEW, South Service Road (future multi-use trail), Warrington Street (future multi-use trail), Lake Avenue (sidewalks and future bike lanes), and King Street East (sidewalks) | Approximate cost for signage of existing and future routes is $10 K | Exempt | Implement following implementation of Preferred Transportation Solution for Active Transportation No. 12 (Recreational Trails Master Plan Project 5-10), No. 13 and No. 15. |

Notes:
1. **Schedule A and A+ Projects**: Consultation for these projects has been completed through the CNTMP. These may proceed to implementation.
2. **Schedule B Projects**: Issue Notice of Completion to review agencies and public. The Project File (this document) is made available for review. If no Part II Order requests are received within 30 days of the Notice of Completion, projects may proceed to implementation.
3. **Schedule C Projects**: Additional study and mandatory consultation required for these projects.
Exhibit 6-7: Map of Preferred Solutions for Active Transportation

No. 2 Protect right-of-way (no cost) as per Urban Official Plan (see below) for Complete Livable Better Streets.

No. 12 Implement Projects in the City of Hamilton’s Recreational Trails Master Plan.

No. 13 Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic and improve walking and cycling connections to create Complete Livable Better Streets.

No. 14 Construct missing sections of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas and schools.

No. 15 Provide cycling facilities on Nash Road, Lake Avenue, Warrington Street and a section of the South Service Road in the future.

No. 16 Improve the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the RHVP.

No. 17 Provide a pedestrian / cycling route to the Confederation GO Station.

No. 18 Develop a pedestrian / cycling route between Confederation Park and Battlefield House Museum and Park.

No. 29 City to request that MTO include the multi-use trail through the QEW / Centennial Parkway interchange.

No. 30 City to request that Metrolinx create non-auto (walking and cycling) “last mile” access to the Confederation GO Station.

Neighbourhood greenways are streets designed with traffic calming and landscape features to reduce speeding, create a pleasant experience for residents and all users of the streets.
### Preferred Transportation Solutions to include in the Secondary Plan

Preferred transportation solutions to be included in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan are listed in Exhibit 6-8 and illustrated on a map in Exhibit 6-9.

These recommendations will be guided by the City of Hamilton’s Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Guide for Development (2015). They will be implemented through the Planning Act and development approval processes (the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment process is not applicable). The timeframe for implementation will be addressed in the Secondary Plan and as development proceeds over the next 20 years. These transportation solutions will generally be funded by the developer.

#### Exhibit 6-8: Preferred Solutions to be included in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan including Approximate Cost, MCEA Schedule and Implementation Timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Manage access to larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety. Identify and implement access management as part of development applications for deeper properties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Manage parking for developments to reduce surface lots. Identify parking requirements including “end-of-trip” cycling facilities such as bike parking, lockers, change rooms and showers for developments in the Secondary Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Improve pedestrian connections through developments. Identify and implement pedestrian connections as part of development applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts. Gateways may include one or a combination of public art, way-finding signage, landscaping or streetscape / built form around the entryways to strengthen a sense of place. Signage should be consistent with the City of Hamilton’s City-wide Wayfinding project including pedestrian and cyclist oriented signage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Support live / work / play development to encourage trips by active transportation and transit through the Secondary Plan land-use recommendations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Facilitate car sharing through a City-wide initiative to consider policies required to support car-sharing and then apply to Centennial Neighbourhoods area. Identify opportunities for car-sharing when applying the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Land Use Guidelines to development applications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Identify traffic calming measures to reduce cut-through traffic, speeding, collisions or safety concerns as part of development applications. Implement with community and Councillor support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Require missing sidewalks adjacent to new developments to be constructed as part of the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Through future re-development of adjacent lands that support the Confederation GO Transit mobility hub, extend Goderich Road (with bikeway and sidewalks) to Kenora Avenue to support direct access to the area and Confederation GO Station and to provide improved road, pedestrian and cycling network connectivity. This solution would require relocating the City of Hamilton’s Transfer Station.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 6-9: Map of Preferred Transportation Solutions to include in the Secondary Plan

No. 19 Manage access to larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety.
No. 21 Improve pedestrian connections through developments.
No. 22 Improve streetscape and gateways
No. 27 Through future re-development of adjacent lands that support the Confederation GO Transit mobility hub, extend Goderich Road (with bikeway and sidewalks) to Kenora Avenue to support direct access to the area and the Confederation GO Station and provide improved road, pedestrian and cycling network connectivity.
6.6 Preferred Transportation Solutions by Other Proponents

Preferred transportation solutions to be implemented by other proponents are listed in Exhibit 6-10. The costs to implement these solutions will be determined by the proponents. Any additional studies required as noted in Exhibit 6-10 will be the responsibility of the proponent. The timeframe for implementation is provided by the proponents.

Exhibit 6-10: Preferred Solutions to be implemented by Other Proponents including Approximate Cost, MCEA Schedule and Implementation Timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL STUDIES REQUIRED</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SoBi Hamilton</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Year 2017 to 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. City to approach SoBi Hamilton bike share to undertake a study to determine the feasibility of serving the Centennial Neighbourhoods study area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Transportation, Ontario</td>
<td>MTO is proponent (Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities)</td>
<td>QEW / Centennial Parkway bridge rehabilitation scheduled by MTO anticipated for 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. City to request that MTO include the multi-use trail (Project 5-10 of the Recreational Trails Master Plan) through the QEW / Centennial Parkway interchange as part of MTO’s initiative for improvements to the interchange and rehabilitation of the bridge. The multi-use trail is recommended to be a minimum of 3.0 m wide plus appropriate offsets to railings and hazards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metrolinx</td>
<td>Metroinx is proponent (GO Transit Class Environmental Assessment)</td>
<td>To be determined by Metroinx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. City to request that Metrolinx create non-auto (walking and cycling) “last mile” access to the Confederation GO Station, and provide bicycle parking and right-sized Park N’ Ride at the Confederation GO Station (see Preferred Solutions for Active Transportation No. 17).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossary

Active and Sustainable School Transportation (ASST) initiatives

ASST emphasizes the importance of walking, cycling, and public transit for transportation to schools. Smart Commute Hamilton, City of Hamilton, and local organizations work with school boards and schools to promote active and sustainable school transportation in elementary and secondary schools. The City of Hamilton, the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board (HWDSB) and the Hamilton-Wentworth Catholic District School Board (HWCDSB) endorsed the Active & Sustainable School Transportation Charter. The goal of is to facilitate a measurable shift in travel behaviour towards active and sustainable transportation through policy change, infrastructure improvements, capacity building, and education and awareness.

Cordon Count

A count of vehicles and people across a designated screenline line to determine the total flow (people and vehicles by mode and time period) into and out of the study area and the accumulation (people and vehicles) within the cordon area by time of day. A series of successive counting stations are grouped to form a “screenline”. A “cordon” refers to a geographic area enclosed by a set of screenlines.

Complete Livable Better Streets

Hamilton’s version of Complete Streets, the Complete Livable Better Streets approach recognizes that no-one size fits all solution is appropriate for street design as different streets can have different priorities. Complete Livable Better Streets recognizes that the primary function of a road may range from Goods Movement to a local road to a higher order rapid transit corridor; however, within all of these contexts a sensitive approach to balancing the needs of multiple users can be taken.

GO Transit

A division of Metrolinx, GO Transit is the regional public transit service for the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area, with routes extending to communities across the Greater Golden Horseshoe. Service includes both train and bus lines.

Hamilton Street Railway or HSR

City of Hamilton public transit system including bus, accessible transit and future rapid transit services,

Light Rail Transit or LRT

A transportation system based on electrically powered light rail vehicles (LRV) that operated on a track in a segregated, right of way. Multiple LRVs, or cars, can be coupled together to form a train. They are designed to deliver rapid, reliable and safe transportation services. With higher capacity than other transit systems, LRT will carry passengers in reserved transit lanes separated from regular traffic. Vehicles will be low floor with multiple entrances that are accessible to customers with all levels of mobility.
Level of Service (LOS)  
A set of characteristics that indicate the quality and quantity of transportation service provided, including characteristics that are quantifiable and those that are more difficult to quantify. Signalized intersection LOS is defined in terms of the average total vehicle delay of all traffic movements (through, left and right turns in all directions) through an intersection. Vehicle delay is a method of quantifying several intangible factors, including driver discomfort, frustration, and lost travel time. Specifically, LOS criteria are stated in terms of average delay per vehicle during a specified time period (for example, the PM peak hour). Vehicle delay is a complex measure based on many variables, including signal phasing (i.e., progression of movements through the intersection), signal cycle length, and traffic volumes with respect to intersection capacity. Level of Service Criteria for Signalized Intersections is as follows:

- **LOS A**: $\leq 10$ sec/veh of average delay  
  **Free flow**
- **LOS B**: $10 - 20$ sec/veh of average delay  
  **Stable flow (slight delays)**
- **LOS C**: $20 - 35$ sec/veh of average delay  
  **Stable flow (acceptable delays)**
- **LOS D**: $35 - 55$ sec/veh of average delay  
  **Approaching unstable flow (tolerable delay, occasionally wait through more than one signal cycle before proceeding)**
- **LOS E**: $55 - 80$ sec/veh of average delay  
  **Unstable flow (intolerable delay)**
- **LOS F**: $> 80$ sec/veh of average delay  
  **Forced flow (jammed)**

**Metrolinx**  
Metrolinx is an agency of the Government of Ontario that champions, develops and implements an integrated transportation system in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area.

**Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA)**  
A planning process that applies to municipal infrastructure projects including roads, water, and wastewater projects. The process is an approved procedure designed to protect the environment and enables the requirements of Ontario’s Environmental Assessment Act to be met in an effective manner.

**MCEA Schedule**  
Projects undertaken by municipalities vary in their environmental impact. Projects are classified in the MCEA in terms of schedules. MCEA Schedules A, A+, B, and C have increasing adverse environmental effects from minimal to significant. This the planning process for each schedule increases in complexity and consultative requirements.
Neighbourhood Greenways
Streets designed with traffic calming and landscape features to reduce speeding, create a pleasant experience for residents and all users of the streets. In the latest Hamilton Transportation Master Plan draft report this term is renamed Bicycle Boulevard.

Design treatments are typically a mix of the following:

- Route Planning: Direct access to destinations such as schools, parks, community centres, and nearby shops
- Signs and Pavement Markings: Easy to find and to follow
- Speed Management: Slow motor vehicle speeds
- Volume Management: Low or reduced motor vehicle volumes
- Minor Street Crossings: Minimal bicyclist delay
- Major Street Crossings: Safe and convenient crossings
- Offset Crossings: Clear and safe navigation
- Green Infrastructure: Enhancing environments

Transit Project Assessment Process
In June 2008, Ontario’s Ministry of the Environment established a streamlined environmental assessment process to expedite the development of transit projects. Rather than requiring a full Environmental Assessment – which can be very time-consuming – the Ministry created the Transit Project Assessment Process (TPAP), enabling assessment of potential environmental impacts to be completed within six months. The TPAP is documented in an Environmental Project Report (EPR).

Integral to the TPAP is detailed public and stakeholder consultation. The TPAP regulation sets out a structured consultation process to both provide information about the proposed transit project and to gather feedback from stakeholders and the public. During the TPAP, information on the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed LRT system, as well as commitments to mitigation and monitoring, will be documented in an Environmental Project Report (EPR) that will be made available for review by the public and the Minister of the Environment.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)
TDM manages the demands placed on transportation infrastructure. It is the use of policies, programs, infrastructure improvements, and/or services to influence travel behaviour. TDM encourages sustainable travel choices by supporting alternatives options over the convention of frequently driving alone. It encompasses a wide range of strategies including:

- Shifting travel modes (e.g. walking, cycling, taking transit or carpooling instead of driving alone)
- Reducing the number of trips people must make (e.g. destinations and activities such as work and shopping, near each other)
- Travelling more efficiently (e.g. making trips outside of peak hours)
Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS)

The Transportation Tomorrow Survey (TTS) is a cooperative effort by local and provincial government agencies to collect information about urban travel in southern Ontario. The survey has been undertaken every five years since 1986. The data collected helps local and regional governments, as well as the province and its agencies make transportation planning and investment decisions.

All TTS are a retrospective survey of travel taken by every member (age 11 of over) of the household during the day previous to the telephone (or web) contact. The TTS data contains detailed demographic on all members of a surveyed household.

The information collected and the method of collection has remained consistent over the six surveys and includes, characteristics of the household, characteristics of each person in the household, and details of the trips taken by each member of the household. Trip information includes details of any trips taken by transit. Information includes trip purpose, mode of transportation (driver, passenger, local or regional transit, walking, cycling and other), trip origin, destination and length.
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Welcome to Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan Focus Group Meeting #1

Purpose

Consider and review alternative options for changes to pedestrian, cycling, transit, truck and other transportation networks, and take into account upcoming GO service improvements to the area.

Address existing and future transportation needs and issues in the study area.

Co-ordinate with the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study that focuses on land use and growth in the area.

Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Process

Municipal Class EA process allows for a Master Plan approach, which is this context a collection of projects, evaluated at the same time.

We are following approach “A” which requires fulfillment of the Class EA requirements for any Schedule A, A+ and B Projects identified within the study; and

Outline additional work that will be required to implement any Schedule C Projects that are identified.

The end of the process will require a Council’s approval, budget process, and 30 day review and possibility of appeal for identified projects with the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change, at the end of the study.

Improving Health by Design

Physical Activity Benefits

Regular physical activity provides health benefits and helps prevent several chronic diseases:
- Cardiovascular disease
- Obesity
- Type 2 diabetes
- Osteoporosis
- Some cancers
- Some mental health issues

High Physical Inactivity Rates in Canada

Objectively measured data shows that 93% of children and youth 5-17 years old, and 85% of adults do NOT accumulate the recommended amount of moderate-to-vigorous intensity physical activity.
Sedentary Behaviour in Canada
Emerging research indicates that high levels of sedentary behaviour are also associated with health risks.
- Children and youth are spending an average of 8.6 hours per day or 62% of their waking hours being sedentary.
- Canadian adults are spending approximately 9.5 hours per day being sedentary (69% of waking hours).

Community Design
The way the built environment is planned, developed, maintained, and modified can support or prevent physical activity, and contributes to a sedentary lifestyle.
- Increased physical activity is associated with mixed use, mixed housing, compact design, and transit-oriented development.
- Car dependency is a sedentary behaviour that is inversely related to these community features.

Next Steps
The Project Team will review the comments collected at today’s meeting and begin to identify the issues, opportunities and alternative solutions.
- Focus Group Members and Members of the Public - survey as of April 16th, 2015.
- Public Open House No. 2 - Fall of 2015.
- Public Open House No. 3 - Late 2015/early 2016.
- Planning Committee of Council.
- 30 Day Review.
If you have any comments, concerns or questions about the study, please reach out to our project team.

Margaret Fazio, B.Sc., EP, MCIP, RPP
Project Manager, Transportation Planning
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 2218
Fax: 905-546-4435
E-mail: tplanning@hamilton.ca

Norma Moores, P.Eng.
Project Manager
IBI Group
Tel: 905-546-1010 x2106
Fax: 905-546-1011
E-mail: norma.moores@ibigroup.com
Study Purpose

The City of Hamilton has initiated the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (TMP) Study. The study will consider and review options for pedestrian, cycling, transit, truck and other transportation networks, and will also take into account upcoming GO service improvements to the area. The purpose of the study is to address existing and future transportation needs and issues in the study area.

This study is being co-ordinated with the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study that focuses on land use and growth in the area. More information on the land use study is available online at www.hamilton.ca/centennialneighbourhoods.

Purpose of the Focus Group Meeting

We have invited people representing various interests in the neighbourhoods to meet with us to discuss transportation issues and opportunities. Your ideas on how well transportation works in these neighbourhoods now, and in the future and with changes to land use from being considered in Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study are important to us.

Focus Group TMP Activities

At the Focus Group Meeting there will be two activities to help us understand your opinions and ideas:

Activity 1: On a large map of the neighbourhood provided at the meeting, work together to identify transportation issues and opportunities in the neighbourhoods. We want to consider all modes: travelling by walking, cycling, car, DARTS, taxi, HSR transit and GO transit. Do you have concerns about transportation safety, comfort and convenience for these modes of travel? Do they work better in some neighbourhoods than others? Where are there issues around trucking and deliveries, parking, traffic short-cutting or speeding through neighbourhoods? Where can improvement be made? Where do you see future issues becoming a problem with changes to transportation and land use?

Activity 2: Identify what is important to you when deciding between options for improving transportation now and in the future. Later in the study we will compare options and how much they impact the community. Some of the things we will consider are listed below. Discuss what are important priorities for you.

- Safety of all users (for example, drivers, bus passengers, pedestrians, cyclists)
- Connected transportation network (for example, how well the streets, sidewalks and trails are connected to places we want to travel to)
- Cost of transportation solutions (for example, cost to build or operate transportation solutions)
- Pedestrians (for example, comfortable and convenient for walking, encourages walking)
- Cyclists (for example, comfortable and convenient for cycling, encourages cycling)
- Drivers (for example, lessens congestion, reduces speeding, operates safely)
- Parking (for example, parking spaces removed or added)
- Transit passengers (for example, easy to get to bus stops, travel time by bus or train)
- Accessibility (for example, who well people with sight problems or those who walkers or scooters get around)
- Urban design (for example, improves how the street looks and feels, adds landscaping such as street trees and planters)
- Natural environment (for example, adds or removes green space, affects air quality)
- Built heritage (for example, impacts historic buildings)
- Archaeology (for example, impacts historical sites)
- Public health (for example, encourages active lifestyles, affects air quality)

**Project Contact**

We look forward to meeting you at the Focus Group meeting on April 8, 2015! If you have any questions about the study, please contact:

**Margaret Fazio, B.Sc., EP, MCIP, RPP**  
Project Manager, Environmental Planning  
Transportation Planning Section,  
Transportation Division, Public Works Department  
City of Hamilton, 400- 77 James St. N  
Hamilton, ON, Canada, L8R 2K3  
Tel: 905-546-2424 ext. 2218  
Fax: 905-546-2039;  
Email: Margaret.Fazio@hamilton.ca

**Norma Moores, P.Eng.**  
Consultant  
IBI Group  
200 east Wing, 360 James Street North  
Hamilton, ON L8L 1H5  
Tel: 905-546-1010 Ext. 2106  
Email: norma.moores@ibigroup.com
MINUTES

Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan and Transportation Management Plan

Subject: Focus Group Event #1 Facilitated by the City, Dillon Consulting and IBI Group

Date: April 8, 2015

Location: Dominic Agostino Riverdale Community Centre, Room 4

Time: 1 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

Invitees:
- Michelle Sergi (City) - Absent
- Christine Newbold (City)
- Melanie Pham (City)
- Margaret Fazio (City)
- Aniqa Shams (City – student)
- Paddy Kennedy (Dillon)
- Melissa Kosterman (Dillon)
- Norma Moores (IBI)(absent)
- Matt Colwill (IBI)
- Judy Kloosterman (Public)
- Gerald Asa (Public)
- Gale Wozney (Public)
- Philip Chin (Public)
- Ghalib A. Qasim (Public)
- Marnie O’Brien (Public)
- Mike Pawlowski (Public)
- Lynne Mans (Public)
- Tracy Harley (Public)
- Franca Rapino (Public)
- Emily Roukhbian (Public)
- Aamir Shahzad (absent)
- Antonietta Greco (absent)

Chair: Melanie Pham

Minutes: Dillon Consulting/Melanie Pham
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Introductions</td>
<td>Melanie Pham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Melanie introduced the project and welcomed members of the Focus Group to the meeting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Role &amp; Mandate of the Focus Group - City</td>
<td>Melanie Pham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Melanie presented the Role and Mandate of the Focus Group to the participants and reminded all of the code of conduct for their participation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. Presentation – Secondary Plan Study / Arterial Commercial Study (Dillon)</td>
<td>Paddy Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Paddy presented about the Secondary Plan (what is a Secondary Plan, Components, Nodes, Study Area, Drivers for Change, How we are working with the TMP Team, Neighbourhood Background, and information about the Arterial Commercial Study. Question – Are we expected work as if the LRT / GO Stations are in place/decided? There are different outcomes otherwise. • We are assuming Rapid Transit (whether or not it is light rail or bus) and GO is coming at some point. The GO Bus terminal is coming next year, and will be built adjacent to the train tracks, the train will be farther along in the future. Margaret encouraged participants to look up and comment on “The Big Move”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. Presentation – Neighbourhood Transportation Management Plan (IBI Group)</td>
<td>Margaret Fazio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Margaret presented the background for the Transportation Management Plan, accommodating uses, connections north of the study area to Confederation Park and accommodation of school active transportation modes south to King, purpose of the study, introduction into the EA process, benefits of Active Transportation, links to health benefits or issues. Question – Will there be a plan to incorporate parking at the GO Bus station? • Yes there will be parking at the station. The details</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(lot/structure) are not finalized.

**Question** – Are there drafts of the plans for the GO station?
- Yes and no, there are plans but they are in draft and are not universally available.

**Concern** – Issue raised that the focus of this study has to reflect the needs of the community, issues such as transportation and health needs. Feelings of being overlooked in the past.

**Concern** – The Police and representatives from Eastgate Mall should be invited to attend the workshop.

**Concern** – Pedestrian / Resident safety is a big issue. There are people who speed on local roads. Tried in the past to get certain roads down to 40 km/h, however unsuccessful. (Violet, Barlake, Delawana, Kenora to name a few).

**Concern** – Eastgate will not succeed as a node if attractors / businesses don’t come back / are introduced back into the area (vacant spaces in the mall / derelict stores along the corridors).

### 4. Discussions & Workshop

**Responses to Question 1: What are some key issues related to development and re-development in the Study Area?**

**Issues Discussed**
- Traffic speed on local roads
- Flooding under the CN Rail Bridge. *(Note from Margaret F. - This will be remedied during the current construction process.)*
- Focus on community needs
- Need to enhance the community “first impression,” it is not attractive upon entry
- Improve pedestrian connections and safety. Crossing roads for pedestrians and cyclists (especially on Centennial Parkway) is dangerous. Impacts ability of people to walk.
- Need to make sure travelling is accessible for people with disabilities.
- Make sure the facilities reflect the needs of the community (Active transportation enhancement).
• Lack of safety for bike riders vs. cost effectiveness of bike lanes.
• Commercial properties along Centennial / Queenston sometimes don’t plow their sidewalks forcing pedestrians to walk on the road, safety issue.
• Enforcement issues (speeding/snow clearing) vs. Regulatory issues (planning changes).
• Certain landowners/residents are for and others are against a BIA type initiative.
• If not a BIA, then more collaboration and “working together as a community”
• Accessibility and frequency of buses in the area to Downtown etc. is lacking. Need more buses, increase trip frequency, have better connections to other areas in the City. Connections are lacking to efficiently get to the mountain, McMaster University, Mohawk college, etc.
• Condition of transit stops can sometimes determine ridership (weather shelter vs. none)
• An full terminal at Eastgate where you can go indoors would improve transit attractiveness.
• Comment made about connecting Arrowhead back to Nash for better connectivity.
• The study area is made up of stable and transitional neighbourhoods so the housing is very much in demand. People want to move here or move from rental units into home/land ownership but there isn’t a lot of space for additional housing or options for home ownership.

Responses to Question 2: What types of physical improvements should the city consider?

Issues Discussed:
• Queenston was noted as being “prettier” than Centennial (trees/landscape buffer) and has sidewalks on both side of the road.
• Streetscaping on Centennial is lacking (benches, garbage containers, etc.) even after road reconstruction
• Larger building setbacks with landscaping (buffer) is an attractive feature. This exists for several apartment buildings in area.
• Need to have trees along the streets, however
should take into account retailers who want to have visibility, so need to place them strategically.

- Feasibility of street trees could be improved by using planters or soil technologies to prolong tree life and health. Average street tree lasts 15 years, often due to root space, and road salt exposure, among other things.
- Possibility of having “options for beautification” for owners to choose from including trees, light standards, planters etc.
- Concern voiced about building heights, make sure that the proposed heights are not too high which could be out of character for the area, (be contextually sensitive).
- Try not to force reduced setbacks, some do not wish to have residential buildings directly adjacent to the street/sidewalk.
- Try not to force commercial to become mixed use.

5a. Interactive Map Activity (Margaret)
- Attendees marked maps noting where there were transportation issues or concerns in the study area.

5b. Evaluation of Networks Criteria (Margaret)
- Attendees reviewed a list of criteria to be used for Transportation Management Plan development, and marked their priorities for consideration.

6. Conclusion and Adjournment
Focus Group comments
April 8, 2015

Neighbourhood Transportation Management Plan Study Area

Centennial Node Secondary Plan Boundary

“Safe” walkability for aging population

40 km/h on residential street

Provide multi-use trail to waterfront

Provide a sidewalk all the way to Confederation Park

Several people use HSR: introduce more routes to increase income

“Bike borrowing” is coming to this area

Need more frequent bus service
Bus stops need to be beautified, add shelters and seating

Not enough bus stops and most without shelters; not enough bus routes

Provide longer pedestrian “walk” signal at every major intersection

Provide bike lanes and green “bike boxes” at major intersections

Provide bike routes from sectors to Confederation Park, Battlefield Park and Redhill Park

TRANSPORTATION ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES
The purpose of this study:
- Support the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan study
- Review and address existing neighbourhood transportation issues
- Identify and evaluate options to address transportation issues

The CNTMP is being undertaken by the City of Hamilton to plan for improve mobility to:
- Accommodate transportation needs of future land use
- Leverage investment from development opportunities
- Support access to major transportation services such as the QEW, Red Hill Valley Parkway, and HSR, Rapid Transit and GO Transit
- Support choices including walking and cycling
- Create livable neighbourhoods and complete communities

The goals of the improvements are to create safe, efficient, and sustainable transportation, that limits impacts to the environment, and supports healthy living.

Walking:
- Important for healthy active living
- Unsafe and/or uncomfortable to walk
- Streetscaping improvements needed
- Major streets crossing times inadequate
- Sidewalks adjacent to traffic on Nash
- Missing sidewalks along portions of Lake, Centennial and Warrington
- Pedestrian access to Eastgate Square / Transit Terminal: easy from west; need better connections east to Riverdale
Issues identified during Phase 1

Bicycling:
- Important for healthy active living
- Uncomfortable due to lack of safe facilities, fast traffic and large trucks
- Expand Hamilton Bike Share (SoBi) to the area
- Need safe connection on Centennial Parkway to Confederation Park
- New bikeways suggested for Nash, Delawana, Owen Place, Kenora, Kentley; to new GO Station and Queenston Library; and extend King Street bike lanes

Local Transit:
- Mixed opinions on potential for rapid transit expansion
- Lack of service between major destinations within the neighbourhoods
- Connect existing routes to Eastgate Square (Route 4 & 5)
- Lack of transit service to Riverdale Community Centre

Regional Transit:
- GO Transit Park n Ride well liked
- How will people access the new GO Station
- Increase non-auto access to new GO Station

Roadways:
- Speeding on residential streets
- Congestion on Red Hill Valley Parkway causes traffic to seek alternate routes in neighbourhoods
- Heavy, noisy truck traffic on Centennial and Barton is unsafe

Traffic Analysis
Secondary Plan land-use options will add 900 to 1,400 peak hour trips – equivalent to 2 lanes of traffic. In 2031:
- Network operates reasonably well with some hot spots
- Barton and Queenston west of Centennial are main constraints
- Other roads approach but do not exceed capacity

Transportation Strategies
Four areas of focus:
- Capacity
- Safety
- Mobility Choice
- Urban Design
Transportation Strategies

Discussion:

ABC We

- Advantages – what makes sense
- Best ideas – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood
- Concerns – what might not work
- What else – add your ideas

Activity:

Confirm your “investments”

Place 4 poker chips in the jars for the strategies that are most important to you. You can put the chips in 4, 3, 2 or just 1 jar.

Capacity, Safety, Mobility Choice, Urban Design
Capacity Focus

**Advantages** – what makes sense

- Improve traffic signal timings
- Add transit priority measures at signalized intersections
- Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections
- Extend B-line LRT from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square
- Implement S-line RT on Centennial and extend to GO Station

**Best ideas** – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood

**Concerns** – what might not work

- Batten + RMP notes that targeted "not wide enough".
- QE7/Confederation would a roundabout work with high speeds?

**What else** – add your ideas

- Transit service east of Lake – more service needed in east end.
- B-Line out to 50 Rd – long, long term

- Skyline $$?
- Truck weight changes?
Mobility Choice Focus

**Advantages** – what makes sense

- Facilitate car sharing
- Extend and modify HSR routes
- Bring in SoBi public bikes
- “Right-size” Park N' Ride at GO Station
- Create non-auto access to GO Station and Confederation Park
- Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Delawana, Warrington, and South Service Road
- Promote travel options

**Best ideas** – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood

**Concerns** – what might *not* work

- Employee perspective
  - Surplus lots when low land values convert to other uses as values increase

**What else** – add your ideas

- Assistance fee for car share
- Reduced parking ratio in exchange for car share locations @ businesses

Questa, King
Safety Focus

**Advantages** – what makes sense

- Neighbourhoods → need speed limits lowered

**Best ideas** – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood

- All neighbourhoods should be treated the same - within City

- Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and Warrington
- Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections
- Manage access to new development to reduce driveways
- Create designs that reflect the speed limit

**Concerns** – what might not work

- Speed limits - police enforcement - is it happening? 40 sets expectation?

**What else** – add your ideas

- Synchronise traffic signals.
- New bridge
- Find optimal location for grade crossing

---
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Urban Design Focus

Advantages – what makes sense

Best ideas – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood

- Manage parking to reduce surface lots
- Create fine-grained street network within developments
- Improve streetscape for pedestrians
- Improve quality and location of bus stops
- Implement cycle tracks on Centennial, and Queenston east of Centennial
- Protect right-of-way for Complete Streets

Concerns – what might not work

- Need, development, concurrency
- Number, size, improve existing areas vs better standards for row
- More transit, less space
- Need to leave some space for security
- Cost not enough, enough space for
- Row are already wide, less desirable for redevelopment
- Integrating land use + transportation to give a sense of streetscape.
The purpose of this study:

• Support the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan study
• Review and address existing neighbourhood transportation issues
• Identify and evaluate options to address transportation issues

The CNTMP is being undertaken by the City of Hamilton to plan for improve mobility to:

• Accommodate transportation needs of future land use
• Leverage investment from development opportunities
• Support access to major transportation services such as the QEW, Red Hill Valley Parkway, and HSR, Rapid Transit and GO Transit
• Support choices including walking and cycling
• Create livable neighbourhoods and complete communities

The goals of the improvements are to create safe, efficient, and sustainable transportation that limits impacts to the environment, and supports healthy living.

Opportunity Statement

The CNTMP is being undertaken by the City of Hamilton to plan for improve mobility to:

• Accommodate transportation needs of future land use
• Leverage investment from development opportunities
• Support access to major transportation services such as the QEW, Red Hill Valley Parkway, and HSR, Rapid Transit and GO Transit
• Support choices including walking and cycling
• Create livable neighbourhoods and complete communities

The goals of the improvements are to create safe, efficient, and sustainable transportation that limits impacts to the environment, and supports healthy living.

Phase 2 Consultation

Transportation Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Solutions</th>
<th>Advantages – what makes sense</th>
<th>Disadvantages – what might not work</th>
<th>Best ideas – what will work for you and your neighbourhood</th>
<th>Concerns – what might not work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian connections through new developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add more sidewalks and bike lanes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement transit priority measures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve traffic signal timings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect rights-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic lanes (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement cycle tracks on Centennial, and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect right-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect rights-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic lanes (beyond 25 years)</td>
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<td></td>
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<td>Implement cycle tracks on Centennial, and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape options</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 2 Consultation

MOBILITY CHOICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Solutions</th>
<th>Advantages – what makes sense</th>
<th>Disadvantages – what will not work well</th>
<th>Concerns – what might not work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N' Ride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add local HSR circulator route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate car sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend and modify HSR routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: Recreational Trails Master Plan:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project 5-4: Bow Valley Open Space and Lawrence Avenue Park just west of Lake Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project 5-9: Pottruff Road near Eugene Street across the RHVP to the Red Hill Valley Recreational Trail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Project 5-10: Connection through QEW / Centennial interchange to Confederation Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add: improve safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through RHVP interchanges</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of Alternatives

TRANSPORTATION: network, access, comfort and delay:
- Pedestrians
- Cyclists
- Transit passengers
- Drivers
- Emergency services
- Goods movement

PUBLIC HEALTH:
- Social interaction
- Transportation equity
- Active transportation
- Collision reduction
- Air quality

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT:
- Natural environment (landscape, parks, open space, waterfronts, and shorelines)
- Public realm (streetscape and public spaces)
- Cultural, heritage, and archaeological resources

COST:
- Implementation
- Operation and maintain
- Economic benefits

Next Steps

Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process

- Stage 1: Identify Environmental Considerations
- Stage 2: Develop Preferred Solution
- Stage 3: Refine the Preferred Solution

Next Steps:
- Refine recommendations based on your feedback
- Public Open House
- Refine recommendations
- Prepare report

Next Step

Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan

Map:
- Streets
- Transit
- Active Transportation
- Secondary Plan
- Other Proponents

Review handout and displays
Appendix B: Public Consultation

Public Consultation Centre #1
Public Consultation Centre #2
Public Consultation Centre #3
LET’S TALK ABOUT
THE CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS!

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE
OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC INPUT

What? The City is hosting a meeting to initiate the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study and Transportation Management Plan Study (Municipal Class Environmental Assessment)

This meeting is an opportunity to learn about the project and provide input to help:
• Create a vision for future land use and transportation changes
• Identify issues and opportunities for change and improvement

Study Area:

When & Where? Thursday, April 30, 2015
St. Gregory the Great Church Hall
125 Centennial Parkway North

Why? Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan
The Centennial Neighbourhoods area is an important area in the east end of the City. It is a focal point for commercial uses, other activities and transportation connections. The area has been identified as a potential area for future change and redevelopment. The purpose of the study is to create a plan and policies to guide future change, promoting positive improvements and changes that meet the community’s needs.

www.hamilton.ca/centennialneighbourhoods

Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan
This study is being carried out in collaboration with the Secondary Plan. The study will consider and review alternative options for changes to pedestrian, cycling, transit, truck and other vehicular networks, and will also take into account upcoming GO service improvements to the area.

The purpose of the study is to address existing and future transportation needs and issues in the area.

www.hamilton.ca/centennialTMP

How? Attend the meeting or contact the project managers for additional information. Access the websites above for more information and to fill out our survey. Formal written comments relating to the Transportation Management Plan are welcome until May 21, 2015.

Please RSVP for the event by emailing planning.team@hamilton.ca or calling 905-546-2424 Ext. 4498. This is not required but it will help staff plan the event.

If you have any accessibility requirements to participate in this event, please call 905-546-2424 Ext. 4498 or email planning.team@hamilton.ca. Advance requests are highly encouraged to enable us to meet your needs adequately.

CONTACT:
Secondary Plan
Melanie Pham, MCIP, RPP
Phone: 905-546-2424 Ext. 6685
E-Mail: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca

Transportation Management Plan
Margaret Fazio, B.Sc., E.P., MCIP, RPP
Phone: 905-546-2424 Ext. 2218
E-Mail: tplanning@hamilton.ca

This Notice issued April 17 and 24, 2015
Welcome!
Public Open House #1

PLEASE SIGN IN

6:00 pm  Review the display boards for information about the study
         Ask questions and discuss your concerns with staff from
         the City and consultant team

6:30 pm  Presentations

7:00 pm  First round of activities

7:45 pm  Second round of activities

8:30 pm  Summary

8:50 pm  Wrap-up

9:00 pm  Adjourn

The purpose of this study is to develop a comprehensive Transportation Management Plan for the Centennial Neighbourhoods that will:

a) Follow the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) process

b) Review neighbourhood transportation issues

c) Identify traffic management options to address noted transportation issues

d) Coordinate analysis and initiatives with the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan study
The Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Master Plan (TMP) study is conducted in accordance with Phase 1 and 2 of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (MCEA) Process, under the Environmental Assessment Act. The Municipal Class EA process is a planning and approval process that ensures that the potential effects of a project are identified and managed prior to implementation.

### Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process

**Phase 1:** Problem or Opportunity

**Phase 2:** Alternative Solutions

**Phase 3:** Alternative Design Concepts

**Phase 4:** Environmental Study Report

**Phase 5:** Implementation

### Capital Project Delivery Process

Once a specific transportation project is identified and approved, it will go through the following delivery process, subject to an approved budget by council:

- **Year 0:** Create Project and Budget
- **Year 1:** Develop Project Scope (MCEA if required)
- **Year 2:** Permit Approvals, Pre-design and Base Plans
- **Year 3:** Detailed Design
- **Year 4:** Utilities Coordination, Land and Tender Preparation
- **Year 5:** Construction

**Construction Timeline:** The time to deliver project can vary from 2 years for a simple rehabilitation project, to 5 years for a more complicated urban arterial reconstruction project (due to potential for MCEAs, land acquisition, detailed underground analysis, permits and approvals, and utility coordination).
Improving Health by Community Design

Community Design Elements:
• Population and employment density
• Nearness of services, including public transit
• Mix of land uses
• Many street connections
• Streetscape including facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and transit users
• Increase in bicycle parking and decrease in car parking

Health-related Priorities:
• Active transportation (walking cycling)
• Public transit
• Equity in transportation and housing options
• Support for all stages of the life cycle
• Safety, comfort and convenience of travel
• Social interaction
• Accessibility

These Community Design Elements provide comprehensive support for Health-related Priorities
Walking Conditions and Trails

* Confederation Park Master Plan in the Process of Finalization - 2015

Source: Hamilton Trails Master Plan (2007) currently under review by 2016
Bikeways and Trails

---

* Confederation Park Master Plan in the Process of Finalization - 2015


---

“Sharrows” planned in 2015 as part of road construction
Public Transit

Source: HSR Route Map (January 2015), Urban Hamilton Official Plan, Niagara Rail Service Expansion Study (2011)
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24-Hour Traffic Volumes

Traffic counts conducted between 2009 and 2014

Daily Volumes (Weekday, 24-hour period)
Truck Routes and 24-Hour Volumes

Source: Hamilton Highways Designated for Use by Heavy Trucks map (2014); traffic counts conducted between 2009 and 2014
Options to address Transportation Management issues that may be considered could include:

- New sidewalks and pedestrian road crossings improvements
- New bikeways
- Improvements to transit service and stops
- Safety measures for people who walk, bicycle, use transit and drive
- Traffic calming
- Changes to parking regulations
- Changes to trucking regulations
- Education programs to improve safety
- Promotion programs for walking, cycling, taking transit or carpooling
- Where land use may change in the future, new streetscape, access or routes at those sites
Stick a ‘dot’ on the 5 criteria that are most important to you! These are potential criteria that may be used to evaluate transportation options later in the study. *Think a criteria is missing? Talk to a team member, add it under “other” or make a note on your comment sheet.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Place Your 5 Dots Here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Safety of all users (drivers, bus passengers, pedestrians, cyclists)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity of the transportation network (can one get from place to place without barriers, in your choice of type of travel; to be able to change from one way of travel to another, as wanted)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost (implementation of &amp; removal, life cycle - building and maintenance, how long will it last before it needs replacement, timing of implementation – City budget schedule)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians (comfort, rest space, access and convenience)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists (comfort, parking, space, access and convenience)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers (congestion, speeding, access, parking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit (bus stop locations, travel time by bus or train, transit shelters, size, location, service frequency)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility (pedestrians with disabilities, the elderly and children)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban design (for example, how the street looks and feels, landscaping such as trees and planters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural environment (green space)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built heritage (impacts to historic buildings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology (impacts to historical sites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health (encouraging active lifestyles, social equity, improving air quality, cost)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Vehicles’ Access (space, time, impact on patients)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Join the discussion group around the table!

Add your ideas to the map using the “post-it” notes:

- Where there are problems with transportation in the study area
- Locations where transportation could be improved and how
- Good places to walk, poor places to walk and important places that you would like to get to by walking
- Good places to ride a bicycle, poor places to ride a bicycle and important places that you would like to get to by bicycle
- Where HSR bus services and stops are good and where they need to be improved
- Parking problems
- Problems with truck routes or issues with deliveries
- Locations where traffic travels too slow (congestion), cuts through neighbourhoods, or travels too fast
- Locations that may not be a problem now but you think could be a problem in the future as population and employment grow
Next Steps

We will review comments collected at today’s Open House. Your comments will help us identify transportation issues, opportunities and possible solutions. Please submit comments and fill out the survey (paper copy or online at www.hamilton.ca/centennialNTMP) by May 21, 2015.

Stay involved by signing up to receive notices of future consultation:

- Public Open House No. 2 – Fall of 2015
- Public Open House No. 3 – Winter 2015 / 2016
- Planning Committee of Council
- MCEA 30-Day Public Review

If you have any comments, concerns or questions about the study, please contact:

**Margaret Fazio, B.Sc., EP, MCIP, RPP**
Project Manager, Transportation Planning
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 2218
Fax: 905-546-4435
E-mail: tplanning@hamilton.ca

OR

**Norma Moores, P.Eng.**
Project Manager, IBI Group
Phone: 905-546-1010 ext. 2106
Fax: 905-546-1011
E-mail: norma.moores@ibigroup.com
Purpose

The purpose of this study:

• Review neighbourhood transportation issues
• Identify options to address transportation issues
• Coordinate with the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan study

Study Area

Project Process

Implementing Projects in the TMP

Phase 1 – Focus of PIC#1

Identify transportation issues:

• Walking
• Bicycling
• Transit
• Driving
• Trucking
• Parking

Good community design and transportation options support healthy, safe, social, active and accessible neighbourhoods!
**Next Steps**

Develop and evaluate options for:
- Existing transportation issues
- Future transportation needs based on the Secondary Plan outcomes

Get your feedback at PIC#2
## Appendix C: Evaluation Criteria

**Stick a ‘dot’ on the 5 criteria that are most important to you!** These are potential criteria that may be used to evaluate transportation options later in the study. **Think a criteria is missing? Talk to a team member, add it under “other” or make a note on your comment sheet.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Place Your 5 Dots Here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety of all users</strong> (drivers, bus passengers, pedestrians, cyclists)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connectivity of the transportation network</strong> (can one get from place to place without barriers, in your choice of type of travel; to be able to change from one way of travel to another, as wanted)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost</strong> (implementation of &amp; removal, life cycle - building and maintenance, how long will it last before it needs replacement, timing of implementation – City budget schedule)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pedestrians</strong> (comfort, rest space, access and convenience)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cyclists</strong> (comfort, parking, space, access and convenience)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drivers</strong> (congestion, speeding, access, parking)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transit</strong> (bus stop locations, travel time by bus or train, transit shelters, size, location, service frequency)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accessibility</strong> (pedestrians with disabilities, the elderly and children)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban design</strong> (for example, how the street looks and feels, landscaping such as trees and planters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Natural environment</strong> (green space)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Built heritage</strong> (impacts to historic buildings)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Archaeology</strong> (impacts to historical sites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public Health</strong> (encouraging active lifestyles, social equity, improving air quality, cost)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Emergency Vehicles’ Access</strong> (space, time, impact on patients)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. DELAWANNA – NO L. R. TURN SIGN GETS KNOCKED DOWN & PEOPLE MAKE AN ILLEGAL LEFT TURN

2. COMING OUT OF THE MALL ONTO KENORA – CANNOT MAKE A RIGHT HAND TURN & ... HAVE TO GO AROUND THE MALL.

3. CENTENNIAL TR Walmart CONSTRUCTION NOISE + CUT THROUGH TRAFFIC ON IRENE AVE (CHECK ON BY-LAW TIMES)

4. RIVERDALE COMMUNITY CENTRE HSR SERVICE

5. KENORA – LOTS OF CUT-THROUGH TRAFFIC & NOISE, ESPECIALLY DURING CONSTRUCTION

6. TRUCKS NEED TO BE ABLE TO USE FAST, EFFICIENT ROUTES – COST OF DOING BUSINESS IF THEY'RE HELD UP IN TRAFFIC (THIS YEAR TRUCK LICENCES WENT UP 70%)

- HwY. 20 (CENTENNIAL) – @ GREEN MOUNTAIN RD. HAS A STOP SIGN – DANGEROUS. RECOMMEND AN UNDERPASS.
7. **Transit Accessibility - Walk from Neighbourhood Interiors Out to the E-W Bus Routes is Challenging; Would Smaller Community Buses on Hourly Frequencies Provide Relief?**

8. **North-South Transit - Improve #56; Would N-S Routes on Lake and on Grays Be Possible?**

9. **Corner King St & Owen Place**
   - # Widing of King St - to have extra lane for turning into hospital
   - (Lane widening from Police Station to Hospital)
   - Major traffic back up from turning in hospital

10. *Were would the go station be located?*

11. **Do Not Like No Left turn onto Delawara from Fortinos. I live in this area and cannot drive home directly, I have to drive thru & around mall to exit onto Kenora.*

12. **Hard to Cross at Light From East Gate to Bulk Barn/Giant Tiger - Not Enough Time Even for Short Bodied People.**

13. **All Ped. Crossings over Cenn. & Queenston - Lights Are Too Short!**

14. **Garbage Pails @ Kenora Rd Stop/Rd hardly ever get emptied.**
15. ADVANCED L. TURN @ DELAWANA INTO CENTENNIAL (N) DOES NOT WORK ALL THE TIME.
   (SUGGESTION - PUT A LOOP IN LIKE @ FROM BARTON @ BOUND ONTO REST HILL VALLEY N. BOUND)

16. A NASH S. BOUND ONTO QUEENSTON EAST BOUND.

17. 3 WAY LG SIGNAL @ NASH & KENTLENT IS WELL LOVED! (TO SOME STILL A BIT CONFUSING - SHOULD WE HAVE A SIGN THAT CLARIFIES RULES?)

18. LOVE OFF RAMP HILL EXPwy. - S BOUND

19. ON-RAMP @ BARTON TO REST HILL - N TOO SHORT. IN HEAVY TRAFFIC COME TO A COMPLETE STOP - NOT SAFE TO MERGE.

20. SIDEWALK B'TN. DELAWANA & CONFED PARK ALMOST NON-EXISTANT. (BOOTH E&W)

21. Kenora N to transfer Stn, dangerous for cars due to Big Trucks - they think they own the road.
To William 21 May
Concern

My husband and I care very much and would like to see more of you. The climate is rather good and we think it would be a great help if you could write us with your plans.

C. G. H. Hall
City of Hamilton
3774 LSE

CITY HALL
City of Hamilton
7! Main St, West (c/o)

Hamilton, ON
1-8 P 4-48
Good afternoon,

Thank you Mike for your information provided today and last week. I have forwarded your earlier comments (attached below for reference) to our Housing Division for a response as a number of them relate to housing.

In addition, I would like to provide clarification on the scope of the Secondary Plan. The Secondary Plan can only address land use planning matters. Land use planning matters do not include an ability to address or regulate tenure/ownership of residential units or the people living in them. Secondary planning provides direction on residential uses by establishing land use regulations that provide opportunities for a variety of different forms of housing (e.g., singles, semis or multiple units) and different densities of housing. It is responsive to the current and future housing needs of the community. Our focus is on providing a wide variety of land uses appropriate to the current and anticipated function of the area (including residential, commercial, employment, open space, and institutional), improving the integration and design of all the land uses that make up the neighbourhood, and looking at public realm improvements through the urban design component of the Plan. The Transportation Management Plan's focus on improving the quality and efficiency of travel in the area is also a vital component. Better transit/walking/biking facilities are also directly related to and support housing function and will be further developed through the Transportation Management Plan process.

Please note that there is a Neighbourhood Action Plan that has been completed for the Riverdale Neighbourhood specifically (for lands east of Centennial). This is a mechanism by which this neighbourhood is working with other City departments, agencies and other partners on some of the concerns that are out of the scope of a Secondary Plan (i.e. such as neighbourhood safety, addressing building enforcement issues, etc.). Please see below for a link to the Riverdale Neighbourhood Action Plan:


In terms of timelines for our next focus group meeting, we are planning to schedule the next meeting for September. At this meeting, various different options for the Secondary Plan and Transportation Management Plan will be presented. Depending on the amount of material to cover, we may hold two meetings to review this information. This timeline is needed to give the project teams enough time to...
review all the inputs received to-date and develop the options. Also, many people are away during the summer and so it is difficult to schedule events during this time.

Best Regards, Melanie Pham

Melanie Pham, MCIP, RPP
Planner I, Community Planning
Planning and Economic Development Department
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor, Hamilton, L8P 4Y5
Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca
T: (905) 546-2424 ext. 6685
F: (905) 546-4202

From: Pham, Melanie; Fazio, Margaret; Newbold, Christine
Cc: Collins, Chad
Subject: Centennial Focus Group

May 22, 2015

Melanie, Margaret, Christine

With this email we provide a copy of yesterday's article in the Stoney Creek News. Though our committee is intended to address the Centennial area in Hamilton; rest assured that this is very much a Stoney Creek issue. One cannot be separated from the other. The shooting on Delawana Drive is a major issue.

The idea of bike lanes is becoming nonsense. Who will ride a bike to be a victim of a drive-by shooting? Or have his/her bike stolen?

We have to make the community safe, if we want to improve it.

Right now, about 1/4 to 1/2 miles from the proposed Hub, we have significant subsidized-income shelters/housing that deplete the nature and vibrancy of the community.

* Drugs and burglaries out of Kenora Avenue
* Drugs, violence and missing persons from Violet Drive
* Drugs, grow-ops, and guns on Delawana Drive (east of Centennial)

We have to get at least one of these communities out of our area before even considering rejuvenating the community. There were sentiments expressed that these are wonderful people. However, events in the last year have clearly proved otherwise.

When is our next meeting? We were told before the end of May. That's nine days from now.

Thank you.
May 14, 2015

Christine, Margaret, Michelle

So much has happened in these last 24hrs that has to be considered before or during our next meeting.

In our meeting of April 8th we only briefly mentioned the impact of subsidized housing within the Centennial area. The suggestion was presented that having three subsidized-housing subdivisions in the area will be an impediment to progress, image, and future development. Unfortunately, not all agreed.

Well, yesterday there was a shooting on Delawana Drive (east of Centennial). The armed dispute definitely involved narcotics. In fact a young teenage girl reported on CHCH News confirming that the shooting must have involved drugs and that drugs were easily accessible in the neighbourhood. Is this the foundation for the image of a neighbourhood or the development of business?

To convey how serious the situation is, I spoke with several neighbours this morning. These live on Fairington Drive. Everyone offered or agreed that there is not one house on Fairington that has not suffered a burglary in the last 25yrs. The culprit according to everyone involved is the low-income subsidized-housing complex at Kenora and Barton. This had already been confirmed by the Police. Businesses and religious institutions were not exempt. At our meeting on April 8th the suggestion was made to move the subsidized housing away from its proximity to the new GO Station, and replace those units with apartment condominium towers for workers and business people who would develop the area or utilize the GO Station. I still stand by that decision.

In Toronto yesterday we heard that in one subsidized-housing complex there were at least seven occupants with income over $100,000. Several families in a low-income complex near us have properties in Florida. How many tenants in our subsidized-housing complexes have incomes and property exceeding $100,000? Has anyone ever checked? Is their signatures on a form entirely reliable?

On this same issue, it is came to our attention today that the Hamilton James St Train Station will soon open. A block away from the train station on James St there is a center for...
those suffering narcotic and alcohol over-indulgence with a propensity to violence. Its presence has detracted the image and importance of the area. Local businesses require security guards 24hrs/day. Candidly it is deplorable.

The City has to answer this: does it intend to condone low income accommodation and narcotics dealings near our Go Stations that will only diminish any impression of the respective area?

Besides the information on the prior OMB decisions and our potential budget, please address this at the next meeting or before. If nothing changes with respect to the subsidized subdivisions on Delawana, Violet and Kenora don't expect businesses to jump on board. An Eastgate Hub? Why would we bother? A GO Station? What would be the benefit?

Image and development are essential for growth and our goals.

Thank you.
From: May-08-15 8:09 PM
To: Fazio, Margaret
Subject: Appreciate your response

May 8, 2015
Margaret Fazio, Project Manager

Thank you so much for your email. To paraphrase mine of last week, the meeting of April 30th was tending to become a 'bitch-fest' by those who thought what they said that night will definitely happen. I have met several of these persons since that meeting and truly they are convinced that their opinion will rule. That's our neighbourhood.

May I suggest that at the start of our next team-meeting that the team members be informed concerning the decisions already made by the O.M.B. that right now and most likely in the future determine what can be done or altered.

Also at the start of the meeting, please include some advice as to our budget. There's no benefit to taking two years recommending projects that may cost $5 million when perhaps we only have $1 million to spend.

Most of the expenditures will involve the Eastgate Hub. Bearing that in mind will there be anything left for the other recommendations? If so, how much? It should come down to this: if there are many good suggestions, which ones could the city afford?

Best wishes always and thank you for your continuing concern and leadership.

From: Margaret.Fazio@hamilton.ca
To: 
CC: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca; Norma.Moores@BLGroup.com; Yishan.Liu@hamilton.ca; Lorissa.Skrypniak@hamilton.ca
Subject: Response to: Suggestion to alter Eastgate Mall exit
Date: Fri, 8 May 2015 13:58:31 +0000

Thank you for your detailed, helpful comments, below. We will be investigating this scenario during the course of our study. We will post a summary of comments from the April 30, 2015 PIC, on the project website after May 21, 2015, i.e. after the comment period has been closed, for the TMP. We will be proposing alternative solutions to identified problems and opportunities, and their evaluation at PIC#2.

Thank you,

Margaret Fazio, B.Sc., EP, MCIP, RPP
Project Manager, Environmental Planning;
Transportation Management; Capital Assets and Strategic Planning,
Public Works Department City of Hamilton,
400- 77 James St. N, Hamilton, ON, Canada, L8R 2K3;
Tel: 905-546-2424 ext. 2218; Fax: 905-546-2039; e-mail: Margaret.Fazio@hamilton.ca
From: May-01-15 8:11 AM
To: Norma Moores
Cc: chad.collins@hamilton.ca
Subject: Suggestion to alter Eastgate Mall exit

May 1, 2015

Norma Moores, IBI Group
norma.moores@ibigroup.com

Dear Ms. Moores,

It was a pleasure to participate in the informative discussions last night concerning transportation in the Centennial-Eastgate area.

The suggestion, to alter the exit from Eastgate Mall onto Delawana Drive, requires a response.

To give you a preamble:
* From investigations completed in 1988 (to Mayor Morrow) and in 2003 (to the Hamilton Police), most of the vehicles speeding in the neighbourhood or violating stop signs are residents of the neighbourhood. It is not an issue of people outside the neighbourhood abusing the solitude and safety of our residents.
* I reside on Delawana Drive, three doors down from the church hall where we met. Traffic volume and speed are major issues.
* Those most likely to complain about speed on Delawana-Fairington-Kenora are usually those most likely to diminish the importance of stop signs.
* On Tuesday, April 28th while I was cutting our grass, a vehicle mounted the sidewalk and almost struck me. The driver of that vehicle was the one giving the instruction to alter the mall exit onto Delawana Drive. He is known to our community as one who is never happy.
* The exit onto Delawana Drive was the result of discussions with Mayor Morrow in 1988 and with Councillors Fred Eisenberger and Chad Collins in June 1999. The OMB hearing was completed in 1999.

Please also consider these factors:
* The OMB approved the design of the exit.
* Mr. Eisenberger and Mr. Collins approved the design of the exit and the finished product.
* Mr. R. Saker, Manager at Eastgate Mall, is pleased with the design.
* Residents on Delawana Drive are opposed to altering the design of the exit.
* Homes will be devalued if the exit is changed as suggested.
* No doubt litigation will follow any change in the exit.

Please do not consider his self-centered suggestion. It's good to have these meetings, but people have to think of the community not just of themselves.

Thank you.

c.c. Chad Collins
From: Pham, Melanie
Sent: May-04-15 8:40 AM
To:
Cc: Transportation Planning
Subject: RE: Centennial Neighbourhoods

Received. Thank you for your comments.
Regards, Melanie

Melanie Pham, MCIP, RPP
Planner I, Community Planning
Planning and Economic Development Department
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor, Hamilton, L8P 4Y5 Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca
T: (905) 546-2424 ext. 6685
F: (905) 546-4202

-----Original Message-----
From:
Sent: April-30-15 7:03 PM
To: Pham, Melanie; tplannng@hamilton.ca
Subject: Centennial Neighbourhoods

Melanie / Margaret

Just some comments on the Centennial Neighbourhoods:

I assume that the Secondary Plan for the Centennial Neighbourhoods will include increasing residential density along Queenston Road especially in the area between the RHVP and Woodman Drive especially due to the proposed transit improvements in this area.

I also assume transit service will increase greatly along Centennial Parkway from Barton to Lake Ontario when the Go Station and Walmart plaza are completed.

I look forward to seeing the proposals.

Thanks,
May 14, 2015

Christine, Margaret, Michelle

So much has happened in these last 24hrs that has to be considered before or during our next meeting.

In our meeting of April 8th we only briefly mentioned the impact of subsidized housing within the Centennial area. The suggestion was presented that having three subsidized-housing subdivisions in the area will be an impediment to progress, image, and future development. Unfortunately, not all agreed.

Well, yesterday there was a shooting on Delawana Drive (east of Centennial). The armed dispute definitely involved narcotics. In fact a young teenage girl reported on CHCH News confirming that the shooting must have involved drugs and that drugs were easily accessible in the neighbourhood. Is this the foundation for the image of a neighbourhood or the development of business?

To convey how serious the situation is, I spoke with several neighbours this morning. These live on Fairington Drive. Everyone offered or agreed that there is not one house on Fairington that has not suffered a burglary in the last 25yrs. The culprit according to everyone involved is the low-income subsidized-housing complex at Kenora and Barton. This had already been confirmed by the Police. Businesses and religious institutions were not exempt.

At our meeting on April 8th the suggestion was made to move the subsidized housing away from its proximity to the new GO Station, and replace those units with apartment condominium towers for workers and business people who would develop the area or utilize the GO Station. I still stand by that decision.

In Toronto yesterday we heard that in one subsidized-housing complex there were at least seven occupants with income over $100,000. Several families in a low-income complex near us have properties in Florida. How many tenants in our subsidized-housing complexes have incomes and property exceeding $100,000? Has anyone ever checked? Is their signatures on a form entirely reliable?

On this same issue, it is came to our attention today that the Hamilton James St Train Station will soon open. A block away from the train station on James St there is a center for those suffering.
narcotic and alcohol over-indulgence with a propensity to violence. Its presence has detracted the image and importance of the area. Local businesses require security guards 24hrs/day. Candidly it is deplorable.

The City has to answer this: does it intend to condone low income accommodation and narcotics dealing near our Go Stations that will only diminish any impression of the respective area?

Besides the information on the prior OMB decisions and our potential budget, please address this at the next meeting or before. If nothing changes with respect to the subsidized housing subdivisions on Delawana, Violet and Kenora don’t expect businesses to jump on board. An Eastgate Hub? Why would we bother? A GO Station? What would be the benefit?

Image and development are essential for growth and our goals.

Thank you.
From: April-26-15 11:12 AM
To: Pham, Melanie; Fazio, Margaret; Newbold, Christine
Subject: Centennial Focus Group - effect of mailboxes

April 26, 2015
Melanie, Margaret, Christine,

In that the mailboxes will devalue properties, cause significant transportation issues, and contribute to excessive debris, the issue has to be included in future discussions regarding the Centennial Area.

This is a copy of today’s correspondence to the Mayor and Councillor.

From: To: mayor@hamilton.ca; chad.collins@hamilton.ca
Subject: MAILBOXES ON CITY/RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY
Date: Sun, 26 Apr 2015 11:04:37 -0400

April 26, 2015
Mayor Fred Eisenberger.
Chad Collins, Councillor.

Gentlemen,

There are issues concerning the Canada Post mailboxes that is seemingly being ignored by your solicitors, the Press and Canada Post.

SAFETY FACTOR
On Thursday April 23rd at 2:43pm a north bound vehicle stopped on Kenora Avenue across from the Canada Post mailbox so the driver could get out of the vehicle and go to the mailbox. The adverse affect on traffic was incredible. She had to cross the street and could barely do it.
On Friday April 24th at 10:10am a woman crossing Kenora Avenue from the Eastgate Plaza to the west side of the road was almost struck by two vehicles.

DEBRIS
Who is going to clean the debris caused by:
1. Post office boxes are obstructions stopping blowing debris, allowing it to gather around the mail boxes
2. Discarded flyers
Who is responsible for cleaning these areas?
At seven such mailboxes that we checked this last week, this is a major issue.

PROPERTY VALUATION
Does the existence of a mail box on the front of your property devalue the selling price of a family’s home? Has this been explored?

LIABILITY
If these mailboxes are being installed, are you putting Canada Post on notice now for any future claims?

Who is legally liable for a fall and injury within feet of the mailbox that is adjacent to the sidewalk, i.e., on city property?

Who is responsible for shovelling the snow and maintaining the quality of the area?

Your input and replies are appreciated.

Thank you.

Yours truly,
Thank you for attending today's Public Information Centre. Your input is important to help the City develop a Secondary Plan and a Transportation Management Plan for the Centennial Neighbourhoods. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 21, 2015 to:

Melanie Pham, Planner OR Margaret Fazio, Project Manager
Planning & Economic Development Department Public Works Department
City of Hamilton City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor 77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5 Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6685 Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 2218
Email: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

YOUR COMMENTS PLEASE!

In your opinion, what makes a community great?

- Neighbors
- Good communication (like neighborly
- Service

Please describe any areas or features in other places you have been, which you like and think would be desirable in the Centennial Neighbourhoods.

- Library + core services in old Story Creek (like
- Original story creek
- Inegrate bus + better to tie services in
- Story Creek together better

What do you feel your community is missing?

- Story Creek (original)
- Taxi service and a bus to train station (like Highland
- Bylaw allowing for 1st floor business
What are the most important issues affecting this area?

Other comments and/or remarks.

Did this event meet your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please Rank</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day of the Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Boards/Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter(s)/Project Team</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did you hear about the meeting?
(I.e. Newspaper, E-mail, Social Media, Postcard in Mail, Postcard from another location, Website, Poster, Other)

THANK YOU!
Comments submitted will be reviewed and a summary posted online after May 21st.
Thank you for attending today’s Public Information Centre. Your input is important to help the City develop a Secondary Plan and a Transportation Management Plan for the Centennial Neighbourhoods. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 21, 2015 to:

Melanie Pham, Planner OR Margaret Fazio, Project Manager
Planning & Economic Development Department Public Works Department
City of Hamilton City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor 77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5 Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6685 Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 2218
Email: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

YOUR COMMENTS PLEASE!

In your opinion, what makes a community great?
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

Please describe any areas or features in other places you have been, which you like and think would be desirable in the Centennial Neighbourhoods.
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

What do you feel your community is missing?
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________

(See Reverse)
What are the most important issues affecting this area?

- Traffic/walking
- Crosswalk from Vineyard to Eastgate across Centennial
- Left turn signal from Centennial to Delowana (west)

Other comments and/or remarks.

---

Did this event meet your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please Rank</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day of the Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Boards/Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter(s)/Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did you hear about the meeting?
(I.e. Newspaper, E-mail, Social Media, Postcard in Mail, Postcard from another location, Website, Poster, Other)

---

THANK YOU!
Comments submitted will be reviewed and a summary posted online after May 21st.
Thank you for attending today's Public Information Centre. Your input is important to help the City develop a Secondary Plan and a Transportation Management Plan for the Centennial Neighbourhoods. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 21, 2015 to:

Melanie Pham, Planner  OR  Margaret Fazio, Project Manager
Planning & Economic Development Department  Public Works Department
City of Hamilton  City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor  77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5  Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6685  Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 2218
Email: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca  Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

YOUR COMMENTS PLEASE!

In your opinion, what makes a community great?
- user-friendly sidewalks
- rest places
- large communal recreation centres
- green spaces accessible to people and animals

Please describe any areas or features in other places you have been, which you like and think would be desirable in the Centennial Neighbourhoods.
- carpool lot at go bus station
- bike shelters

What do you feel your community is missing?
- affordable multi residential housing
- increase HSR frequency during non commute time 9-5 pm
- 7 pm - 11 pm

(See Reverse)
What are the most important issues affecting this area?
- Traffic congestion on RHVP, QEW Niagara.

Other comments and/or remarks.
- White board presentation on the 1yr, 5yr, 10yr time lines for transportation and secondary use plan.
- More indepth data on projected population demographics, HSR ridership in area, future commercial development impact on income generating for taxbase.

Did this event meet your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please Rank</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day of the Week</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>(Acoustics poor)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Day</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Boards/Information</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter(s)/Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound System</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual System</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of Event</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did you hear about the meeting?
(I.e. Newspaper, E-mail, Social Media, Postcard in Mail, Postcard from another location, Website, Poster, Other)
- Online survey prior to meeting was very user friendly.

THANK YOU!
Comments submitted will be reviewed and a summary posted online after May 21st.
Thank you for attending today’s Public Information Centre. Your input is important to help the City develop a Secondary Plan and a Transportation Management Plan for the Centennial Neighbourhoods. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 21, 2015 to:

Melanie Pham, Planner  
Planning & Economic Development Department  
City of Hamilton  
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor  
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6685  
Email: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca

Margaret Fazio, Project Manager  
Public Works Department  
City of Hamilton  
77 James Street North, Suite 400  
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 2218  
Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

YOUR COMMENTS PLEASE!

In your opinion, what makes a community great?

- Parks
- Recreation centres
- Walking areas
- Public transportation
- Trees and greenery
- Traffic calming
- 3-phase traffic lights
- At Nash and Kentley, staff helps with this

Please describe any areas or features in other places you have been, which you like and think would be desirable in the Centennial Neighbourhoods.


What do you feel your community is missing?

Cash trees were removed along Nash Rd W between Barton and Kentley St.  
I would like to see lots of trees  
Implanted along the area.

(See Reverse)
What are the most important issues affecting this area?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Other comments and/or remarks.

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Did this event meet your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please Rank</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day of the Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Boards/Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter(s)/Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did you hear about the meeting?
(I.e. Newspaper, E-mail, Social Media, Postcard in Mail, Postcard from another location, Website, Poster, Other)

________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU!
Comments submitted will be reviewed and a summary posted online after May 21st.
Thank you for attending today's Public Information Centre. Your input is important to help the City develop a Secondary Plan and a Transportation Management Plan for the Centennial Neighbourhoods. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 21, 2015 to:

Melanie Pham, Planner OR Margaret Fazio, Project Manager
Planning & Economic Development Department Public Works Department
City of Hamilton City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor 77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5 Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6685 Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 2218
Email: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca Email: tPlanning@hamilton.ca

YOUR COMMENTS PLEASE!

In your opinion, what makes a community great?

- The accessibility to major highways.
- Schools are great with playgrounds.
- A community should not be of one ethnicity but of many

Please describe any areas or features in other places you have been, which you like and think would be desirable in the Centennial Neighbourhoods.

- Burlington bridges & streets are nicer & cleaner (although not in the winter).
- Snow clearing is good (in Hamilton)
- But our streets are very old.

What do you feel your community is missing?

- City Hall office in Stoney Creek.

(See Reverse)
What are the most important issues affecting this area?

- It needs to be more accessible for pedestrians.
- Not enough housing for seniors (active seniors).

Other comments and/or remarks.

- Hamilton is getting very expensive in regards to housing.
- Jobs are not good paying jobs for regular people.

Did this event meet your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please Rank</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day of the Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Boards/Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Activities</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter(s)/Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did you hear about the meeting?
(I.e. Newspaper, E-mail, Social Media, Postcard in Mail, Postcard from another location, Website, Poster, Other)

Received Postcard

THANK YOU!
Comments submitted will be reviewed and a summary posted online after May 21st.
Thank you for attending today’s Public Information Centre. Your input is important to help the City develop a Secondary Plan and a Transportation Management Plan for the Centennial Neighbourhoods. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 21, 2015 to:

Melanie Pham, Planner
Planning & Economic Development Department
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6685
Email: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca

Margaret Fazio, Project Manager
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 2218
Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

YOUR COMMENTS PLEASE!

In your opinion, what makes a community great?

- Churches, mosques, temples, etc.
- Public transit
- Job opportunities
- Walkability
- Parks & recreation
- Safety, lower parking lots, high density

Please describe any areas or features in other places you have been, which you like and think would be desirable in the Centennial Neighbourhoods.

- Public art
- Civic centres, connecting to parks, malls
- Libraries, multipurpose arenas, fountains
- Trees, green space, outdoor sports opportunities

What do you feel your community is missing?

- Special bike, skateboard, bike, car share
- Wider sidewalks, green space, bike lanes
- LRT / high order transit

(See Reverse)
What are the most important issues affecting this area?

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

Other comments and/or remarks.

Need more youth and new council representation.

_________________________________________________________________________

_________________________________________________________________________

Did this event meet your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please Rank</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day of the Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Boards/Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter(s)/Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did you hear about the meeting?
(I.e. Newspaper, E-mail, Social Media, Postcard in Mail, Postcard from another location, Website, Poster, Other)

Mail.

THANK YOU!
Comments submitted will be reviewed and a summary posted online after May 21st.
Thank you for attending today’s Public Information Centre. Your input is important to help the City develop a Secondary Plan and a Transportation Management Plan for the Centennial Neighbourhoods. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by **May 21, 2015** to:

Melanie Pham, Planner
Planning & Economic Development Department
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6685
Email: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca

Margaret Fazio, Project Manager
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 2218
Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

**YOUR COMMENTS PLEASE!**

In your opinion, what makes a community great?

- The people, community togetherness.
- Getting out to meet others.
- Being part of change.

Please describe any areas or features in other places you have been, which you like and think would be desirable in the Centennial Neighbourhoods.

- HSR service expanded to reach community services and recreation centres, libraries, malls, schools, etc.

What do you feel your community is missing?

- HSR services
- One side only parking on our side streets during winter months
- Night time policing
What are the most important issues affecting this area?

TRANSPORTATION.

Other comments and/or remarks.

Did this event meet your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please Rank</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day of the Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Boards/Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter(s)/Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound System</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did you hear about the meeting?

(I.e. Newspaper, E-mail, Social Media, Postcard in Mail, Postcard from another location, Website, Poster, Other)

Postcard.

THANK YOU!
Comments submitted will be reviewed and a summary posted online after May 21st.
Thank you for attending today’s Public Information Centre. Your input is important to help the City develop a Secondary Plan and a Transportation Management Plan for the Centennial Neighbourhoods. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 21, 2015 to:

Melanie Pham, Planner
Planning & Economic Development Department
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6685
Email: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca

Margaret Fazio, Project Manager
Public Works Department
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 2218
Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

YOUR COMMENTS PLEASE!

In your opinion, what makes a community great?

The people!

Please describe any areas or features in other places you have been, which you like and think would be desirable in the Centennial Neighbourhoods.

What do you feel your community is missing?

more parks & people space benches
What are the most important issues affecting this area?

traffic congestion

Other comments and/or remarks.

Did this event meet your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please Rank</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day of the Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Boards/Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter(s)/Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did you hear about the meeting?
(I.e. Newspaper, E-mail, Social Media, Postcard in Mail, Postcard from another location, Website, Poster, Other)

Newspaper

THANK YOU!
Comments submitted will be reviewed and a summary posted online after May 21st.
Thank you for attending today's Public Information Centre. Your input is important to help the City develop a Secondary Plan and a Transportation Management Plan for the Centennial Neighbourhoods. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 21, 2015 to:

Melanie Pham, Planner  OR  Margaret Fazio, Project Manager
Planning & Economic Development Department   Public Works Department
City of Hamilton                        City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor                77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5                       Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6685                Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 2218
Email: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca             Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

YOUR COMMENTS PLEASE!

In your opinion, what makes a community great?

WIDEN THE CENTENNIAL PARKWAY FROM QUEENSTON ROAD TO KING ST, WHILE THEY ARE DOING SEWER WORK.

Please describe any areas or features in other places you have been, which you like and think would be desirable in the Centennial Neighbourhoods.

What do you feel your community is missing?

(See Reverse)
What are the most important issues affecting this area?

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Other comments and/or remarks.

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________

Did this event meet your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please Rank</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day of the Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Boards/Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter(s)/Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did you hear about the meeting?
(I.e. Newspaper, E-mail, Social Media, Postcard in Mail, Postcard from another location, Website, Poster, Other)

________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU!
Comments submitted will be reviewed and a summary posted online after May 21st.
Thank you for attending today’s Public Information Centre. Your input is important to help the City develop a Secondary Plan and a Transportation Management Plan for the Centennial Neighbourhoods. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 21, 2015 to:

Melanie Pham, Planner  
Planning & Economic Development Department  
City of Hamilton  
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor  
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6685  
Email: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca

Margaret Fazio, Project Manager  
Public Works Department  
City of Hamilton  
77 James Street North, Suite 400  
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 2218  
Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

YOUR COMMENTS PLEASE!

In your opinion, what makes a community great?

People  -- supporting each other, the local events, businesses and places for the future.

Please describe any areas or features in other places you have been, which you like and think would be desirable in the Centennial Neighbourhoods.

Walking/biking community ‘shovel ready’ like it at Kenmore.

What do you feel your community is missing?

Bike routes.

(See Reverse)
What are the most important issues affecting this area?

- Increasing Traffic through or Centennial through Traffic
- Housing Costs vs. Upgrading

Other comments and/or remarks.

- Much better discussions when a facilitator was at the table.

Did this event meet your needs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please Rank</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Above Average</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day of the Week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location/Facility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time of Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation Boards/Information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation Activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter(s)/Project Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usefulness of Event</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How did you hear about the meeting?

(I.e. Newspaper, E-mail, Social Media, Postcard in Mail, Postcard from another location, Website, Poster, Other)

THANK YOU!
Comments submitted will be reviewed and a summary posted online after May 21st.
Centennial Neighbourhoods Survey

Primary tabs

- View
- Edit
- Webform
- Results(active tab)
- Revisions

Secondary tabs

- Submissions
- Analysis(active tab)
- Table
- Download
- Clear

This page shows analysis of submitted data, such as the number of submissions per component value, calculations, and averages. Additional components may be added under the "Add analysis components" fieldset.

How old are you?

- 25 to 34 years old: 2
- 35 to 44 years old: 2
- 45 to 54 years old: 2
- 65 to 74 years old: 3
- 75 years or older: 1
Gender:

Left Blank 2
User entered value 9
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 1.00

How do you use the Centennial Neighbourhoods Area? (check all that apply)

Live in the area 9
Work in the area 1
Visit people in the area 5
Shop, access services, recreation or entertainment in the area 9

If you live in the study area, please provide your postal code:

Left Blank 4
User entered value 7
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 3.00

If you work in the study area, please tell us where:

Left Blank 10
User entered value 1
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 3.00

If you go to school in the area, please tell us which school you attend:

If other, please specify:

Left Blank 11
User entered value 0
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 0
1. What do you like about the Centennial Neighbourhoods?

Left Blank
User entered value
Average submission length in words (ex blanks)

2. What public or private spaces do you like to visit in the Centennial Neighbourhoods? What makes them special?

Left Blank
User entered value
Average submission length in words (ex blanks)

3. In your opinion, what are the three most important elements that would help to improve the Centennial Neighbourhoods?

New or improved public spaces (i.e. such as parks, plazas, squares and trails)
Walking or cycling routes
Access to higher order transit (i.e. train, light rail transit, bus rapid transit)
New mixed use developments (commercial and residential together) along Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road
Streetscape improvements (i.e. better lighting, sidewalks, trees and greenery, and seating areas, etc.)
Improvements to the appearances of buildings
Other

If other, please specify:

Left Blank
User entered value
Average submission length in words (ex blanks)
4. What additional destinations, types of uses or buildings would you like to see in the Centennial Neighbourhoods?

Left Blank 2
User entered value 9
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 37.33

5. Are there any places within the Centennial Neighbourhoods where you feel unsafe?

No 3
Yes 6

If yes, then where? What makes them unsafe?

Left Blank 5
User entered value 6
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 28.83

6. Do you have any other comments you wish to provide?

Left Blank 5
User entered value 6
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 47.00

1. If you go to school, how do you usually travel to school? Select your most frequent way of traveling to school.

Share a ride or get dropped off 1

If you selected combination, please specify

Left Blank 11
User entered value 0
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 0
If you selected other way, please specify

Left Blank 11
User entered value 0
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 0

2. What other ways do you sometimes use to travel to school? Select any that you sometimes use.

Drive by myself 1
HSR Bus 1

3. Do you have any problems, such as poor health, poor vision, difficulty walking, that make it hard to travel around?

Yes 3
No 7

4. Do you use a scooter, wheelchair, walker, cane or assistance dog to help you travel around?

Yes 1
No 9

5. How do you typically travel to work? Select your most frequent way of traveling to work.

Walk 1
Drive by myself 4
HSR bus 1
A combination, such as walk to transit 1
If you selected combination, please specify

Left Blank 10
User entered value 1
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 10.00

If you selected other way, please specify

Left Blank 11
User entered value 0
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 0

7. How do you travel for other trips you make? Select any that you typically or sometimes use for travelling for other trips.

Walk 2
Drive by myself 3
Taxi 1
HSR Bus 3
DARTS Accessible Transit 1
Other 1

If you selected other way, please specify

Left Blank 10
User entered value 1
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 17.00

6. What other ways do you sometimes use to travel to work? Select any that you sometimes use.

Drive by myself 2
Share a ride or get dropped off 2
HSR bus 1
8. What is the most important transportation issue or opportunity for improvement to you in the study area?

Left Blank 2
User entered value 9
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 39.33

9. Rate how easily you travel in the study area by the following methods:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Easy</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Not very easy</th>
<th>Difficult</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Driving</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crossing the street when walking</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding the bus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking or cycling to the bus stop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making deliveries by truck</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding Parking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10. Which of the following do you feel are problems in your neighbourhood?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Not a problem</th>
<th>Somewhat of a problem</th>
<th>A big problem</th>
<th>I don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cars speeding in my neighbourhood</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars driving on local streets in my neighbourhood to avoid major streets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion or traffic delays on major streets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucks not being able to make deliveries easily or on time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many trucks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service not frequent enough</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service that does not go where you travel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service that starts too late or ends too early in the day</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing sidewalks or pathways for walking</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of safe and comfortable cycling paths</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of safe and comfortable places for pedestrians and cyclists to cross major streets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough carpool, or park-and-ride lots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you feel there are other problems, please specify:

- Left Blank: 9
- User entered value: 2
- Average submission length in words (ex blanks): 69.50

11. What aspects of travelling in the study area are working well?

- Cars can easily move through the study area: 4
- There is no trouble driving through the neighbourhood even during high traffic hours: 1
- Bus service frequent enough: 1
- Bus service provides options and travels where I want to go: 1
- Bus service that starts early enough and ends late enough: 1
- Sidewalks are complete, and easily accessible: 1
- Other: 1
If other, please specify:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left Blank</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User entered value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average submission length in words (ex blanks)</td>
<td>11.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. If you could improve one thing about getting around in the study area today, what would it be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left Blank</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User entered value</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average submission length in words (ex blanks)</td>
<td>12.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. What do you think would be your biggest concern about travelling in this area 10 - 25 years from now? Consider that new development and growth may occur in the Centennial Neighbourhoods and the areas around it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left Blank</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User entered value</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average submission length in words (ex blanks)</td>
<td>19.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Carpooling (more than one person travelling together)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left Blank</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User entered value</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average submission length in words (ex blanks)</td>
<td>11.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Walking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left Blank</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User entered value</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average submission length in words (ex blanks)</td>
<td>10.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cycling

Left Blank 4
User entered value 5
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 8.40

HSR Bus

Left Blank 5
User entered value 4
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 9.25

GO Bus

Left Blank 7
User entered value 2
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 3.00

Future GO Train

Left Blank 3
User entered value 6
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 7.67

Carshare

Left Blank 5
User entered value 4
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 7.75
15. Do you have any other comments about transportation in the Centennial Neighbourhoods study area?

Left Blank 6
User entered value 5
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 34.00

Show Add analysis components
The selected components will be included on the analysis page.

- [x] Instructions
- [x] Your info
- [x] About you
- [x] Tell us a little bit about yourself
- [x] How old are you?
- [x] Gender:
  - [x] You and the Centennial Neighbourhoods Area
- [x] How do you use the Centennial Neighbourhoods Area? (check all that apply)

Update analysis display
Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan—
Summary of Phase 1 Consultation

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (CNTMP) is being undertaken to support the Secondary Plan for the Study Area, as well as to address existing transportation needs and issues. The objective of Phase 1 of the CNTMP is to identify issues or opportunities related to transportation. This summary provides an overview of stakeholder and public consultation events undertaken to date to understand existing conditions and issues. The events include:

- Stakeholder focus group (April 8, 2015)—12 people attended form the public
- Public information centre (April 30, 2015)—86 people signed the sign-in sheet
- Comments from City of Hamilton staff—Public Works, HSR, Planning and Public Health
- Public opinion survey posted on the City of Hamilton website—14 people filled it out on-line; two people submitted hard copies
- Direct submissions from the public—11 comment forms, one written submission and 10 emails

Overview of Issues

An overview of the issues and opportunities identified through the above consultation is provided below. The issues presented are "as heard". While many are directly related to the scope of the CNTMP, others may be subject to other processes and City Divisions. In particular, many of the transit-related issues are of an operational nature and need to be considered in the context of HSR’s overall transit plans. However, the CNTMP will continue to highlight these issues and articulate broader strategies to address them. The timing of transit improvements also influences the success of TDM programs and other initiatives aimed at increasing transit modal shares.

Local Transit Service

High-level local transit comments:

- **Connectivity to major destinations** within and outside of the community was an issue for many individuals. Within the area, a number of major destinations lacked direct connections to one another, such as the GO Park n’ Ride, St. Joseph’s UCC, Walmart Plaza, Eastgate Square and Riverdale Community Centre. Of particular concern was the lack of a direct connection between Eastgate Square and the current GO Transit Park n’ Ride. Similarly, a connection to the future GO Station from the neighbourhoods was a longer-term concern.

- **Supporting expansion of rapid transit** (both LRT and BRT were suggested) along the B-Line corridor received mixed reviews. Some considered it a top priority while others were opposed to it. Some implied that it would be a good way to solve congestion in the area while others said taking lanes away would increase traffic.

- A resident indicated that **connecting existing routes with Eastgate Square**, specifically Route 4 Bayfront, and the Route 5 Delaware branches that operate south of King, would make it easier to connect to other routes by transit and to get to the mall.

- **Riverdale Community Centre needs direct transit service** for the youth, women and recent immigrants who access its services.
**Issues to be addressed outside the CNTMP:**

- **Doubling the size of the Eastgate Square terminal** is part of the HSR’s long-term plans for the area and they encourage the study to identify where this could take place. Along the same lines, many residents indicated that an indoor waiting area at Eastgate Square, with washrooms and real-time departure information, would improve the experience and make long-transfers between vehicles more comfortable.

- **Low-frequency, community bus routes** that enter local neighbourhoods were suggested for areas with lower densities.

- **Frequency of routes** needing improvement was the transit issue identified by the most people. The Queenston Corridor (from Downtown to Eastgate Square) and Barton (from Downtown to Bell Manor Loop) were seen as being well served. However, other routes were viewed as needing to operate more frequently to improve their usefulness, particularly for seniors, children/youth, women, new immigrants and low income residents. The HSR did indicate that improvements would be coming to the Route 56 Centennial route within the next three years as part of their 10-year strategy.

- **Daily operating hours** were viewed as needing improvement by many people. Comments identified that service started too late in the morning and ended too early. Some routes were cited as not operating for the full service span of the destinations they serve, particularly the Route 56 Centennial bus that started operating later and ending earlier than the hours of the Walmart it primarily serves.

- Many comments were received that **Route 56 Centennial does not operate frequently or long enough.** Its hours should align with the Walmart Plaza to provide safe access for workers.

- Many indicated that **one bus should operate the full length of Centennial Parkway.** Currently, Route 56 Centennial operates on the section north of Eastgate Square, while Route 44 Rymal operates on the section south of Eastgate Square and continues to Upper Centennial for mountain access.

- **Providing more transit stop amenities** like shelters, benches and waste containers was cited as an opportunity for improvement.

- **Garbage bins are not being emptied** at some bus stops, primarily along Queenston and Barton.

**Regional Transit**

- The **existing GO Transit Park n Ride/carpool lot** is well liked.

- There is an opportunity to **increase non-auto access to the new GO bus station** by improving the cycling and pedestrian infrastructure in the vicinity and providing more frequent and direct HSR service to it.

- Concerns were raised with **how the new GO Train station will be accessed.** Individuals supported options such as transit, pedestrian, cycling and driving in order to provide multi-modal access for residents.

- **GO buses connecting to Burlington GO should still operate after the new GO Train Station opens.** The train will take too long to get to Burlington as it has to go through Downtown Hamilton.

- Concerns were raised that the **new GO Train station will make the community a suburb of Toronto.**
Pedestrians

*High-level pedestrian comments:*

- While many of the destinations in the area are a “walkable” distance, most considered it **unsafe and/or uncomfortable to walk** due to an unattractive pedestrian realm, lack of infrastructure and very short crossing times at major intersections. This was cited most frequently for any trip that required crossing an arterial road like Centennial, Barton or Queenston.

- Encouraging and facilitating **walking is important to encourage healthy active living** in the area. Residents should be able to access major destinations in the community by foot to incorporate healthy living by design into their everyday lives.

- **Streetscaping improvements**, such as benches and trees, were requested to be added to improve the area. Generally, Queenston was viewed as “attractive” because of the sidewalk setback from the road and trees along the boulevard, while Centennial, King and Barton were not attractive due to the sidewalk adjacent to the roadway and a lack of amenities and trees along it.

- **Mixed comments were received about installing new sidewalks along low-volume residential roads** that were built without them.

*Location-specific pedestrian comments:*

- **Pedestrian access to Eastgate Square received mixed reviews:**
  - Individuals west of Centennial between Barton and Queenston generally said access by foot was easy, though speeding traffic was a concern.
  - Individuals east of Centennial cited the need for a pedestrian crossing on the eastern side of the mall in the vicinity of Vineyard Road. This was of particular concern for people from the Riverdale area who walk to the mall and transit terminal.

- **Narrow sidewalks on Nash** make it uncomfortable to walk along.

- **Missing sidewalks along portions of Lake and Centennial** make it difficult for individuals to travel by foot. Access to the Walmart Plaza and Confederation Park was cited as being difficult because of this.

*Issues to be address outside the CNTMP:*

- Current **crossing times were considered inadequate** across major roads, even for abled-bodied people. Intersections that received a large volume of comments about this were Centennial at Queenston, Centennial at Delawana, and Centennial at Barton.

- **New ladder-style pedestrian crossings** were recommended for Kenora at Kentley, Kentley at Oakland, and Kentley at Nash.

Cycling

*High-level cycling comments:*

- Many individuals stated they **do not feel comfortable cycling** in most parts of the community due to the **lack of safe facilities, fast traffic and the large volumes of trucks**. While many of the destinations in the area are a “bikeable” distance, it is not safe and/or comfortable to bike.

- **Expanding Hamilton Bike Share to the area** was cited multiple times as an opportunity.

- **Encouraging cycling is important for healthy active living** in the area. Accessing major destinations in the community by bike should be encouraged to incorporate healthy living by design into residents’ everyday lives.
Location-specific cycling comments:

- Many cited the need for a **safe active transportation connection on Centennial Parkway in order to reach Confederation Park.** The City and MTO are currently working on a multi-use path connection on the Centennial Parkway structure over the QEW that will accomplish this, however the timing is currently unknown.

- **New bikeways** were suggested for Nash, Delawana, Owen Place, Kenora and Kentley, as was continuing the lanes on King Street. As well, adding new facilities to reach the new GO Station and Queenston Library were suggested.

Roadways

High-level roadway comments:

- **Speeding is perceived as happening on all residential streets.** Some mention the need for better enforcement or a 40 km/hr blanket speed limit in the area.

- **RHVP congestion causes traffic to seek alternate routes** in study area arterial roads, especially Centennial up to the mountain.

- **Heavy truck traffic uses Centennial and Barton and is often noisy,** especially at night. Individuals indicated that the large volume poses a perceived safety risk.

Specific level roadways comments:

- The **left-turn only movement onto Kenora and right-turn only movement onto Delawana from Eastgate Square were viewed as an inconvenience** by some residents. Many indicated they drive around the mall in order to get home from shopping. These traffic movement restrictions are from an OMB ruling issued September 22, 2000.

Issues to be address outside the CNTMP:

- There were concerns that the **traffic signals along arterial routes have too short of a green phase.** This needs to be extended in order to allow cars and goods movement vehicles to travel efficiently.

- The **split-phase traffic signal at Nash and Kentley is well liked.** Suggestions were given to improve the signage to help people understand it better.

- Many comments requested an **advanced left turn signal at Centennial and Delawana** for traffic turning onto Delawana (both directions).

- Concerns were raised about the **queue that forms to make a left-turn into St. Joeseph’s UCC on King Street.**

- Concerns were raised about **construction-related cut-through traffic from recent / on-going projects on Barton and Centennial.** Roads that were mentioned include Irene and Kenora.

Evaluation Criteria

As part of the focus group and PIC, individuals were asked to select the five most important factors to them from a list of criterion for evaluating transportation options. The results are shown in Exhibit 1. Pedestrians and transit were select as important by the most people (17). Urban Design was the most important factor for stakeholders attending the focus group meeting; drivers was the most important to members of the public who participated in this activity at the PIC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>PIC</th>
<th>FOCUS GROUP</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity of the transportation network</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety for all users</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Environment</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclist</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built Heritage</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Vehicles Access</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let's Talk about the Centennial Neighbourhoods!
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2 - OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC INPUT

What?
The City is hosting a meeting to engage with the public about the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study and Transportation Management Plan (TPM) Study (Municipal Class Environmental Assessment).
This meeting is an opportunity to:
• Hear an update on the status of these projects
• Learn about and provide input into the various land use, intensification, and transportation options that we have developed. Your input will help us to determine the preferred changes and plans for the Study Areas.

Study Area:

Why?
Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan
The Centennial Neighbourhoods area is an important area in the east end of the City. It is a focal point for commercial uses, other activities and transportation connections. The area has been identified as a potential area for future change and redevelopment. The purpose of the study is to create a plan and policies to guide future change, promoting positive improvements that meet the community’s needs.
www.hamilton.ca/centennialneighbourhoods

Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan
This study is being carried out in collaboration with the Secondary Plan. The study will consider and review alternative options for changes to pedestrian, cycling, transit, truck and other vehicular networks, and will also take into account upcoming GO Transit service improvements to the area. The purpose of the study is to address existing and future transportation needs and issues in the area.
www.hamilton.ca/centennialNTMP

How?
Attend the meeting or contact the project managers for additional information. Access the websites above for more information. You can also submit your comments online from Dec 2nd to Dec 18th, 2015.
Optional: RSVP for the event by emailing planning.team@hamilton.ca or calling 905-546-2424 Ext. 4498.

If you have any accessibility requirements to participate in this event, please call 905-546-2424 Ext. 4498 or email planning.team@hamilton.ca. Advance requests are highly encouraged to enable us to meet your needs adequately.

Contact:
Secondary Plan
Melanie Pham, MCIP, RPP, Planner
Phone: 905-546-2424 Ext. 6685 | E-Mail: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca

Transportation Management Plan
Mohan Philip, M.Eng., P.Eng., Project Manager
Phone: 905-546-2424 Ext. 3438 | E-Mail: tplanning@hamilton.ca

This Notice issued November 20th, 2015 and November 27th, 2015.
Let's Talk about the Centennial Neighbourhoods!
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2
OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC INPUT

What? The City is hosting a meeting to engage with the public about the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study and Transportation Management Plan (TMP) Study (Municipal Class Environmental Assessment)

This meeting is an opportunity to:
• Hear an update on the status of these projects
• Learn about and provide input into the various land use, intensification, and transportation options that we have developed. Your input will help us to determine the preferred changes and plans for the Study Areas.

Study Area:

When & Tuesday, Dec 1st, 2015
Where? 6:30 pm - 9:00 pm (Presentation at 6:45 pm)
Lake Avenue Public School, West Gymnasium
157 Lake Avenue North, Hamilton, ON L8E 1L5

Why? Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan
The Centennial Neighbourhoods area is an important area in the east end of the City. It is a focal point for commercial uses, other activities and transportation connections. The area has been identified as a potential area for future change and redevelopment. The purpose of the study is to create a plan and policies to guide future change, promoting positive improvements that meet the community's needs.
www.hamilton.ca/centennlalneiahbourhoods

Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan
This study is being carried out in collaboration with the Secondary Plan. The study will consider and review alternative options for changes to pedestrian, cycling, transit, truck and other vehicular networks, and will also take into account upcoming GO Transit service improvements to the area. The purpose of the study is to address existing and future transportation needs and issues in the area.
www.hamilton.ca/centennialNTMP

How? Attend the meeting or contact the project managers for additional information. Access the websites above for more information. You can also submit your comments online from Dec 2nd to Dec 18th, 2015.

Optional: RSVP for the event by emailing planning.team@hamilton.ca or calling 905-546-2424 Ext. 4498.

If you have any accessibility requirements to participate in this event, please call 905-546-2424 Ext. 4498 or email planning.team@hamilton.ca. Advance requests are highly encouraged to enable us to meet your needs adequately.

Contact Secondary Plan
Melanie Pham, MCIP, RPP, Planner
Phone: 905-546-2424 Ext. 6685 I E-Mail: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca

Transportation Management Plan
Mohan Philip, M.Eng., P.Eng., Project Manager
Phone: 905-546-2424 Ext. 3438 I E-Mail: tplaning@hamilton.ca

This Notice issued November 19th, 2015 and November 26th, 2015.
Let's Talk about the Centennial Neighbourhoods!

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2

OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC INPUT

What?
The City is hosting a meeting to engage with the public about the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study and Transportation Management Plan (TMP) Study (Municipal Class Environmental Assessment).

This meeting is an opportunity to:
- Hear an update on the status of these projects
- Learn about and provide input into the various land use, intensification, and transportation options that we have developed. Your input will help us to determine the preferred changes and plans for the Study Areas.

Study Area:

When & Where?
Tuesday, Dec 1st, 2015
6:30 pm – 9:00 pm (Presentation at 6:45 pm)
Lake Avenue Public School, West Gymnasium
157 Lake Avenue North, Hamilton, ON L8E 1L5

Why?

**Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan**
The Centennial Neighbourhoods area is an important area in the east end of the City. It is a focal point for commercial uses, other activities and transportation connections. The area has been identified as a potential area for future change and redevelopment. The purpose of the study is to create a plan and policies to guide future change, promoting positive improvements that meet the community’s needs.

www.hamilton.ca/centennialneighbourhoods

**Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan**
This study is being carried out in collaboration with the Secondary Plan. The study will consider and review alternative options for changes to pedestrian, cycling, transit, truck and other vehicular networks, and will also take into account upcoming GO Transit service improvements to the area. The purpose of the study is to address existing and future transportation needs and issues in the area.

www.hamilton.ca/centennialNTMP

How?

Attend the meeting or contact the project managers for additional information. Access the websites above for more information. You can also submit your comments online from Dec 2nd to Dec 18th, 2015.

Optional: RSVP for the event by emailing planning.team@hamilton.ca or calling 905-546-2424 Ext. 4498. If you have any accessibility requirements to participate in this event, please call 905-546-2424 Ext. 4498 or email planning.team@hamilton.ca. Advance requests are highly encouraged to enable us to meet your needs adequately.

Contact:
- Secondary Plan
  - Melanie Pham, MCIP, RPP, Planner
  - Phone: 905-546-2424 Ext. 6685 | E-Mail: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca

- Transportation Management Plan
  - Mohan Philip, M.Eng., P.Eng., Project Manager
  - Phone: 905-546-2424 Ext. 3438 | E-Mail: tpplanning@hamilton.ca

This Notice issued November 20th, 2015 and November 27th, 2015.

www.hamilton.ca/centennial
LET'S TALK ABOUT THE DRAFT TALL BUILDING GUIDELINES FOR DOWNTOWN HAMILTON

What?
The City is hosting a meeting to engage with the community about the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study and Transportation Management Plan Study (Municipal Class Environmental Assessment).

Why?
The purpose of the study is to create a plan and policies to guide future change, promoting positive improvements that meet the community's needs. The Centennial Neighbourhoods area is an important area in the east end of Hamilton. It is a focal point for commercial uses, other vehicular networks, and will also take into account upcoming GO Transit service improvements to the area.

When & Where:
Wednesday, April 27th, 2016
6:30 p.m. – 8:30 p.m.
Presentation begins at 7 pm
Hilton Homewood Suites, 48 Bay Street South
Hamilton, ON, L8P 5L3

CONTACT:
Alissa Mahood, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner, Community Planning Section
City of Hamilton, 71 Main Street West, 6th Floor, Hamilton, ON, L8P 4Y5
Phone: 905-546-2424 Ext. 1320
Email: alissa.mahood@hamilton.ca

NOTICES

CITY OF HAMILTON
NOTICES

SALE OF LANDS FOR TAX ARREARS

Tender notices that tenders are invited for the purchase of the land(s) described below and will be received until 3:00 p.m. local time on Wednesday May 11, 2016 at the Citizen Service Centre 1st Floor, City Hall, 71 Main Street West, Hamilton, Ont.

Tenders will then be opened in public on the same day at 3:10 p.m. local time in Room 206 of City Hall, 71 Main Street West, Hamilton, Ont.

Tender must be submitted in the prescribed form and must be accompanied by a deposit in the form of a money order or a bank draft or cheque certified by a bank or trust company payable to the City of Hamilton. The deposit is non-refundable and will be forfeited if the tender is not accepted.

The City will be required to pay any relevant federal or provincial taxes relating to the land to be sold. Any remaining deposits and/or tender amounts will remain on title and may become the responsibility of the potential purchaser.

The City of Hamilton does not make representation as to the condition of the property or the legal description thereof and does not assume any responsibility for potential purchasers to view properties by personal inspection.

For further information regarding this sale, please contact the City of Hamilton’s Tax Sale Officer. A copy of the property description for each property will be available for sale, and a copy of the prescribed form of Tender endorsement, will be available on the City of Hamilton’s website at: www.hamilton.ca/taxsaleproperties

Tenders must be received until 3:00 p.m. local time on Wednesday May 11, 2016 at the Citizen Service Centre 1st Floor, City Hall, 71 Main Street West, Hamilton, Ont.

The City will be required to pay any relevant federal or provincial taxes relating to the land to be sold. Any remaining deposits and/or tender amounts will remain on title and may become the responsibility of the potential purchaser.

The City of Hamilton does not make representation as to the condition of the property or the legal description thereof and does not assume any responsibility for potential purchasers to view properties by personal inspection.

For further information regarding this sale, please contact the City of Hamilton’s Tax Sale Officer. A copy of the property description for each property will be available for sale, and a copy of the prescribed form of Tender endorsement, will be available on the City of Hamilton’s website at: www.hamilton.ca/taxsaleproperties

Tenders must be received until 3:00 p.m. local time on Wednesday May 11, 2016 at the Citizen Service Centre 1st Floor, City Hall, 71 Main Street West, Hamilton, Ont.

The City will be required to pay any relevant federal or provincial taxes relating to the land to be sold. Any remaining deposits and/or tender amounts will remain on title and may become the responsibility of the potential purchaser.

The City of Hamilton does not make representation as to the condition of the property or the legal description thereof and does not assume any responsibility for potential purchasers to view properties by personal inspection.
The **purpose of this study** is to develop a comprehensive Transportation Management Plan for the Centennial Neighbourhoods that will:

a) Follow the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process

b) Support the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan study

c) Review and address existing neighbourhood transportation issues

d) Identify and evaluate options to address transportation issues
The Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Master Plan (CNTMP) study is conducted in accordance with Phase 1 and 2 of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Process, under the Environmental Assessment Act. This is a planning and approval process that ensures that the potential effects of a project are identified and managed prior to implementation.

**Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process**

- **Phase 1:** Problem or Opportunity
- **Phase 2:** Alternative Solutions
- **Phase 3:** Alternative Design Concepts
- **Phase 4:** Environmental Study Report
- **Phase 5:** Implementation

**Capital Project Delivery Process**

Once a specific transportation project is identified and approved, it will go through the following delivery process, subject to an approved budget by council:

- **Step 1:** Create Project and Budget
- **Step 2:** Develop Project Scope (EA if required)
- **Step 3:** Permit Approvals, Pre-design and Base Plans
- **Step 4:** Detailed Design
- **Step 5:** Utilities Coordination, Land and Tender Preparation
- **Step 6:** Construction

**Construction Timeline:** The time to deliver project can vary from 2 years for a simple rehabilitation project, to 5 years for a more complicated urban arterial reconstruction project (due to potential for EAs, land acquisition, detailed underground analysis, permits and approvals and utility coordination).
Opportunity Statement

The CNTMP is being undertaken by the City of Hamilton to plan for improved mobility to:

- Accommodate transportation needs of future land use
- Take advantage of investment from development opportunities
- Support access to major transportation services such as the QEW, Red Hill Valley Parkway, HSR, Rapid Transit and GO Transit
- Support choices including walking and cycling
- Create livable neighbourhoods and complete communities

The goals of the improvements are to create safe, efficient, and sustainable transportation, that limits impacts to the environment, and supports healthy living.
Improving Health by Community Design

Community Design Elements:
- Population and employment density
- Nearness of services, including public transit
- Mix of land uses
- Many street connections
- Streetscape including facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and transit users
- Increase in bicycle parking and decrease in car parking

Health-related Priorities:
- Active transportation (walking cycling)
- Public transit
- Equity in transportation and housing options
- Support for all stages of the life cycle
- Safety, comfort and convenience of travel
- Social interaction
- Accessibility

These Community Design Elements provide comprehensive support for Health-related Priorities
During Phase 1 of the study, we heard from a number of people: 12 focus group stakeholders, 86 people at PIC#1, and 12 written submissions. This is a summary of what we heard.

**Roadways:**
- Speeding on residential streets
- Congestion on Red Hill Valley Parkway causes traffic to seek alternate routes in neighbourhoods
- Heavy, noisy truck traffic on Centennial and Barton is unsafe

**Regional Transit:**
- GO Transit Park n Ride well liked
- How will people access the new GO Station
- Increase non-auto access to new GO Station

**Local Transit:**
- Mixed opinions on potential for rapid transit expansion
- Lack of service between major destinations within the neighbourhoods
- Connect existing routes to Eastgate Square (Route 4 & 5)
- Lack of transit service to Riverdale Community Centre

**Walking:**
- Important for healthy active living
- Unsafe and/or uncomfortable to walk
- Streetscaping improvements needed
- Major streets crossing times inadequate
- Sidewalks adjacent to traffic on Nash
- Missing sidewalks along portions of Lake, Centennial and Warrington
- Pedestrian access to Eastgate Square / Transit Terminal: easy from west; need better connections east to Riverdale

**Bicycling:**
- Important for healthy active living
- Uncomfortable due to lack of safe facilities, fast traffic and large trucks
- Expand Hamilton Bike Share (SoBi) to the area
- Need safe connection on Centennial Parkway to Confederation Park
- New bikeways suggested for Nash, Delawana, Owen Place, Kenora, Kentley; to new GO Station and Red Hill Library; and extend King Street bike lanes
We have identified alternative transportation solutions that address the opportunity statement: accommodate transportation needs of future land use; take advantage of investment from development opportunities; support access to major transportation services such as the QEW, Red Hill Valley Parkway, and HSR, Rapid Transit and GO Transit; support choices including walking and cycling; and create livable neighbourhoods and complete communities.

The Secondary Plan land-use options will add 900 to 1,400 peak hour trips – equivalent to 2 lanes of traffic. In 2031, it is estimated that:

- The road network will operate reasonably well with some “hot spot” intersections with long delays
- Barton and Queenston west of Centennial will experience higher levels of congestion during peak periods
- Other roads approach but do not exceed their capacity to move traffic

The CNTMP alternative solutions are grouped into four focus areas of improvements:

- Capacity
- Safety
- Urban Design
- Mobility Choices

The City-wide Transportation Master Plan vision (draft): The key objective of the Transportation Master Plan is to provide a COMPREHENSIVE AND ATTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION BLUEPRINT for Hamilton as a WHOLE that BALANCES ALL MODES OF TRANSPORTATION. The ULTIMATE GOALS include reducing dependence on single-occupant vehicles and promoting ACCESSIBILITY AND improved options for walking, cycling and transit, while maintaining and improving the efficiency of trips related to the movement of goods and servicing employment areas. THE SUCCESS OF THE PLAN WILL BE BASED ON SPECIFIC, MEASURABLE, ACHIEVABLE, RELEVANT AND PROGRAMMED RESULTS.

These alternatives will be evaluated and recommendations presented at a third PIC in Winter 2016.
Capacity Focused Alternative Solutions

Extend the B-line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (within 15 years west of Centennial & beyond 25 years east of Centennial)

Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to CO Station (beyond 25 years)

Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic lanes (beyond 25 years)

Improve traffic signal timings
Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections
Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections

Other transit alternative solutions can be found on Urban Design : B and Mobility Choices : E and F
Safety Focused Alternative Solutions

A. Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds

B. Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue

C. Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas.

D. Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections.

E. Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety.

F. Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park.

Other pedestrian alternative solutions can be found on Urban Design: C and Mobility Choices: H

Other cycling alternative solutions can be found on Urban Design: E and Mobility Choices: A, G and H
Urban Design Focused Alternative Solutions

A. Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots

B. Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50%

C. Improve pedestrian connections through new developments

- Other pedestrian alternative solutions can be found on Safety: C, D and F, and Mobility Choices: H

D. Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts

E. Implement cycle tracks in the boulevard on Centennial and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape options

- Other cycling alternative solutions can be found on Safety: D and F, and Mobility Choices: A, G and H

F. Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete/Livable/Better Streets
Mobility Choices Focused Alternative Solutions

- **A**: Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods
- **B**: Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances
- **C**: Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools
- **D**: Facilitate car sharing
- **E**: Extend and modify HSR routes
- **F**: Add local HSR circulator route
- **G**: Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington, and South Service Road
- **H**: Create non-aut (walking & cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park n’Ride

Other transit alternative solutions can be found on Capacity: A, B and F, and Urban Design: B.

Other pedestrian alternative solutions can be found on Safety: C, D and F, and Urban Design: C.

Other cycling alternative solutions can be found on Safety: D and F, and Urban Design: E.
CNTMP Activity #1 – Discuss the Alternatives

Discuss the transportation alternative solutions using ABC-We (30 mins.):

- **Advantages** – what makes sense
- **Best ideas** – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood
- **Concerns** – what might not work
- **What else** – add your ideas

Review the transportation options using ABC-We. **Write your ideas** on the worksheet.
After discussing the transportation options, let us know where you think the City should be making transportation investments.

Place 4 poker chips in the jars for the strategies that are most important to you.

You can put more than one chip in a jar, or you can spread them out over some or all of the jars.
The next step is to evaluate the transportation alternative solutions and present the recommended alternatives at PIC #3.

We will review comments collected at today’s Open House. Your comments will help us evaluate the transportation options.

Please submit comments by December 18, 2015.

Stay involved by signing up to receive notices of future consultation:

- Public Open House No. 3 – Winter 2016
- Public Works Committee and then Council
- MCEA 30-Day Public Review

If you have any comments, concerns or questions about the study, please contact:

**Mr. Mohan Philip, M.Eng., P.Eng.**
Project Manager, Transportation Planning
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438
Fax: 905-546-2039
E-mail: tplanning@hamilton.ca

OR

**Ms. Norma Moores, P.Eng.**
Project Manager, IBI Group
Phone: 905-546-1010 ext. 2106
Fax: 905-546-1011
E-mail: norma.moores@ibigroup.com

[www.hamilton.ca/CentennialNTMP](http://www.hamilton.ca/CentennialNTMP)
Purpose

The purpose of this study:

• Support the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan study
• Review and address existing neighbourhood transportation issues
• Identify and evaluate options to address transportation issues

Study Area

Project Process

Implementing Projects in the TMP

Opportunity Statement

The CNTMP is being undertaken by the City of Hamilton to plan for improved mobility to:

• Accommodate transportation needs of future land use
• Take advantage of investment from development opportunities
• Support access to major transportation services such as the QEW, Red Hill Valley Parkway, and HSR, Rapid Transit and GO Transit
• Support choices including walking and cycling
• Create livable neighbourhoods and complete communities

The goals of the improvements are to create safe, efficient, and sustainable transportation, that limits impacts to the environment, and supports healthy living.
Stage 1 Consultation

Wide range of comments and issues from improving transit to addressing speeding and more…

Traffic Analysis for Secondary Plan

Secondary Plan land-use options will add 900 to 1,400 peak hour trips – equivalent to 2 lanes of traffic

In 2031:
- Network operates reasonably well with some hot spots
- Barton and Queenston west of Centennial are main constraints
- Other roads approach but do not exceed capacity

City-wide Transportation Master Plan

Vision Statement (draft)

The key objective of the Transportation Master Plan is to provide a COMPREHENSIVE AND ATTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION BLUEPRINT for Hamilton as a WHOLE that BALANCES ALL MODES OF TRANSPORTATION. The ULTIMATE GOALS include reducing dependence on single-occupant vehicles and promoting ACCESSIBILITY AND improved options for walking, cycling and transit, while maintaining and improving the efficiency of trips related to the movement of goods and servicing employment areas.

THE SUCCESS OF THE PLAN WILL BE BASED ON SPECIFIC, MEASURABLE, ACHIEVABLE, RELEVANT AND PROGRAMMED RESULTS.

Transportation Alternative Solutions

Activity #1: Discussion
At each table, discuss your ideas and write them on the worksheet using ABC We:
- Advantages – what makes sense
- Best ideas – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood
- Concerns – what might not work
- What else – add your ideas
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Capacity Focused Alternative Solutions

Extend the B-line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (within 15 years west of Centennial & beyond 25 years east of Centennial)

Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GC Station (beyond 25 years)

Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic lanes (beyond 25 years)

Improve traffic signal timings
Add turn lanes or roundabouts at "hot spot" intersections
Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections

Other transit alternative solutions can be found on Urban Design: B and Mobility Choices: E and F
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Capacity Focused Alternative Solutions

Extend the B-line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (within 15 years west of Centennial & beyond 25 years east of Centennial)

Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)

Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic lanes (beyond 25 years)

Improve traffic signal timings Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections

Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections

Other transit alternative solutions can be found on Urban Design: B and Mobility Choices: E and F
Appendix "C" to Report PED18007

Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds
Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue

C. Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas

D. Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections

E. Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety

F. Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park

Other pedestrian alternative solutions can be found on Urban Design: C and Mobility Choices: H

Other cycling alternative solutions can be found on Urban Design: E and Mobility Choices: A, G and H
Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds

Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue

Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas

Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections

Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety

Other pedestrian alternative solutions can be found on Urban Design: C and Mobility Choices: H

Other cycling alternative solutions can be found on Urban Design: E and Mobility Choices: A, G and H

Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park
Urban Design Focused Alternative Solutions

A. Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots

B. Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50%

C. Improve pedestrian connections through new developments

Other pedestrian alternative solutions can be found on Safety: C, D and F, and Mobility Choices: H

D. Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts

E. Implement cycle tracks in the boulevard on Centennial and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape options

Other cycling alternative solutions can be found on Safety: D and F, and Mobility Choices: A, G and H

F. Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete/Livable/Better Streets
Mobility Choices Focused Alternative Solutions

A. Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods
B. Support live/work/play development so people do not have to travel long distances
C. Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools
D. Facilitate car sharing
E. Extend and modify HSR routes
F. Add local HSR circulator route
G. Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington, and South Service Road
H. Create non-auto (walking & cycling) access to GC Station and right-sized Park n’Ride

Other transit alternative solutions can be found on Capacity: A, B and F, and Urban Design: B

Other pedestrian alternative solutions can be found on Safety: C, D and F, and Urban Design: C

Other cycling alternative solutions can be found on Safety: D and F, and Urban Design: E
Mobility Choices Focused Alternative Solutions

A. Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods

B. Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances

C. Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools

D. Facilitate car sharing

E. Extend and modify HSR routes

F. Add local HSR circulator route

G. Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington, and South Service Road

H. Create non-auto (walking & cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park n'Ride

Other transit alternative solutions can be found on
Capacity: A, B and F, and Urban Design: B

Other pedestrian alternative solutions can be found on
Safety: C, D and F, and Urban Design: C

Other cycling alternative solutions can be found on
Safety: D and F, and Urban Design: E

Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
www.hamilton.ca/CentennialNTMP

Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan
Public Information Centre #2
December 1, 2015
Transportation Alternative Solutions: ABC-We Activity #1

**Capacity**
- **Extend the B-line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square** (within 15 years west of Centennial & beyond 25 years east of Centennial)
- **Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station** (beyond 25 years)
- **Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic lanes** (beyond 25 years)
- **Improve traffic signal timings**
- **Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections**
- **Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections**

**Safety**
- **Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds**
- **Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue**
- **Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas**
- **Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections**
- **Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety**
- **Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park**

**Urban Design**
- **Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots**
- **Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50%**
- **Improve pedestrian connections through new developments**
- **Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts**
- **Implement cycle tracks on Centennial, and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape concepts**
- **Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets**

**Mobility Choices**
- **Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods**
- **Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances**
- **Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools**
- **Facilitate car sharing**
- **Extend and modify HSR routes**
- **Add local HSR circulator route**
- **Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road**
- **Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N’ Ride**

**Advantages** – what makes sense

**Best Ideas** – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood

**Concerns** – what might not work

**What else** – add your ideas

Check school travel plans + neighbourhood activity plans

- More bicycle play?
- Cleanliness of area - park - no bins, too much trash
Transportation Alternative Solutions: ABC-We Activity #1

**CAPACITY**
- Extend the B-line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (within 15 years west of Centennial & beyond 25 years east of Centennial)
- Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)
- Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic lanes (beyond 25 years)
- Improve traffic signal timings
- Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections
- Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections

**SAFETY**
- Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds
- Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue
- Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas
- Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections
- Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety
- Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park

**URBAN DESIGN**
- Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots
- Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50%
- Improve pedestrian connections through new developments
- Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts
- Implement cycle tracks on Centennial, and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape options
- Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets

**MOBILITY CHOICES**
- Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods
- Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances
- Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools
- Facilitate car sharing
- Extend and modify HSR routes
- Add local HSR circulator route
- Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road
- Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N' Ride

**Advantages** – what makes sense

**Best ideas** – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood

**Concerns** – what might not work

**What else** – add your ideas
Transportation Alternative Solutions: ABC-We Activity #1

**CAPACITY**
- Extend the B-line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (within 15 years west of Centennial & beyond 25 years east of Centennial)
- Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)
- Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic lanes (beyond 25 years)
- Improve traffic signal timings
- Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections
- Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections

**SAFETY**
- Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds
- Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue
- Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas
- Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections
- Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety
- Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park

**URBAN DESIGN**
- Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots
- Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50%
- Improve pedestrian connections through new developments
- Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts
- Implement cycle tracks on Centennial, and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape options
- Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets

**MOBILITY CHOICES**
- Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods
- Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances
- Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools
- Facilitate car sharing
- Extend and modify HSR routes
- Add local HSR circulator route
- Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road
- Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N' Ride

**Advantages** – what makes sense

**Best ideas** – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood

**Concerns** – what might not work

**What else** – add your ideas
Transportation Alternative Solutions: ABC-We Activity #1

**Capacity**
- A: Extend the B-line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (within 15 years west of Centennial & beyond 25 years east of Centennial)
- B: Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)
- C: Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic lanes (beyond 25 years)
- D: Improve traffic signal timings
- E: Add turn lanes or roundabouts at "hot spot" intersections
- F: Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections

**Safety**
- A: Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds
- B: Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue
- C: Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas
- D: Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections
- E: Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety
- F: Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park

**Urban Design**
- A: Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots
- B: Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50%
- C: Improve pedestrian connections through new developments
- D: Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts
- E: Implement cycle tracks on Centennial and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape options
- F: Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets

**Mobility Choices**
- A: Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods
- B: Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances
- C: Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools
- D: Facilitate car sharing
- E: Extend and modify HSR routes
- F: Add local HSR circulator route
- G: Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road
- H: Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N’ Ride

**Advantages** - what makes sense
- B: No brainer - should extend S-line on Centennial
- C: Capacity - makes sense
- F: Capacity = priority measure for buses good idea.

**Best Ideas** - what will work best for you and your neighbourhood
- Traffic calming on old section of Gainsborough Road needed.
- Reducing speeds to 40 km/h is essential. Delormap, Kentley, Kenora, all residential streets in that area. Speeding is a big issue.
- Must fill in missing sidewalk pieces, substantially necessary.
- Sidewalks in industrial areas important.

**Concerns** - what might not work
- Bus route changes should be studied, discussed separately when LRT/GO comes in.
- Enough bus shelters in place.

**What Else** - add your ideas
- Signal - traffic - already ok.
- Ok with current turn lanes.
- No show on Queenston because of so many lights/access might along here could help.
- Connection through open spaces to Confederation Park could be made - shorter.
- Multi-use trail all the way through.
- Public notices should be up.
- Bus stop/NGS, Queenston slips.
Thank you for attending today’s Public Information Centre. Your input is important to us. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by December 18, 2015 to:

Melanie Pham, RPP, MCIP OR Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Planning & Economic Development Dept. Project Manager, Public Works Dept.
City of Hamilton City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor 77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5 Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6685 Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438
Email: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

If you would like to be added to the contact list for these projects for notices of future public information centres, please provide your contact information below:

__________________________________________________________________________________________

All comments and information received from the public regarding this project are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the Public Record.

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN

1. Are there any issues or potential changes to the study area that were not addressed by the options presented tonight?

   I was not present at the meeting; please see my concerns at bottom of page.

   _______________________________________________________________________________________

   _______________________________________________________________________________________

   _______________________________________________________________________________________

2. Are there any public realm improvements that were not identified that you would like to see?

   _______________________________________________________________________________________

   _______________________________________________________________________________________

   _______________________________________________________________________________________

   _______________________________________________________________________________________

   _______________________________________________________________________________________

   _______________________________________________________________________________________

   (See Reverse)
3. Do you have any additional suggestions to improve the streetscapes along Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway?

4. Other comments and/or remarks:

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. Of the four areas of focus for the transportation alternatives solutions, which areas are the most important to you – please check (√):

☐ Capacity  ☑ Safety  ☐ Urban design  ☐ Mobility choices

Are there any transportation issues that are not addressed by the alternative solutions that were presented? If so, please describe the issue and what you think the alternative solutions would be Issue(s):

Having lived on Oakland Drive for 8 yrs, we have noticed a high influx of traffic. This stems mostly from people coming out of Eastgate Square onto Kenora where there is no right hand turn onto Kenora. They cut down Oakland Dr to miss the lights and traffic at Queenston. In coming down Oakland Dr the straight away which is approx 1/2 km, allows for cars to speed excessively down Oakland Dr to Kently, as there are no stop signs, no on coming streets or speed bumps. This also has 50 km/hr speed limit. I have talked with Sgt. Cavanaugh in the past and once they have come out with speed radar, but there was no outcome. With the amount of children and seniors in the area, this is an extreme safety issue.

Alternative Solution(s):

My alternatives for these issues would be the following. (1) Allow a right hand turn out of Eastgate Square onto Kenora. (Which would reduce the amount of accidents at that intersection; check your records for that amount). (2) Make Oakland Dr a one way east bound at Kenora. (3) Do the same as Lake Ave 40km/hr with speed bumps.

2. Other comments and/or remarks:

THANK YOU!
From: Philip, Mohan <Mohan.Philip@hamilton.ca>
Sent: October-21-15 12:39 PM
To: Parsons, Catherine; Pham, Melanie; Norma Moores; Collins, Chad
Subject: RE: SPEED CONTROL HUMPS AND REDUCED SPEED

Hi,

Thanks for your suggestions. As you know the Centennial Neighbourhood Transportation Management Study is underway and the project team will consider your suggestions as part of the transportation management for the study area. The various options under consideration will be discussed at the upcoming focus group meeting for which you will be receiving the invitation.

Thanks
Mohan Philip
Project Manager

From:
Sent: October-19-15 3:47 PM
To: Collins, Chad; Pham, Melanie
Subject: SPEED CONTROL HUMPS AND REDUCED SPEED

So many streets in this city can have speed humps. The most recent I noticed today was on St. Clair Avenue. Why can't we have them on Delawana and/or Kenora?

So many streets in our area have speed limits reduced to 40KPH. Why can't the speed be reduced to 40kph on Delawana and Kenora?

Please advise.

Thank you.
From: November-09-15 2:35 PM
To: Norma Moores <Norma.Moores@IBIGroup.com>
Subject: RE: Centennial Study

Norma:
If you are forwarding on - then I have added more detailed remarks below. They are intended to capitalize on my knowledge of the area and of the master plans for Hamilton (cycling, trails & recreation). You can also request that some of the remarks be forwarded to the Trails & Recreational Master Planning process which I understand is currently underway (I have not commented). I will see if I can make the PIC. Thanks for your consideration Frank

From: Norma Moores [mailto:Norma.Moores@IBIGroup.com]
Sent: November 9, 2015 12:10 PM
To: 
Subject: RE: Centennial Study

I’ll copy the City’s project manager on your ideas.

The next PIC is planned for December 1, 2015 at Lake Avenue Public School, 157 Lake Ave. North.

Best regards, Norma

Norma Moores P.Eng.

Associate
mob +1 289 260 6060
e-mail Norma.Moores@IBIGroup.com web www.ibigroup.com

IBI GROUP
Suite 200, East Wing
360 James Street North
Hamilton ON L8L 1H5 Canada
tel +1 905 546 1010 ext 2106 fax +1 905 546 1011

NOTE: This email message/attachments may contain privileged and confidential information. If received in error, please notify the sender and delete this e-mail message.

NOTE: Ce courriel peut contenir de l'information privilégiée et confidentielle. Si vous avez recu ce message par erreur, veuillez le mentionner immédiatement à l'expéditeur et effacer ce courriel.

From: November-09-15 11:32 AM
To: Norma Moores <Norma.Moores@IBIGroup.com>
Cc: 
Subject: Centennial Study

Hi Norma:
I was going through some Hamilton web-sites and noticed a Centennial transportation study and to my surprise, you were the consulting contact. It is in the next ward
#2. On Trails and Bikeways –
Nash Connection to proposed Red Hill Creek crossing and Centennial Parkway -
always thought that there should be a connection from the north end of Nash to the Red
Hill Creek Tail, and I am quite angry that it was not considered or contemplated. The
City built this $50M+ signature pedestrian / cycling bridge (when they could have
built three or four more for the same price - but I know the history) - the pedestrian
cycling bridge connections to Ward 10 are unnecessarily horrible. The existing Red Hill
Creek Trail from Barton North is stone dust and involves several steep climbs - few
people seem to use them.

All Ward 10 would have much improved access to the Red Hill Creek Trail / QEW Pedestrian / Cycling Bridge if a new trail connection were constructed that started
at the
north end of Nash (where Nash turns North-East) - run under the Red Hill Creek
Expressway using the existing expressway overpass of the Red Hill Creek, crossed
the Red Hill Creek (new pedestrian / cycling bridge) and connected into the Red Hill
Creek Trail (the length is about a ½ km). If paved this would provide direct access to Confederation Park and provide a crossing of the Red Hill Creek that does NOT involve road traffic.

Nash- it looks as if planned cycling facilities on Nash and Barton are being
removed rather than implemented. I suggest extending the Bike Lanes to the proposed trail connection noted above - if this were implemented in conjunction with the trail, there would most likely be considerable increase in usage of these trails.

I also suggest keeping Nash as part of the Hamilton Bicycle Master Plan.

#3. Transit / Pedestrian Multi-modal Hub and Gateway –
This is a major proposal that requires planning and coordination that both
benefits the City of Hamilton, Stoney Creek, Ward 10, regional travellers, transit travellers,
active transportation and recreational users. Some or all of the ideas could be
considered but they achieve maximum synergy of all implemented in stages over time in accordance with a Master Plan.

Components centre on the planned Confederation Go Station - the Confederation Go
Station EA Plan focuses on a Go Station stop with parking and some bus components. It could have the following:

- LRT Extension from Eastgate to the Confederation Go Station
- East – West / North / South bicycle lanes / paths / pedestrian access into GO station via
  o West - Bancroft / Arrowhead / Goderich with connections to Nash (bike lanes & above proposed Red Hill crossing & Kenora)
  o East – Warrington / Cascade connection to Lake Street
- Propose a bike lane on Lake Street from Warrington south (I understand that bike lanes are proposed on Lake Street south of Barton - possibly through a road diet) - this also connects to the Barton Bike Lanes easterly
  o South - I suggest a future study to improve Centennial Parkway in include a Bike Track / Pedestrian access to Confederation Park OR new Pedestrian Bridge (possibly located at approximately Warrington & South Service Road

I expect it would be a challenge is to design and integrate a major east-west cycling route from Lake Street to Nash (and beyond) in light of the various properties in the area (Home Depot, Wal-mart Plaza). The Go Transit design and properties could allow this happen.

Bicycle - Pedestrian Benefits: It would provide an alternative to the Barton corridor (that was NOT built) from Nash to Lake. It would provide North - South bike lane connections on Nash and Lake (Ward 10+) and possibly into Confederation Park.

Traffic and Transit Benefits: If the LRT was incorporated, it would provide a major multi-modal hub and connect both the QEW and GO Transit line with all of Stoney Creek and Hamilton, and likely remove traffic off major arterials. It would provide east end Hamiltonians and opportunity to connect with Go Transit and would provide a rapid transit friendly connection to Confederation Park. This proposal provides major synergies for improved accessibility, connections, use of transit and active transportation at all levels (regional to local / commuting, shopping and recreation).

With these improvements over the long-term, there is considerable potential to capture costs through higher density built form along the Centennial corridor.

Cost: the cycling / pedestrian improvements would not be costly as long as they are planned in advance across all agencies and implemented in coordination with planned improvements - given that the Go Station has not yet been built - the benefits would be large. The LRT would require a fundamental change in the plan, as would the ultimate very long range transit plan for Hamilton.

Final Observation - it appears as if the planning is occurring in silos. Seems like such a ‘no brainer’ to have a major multi-modal hub as this location as a gateway to Hamilton / Stoney Creek and gateway access to Centennial Park and integrate with active transportation.
#4. Other Suggested Trail Improvements:
Connect various trail components from either Barton Street or Lake Street at Henry & Beatrice Warden Park, Green Acres Park, Stoney Creek Tennis Club, with a new west branch at Hopkins Park that would directly connect the into the proposed Battlefield Park Trail (in the Hamilton Trails Master Plan). Build trail culverts under Queenston to remove steep climbs. It would interesting to know if the trail could extend north of Barton (even under the QEW using the culvert).

Again - thanks for hearing me out.
There is a significant voice within our Centennial Neighbourhood Focus Group that constantly proposes an excessive stream of bike lanes throughout the community. To clarify the issue, they do not recommend bike lanes on the streets on which they live.

We all acknowledge the meetings are to be forums for members to "work together to ensure full discussion." The City's letter of February 26, 2015 urges us to address "options for pedestrian, cycling, transit, truck and other transportation networks." At the meeting on April 8th we were given five brochures and documents relative to bike routes and cycling.

To this point, only Councillor Conley mentioned trucks on Centennial Parkway. There seemed to be a consensus that something had to be done to control the truck traffic, but there were no firm ideas. With respect to transit, we acknowledged the eventualilty of the GO Station and LRT, but these may be long into the future. So much requires our focus that we cannot be pigeon-holed into mainly addressing only bike lanes. Though this may be the interest of a few, it has not appeared to be the common view of our focus group.

Personally, I am absolutely opposed to the idea of spending tens of millions to widen streets, or to narrow the venue for cars and trucks to install bike lanes. That is not what this committee is for. We are to make plans to improve the area, not to inhibit progress. We are to plan for everyone not for the one in a thousand.

Dealing with these bike lanes, allow me to add:

* In our April 8th meeting we asked for information regarding the amount budgeted for this project, ie for our overall recommendations. We didn't get an answer then and we still don't have that information. A person suggested to me after the last meeting that this is "kind of half-ass backwards." So we have no idea if bike lanes are even possible or even an option based on the budget dollars available.

* Between April and November it was noted, even in summer months, we might see one bicyclist per day on our residential streets.

* With the average age of homeowners in our neighbourhood exceeding 65, the propensity to use a bike is nil.

* Suggestions were made to have bike lanes on routes to facilitate shopping. Hazards would be created by the bulkiness of groceries such that the city's liability exposure could be significantly increased for any bike using a city designated-lane if such involved serious injury. The Occupiers Liability Act is firm on this issue.

* Suggestions were made that these bike lanes could be used by the E-Scooters. Aren't there steps to legislate these scooters as motorized vehicles? In that case, they couldn't use the bike lanes.

* Since the meeting ended on November 10th, in these last two days, I have conferred with 17 residents and business-persons in the area in discussions in offices, on the street or in Eastgate Mall. All 17 are strenuously opposed to bike lanes in the area.

* This is exactly the same opinion of 26 residents between April 8th and November 10th. There is no apparent public support for bike lanes in this area.
The comments from these 43 persons include:

"I am not paying my taxes for bike lanes."

"Tell these politicians to get their heads out of the ground."

Other comments are not repeatable.

Let's move forward addressing all of the factors influencing our community.
The Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (CNTMP) is being undertaken to support the Secondary Plan for the Study Area, as well as to address existing transportation needs and issues. The objective of Phase 2 of the CNTMP is to develop alternative solutions to the identified transportation issues and opportunities. This summary provides an overview of stakeholder and public consultation events undertaken to date to understand people’s opinions about the alternatives. The events include:

- Technical Advisory Committee consisting of City of Hamilton staff (October 29, 2015)—Public Works, Transit, Traffic, Planning and Public Health
- Stakeholder focus group (November 10, 2015)—7 people attended from the public
- Public information centre (December 1, 2015)—24 people signed the sign-in sheet
- Direct submissions from the public—7 submissions provide comments related to the Transportation Management Plan

Discussion of Alternative Transportation Solutions

The transportation solutions were categorized by the main issue or opportunity they address:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Mobility Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

At the Focus Group and PIC, attendees working in groups were asked to consider and identify the alternatives as follows:

- **Advantages** – what makes sense
- **Best ideas** – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood
- **Concerns** – what might not work
- **What Else** – add your ideas

The results are shown in Exhibit 2, i.e. the number of groups that sorted each alternative according to the above categories.

Based on ideas raised by the groups and comments submitted by individuals, the following modifications to the alternatives are recommended:

- **Modify “protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic lanes (beyond 25 years)”** to include considering HOV / transit-only lanes
- **Include reviewing pedestrian walk times as part of “improve traffic signal timing”**
- **Add the multi-use recreational trails from the Recreational Master Plan: Project 5-4 in Bow Valley Open Space and Lawrence Avenue Park just west of Lake Avenue; Project 5-9 connecting Pottruff Road near Eugene Street across the RHVP to the Red Hill Valley Recreational Trail**
- **Add a new alternative to improve the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the RHVP**

Participants at the Focus Group and PIC were asked to select what they thought were their priorities by placing four plastic coins in jars marked Capacity, Safety, Urban Design and Mobility Choices. The results of this prioritization are shown in **Error! Reference source not found.**.

**Exhibit 1: Results of Prioritization of Groups of Transportation Solutions (PIC and Focus Group)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Mobility Choice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 2: Outcomes of “ABC-We” Group Discussions of Alternative Transportation Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Solutions</th>
<th>Advantages – what makes sense</th>
<th>Best Ideas – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood</th>
<th>Concerns – what might not work</th>
<th>No. of groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend the B-line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (within 15 years west of Centennial &amp; beyond 25 years east of Centennial)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve traffic signal timings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic lanes (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Design</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement cycle tracks on Centennial, and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape options</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian connections through new developments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobility Choices</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N’ Ride</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add local HSR circulator route</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate car sharing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend and modify HSR routes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let's Talk about the Centennial Neighbourhoods!

PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #3
OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC INPUT

What? The City is hosting a meeting to engage with the community about the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study and Transportation Management Plan Study (Municipal Class Environmental Assessment).

At this meeting, you will have the opportunity to:
• Hear an update on the status of these projects; and
• Learn about and provide feedback on the preferred options for future land use, intensification, public space, and transportation changes to the area.

Study Area:

When & Where?
Thursday, April 28th, 2016
6:30 pm – 8:30 pm (Presentations at 7 pm)
Lake Avenue Public School, East Gymnasium
157 Lake Avenue North, Hamilton, ON L8E 1L5

Why?
Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan
The purpose of the study is to create a plan and policies to guide future change, promoting positive improvements that meet the community's needs. The Centennial Neighbourhoods area is an important area in the east end of Hamilton. It is a focal point for commercial uses, other activities and transportation connections. The area has been identified as a potential area for future change and redevelopment.

www.hamilton.ca/centennialneighbourhoods

Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan
This study is being carried out in collaboration with the Secondary Plan. The purpose of the study is to address existing and future transportation needs and issues in the area. The study will consider and review alternative options for changes to pedestrian, cycling, transit, truck and other vehicular networks, and will also take into account upcoming GO Transit service improvements to the area.

www.hamilton.ca/centennialNTMP

How?
Attend the meeting, contact the project managers, or visit the websites above to provide us with your input and to obtain additional information. You will be able to access the proposed plans and provide comments online between April 29th and May 13th, 2016.

If you have any accessibility requirements to participate in this event, please call 905-546-2424 Ext. 4498 or email planning.team@hamilton.ca. Advance requests are highly encouraged to enable us to adequately meet your needs.

Contact
Secondary Plan
Melanie Pham, MCIP, RPP, Planner
Phone: 905-546-2424 Ext. 6685 | E-Mail: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca

Transportation Management Plan
Mohan Philip, M.Eng., P.Eng., Project Manager
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Mohan Philip, M.Eng., P.Eng., Project Manager
Phone: 905-546-2424 Ext. 3438
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The purpose of this study is to develop a comprehensive Transportation Management Plan for the Centennial Neighbourhoods that will:

a) Follow the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process

b) Support the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan study

c) Identify future transportation needs and address existing transportation issues

d) Identify and evaluate transportation options and recommend solutions

Study Area

Centennial Neighbourhoods TMP Boundary

Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study Area
The Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Master Plan (CNTMP) study is conducted in accordance with Phase 1 and 2 of the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) Process, under the Environmental Assessment Act. This is a planning and approval process that ensures that the potential effects of a project are identified and managed prior to implementation.

Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process

Phase 1: Problem or Opportunity
Phase 2: Alternative Solutions
Phase 3: Alternative Design Concepts
Phase 4: Environmental Study Report
Phase 5: Implementation

Capital Project Delivery Process

Once a specific transportation project is identified and approved, it will go through the following delivery process, subject to an approved budget by council:

Step 1: Create Project and Budget
Step 2: Develop Project Scope (EA if required)
Step 3: Permit Approvals, Pre-design and Base Plans
Step 4: Detailed Design
Step 5: Utilities Coordination, Land and Tender Preparation
Step 6: Construction

Construction Timeline: The time to deliver project can vary from 2 years for a simple rehabilitation project, to 5 years for a more complicated urban arterial reconstruction project (due to potential for EAs, land acquisition, detailed underground analysis, permits and approvals and utility coordination).
Opportunity Statement and Transportation Options

The CNTMP is being undertaken by the City of Hamilton to plan for improved mobility to:

- Accommodate transportation needs of future land use
- Take advantage of investment from development opportunities
- Support access to major transportation services such as the QEW, Red Hill Valley Parkway, HSR, Rapid Transit and GO Transit
- Support choices including walking and cycling
- Create livable neighbourhoods and complete communities

The goals of the improvements are to create safe, efficient, and sustainable transportation, that limits impacts to the environment, and supports healthy living.

We identified alternative transportation solutions that address the opportunity statement. They were presented at PIC#2. They were grouped into four focus areas:

- Capacity
- Safety
- Urban Design
- Mobility Choices
Improving Health by Community Design

**Community Design Elements:**

- Population and employment density
- Nearness of services, including public transit
- Mix of land uses
- Many street connections
- Streetscape including facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and transit users
- Increase in bicycle parking and decrease in car parking

**Health-related Priorities:**

- Active transportation (walking cycling)
- Public transit
- Equity in transportation and housing options
- Support for all stages of the life cycle
- Safety, comfort and convenience of travel
- Social interaction
- Accessibility

These Community Design Elements provide comprehensive support for Health-related Priorities.
The City of Hamilton is undertaking a review and update of the city-wide Transportation Master Plan. The City-wide Transportation Master Plan vision (draft) is:

**VISION (PROBLEM) STATEMENT**

The key objective of the Transportation Master Plan is to provide a **COMPREHENSIVE AND ATTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION BLUEPRINT** for Hamilton as a **WHOLE** that **BALANCES ALL MODES OF TRANSPORTATION**. The success of the Plan will be based on **SPECIFIC, MEASURABLE, ACHIEVABLE, RELEVANT AND PROGRAMMED RESULTS**.

The ultimate goals of the TMP are to:

- Reduce dependence on single occupant vehicles;
- Promote accessibility;
- Improve options for walking, cycling and transit; and
- Maintain and improve the efficiency of Goods Movement trips.

Contact:
Mr. Steve Molloy  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext.2975  
Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca
During **Phase 1** of the study, we heard from a number of people: 12 focus group stakeholders, 86 people at PIC#1, and 12 written submissions. This is a summary of what we heard.

**Roadways:**
- Speeding on residential streets
- Congestion on Red Hill Valley Parkway causes traffic to seek alternate routes in neighbourhoods
- Heavy, noisy truck traffic on Centennial and Barton is unsafe

**Regional Transit:**
- GO Transit Park n Ride well liked
- How will people access the new GO Station
- Increase non-auto access to new GO Station

**Local Transit:**
- Mixed opinions on potential for rapid transit expansion
- Lack of service between major destinations within the neighbourhoods
- Connect existing routes to Eastgate Square (Route 4 & 5)
- Lack of transit service to Riverdale Community Centre

**Walking:**
- Important for healthy active living
- Unsafe and/or uncomfortable to walk
- Streetscaping improvements needed
- Major streets crossing times inadequate
- Existing sidewalks adjacent to traffic on Nash
- Missing sidewalks along portions of Lake, Centennial and Warrington
- Pedestrian access to Eastgate Square / Transit Terminal: easy from west; need better connections east to Riverdale

**Bicycling:**
- Important for healthy active living
- Uncomfortable due to lack of safe facilities, fast traffic and large trucks
- Expand Hamilton Bike Share (SoBi) to the area
- Need safe connection on Centennial Parkway to Confederation Park
- New bikeways suggested for Nash, Delawana, Owen Place, Kenora, Kentley; to new GO Station and Red Hill Library; and extend King Street bike lanes
During **Phase 2** of the study, we heard from a number of people: 7 focus group stakeholders, 24 people at PIC#2, and 7 written submissions.

At the Focus Group Meeting and PIC#2, groups discussed the transportation solutions; their opinions are summarized in this chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Advantages – what makes sense</th>
<th>Best ideas – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood</th>
<th>Concerns – what might not work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extend the B-line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (within 15 years west of Centennial &amp; beyond 25 years east of Centennial)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve traffic signal timings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic lanes (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Advantages – what makes sense</th>
<th>Best ideas – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood</th>
<th>Concerns – what might not work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Advantages – what makes sense</th>
<th>Best ideas – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood</th>
<th>Concerns – what might not work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement cycle tracks on Centennial, and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape options</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian connections through new developments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobility Choices</th>
<th>Advantages – what makes sense</th>
<th>Best ideas – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood</th>
<th>Concerns – what might not work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N’ Rides</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add local HSR circulator route</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate car sharing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend and modify HSR routes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommended Solutions for Streets

City-wide Policies
- Support future designs of streets to reflect desirable operating speeds through the Transportation Master Plan Complete Livable Better Streets policy.
- Protect right-of-way for Complete Livable Better Streets on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial to increase capacity, on Centennial and Queenston for future LRT, and on all arterials for HOV, transit-only lanes, cycle tracks, pedestrian facilities and amenities, and / or enhanced streetscaping as per Urban Official Plan.

City-wide Activities & Programs
- Improve traffic signal timings including pedestrian walk times. A signal optimization study is recommended for Centennial Neighbourhoods study area.
- Implement traffic calming on local streets where speeding, cut-through traffic volumes and safety concerns are ascertained; future studies are required. Implement with community and Councillor support.
- Continue to promote travel options to employers and schools through the City-wide Smart Commute program and Active and Safe Routes to School program.

Centennial Neighbourhoods Specific Initiatives
- Undertake a feasibility study for the Centennial neighbourhoods to communicate travel options for new immigrants aligned with settlement activities.

Alternative Not Supported
- Turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections are not supported because these intersections were recently reconstructed.

---

Through the TMP Update, the City is identifying policy and a decision-making process for adopting a Complete Livable Better Streets design approach. It balances the needs of all users yet is sensitive to local context that considers both the transportation and place-making function of the street.
Recommended Solutions for Transit

City-wide Policy
- Determine appropriate transit priority measures and funding. A transit priority study is recommended for Centennial Neighbourhoods following adoption of a new policy.

City-wide Activities & Programs
- New guidelines are being developed for bus stop placement and design, including installing passenger amenity features. More transit shelters throughout the HSR bus route system is a key element for improving the customer experience, helping to grow transit ridership. Apply these guidelines to the study area routes.
- Through the City-wide Annual Transit Service Plans, consider extending or modifying HSR routes in the study area. Review the potential for improving connections between the LRT terminus at Queenston Circle and HSR Terminal at Eastgate Square, and to new GO Transit station.

City-wide Projects
- Extend the B-line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (beyond year 2024)
- Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)

Alternative Not Supported
- Local HSR circulator route is not supported due to high cost. Focus effort on existing route monitoring and adjustments.
Recommended Solutions for Active Transportation

City-wide Projects
- Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic and improve walking and cycling connections. Neighbourhood greenways are streets designed with traffic calming and landscape features to reduce speeding, create a pleasant experience for residents and all users of the streets. Co-ordinate with traffic calming initiatives.
- Implement Projects in the Recreational Trails Master Plan:
  - Project 5-4 in Bow Valley Open Space and Lawrence Avenue Park just west of Lake Avenue
  - Project 5-9 connecting Pottruff Road near Eugene Street across the RHVP to the Red Hill Valley Trails
  - Project 5-10 providing multi-use trail access to Confederation Park (see Recommended Solutions by Other Proponents)

Centennial Neighbourhoods Specific Initiatives
- Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas. Phase in with road resurfacing / reconstruction projects or through development applications (see Secondary Plan Policies)
- Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road in the future. Consider implementing with future development to provide cycling capacity in response to growth in travel.
- Improve the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the RHVP. A design study is recommended to determine issues and appropriate treatments.

Alternative Not Supported
- Cycle tracks on Centennial and Queenston, presented at PIC#2 in streetscape options for the Secondary Plan study, are not supported. Centennial was recently reconstructed so this opportunity is very long term, beyond the horizon year of the Secondary Plan. Options to incorporate cycle tracks into Queenston corridor east of Centennial can be explored as part of the B-line LRT extension. Right-of-way widths are being protected in the Urban Official Plan to create Complete Liveable Better Streets in the longer term.
Recommended Solutions for Secondary Plan Policy

Secondary Plan Policies

- Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety. Identify and implement access management as part of development applications for deeper properties.
- Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots. Identify parking requirements for developments in the Secondary Plan.
- Improve pedestrian connections through new developments. Identify and implement pedestrian connections as part of development applications.
- Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts. Address implementation and funding sources in the Secondary Plan. Gateways may include one or a combination of public art, way-finding signage, landscaping or streetscape / built form around the entryways to strengthen a sense of place.
- Support live / work / play development to encourage trips by active transportation and transit through the Secondary Plan land-use recommendations.
- Facilitate car sharing through a City-wide initiative to consider policies required to support car-sharing and then apply to Centennial Neighbourhoods area. Identify opportunities for car-sharing when applying the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Land Use Guidelines to development applications.
- Identify traffic calming measures to reduce cut-through traffic and speeding as part of development applications. Implement with community and Councillor support.
- Require missing sidewalks adjacent to new developments to be constructed as part of the development.

The Secondary Plan land-use options will add 900 to 1,400 peak hour trips – equivalent to 2 lanes of traffic. In 2031, it is estimated that:

- The road network will operate reasonably well with some "hot spot" intersections with long delays
- Barton and Queenston west of Centennial will experience higher levels of congestion during peak periods
- Other roads approach but do not exceed their capacity to move traffic
**Recommended Solutions by Other Proponents**

**SobiHamilton**
- City to approach SoBiHamilton bike share to undertake a study to determine the feasibility of serving the Centennial neighbourhoods.

**Ministry of Transportation, Ontario (MTO)**
- City to request MTO to include the multi-use trail (Project 5-10 of the Recreational Trails Master Plan) through the QEW / Centennial Parkway interchange as part of MTO’s initiative for improvements to the interchange.

**Metrolinx**
- City to request that Metrolinx create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Transit Station and right-sized Park N’ Ride at the GO Transit bus and train stations. GO Transit bus station is planned to be opened in December 2016; rail station is targeted to be open in 2019. Potential routing to be investigated includes a connection from Kenora Avenue north of the railway through the City’s Transfer Station lands to the GO Transit bus station, or south of the railway along Bancroft Street to the GO Transit rail station, with access over the railway to the GO Transit bus station.

The MTO and Metrolinx initiatives together create a cycling and walking network connecting the neighbourhood to the GO Transit stations and Confederation Park / Lake Ontario waterfront. These links provide an alternative to avoid much of Centennial Parkway that does not have any cycling facilities.
Some of the recommended transportation solutions will require **additional study and consultation** under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process (MCEA).

### MCEA Schedule for Recommended Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule A</th>
<th>Schedule A+</th>
<th>Schedule B</th>
<th>Schedule C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic signal timing improvements</td>
<td>Retrofit bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road</td>
<td>Streetscape and gateways over $2.7 M</td>
<td>Rapid Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit priority measures</td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreational Trails Master Plan projects between $3.5 M and $9.5 M</td>
<td>Recreational Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Master Plan projects over $9.5 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood greenways</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New or improved bus stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape and gateways under $2.7 M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian and cycling interchange treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consultation for these projects has been completed through the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (CNTMP)**

**These may proceed to implementation**

**Additional study and mandatory consultation required**
Next Steps

The next steps are as follows:

- Review public comments on the recommended transportation solutions.
- Prepare a Project File report about the study and preferred transportation solutions.
- Forward staff report and preferred transportation solutions to the City of Hamilton Public Works Committee and Council.
- Place the Project File report for public review and comment for 30 days.

Please submit comments by May 13, 2016.

Stay involved by signing up to receive notice of the MCEA 30-Day Public Review of the Project File report.

If you have any comments, concerns or questions about the study, please contact:

Mr. Mohan Philip, M.Eng., P.Eng.
Project Manager, Transportation Planning
Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438
Fax: 905-546-2039
E-mail: tplanning@hamilton.ca

OR

Ms. Norma Moores, P.Eng.
Project Manager, IBI Group
Phone: 905-546-1010 ext. 2106
Fax: 905-546-1011
E-mail: norma.moores@ibigroup.com

www.hamilton.ca/CentennialNTMP
Purpose

The purpose of this study:

- Support the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan study
- Identify future transportation needs and address existing transportation issues
- Identify and evaluate options and recommend transportation solutions

Study Area

The CNTMP is being undertaken by the City of Hamilton to plan for improve mobility to:

- Accommodate transportation needs of future land use
- Leverage investment from development opportunities
- Support access to major transportation services such as the QEW, Red Hill Valley Parkway, and HSR, Rapid Transit and GO Transit
- Support choices including walking and cycling
- Create livable neighbourhoods and complete communities

The goals of the improvements are to create safe, efficient, and sustainable transportation, that limits impacts to the environment, and supports healthy living.

Vision Statement (draft)

The key objective of the Transportation Master Plan is to provide a COMPREHENSIVE AND ATTAINABLE TRANSPORTATION BLUEPRINT for Hamilton as a WHOLE that BALANCES ALL MODES OF TRANSPORTATION.

The ULTIMATE GOALS include reducing dependence on single-occupant vehicles and promoting ACCESSIBILITY AND improved options for walking, cycling and transit, while maintaining and improving the efficiency of trips related to the movement of goods and servicing employment areas.

THE SUCCESS OF THE PLAN WILL BE BASED ON SPECIFIC, MEASURABLE, ACHIEVABLE, RELEVANT AND PROGRAMMED RESULTS.

Opportunity Statement

The CNTMP is being undertaken by the City of Hamilton to plan for improve mobility to:
Implementing Projects in the TMP

Delivering the Recommendations of the CNTMP over the next 10 to 20 years

Phase 2 Consultation

5 groups reviewed the transportation alternatives:

Advantages – what makes sense
Best Ideas – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood
Concerns – what might not work
What else – add you ideas

Well-liked transportation alternatives:
- B-line Rapid Transit
- Improve signal timings
- S-line Rapid Transit
- Multi-use trail to Confederation Park
- Traffic calming to address speeding
- Neighbourhood greenways
- Missing pieces of sidewalk
- Manage access to larger developments
- Walk and bike to GO Station and Park N’ Ride

Transportation alternatives with concerns:
- Turn lanes / roundabouts at intersections
- Protect ROW on Barton

Strategies most important to you:
- Capacity: 29%
- Safety: 27%
- Mobility: 21%
- Urban Design: 22%

Modifications to the Alternatives

- Add Recreational Trails Master Plan Projects:
  - Project 5-4 Bow Valley / Lawrence Avenue Park
  - Project 5-9 Redhill Valley Trail connection
  - Project 5-10 Confederation Park connection
- Add improve safety and comfort of pedestrians and cyclists at RHVP interchanges
**Evaluation of Alternatives**

**TRANSPORTATION:** network, access, comfort and delay:
- Pedestrians
- Cyclists
- Transit passengers
- Drivers
- Emergency services
- Goods movement

**PUBLIC HEALTH:**
- Social interaction
- Transportation equity
- Active transportation
- Collision reduction
- Air quality

**PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT:**
- Natural environment (landscape, parks, open space, watercourses, and shorelines)
- Public realm (streetscape and public spaces)
- Cultural, heritage, and archaeological resources

**COST:**
- Implementation
- Operation and maintain
- Economic benefits

---

**Recommended Transportation Solutions**

**For Streets:**
- Protect ROW for Complete Liveable Better Streets
- Improve traffic signal timings
- Traffic calming where needed with support
- Smart Commute and Active and Safe Route to School programs
- Travel options with settlement activities

**For Transit:**
- Transit priority measures
- More and improved bus stops
- Extend and modify HSR routes
- B-line Rapid Transit to Eastgate Square and beyond
- S-line Rapid Transit to GO Transit Station

**For Active Transportation:**
- Neighbourhood greenways
- 3 projects in the Recreational Trails Master Plan
- Construct missing sidewalks
- Bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service
- Pedestrian and cyclist RHVP interchange improvements

**By Other Proponents:**
- SobiHamilton – Feasibility of bike share
- Ministry of Transportation, Ontario – Multi-use trail connection to Confederation Park
- Metrolinx – Walking and Cycling access to GO Transit stations and ‘right-sized’ Park n’ Ride
Next Steps

• Review public comments on the recommended transportation solutions
• Prepare a Project File report
• Forward staff report and preferred transportation solutions to the City of Hamilton Public Works Committee and Council.
• Place the Project File report for public review and comment for 30 days
Introduction

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (CNTMP) is being undertaken to:

a) Follow the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment (EA) process
b) Support the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan study
c) Identify future transportation needs and address existing transportation issues
d) Identify and evaluate transportation options and recommend solutions

Alternative transportation solutions that address the opportunity statement were presented at PIC#2, December 1, 2015. Based on the feedback from the public and stakeholders, and an evaluation of the alternatives, recommended transportation solutions were selected. Maps of the recommended transportation solutions are available on the project web site at www.hamilton.ca/CentennialNTMP.

Recommended Transportation Solutions for Streets

City-wide Policies

- Support future designs of streets to reflect desirable operating speeds through the Transportation Master Plan Complete Liveable Better Streets policy.
- Protect right-of-way for Complete Liveable Better Streets on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial to increase capacity, on Centennial and Queenston for future LRT, and on all arterials for HOV, transit-only lanes, cycle tracks, pedestrian facilities and amenities, and / or enhanced streetscaping as per Urban Official Plan (Schedule C-2).

City-wide Activities & Programs

- Improve traffic signal timings including pedestrian walk times. A signal optimization study is recommended for Centennial Neighbourhoods study area.
- Implement traffic calming on local streets where speeding, cut-through traffic volumes and safety concerns are ascertained; future studies are required. Implement with community and Councillor support.
- Continue to promote travel options to employers and schools through the City-wide Smart Commute program and Active and Safe Routes to School program.

Centennial Neighbourhoods Specific Initiatives

- Undertake a feasibility study for the Centennial neighbourhoods to communicate travel options for new immigrants aligned with settlement activities.

Alternative Not Supported

- Turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections are not supported because these intersections were recently reconstructed.
Recommended Transportation Solutions for Transit

City-wide Policy

- Determine appropriate transit priority measures and funding. A transit priority study is recommended for Centennial Neighbourhoods following adoption of a new policy.

City-wide Activities & Programs

- New guidelines are being developed for bus stop placement and design, including installing passenger amenity features. More transit shelters throughout the HSR bus route system is a key element for improving the customer experience, helping to grow transit ridership. Apply these guidelines to the study area routes.
- Through the City-wide Annual Transit Service Plans, consider extending or modifying HSR routes in the study area. Review the potential for improving connections between the LRT terminus at Queenston Circle and HSR Terminal at Eastgate Square, and to new GO Transit station.

City-wide Projects

- Extend the B-line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (beyond year 2024)
- Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)

Alternative Not Supported

- Local HSR circulator route is not supported due to high cost. Focus effort on existing route monitoring and adjustments.

Recommended Transportation Solutions for Active Transportation

City-wide Projects

- Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic and improve walking and cycling connections. **Neighbourhood greenways** are streets designed with traffic calming and landscape features to reduce speeding, create a pleasant experience for residents and all users of the streets. Co-ordinate with traffic calming initiatives.
- Implement Projects in the **Recreational Trails Master Plan:**
  - Project 5-4 in Bow Valley Open Space and Lawrence Avenue Park just west of Lake Avenue
  - Project 5-9 connecting Pottruff Road near Eugene Street across the RHVP to the Red Hill Valley Trails
  - Project 5-10 providing multi-use trail access to Confederation Park (see Recommended Solutions by Other Proponents)

Centennial Neighbourhoods Specific Initiatives

- Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas. Phase in with road resurfacing / reconstruction projects or through development applications (see Secondary Plan Policies)
- Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road in the future. Consider implementing with future development to provide cycling capacity in response to growth in travel.
- Improve the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the RHVP. A design study is recommended to determine issues and appropriate treatments.
Alternative Not Supported

- Cycle tracks on Centennial and Queenston, presented at PIC#2 in streetscape options for the Secondary Plan study, are not supported. Centennial was recently reconstructed so this opportunity is very long term, beyond the horizon year of the Secondary Plan. Options to incorporate cycle tracks into Queenston corridor east of Centennial can be explored as part of the B-line LRT extension. Right-of-way widths are being protected in the Urban Official Plan to create Complete Liveable Better Streets in the longer term.

Recommended Solutions for Secondary Plan Policy

- Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety. Identify and implement access management as part of development applications for deeper properties.
- Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots. Identify parking requirements for developments in the Secondary Plan.
- Improve pedestrian connections through new developments. Identify and implement pedestrian connections as part of development applications.
- Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts. Address implementation and funding sources in the Secondary Plan. Gateways may include one or a combination of public art, way-finding signage, landscaping or streetscape / built form around the entryways to strengthen a sense of place.
- Support live / work / play development to encourage trips by active transportation and transit through the Secondary Plan land-use recommendations.
- Facilitate car sharing through a City-wide initiative to consider policies required to support car-sharing and then apply to Centennial Neighbourhoods area. Identify opportunities for car-sharing when applying the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Land Use Guidelines to development applications.
- Identify traffic calming measures to reduce cut-through traffic and speeding as part of development applications. Implement with community and Councillor support.
- Require missing sidewalks adjacent to new developments to be constructed as part of the development.

Recommended Solutions by Other Proponents

SobiHamilton

- City to approach SoBiHamilton bike share to undertake a study to determine the feasibility of serving the Centennial neighbourhoods.

Ministry of Transportation, Ontario (MTO)

- City to request MTO to include the multi-use trail (Project 5-10 of the Recreational Trails Master Plan) through the QEW / Centennial Parkway interchange as part of MTO’s initiative for improvements to the interchange.

Metrolinx

- City to request that Metrolinx create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Transit Station and right-sized Park N’ Ride at the GO Transit bus and train stations. GO Transit bus station is planned to be opened in December 2016; rail station is targeted to be open in 2019. Potential routing to be investigated includes a connection from Kenora Avenue north of the railway through the City’s Transfer Station lands to the GO Transit bus station, or south of the railway along Bancroft Street to the GO Transit rail station, with access over the railway to the GO Transit bus station.
The MTO and Metrolinx initiatives together create a cycling and walking network connecting the neighbourhood to the GO Transit stations and Confederation Park/Lake Ontario waterfront. These links provide an alternative to avoid much of Centennial Parkway that does not have any cycling facilities.

MCEA Schedule for Recommended Solutions

Some of the recommended transportation solutions will require additional study and consultation under the Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process (MCEA).

Next Steps

The next steps are as follows:

- Review public comments on the recommended transportation solutions.
- Prepare a Project File report about the study and preferred transportation solutions.
- Forward staff report and preferred transportation solutions to the City of Hamilton Public Works Committee and Council.
- Place the Project File report for public review and comment for 30 days.

Please submit comments by May 13, 2016.

Stay involved by signing up to receive notice of the MCEA 30-Day Public Review of the Project File report.

If you have any comments, concerns or questions about the study, please contact:

Mr. Mohan Philip, M.Eng., P.Eng., Project Manager
Transportation Planning, Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438
Fax: 905-546-2039
E-mail: tplanning@hamilton.ca
CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS
SECONDARY PLAN AND TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN
COMMENT SHEET
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE No. 3
Thursday, April 28, 2016

Thank you for attending today's Public Information Centre. Your input is important to us. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 13, 2016 to:

Kirsten McCauley, RPP, MCIP
Secondary Plan
Planning & Economic Development Dept.
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 1287
Email: kirsten.mccauley@hamilton.ca

OR

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Transportation Management Plan
Project Manager, Public Works Dept.
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438
Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

If you would like to be added to the contact list for these projects for notices of future public information centres, please provide your contact information below:

All comments and information received from the public regarding this project are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the Public Record.

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN

1. What do you like about the draft plans?

[approve or reiterate the area of
[centennial and core.]
[There is potential]

2. What could be improved?

look at traffic flow improve if more efficiency
add more solar panels to power lights if can'll add
into the city power grid. Add more rainforest trees
to improve air quality raise wages limits growth
allows to slow growth. Consider commercial plans that have
multiple uses, not just offices or stores. maximum
potential use of space add multiple methods to gather
power. a self-sufficient city

(See Reverse)
3. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions you wish to provide?

keep a close eye on developers as they tend regulating be accountable, do not use non union workers dont go over budget I recall your grand stadium over budget an essentially a failure.

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. Which transportation solutions do you think will work the best to help you travel in these neighbourhoods?

biker lanes need to be implemented, and there need to be a law for them to use these law offenders need to be held accountable, part (a) improve efficiency and flow of traffic, we need regulation, the behaviour of the users is deplorable

2. Which transportation solutions do you not like and why?

________________________

________________________

________________________

3. Do you have any other comments about the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan?

Consider adding a police station in the neighborhood as it is near. A police presence encourages community and less undesirable acts. Consider repurposing buildings that are useful.

THANK YOU!
Thank you for attending today’s Public Information Centre. Your input is important to us. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 13, 2016 to:

Kirsten McCauley, RPP, MCIP  
Secondary Plan  
Planning & Economic Development Dept.  
City of Hamilton  
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor  
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 1287  
Email: kirsten.mccauley@hamilton.ca  

OR  
Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.  
Transportation Management Plan  
Project Manager, Public Works Dept.  
City of Hamilton  
77 James Street North, Suite 400  
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438  
Email:tplanning@hamilton.ca

If you would like to be added to the contact list for these projects for notices of future public information centres, please provide your contact information below:

All comments and information received from the public regarding this project are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the Public Record.

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN

1. What do you like about the draft plans?

The plan shows a great mixture of residential and business areas as well.

2. What could be improved?

The pedestrian predominant streets seem cluttered and need to flow more safety.

(See Reverse)
3. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions you wish to provide?

make it predominately more people oriented then Industrial

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. Which transportation solutions do you think will work the best to help you travel in these neighbourhoods?

buses and go stations

2. Which transportation solutions do you not like and why?

the transportation solution seems to go in a cluttered unplanned pattern

3. Do you have any other comments about the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan?

improve upon bus routes, layout better and change routes to suite people better who live further in downtown then just stay closer

THANK YOU!
CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS
SECONDARY PLAN AND TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN
COMMENT SHEET
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE No. 3
Thursday, April 28, 2016

Thank you for attending today's Public Information Centre. Your input is important to us. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 13, 2016 to:

Kirsten McCauley, RPP, MCIP
Secondary Plan
Planning & Economic Development Dept.
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 1287
Email: kirsten.mccauley@hamilton.ca

OR

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Transportation Management Plan
Project Manager, Public Works Dept.
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438
Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

If you would like to be added to the contact list for these projects for notices of future public information centres, please provide your contact information below:

All comments and information received from the public regarding this project are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the Public Record.

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN

1. What do you like about the draft plans?

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

2. What could be improved?

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________________________

(See Reverse)
3. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions you wish to provide?


CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. Which transportation solutions do you think will work the best to help you travel in these neighbourhoods?


2. Which transportation solutions do you not like and why?


3. Do you have any other comments about the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan?

Crosswalk at Vineyard across Centennial

cars making U turns from Vineyard to Centennial - south dangerous for pedestrians

THANK YOU!
CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS
SECONDARY PLAN AND TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN
COMMENT SHEET
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE No. 3
Thursday, April 28, 2016

Thank you for attending today’s Public Information Centre. Your input is important to us. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 13, 2016 to:

Kirsten McCauley, RPP, MCIP
Secondary Plan
Planning & Economic Development Dept.
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 1287
Email: kirsten.mccaulley@hamilton.ca

OR

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Transportation Management Plan
Project Manager, Public Works Dept.
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438
Email: tPlanning@hamilton.ca

If you would like to be added to the contact list for these projects for notices of future public information centres, please provide your contact information below:

_________________________

All comments and information received from the public regarding this project are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the Public Record.

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN

1. What do you like about the draft plans?

- New GO Station on Centennial Pkwy.
- Upgrade to buildings & businesses on Centennial Pkwy.
- Better access through bike paths & pedestrian paths along Centennial Pkwy.

2. What could be improved?

- Need for new apartment buildings in Centennial Neighbourhood

(See Reverse)
3. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions you wish to provide?


CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. Which transportation solutions do you think will work the best to help you travel in these neighbourhoods?
   - Safe - good sidewalks
   - Protected bike paths


2. Which transportation solutions do you not like and why?
   - The on ramp to OEW to Ashgrove Falls is not needed. Clearly it does create confusion. Do I take the South Service Ramp up OEW ramp as they are very close to each other?

3. Do you have any other comments about the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan?


THANK YOU!
Thank you for attending today’s Public Information Centre. Your input is important to us. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 13, 2016 to:

Kirsten McCauley, RPP, MCIP  
Secondary Plan  
Planning & Economic Development Dept.  
City of Hamilton  
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor  
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 1287  
Email: kIRSTEN.MCCAULEY@hamilton.ca

OR  
Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.  
Transportation Management Plan  
Project Manager, Public Works Dept.  
City of Hamilton  
77 James Street North, Suite 400  
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438  
Email: tPLANNING@hamilton.ca

If you would like to be added to the contact list for these projects for notices of future public information centres, please provide your contact information below:

All comments and information received from the public regarding this project are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the Public Record.

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN

1. What do you like about the draft plans?


2. What could be improved?


(See Reverse)
3. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions you wish to provide?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. Which transportation solutions do you think will work the best to help you travel in these neighbourhoods?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

2. Which transportation solutions do you not like and why?

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________

3. Do you have any other comments about the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan?

Traffic calming measures on Cromwell and Owen Place. Cars are too fast for the 40 km school zone.

THANK YOU!
CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS
SECONDARY PLAN AND TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN
COMMENT SHEET
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE No. 3
Thursday, April 28, 2016

Thank you for attending today’s Public Information Centre. Your input is important to us. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 13, 2016 to:

Kirsten McCauley, RPP, MCIP  
Secondary Plan  
Planning & Economic Development Dept.  
City of Hamilton  
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor  
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 1287  
Email: kirsten.mccauley@hamilton.ca

OR

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.  
Transportation Management Plan  
Project Manager, Public Works Dept.  
City of Hamilton  
77 James Street North, Suite 400  
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3  
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438  
Email: tPlanning@hamilton.ca

If you would like to be added to the contact list for these projects for notices of future public information centres, please provide your contact information below:

All comments and information received from the public regarding this project are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the Public Record.

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN

1. What do you like about the draft plans?
   Violent CBZG will be more 90 metres trees from which of the country's? S
   Darker and shynie around the Hamilton.

2. What could be improved?
   The men don't like to listen for the girls and which of men I can help your plant tree?

(See Reverse)
3. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions you wish to provide?


CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. Which transportation solutions do you think will work the best to help you travel in these neighbourhoods?
   Read Soil with Horwatty a train.

2. Which transportation solutions do you not like and why?
   Train

3. Do you have any other comments about the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan?
   More Ramping may open
   the Hamilton Violet Drive's

THANK YOU!

for the Happy Hall Drive.

Cast Gate
Thank you for attending today's Public Information Centre. Your input is important to us. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 13, 2016 to:

Kirsten McCauley, RPP, MCIP
Secondary Plan
Planning & Economic Development Dept.
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 1287
Email: kirsten.mccauley@hamilton.ca

OR

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Transportation Management Plan
Project Manager, Public Works Dept.
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438
Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

If you would like to be added to the contact list for these projects for notices of future public information centres, please provide your contact information below:

All comments and information received from the public regarding this project are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the Public Record.

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN

1. What do you like about the draft plans?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. What could be improved?

- Bus Route Lake Ave N to Village of Stoney Creek

- Most important "advance green" Street light to turn on to South Service Road from QE/W/Centennial Parkway.

(See Reverse)
3. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions you wish to provide?

- ped/bike walk way on Lake Ave over QEW to waterpark

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. Which transportation solutions do you think will work the best to help you travel in these neighbourhoods?

- Love bike/ped paths/green spaces
- Love GO TRAIN!!!

2. Which transportation solutions do you not like and why?


3. Do you have any other comments about the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan?


THANK YOU!
Thank you for attending today's Public Information Centre. Your input is important to us. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 13, 2016 to:

Kirsten McCauley, RPP, MCIP
Secondary Plan
Planning & Economic Development Dept.
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 1287
Email: kirsten.mccauley@hamilton.ca

OR

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Transportation Management Plan
Project Manager, Public Works Dept.
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438
Email: tPlanning@hamilton.ca

If you would like to be added to the contact list for these projects for notices of future public information centres, please provide your contact information below:

All comments and information received from the public regarding this project are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the Public Record.

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN

1. What do you like about the draft plans?

A great deal of thought has gone into the draft plans

2. What could be improved?

More information about feeder bus routes to the Queenston LRT station

(See Reverse)
3. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions you wish to provide?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. Which transportation solutions do you think will work the best to help you travel in these neighbourhoods?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. Which transportation solutions do you not like and why?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3. Do you have any other comments about the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU!
Thank you for attending today’s Public Information Centre. Your input is important to us. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 13, 2016 to:

Kirsten McCauley, RPP, MCIP
Secondary Plan
Planning & Economic Development Dept.
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 1287
Email: kirsten.mccauley@hamilton.ca

OR

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Transportation Management Plan
Project Manager, Public Works Dept.
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438
Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

If you would like to be added to the contact list for these projects for notices of future public information centres, please provide your contact information below:

Name: ___________________________________________ Email: ___________________________________________

Mailing address: ___________________________________________ Postal Code: ______________________

All comments and information received from the public regarding this project are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the Public Record.

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN

1. What do you like about the draft plans?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. What could be improved?

OPEN KENORA AVE
BARTON TO QUEENSLAND

(See Reverse)
3. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions you wish to provide?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. Which transportation solutions do you think will work the best to help you travel in these neighbourhoods?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

2. Which transportation solutions do you not like and why?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

3. Do you have any other comments about the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan?

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU!
CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS
SECONDARY PLAN AND TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN
COMMENT SHEET
PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE No. 3
Thursday, April 28, 2016

Thank you for attending today's Public Information Centre. Your input is important to us. It would be appreciated if you would answer the following questions and drop them off in the box provided tonight, OR mail or email them, by May 13, 2016 to:

Kirsten McCauley, RPP, MCIP
Secondary Plan
Planning & Economic Development Dept.
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 1287
Email: kirsten.mccauley@hamilton.ca

OR

Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Transportation Management Plan
Project Manager, Public Works Dept.
City of Hamilton
77 James Street North, Suite 400
Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3
Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438
Email: tplanning@hamilton.ca

If you would like to be added to the contact list for these projects for notices of future public information centres, please provide your contact information below:

Name: ____________________________ Email: ____________________________

Mailing address: ____________________________ Postal Code: ____________

All comments and information received from the public regarding this project are being collected to assist the City of Hamilton. With the exception of personal information, all comments will become part of the Public Record.

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN

1. What do you like about the draft plans?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

2. What could be improved?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

(See Reverse)
3. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions you wish to provide?

Why is there so much truck traffic on Centennial Rd - why not using RTHP? Is there notable trucks crossing escarpment here?

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

1. Which transportation solutions do you think will work the best to help you travel in these neighbourhoods?

2. Which transportation solutions do you not like and why?

3. Do you have any other comments about the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan?

   Need to take 3 lanes to go to King + Dale from Lake + Barton - up to 1/2 hrs. at a time. When are you going to improve this? A lane or a bus on Lake possible?

   Plan for a ped/bike bridge over QEW @ Lake Ave too, especially if MTO says no to Centennial Trail for the Waterpark. THANK YOU!
From: Pham, Melanie
Sent: April-08-16 12:00 PM
To: Pham, Melanie
Cc: Christian Kieller
Subject: Centennial Parkway Secondary Plan - Additional Thoughts

Good Morning,

I have some additional comments coming out of yesterdays meeting after taking a further look at the materials provided and driving the surrounding neighbourhood around our property at the SE corner of Barton and Centennial. As mentioned yesterday, while the overall draft land use plan and proposed permissions seem to be moving in the right direction, the devil is in the details. Some of my thoughts:

* Providing density & height flexibility within the secondary plan is important to avoid OMB hearings or contentious amendments.
* Consider permitting 20 stories at corner of Barton & Centennial and along Barton frontage to offset the density which will be lost due to the 45 deg angular plane along the southerly edge of the property due to the low rise townhouse development. There are existing high rise buildings along Barton and therefore no transition is required along this area to a low rise residential neighbourhood. Perhaps there could be a split designation of 20 and 15?
* For properties or proposed buildings North or West of low rise neighbourhoods, the 45 Degree Angular plane should start from the 3 storey height of the building, not the property line.
* Understanding building height is a sensitive issue for the residents in this neighbourhood, perhaps additional height could be permitted through a bonusing provision or community benefit. This may be a bit more palatable to the community while offering flexibility to developers.
* Understanding the High Density residential designation may be more conducive to larger building setbacks as discussed in the meeting; however, in order for mixed use buildings to be successful they cannot be set back 10 or 20 m from the street. Further, many of the properties along the Centennial and Queenston corridors are shallow and restricting development along the street edge could potentially make re-developing these properties not possible. I would envision an abundance of Minor Variance requests if the setback requirements were excessive for the mixed use designations.

The proposed plan needs be both practical and feasible from a financial standpoint in order to encourage and support re-development. The shallow nature of many of the properties and the density proposed for the Centennial corridor will necessitate some form of underground parking. This is the type of math that can get lost in a high level secondary plan process, as developments can very quickly become cost prohibitive if the density does not support the exorbitant cost of underground parking at $40,000-$50,000/parking stall.
Please distribute to Dillon and team and appreciate you taking these points into consideration.

This message is intended for the addressee. It may contain privileged or confidential information. Any unauthorized disclosure is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately so that we may correct our internal records. Please then delete the original message. Thank you.
From: Pham, Melanie
Sent: April-29-16 11:53 AM
To: McCauley, Kirsten; Philip, Mohan
Cc: Azher
Subject: RE: Feedback re. Centennial Neighbourhoods

Thank you for your comments Azher. They will be incorporated into our review as we prepare the final plans and recommendations.

Best Regards, Melanie

Melanie Pham, MCIP, RPP
Planner I, Community Planning
Planning and Economic Development Department
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor, Hamilton, L8P 4Y5
Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca
T: (905) 546-2424 ext. 6685
F: (905) 546-4202

From:
Sent: April-28-16 5:10 PM
To: Pham, Melanie
Subject: Feedback re. Centennial Neighbourhoods

Dear Melanie,

My name is . I'm a resident of East Hamilton.

Unfortunately, I'm not able to attend tonight's public info session on the Centennial Neighbourhood plans. However I wanted to provide my input as to what I think would improve the neighbourhood. My "wish list" is as follows:

1. Future LRT connection to Eastgate Square and then to the new GO station and then to Confederation Park. I feel Hamilton council members should request Metrolinx to postpone James St. spur line and stick with original plan for B-line.

2. Red Hill Library should have direct connection/ access to Sam Manson Park. The library definitely needs an expansion. Would be nice to have any future expansion incorporate a rec centre to take the pressure off Riverdale community centre. Likewise, Riverdale redevelopment should include a library to take the pressure of Red Hill library.

3. Wider sidewalks and protected bike lanes on Nash, Queenston, Centennial, Barton.

4. More trees wherever possible, along streets and in parks.

5. Lighting for Sam Manson park. More trees in this park, and more pathways for people with strollers or wheelchairs to be able to enjoy.

6. Higher residential and commercial density (20 plus stories) / greater intensification for develop-able areas north of Barton (i.e. Adjacent to GO station) on Centennial and Nash.

7. Better use/ repositioning of commercial space along Queenston, Centennial, Barton.
comment 2

Businesses should be easily accessible from the sidewalks with parking in the back/under ground/garage.

8. Wherever possible, developments with commercial on bottom floors and residential units on top.

These changes would make the neighbourhood safer, walkable, and economically prosperous, and therefore a more desirable place to live for all.

Thank you for taking my input into consideration. Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Best Regards,
Hello,

I'm just writing to say the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan looks very good. I may have missed it but if it's not already in the plan I think we should have an easy connection/pathway from the GO station to Confederation Park.

Thank you,
The Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (CNTMP) is being undertaken to support the Secondary Plan for the Study Area, as well as to address existing transportation needs and issues. The objective of Phase 2 of the CNTMP is to develop and recommend alternative solutions to the identified transportation issues and opportunities. This summary provides an overview of stakeholder and public consultation events undertaken to date to understand people’s opinions about the recommendations. The events include:

- Technical Advisory Committee consisting of City of Hamilton staff (February 23, 2016)—Public Works, Transit, Traffic, Planning and Public Health
- Stakeholder focus group (April 7, 2016)—7 people attended from the public
- Public information centre (April 28, 2016)—43 people signed the sign-in sheet
- Drop-in location with displays at Eastgate Square (April 29, 2016)—about 62 people discussed the studies with City staff
- Direct submissions from the public—21 written submissions were received (comment form, email or web site form)

**Recommended Transportation Solutions**

The recommended transportation solutions were presented through a series of maps:

- Recommended solutions for **streets** including City-wide policies, City-wide activities and programs, and Centennial Neighbourhoods specific initiatives
- Recommended solutions for **transit** including City-wide policies, City-wide activities and programs, and City-wide projects
- Recommended solutions for **active transportation** including City-wide projects and Centennial Neighbourhoods specific initiatives
- Recommended solutions for **Secondary Plan Policies**
- Recommended solutions for **other proponents** including Sobi Hamilton, Ministry of Transportation, Ontario and Metrolinx

**Comments Received**

Members of the focus group expressed concerns regarding the CNTMP around cycling, walking, and the QEW interchanges. They would like to promote green space along the frontage of buildings on Centennial and Queenston similar to the green space that is present along some properties today, instead of having building fronts adjacent a hardscaped pedestrian area. There was concern regarding who rides bicycles in the area, since there are a large number of senior residents. They also wanted to know if there was a new interchange planned for the QEW at Grey’s Road, which is under the Ministry of Transportation, Ontario, jurisdiction.

Transportation recommendations received from the public by way of a comment form or email that members of the public liked are summarized below. Some people generally support improved transportation, while others remarked generally that not enough is being done:

- The CNTMP “does not address an increase in traffic to an area that already has traffic issues”
- “There needs to be a careful and considerate review of the traffic issues in all of Stoney Creek, and real and doable options made available to ratepayers to consider. I support cleaner and leaner transportation, as long as there are no negative impacts on existing residential home owners, businesses, and this community.”
- “This is a great plan. It should help reduce car dependency, increase active lifestyles, and result in greater economic opportunities for the neighbourhood.”
“The traffic is TERRIBLE in this area. I believe the issue is due to poor planning, by allowing the Walmart development to proceed before having a proper transportation infrastructure plan designed, approved, and put in place. This seems to be an ongoing issue in our City, and one that can be easily corrected by putting the interests of the ratepayers and people that reside and work in the community first.”

Specific comments and suggestions are divided into three categories:

- Support for recommended transportation solutions
- Suggested changes regarding the recommendations or new ideas to consider
- Comments that are outside the scope of the CNTMP and should be referred to other City departments or agencies

### Support for Recommended Transportation Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streets Solutions</th>
<th>Transit Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support better traffic flow and signal timing (2 people)</td>
<td>Support connections transit hubs, more bus routes, stops and shelters, and feeder bus routes to the Queenston LRT station (6 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support traffic calming (2 people). Specific streets mentioned are Cromwell, Owen Place, Kentley, and streets used to access Eastgate Mall from Nash Road</td>
<td>Support connections to public transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support LRT to Eastgate Square (not BRT) (5 people), including extending the first phase to Eastgate Transit Hub from Queenston Circle</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Transportation Solutions</th>
<th>Other Proponents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support active transportation with new and enhanced infrastructure</td>
<td>Support the GO train station at Centennial Parkway (4 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support increase in walkability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support more bike lanes (2 people), specifically on Lake Avenue connecting Confederation Park entrance (2 people)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support improving east-west active transportation connections in the study area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support improving the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the RHVP and make it a top priority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Suggestions for the Recommended Transportation Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streets Solutions</th>
<th>Transit Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Complete Liveable Better Streets, wider sidewalks (2 people). Specific streets mentioned are Nash, Queenston, Centennial, and Barton</td>
<td>Locate the LRT on Barton closer to the Centennial GO Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Kenora from Barton to Queenston to ease congestion along Nash and Centennial once the Centennial GO Station is in full use</td>
<td>With the bus service review, consider extending bus service to Confederation Park, and looping Routes 4 and 44 around St. Joseph’s Hospital and Eastgate Transit Hub</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Transportation Solutions</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project 5-9 connecting Pottruff Road near Eugene Street across the RHVP to the Red Hill Valley Trails requires more study regarding costs. It may be for effective to invest in pedestrian and cyclists improvements on Queenston and Barton.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the neighbourhood greenways, include bike lanes on Delawana, Kenora, and Kentley along with 40 km/h posted speed limit.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide high visibility crosswalks (‘ladder’ markings) throughout the neighbourhoods</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect Battlefield Park to Confederation Park for tourists</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide protected bike lanes or cycle tracks (4 people). Specific streets mentioned are Nash, Queenston, and Centennial.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Next Steps

Based on the public consultation on the recommended transportation solutions, the following modifications will be made:

- **Support for cycle tracks on Centennial and Queenston and other arterials in the study area will be noted. Right-of-way widths are being protected in the Urban Official Plan to create Complete Liveable Better Streets in the longer term. However, as previously noted, opportunities to implement cycle tracks are very long term, beyond the horizon year of the Secondary Plan. Centennial was recently reconstructed. Options to incorporate cycle tracks into Queenston corridor east of Centennial can be explored as part of the B-line LRT extension; west of Centennial the approved LRT EA study did not include them. In the meantime, other cycling facilities recommended in the CNTMP can be pursued.**

- **Providing a linkage between Battlefield Park and Confederation Park will be noted as a concept to pursue in future Recreational Trails Master Plans.**

The CNTMP will be completed by:

- **Preparing a Project File report**
- **Forwarding the staff report and preferred transportation solutions to the City of Hamilton Public Works Committee and Council.**
- **Placing the Project File report for public review and comment for 30 days**

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments Outside the CNTMP Scope</th>
<th>Referral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Need a direct, faster bus route to Mohawk College on Barton; stopover / transfer at Bell Manor Loop is too long</td>
<td>HSR, City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cars making U-turns from Vineyard to Centennial south are very dangerous for pedestrians</td>
<td>Traffic, City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce speed limit on Queenston Road - 60 km/hr is too fast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is too much truck traffic on Centennial; it should be using the Red Hill Valley Parkway</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more lighting, trees and pathways for people with strollers or wheelchairs to enjoy in Sam Manson Park</td>
<td>Parks, City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Hill Library should have direct connection/ access to Sam Manson Park (3 people)</td>
<td>Hamilton Public Library and Parks, City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better traffic markings for QEW</td>
<td>Ministry of Transportation, Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend the HOV lanes on the QEW through Hamilton / Stoney Creek</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more train services throughout the GTA and Niagara region interconnected along the lakeshore/ QEW and with more bus stops</td>
<td>Metrolinx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need more parking space and parking garage and bike cage at Centennial GO Transit Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1 Introduction

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (CNTMP) was undertaken to support the Secondary Plan for the Study Area, as well as to address existing transportation needs and issues. A Transportation Management Plan is required to support the Secondary Plan for the Area, as well as to address existing transportation needs and issues.

This report addresses the potential impacts of the Secondary Plan on traffic on the surrounding road network. The existing conditions year is 2015 with the future horizon year of 2031. Traffic analysis components of this study include an operational analysis of the types of developments from the Secondary Plan and its effect on the adjacent street network to determine any operation deficiencies.

Two approaches were used to analyze the potential impacts of the Secondary Plan: a capacity analysis and an intersection analysis. The capacity analysis involved creating screenlines for the study area to determine overall traffic operations based on the volume to capacity ratio. The analysis was completed on four major screenlines: south of the QEW, east of Lake Avenue, east of the Red Hill Valley Expressway, and north of King Street. The intersection analysis focus on nine specific intersections and analyzed the overall intersection operations and individual movement performances.

1.1 Study Area

The Centennial Neighbourhoods are located east of downtown Hamilton, south of the QEW and Confederation Park, north of King Street, east of the Red Hill Expressway, and west of Lake Avenue. The area includes a mix of industrial, residential, and commercial land uses.

Nine intersections were identified for analysis and confirmed with City of Hamilton staff:

- Barton Street at Nash Road;
- Barton Street at Centennial Parkway North;
- Barton Street at Lake Avenue North;
- Queenston Road at Nash Road;
- Queenston Road at Centennial Parkway North;
- Queenston Road at Lake Avenue North;
- King Street at Nash Road;
- King Street at Centennial Parkway North; and
- King Street at Lake Avenue.

The study area and above intersections are shown in Exhibit 1-1.
1.2 Secondary Plan

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan (CNSP) divided the study area into four districts: Regional Gateway, Eastgate Square and Centennial Parkway, Queenston Road (east), and Queenston Road (west). Exhibit 1-2 shows the boundaries of the four districts. Each district is shown to have three draft secondary plan options, consisting of:

- Land Use Option 1 – Current Official Plan;
- Land Use Option 2 – Medium Density Mixed Use Development; and
- Land Use Option 3 – Medium and High Density Mixed Use Development.
Exhibit 1-2: Locations of Districts of Secondary Plan

The three land use options present alternate population and employment forecasts, in addition to spatial allocation of these forecasts. Exhibit 1-3 shows the growth and spatial allocation of the three options. These forecasts were used to calculate trip generation in Section 3.

Exhibit 1-3: Growth and Spatial Allocation of Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,950</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>24,550</td>
<td>27,150</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>24,550</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>18,975</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial Floorspace (Growth - ft²)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>295,000</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>295,000</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dillion Consulting, Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study Draft Secondary Plan Options
1.3 Study Objective

The objective of the transportation management plan for the Secondary Plan is to identify any problems in the road network and to evaluate solutions.

Section 2 provides the existing road network and traffic operations of the analysis intersections in the study area.

Section 3 discusses the traffic volume projections of the proposed development, including the assignment of site-generated trips in the study area.

Section 4 provides the projection of future traffic volumes, the summary of future traffic operations, and mitigation measures for the network.

2 Existing Conditions

2.1 Road Network

*Barton Street* and *Queenston Road* are five lane east-west Arterials with urban cross section. The centre lane is used as a two-way turn lane for the many commercial uses located on the corridor. They have signalized intersections with left turn bays at Nash Road, Centennial Parkway North, and Lake Avenue North.

*King Street* is a five lane east-west Arterial with urban cross section. Approximately 115m east of Centennial Parkway South, King Street becomes a two lane road with on-street parking.

*Centennial Parkway North* is a five lane north-south Arterial with urban cross section. The centre lane is used as a two-way turn lane for the many commercial and industrial uses located on the corridor. It has signalized intersections with left turn bays at Barton Street, Queenston Road, and King Street.

*Nash Road* is a four lane north-south Collector with urban cross section. It has signalized intersections with Barton Street, Queenston Road, and King Street.

*Lake Avenue North* is a north-south Collector with urban cross section. It is a two lane road that turns to a four lane road between Barton Street and Queenston Road.

2.2 Data Collection

Traffic data was obtained from the City of Hamilton. Exhibit 2-1 shows the count date of the Turning Movement Count (TMC) and the programming date of the Signal Timing Plan (STP) for each analysis intersections.

Exhibit 2-1: TMC and STP Dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>TMC-Date</th>
<th>STP-Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Barton and Nash</td>
<td>3-May-10</td>
<td>10-Jan-07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Barton and Centennial</td>
<td>22-Feb-13</td>
<td>28-Jan-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Barton and Lake</td>
<td>4-Jun-08</td>
<td>3-July-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Queenston and Nash</td>
<td>27-May-15</td>
<td>20-Mar-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Queenston and Centennial</td>
<td>24-Jun-15</td>
<td>17-Aug-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Queenston and Lake</td>
<td>6-May-08</td>
<td>25-Mar-13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>King and Nash</td>
<td>24-Jun-15</td>
<td>23-Jun-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>King and Centennial</td>
<td>29-Nov-13</td>
<td>1-May-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>King and Lake</td>
<td>24-Jun-15</td>
<td>14-Feb-13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Historical TMCs were used to calculate the background growth rate for the study area. It was found that through 2009 to 2015, background traffic in the study area has steadily decreased. Although the background growth trend is negative, it is not reasonable to assume a negative background growth rate for this study based on the growth projections for the City of Hamilton. Therefore, an annual compounded growth rate of 0.5% was used for all intersections in the study area.

2.3 Traffic Operations

A two level analysis was undertaken for the Centennial Neighbourhoods: strategic/screenline analysis and a corridor/hotspot analysis. The existing conditions year is 2015. Analysis was conducted for weekday a.m. and p.m. peak hours for all study are intersections.

Peak hour factors (PHFs) were calculated based on the counts received for the intersection total volumes. The calculated PHF values range between 0.90 and 0.98, indicating that existing conditions peak hour traffic volumes are relatively consistent within the defined a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

Existing conditions traffic volumes are shown in Exhibit 2-2.

Exhibit 2-2: Existing Conditions (2015) Peak Hour Volumes AM (PM)
2.3.1 Capacity Analysis

A screenline analysis was completed to determine the overall traffic operations in the study area based on the volume to capacity ratio. The capacity for collector roads is 650 vehicles/hour/lane and for arterial roads is 800 vehicles/hour/lane. The analysis was completed on four major screenlines which encompass the study area and include:

- South of the QEW;
- West of Lake Avenue;
- East of the Red Hill Valley Expressway; and
- North of King Street.

Exhibit 2-3 illustrates the locations of the screenlines.

Exhibit 2-3: Screenline Analysis
Exhibit 2-4 shows the detailed results of the screenline analysis. According to the City of Hamilton Traffic Impact Study Guidelines, 0.85 is the maximum acceptable V/C ratio, beyond which the City would consider capacity improvements to benefit traffic operations. The following are the major findings:

- With a p.m. peak hour average V/C ratio of 0.91, the Red Hill Valley Expressway screenline is over the acceptable range and is nearing capacity. This is due to the high p.m. peak hour volumes on Barton Street and Queenston Road, operating at a V/C of 1.01 and 0.83 respectively. With a v/c ratio exceeding 1.0, further analysis of Barton Street and potentially Queenston Road is warranted in consideration of potential for future road widening.

- Centennial Parkway operates at v/c ratio of 0.55 in the a.m. peak and 0.78 in the p.m. peak. Both periods are within acceptable range for the City.

- To the south, the screenline at King Street operates well with overall v/c ratio of 0.36 in the a.m. peak and 0.54 in the p.m. peak. This indicates that north-south capacity is sufficient in the southern portions of Centennial.

- To the east, the Lake Avenue screenline operates well overall with v/c ratio of 0.56 in the a.m. peak and 0.67 in the p.m. peak. King Street, which is reduced to two lanes (one per direction) plus turning lanes near Lake Avenue, is operating near capacity especially westbound in the p.m. peak.

Overall the main operational constraint identified through the screenline analysis is east-west operations at Barton Street and Queenston Road in the p.m. peak hour. Both corridors are busy with volumes approaching capacity, in particular in the westbound direction but eastbound also has constraints.

### 2.3.2 Intersection Analysis

Intersection operations analysis was conducted using Synchro 9, which utilizes the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM) 2000 methodology to evaluate overall intersection and individual movement performances. The level of service (LOS) is a measure of performance based on the control delay, defined as follows in Exhibit 2-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screenline</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>AM V/C Ratio</th>
<th>PM V/C Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB/EB</td>
<td>SB/WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of the QEW</td>
<td>Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West of Lake Avenue North</td>
<td>Barton Street</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Red Hill Valley Expressway</td>
<td>Barton Street</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of King Street</td>
<td>Nash Road</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Avenue Drive</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 2-5: Intersection LOS Reference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HCM</th>
<th>Control Delay per Vehicle (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LOS</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>≤10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>&gt;10 and ≤20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>&gt;20 and ≤35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>&gt;35 and ≤55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>&gt;55 and ≤80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>&gt;80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Critical movements were identified by satisfying any one or more of the following criteria, based on the City of Hamilton TIS Guidelines:

- 95th percentile queue exceeding the provided storage/link length;
- Control delay of LOS D or worse for unsignalized intersections;
- Volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio of 0.85 or greater for through movements or shared through/turning movements; and
- V/C ratio of 0.90 or greater for exclusive turning movements.

A summary of the Synchro analysis including delay, 95th percentile queue, and level-of-service (LOS) indicators are shown in Exhibit 2-6 and Exhibit 2-7 with detailed output provided in Appendix A-1.

**Barton and Nash:** Intersection operates at LOS C in both peak hours. The northbound left movement operates at LOS E with the queue exceeding the available storage length.

**Barton and Centennial:** Intersection operates at LOS D in both peak hours. In the a.m. peak hour, the westbound through/right movement experiences high delay. In the p.m. peak hour, the three movements experience high delays and queues that may exceed the available storage length.

**Barton and Lake:** Overall, the intersection operates at LOS C in both peak hours. In the a.m. peak hour, the eastbound left movement 95th queue length is critical. In the p.m. peak hour, the eastbound and westbound left turning movements experience high delays and critical queue lengths.

**Queenston and Nash:** Intersection operates at LOS C in the a.m. peak hour and at LOS E in the p.m. peak hour. In the p.m. peak hour, the northbound left and southbound through/right movements experience high delays and critical queue lengths.

**Queenston and Centennial:** Intersection operates at LOS C in both peak hours with no critical movements.

**Queenston and Lake:** Intersection operates at LOS B in the a.m. peak hour and LOS C in the p.m. peak hour. The northbound left turning movement may exceed the available storage length in the p.m. peak hour.

**King and Nash:** Intersection operates at LOS C in both peak hours with no critical movements.

**King and Centennial:** Overall, the intersection operates at LOS D in the a.m. peak hour and LOS E in the p.m. peak hour. Several critical movements are located at this intersection and experience high delays and critical queue lengths with several volume-to-capacity ratios over 1.

**King and Lake:** Intersection operates at LOS B (C) in the a.m. (p.m.) peak hour with no critical movements.
Exhibit 2-6: Existing Conditions (2015) AM Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Overall LOS</th>
<th>AM Overall Delay (s)</th>
<th>Critical Movement AM</th>
<th>V/C Ratio</th>
<th>95th Queue Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Nash</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Centennial</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Lake</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>#32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Nash</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Centennial</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Lake</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Nash</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Centennial</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>#59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Lake</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 2-7: Existing Conditions (2015) PM Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>PM Overall LOS</th>
<th>PM Overall Delay (s)</th>
<th>Critical Movement PM</th>
<th>V/C Ratio</th>
<th>95th Queue Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Nash</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>NBL</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>#39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Centennial</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Lake</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>#34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Nash</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>NBL</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>#43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Centennial</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>SBTR</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>#155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Lake</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NBL</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>#31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Nash</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Centennial</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>#75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Lake</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4 Transit Access

The City of Hamilton is served by the Hamilton Street Railway (HSR) bus network. Exhibit 2-8 illustrates the bus routes operating in the study area. There are ten existing bus routes that service the study area and includes:

- Route 1/1A King – an east-west that runs from McMaster University, along Queenston Road to the Fiesta Mall;
- Route 2 Barton – an east-west route that runs from the Hamilton General Hospital in the west, along Barton to the Bell Manor Loop;
- Route 4 Bayfront – an east-west route than runs from McNab Terminal, along Burlington Street and Nash Road to the Mount Albion Loop;
• Route 5/5E Delaware – an east-west route that runs from Governor's Road / Dundas Street along Main Street and King Street to New Mountain Road;

• Route 10/10A B Line Express – an east-west route that runs from University Plaza along Queenston Road to Eastgate Square;

• Route 44 Rymal – a route that runs from the Ancaster Business Park, along Rymal Road and Centennial Parkway to Eastgate Square;

• Route 55/55A Stoney Creek Central – an east-west route that runs from Eastgate Square to Jones Road along Queenston Road and returning by Barton Street;

• Route 56 Centennial – a north-south route that runs along Centennial Parkway from Eastgate Square to the Lakeland Loop; and

• Route 58 Stoney Creek Local – an east-west route that runs from Eastgate Square, along King Street to Green Road.

Exhibit 2-8: Existing Transit Bus Routes
3 Development Alternatives Traffic

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan (CNSP) divided the study area into four districts: Regional Gateway, Eastgate Square and Centennial Parkway, Queenston Road (east), and Queenston Road (west).

Each district is shown to have three draft secondary plan options, consisting of:

- Land Use Option 1 – Current Official Plan;
- Land Use Option 2 – Medium Density Mixed Use Development; and
- Land Use Option 3 – Medium and High Density Mixed Use Development.

Trip generation and distribution are divided according to the three land use options and four districts. Exhibit 3-2 summarizes the statistics of the Draft Secondary Plan Options.

Exhibit 3-1: Growth and Spatial Allocation of Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>24,950</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>24,550</td>
<td>27,150</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>23,200</td>
<td>24,550</td>
<td>28,400</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>18,975</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>295,000</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>295,000</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dillon Consulting, Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study Draft Secondary Plan Options

3.1 Trip Generation

3.1.1 Residential

Exhibit 3-2 shows the trips for the Centennial Neighbourhoods study area in regards to 2011 TTS data. The data accounts for residential trips only and does not account for institutional, industrial, or commercial land uses. This data was used to calculate the number of residential trips exiting the study area in the a.m. peak hour and entering the study area in the p.m. peak hour. From the TTS data, it was determined that residential trips exiting and entering in the a.m. and p.m. peak hours, respectively, are at a rate of 0.37 trips per household and 0.16 trips per person.

Exhibit 3-2: Summary of 2011 TTS Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>TTS Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average No. of AM Peak Hour Trips per Household</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average No. of AM Peak Hour Trips per Person</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auto Mode Split</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exhibit 3-3 shows the estimated population growth for the Centennial Neighbourhoods land use options and the distribution of traffic in each district using the TTS rate of 0.16 trips per person.

Exhibit 3-3: Population Generated Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Population Growth (2011 - 2031)</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Trips District 1 District 2 District 3 District 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Dillon Consulting, Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Study Draft Secondary Plan Options

3.1.2 Employment

As seen in Section 1.2, the employment and commercial growth numbers represent the same growth in different units. The ITE Trip Generation Manual (9th Edition) was used to calculate peak hour trips. As the type of employment is not specified in the Draft Secondary Plan Options, it was assumed that the land use is 60% General Office Building (#710) and 40% Shopping Centre (#820).

Exhibit 3-4 shows the summary of the site generated trips. As the general office code provides units for employees and gross floor area (GFA), it was decided that the larger number would be used to represent a more conservative estimate. The proposed secondary plan generates:

- 389 trips (313 entering, 76 exiting) in the a.m. peak hour and 702 trips (255 entering, 447 exiting) in the p.m. peak hour for Options 1 and 2; and

- 502 trips (403 entering, 98 exiting) in the a.m. peak hour and 904 trips (328 entering, 575 exiting) in the p.m. peak hour for Option 3.

Exhibit 3-4: Site Generated Trips

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>AM Rate</th>
<th>Entering</th>
<th>Exiting</th>
<th>PM Rate</th>
<th>Entering</th>
<th>Exiting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Office</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1000 GFA ft²</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Generated Traffic</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Trip Distribution

### 3.2.1 Residential

Exhibit 3-5 shows the origin-destination trip distribution based on 2011 TTS data in the a.m. peak hour (7:45 – 8:45 a.m.). It is found that majority of the trips from originating from the Centennial Neighbourhoods end within the City of Hamilton. For these trips, it was calculated that:

- 85% head into West Hamilton;
- 10% head to East Hamilton; and
- 5% head to South Hamilton.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of Destination</th>
<th>Centennial Neighbourhoods</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>3,024</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brantford</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,484</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 3-6 shows the spatial distribution of trips leaving from each district. The spatial distribution is summarized via the main arterials and the location of each district in the study area. For the residential trips returning in the p.m. peak hour, the opposite direction is used.

### 3.2.2 Employment

Exhibit 3-7 shows the trip distribution from the region of origin to the Centennial Neighbourhoods from 2011 TTS data. Again, the majority of trips begin within the City of Hamilton, with the same internal spatial distribution mentioned in Section 3.1.1.
### Exhibit 3-7: Origin-Destination Trip Distribution (Employment)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region of Origin</th>
<th>Percentage Distribution of Trips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exhibit 3-8 shows the spatial distribution of trips for each district and is summarized via the main arterials and the location of each district in the study area.

### Exhibit 3-8: Spatial Distribution per District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spatial Distribution</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2*</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto, Peel, Halton, Niagara via N/S on Centennial</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hamilton via E/W on Barton</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hamilton via E/W on Queenston</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hamilton via E/W on Barton</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hamilton via E/W on Queenston</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Hamilton via N/S on Centennial</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Area via N/S on Centennial</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For District 2, 70% of the development going E/W is using Queenston Road and 30% is using Barton Road.

### 4 Future Conditions

Existing traffic counts were scaled to 2031 volumes using a calculated annual compounded growth rate of 0.5%. This equates to a total growth of 8.3% over the 16-year horizon from 2015 to 2031. Exhibit 4-1 shows the future background traffic volumes for the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.
4.1 Screenline Analysis

4.1.1 Future Background

The existing conditions screenline analysis was scaled to 2031 volumes with the calculated background growth rate. Exhibit 4-2 shows the detailed output of the screenline analysis. Background conditions have significantly deteriorated in the Lake Avenue North and Red Hill Valley Screenlines.

For the Lake Avenue North screenline:
- In the a.m. peak hour, westbound traffic on Barton Street has deteriorated from a V/C of 0.86 to 0.94; and
- In the p.m. peak hour, westbound traffic on King Street has deteriorated from a V/C of 0.91 to 0.98.

For the Red Hill Valley screenline, in the p.m. peak hour:
- Westbound traffic on Barton Street has deteriorated from a V/C of 1.20 to 1.30; and
- Westbound traffic on Queenston Road has deteriorated from a V/C of 0.90 to 0.97.
4.1.2 Option 1

The population and employment forecasts of Option 1 from Section 3 were added to future background traffic for the screenline analysis. Exhibit 4-3 shows the detailed screenline analysis. While most operations have remained the same, operations have deteriorated across the Red Hill Valley Expressway. A significant increase in the volume to capacity ratio is observed in the p.m. peak hour.

Exhibit 4-3: Future Option 1 Detailed Screenline Analysis

4.1.3 Option 2

Exhibit 4-4 summarizes the screenline analysis with Option 2. The largest change from future background traffic is again seen across the Red Hill Valley Expressway. This is due to the majority of development from the Secondary Plan Options occurring in Districts 1 and 2, which cause east/west traffic to use Barton Street and Queenston Road.
4.1.4 Option 3

Exhibit 4-5 summarizes the volume to capacity ratios for Option 3, showing the largest change from 2031 background traffic. Operation from the Red Hill Valley Expressway screenline see the largest volume to capacity ratios, with a ratio of 0.99 and 1.23 for the eastbound and westbound volumes, respectively.

Exhibit 4-5: Future Option 3 Detailed Screenline Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screenline</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>AM V/C Ratio</th>
<th></th>
<th>PM V/C Ratio</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NB/EB</td>
<td>SB/WB</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>NB/EB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of the QEW</td>
<td>Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Lake Avenue North</td>
<td>Barton Street</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Red Hill Valley</td>
<td>Barton Street</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of King Street</td>
<td>Nash Road</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Avenue Drive</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Synchro Analysis

A summary of the Synchro analysis including delay, 95\textsuperscript{th} percentile queue, and level-of-service (LOS) indicators are shown in Exhibit 4-6 and Exhibit 4-7 with detailed output provided in Appendix A-1.

**Barton and Nash:** Operations have remained the same for both peak hours, with an overall LOS C. The northbound left turning movement in the p.m. peak hour sees a slight increase in delay.
**Barton and Centennial:** Intersection operates at LOS D in both peak hours. In the p.m. peak hour, two additional critical movements appear: the northbound and southbound left turning movements.

**Barton and Lake:** Intersection operations have deteriorated in the p.m. peak hour from an overall LOS C to D. Overall intersection delay has increased by 10 seconds.

**Queenston and Nash:** Operations have remained the same for both peak hours. In the p.m. peak hour, delay has significant increased with the southbound through/right operating at LOS F.

**Queenston and Centennial:** Operations have remained the same for both peak hours, with an overall LOS C.

**Queenston and Lake:** Intersection operates at LOS B in the a.m. peak hour and LOS C in the p.m. peak hour. In the a.m. peak hour, the southbound left movement becomes critical and in the p.m. peak hour, the southbound through/right becomes critical.

**King and Nash:** Operations have remained the same for both peak hours, with an overall LOS C.

**King and Centennial:** Intersection operations have significantly deteriorated in the p.m. peak hour from LOS E to F. Several critical movements operate well over capacity with significant queue lengths.

**King and Lake:** Operations have slightly deteriorated in the a.m. peak hour from LOS B to C.

---

Exhibit 4-6: Future (2031) Background Conditions AM Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>AM Overall LOS</th>
<th>AM Overall Delay (s)</th>
<th>Critical Movement AM</th>
<th>Mvmt LOS</th>
<th>V/C Ratio</th>
<th>95th Queue Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Nash</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Centennial</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>#39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Lake</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>#140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Nash</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>#39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Centennial</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>#140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Lake</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>SBL</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>#31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Nash</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>#77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Centennial</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>NBT</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>#162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Lake</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Exhibit 4-7: Future (2031) Background Conditions PM Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>Overall LOS</th>
<th>Overall Delay (s)</th>
<th>Mvmt</th>
<th>LOS</th>
<th>V/C Ratio</th>
<th>95th Queue Length (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Nash</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Centennial</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Lake</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Nash</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Centennial</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Lake</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Nash</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Centennial</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Lake</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>#185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.3 Remedial Measures

Several remedial measures are recommended to mitigate congestion problems. Based on the synchro hotspot analysis, it is recommended that:

- The retiming of signalized intersections to optimize performance would eliminate several critical movements;
- Signal coordination of a corridor would help with the flow of traffic and improve operations across the study area;
- The construction of a second southbound left turning lane or the conversion of the right turn lane into a left/right lane at King Street and Nash Road can be considered as it is warranted for volumes of over 400 vehicles per hour (vph). The intersection experiences a volume of 413 vehicles in the p.m. peak hour;
- Adding protected left turn phases to intersections, including Barton Street and Lake Avenue to mitigate critical queue lengths;

Long term remedial measures include overall corridor improvement through widening. However, this measure is not recommended as it is a costly option and the study area is constrained in terms of space in the right of way.
5 Conclusion

This study presents the existing transportation needs and issues of the Centennial Neighbourhood. The Secondary Plan for the study area resulted in the need to address the potential impacts of traffic on the surrounding road network.

Background traffic analysis in the existing conditions year of 2015 shows that the majority of the intersection in the study area operate well in the a.m. peak hour. In the p.m. peak hour, several critical movements experience high delay and may exceed the available storage length. With a growth of 8.3% over a 16 year period, traffic conditions deteriorate in the future year of 2031. This can be addressed through remedial measures to mitigate congestion in the study area.

Site traffic for the proposed options of the Draft Secondary Pan was calculated based on 2011 TTS Data and on the ITE trip generation manual rates. Through the screenline analysis, it is clear that site generated traffic has a great impact on the traffic heading east/west on Barton Street and Queenston Road by the Red Hill Valley Expressway screenline. Overall, the study area deteriorates in terms of the volume to capacity ratio.
Appendix D: Detailed Evaluation of Transportation Solutions
# Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan

## Evaluation of Alternative Transportation Solutions

### Transportation Network, Access, Comfort and Delay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>EMS</th>
<th>Goods Movement</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend the B-line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (within 15 years west of Centennial &amp; beyond 25 years east of Centennial)</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significantly improves comfort and reduces delay</td>
<td>Shift to transit reduces delay</td>
<td>Shift to transit reduces delay</td>
<td><strong>Median LRT reduces access mid-block</strong></td>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **B** | | | | | | | **Good** |
| Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years) | No impact | No impact | Significantly improves comfort and reduces delay beyond secondary plan horizon | Shift to transit reduces delay beyond secondary plan horizon | Shift to transit reduces delay beyond secondary plan horizon | **Median LRT reduces access mid-block** | **Good** |

| **C** | | | | | | | **Neutral** |
| Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic, HDV or transit only lanes (beyond 25 years) | Wider road will increase crossing times and decrease comfort | Wider road will decrease comfort | Reduces delay due to additional road capacity but only in the long term | Provides additional capacity but only in the long term | **Provides additional capacity but only in the long term** | **Neutral** |

| **D** | | | | | | | **Neutral** |
| Improve traffic signal timings including pedestrian walk times | Improve crossing comfort | Reduce delay somewhat | Reduce delay somewhat | Reduce delay somewhat | No impact on traffic signal preemption | Reduce delay somewhat | **Neutral** |

| **E** | | | | | | | **Good** |
| Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections | Wider intersection will increase crossing times and decrease comfort | Wider intersection will decrease comfort | Reduces delay for turning movements at some intersections for some bus routes | Reduces delay for turning movements | Reduces delay for turning movements | **Reduces delay for turning movements** | **Good** |

| **F** | | | | | | | **Good** |
| Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections | No impact | No impact | Reduces delay | Increases delay offset by shift to transit | No impact on traffic signal pre-emption | Increases delay offset by shift to transit | **Good** |

### Issue / Opportunity: Safety

| **A** | | | | | | | **Neutral** |
| Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds | Improves comfort but opportunities to apply are limited since most arterials have been reconstructed recently | Improves comfort but opportunities to apply are limited since most arterials have been reconstructed recently | Improves comfort but opportunities to apply are limited since most arterials have been reconstructed recently | Reduces number of drivers exceeding speed limit, improving their comfort with minor increases in delay but opportunities to apply are limited since most arterials have been reconstructed recently | **No impact** | **Neutral** |

| **B** | | | | | | | **Good** |
| Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue | Improve comfort | Improve comfort | Improve comfort | Reduces number of drivers exceeding speed limit, improving their comfort with minor increases in delay | **No impact** | **Good** |

| **C** | | | | | | | **Excellent** |
| Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lakes, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas | Improve comfort and reduces delay with loss out-of-the-way travel | Adds an additional 5.9 km to the sidewalk network | Improve comfort to walk to from transit stops | Improves comfort with fewer pedestrians walking in the roadway | **No impact** | **Excellent** |

| **D** | | | | | | | **Good** |
| Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections | Improve comfort | Improve comfort | Improve comfort | Adds an additional 7.2 km of bikeways to the existing network | **Provides alternate access to destinations using quiet streets instead of busy, arterial roads** | **Good** |

| **E** | | | | | | | **Good** |
| Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveway for improved safety - limited to arterial roads with the potential to combine driveways for deeper properties (see notes in summary) | Improve comfort | Improve comfort | Improve comfort | **Reduces driveway options to access buildings** | **Decreases friction on arterials from traffic turning at driveway** | **Good** |
## Transportation Network, Access, Comfort and Delay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>EMS</th>
<th>Goods Movement</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F+ Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>Improve comfort and access to Confederation Park.</td>
<td>Improve comfort and access to Confederation Park.</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adds an additional 0.6 km to the multi-use trail network.</td>
<td>Adds an additional 0.6 km to the multi-use trail network.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issue / Opportunity: Urban Design

#### A+ Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>EMS</th>
<th>Goods Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reduction in surface parking may result in additional circulation to find parking space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B+ Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50%.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>EMS</th>
<th>Goods Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C+ Improve pedestrian connections through new developments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>EMS</th>
<th>Goods Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve comfort with more direct access to developments.</td>
<td>Improve comfort with more direct access to developments</td>
<td>If shared use permitted with pedestrians, improves comfort with more direct access to developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### D+ Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>EMS</th>
<th>Goods Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### E+ Implement cycle tracks on Centennial and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape options.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>EMS</th>
<th>Goods Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve comfort with travelling through various streets.</td>
<td>Improve comfort with access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>Improve comfort with potential for short-cuts to/from transit stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issue / Opportunity: Mobility Choices

#### A+ Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>EMS</th>
<th>Goods Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shift to other modes reduces delay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B+ Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>EMS</th>
<th>Goods Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve comfort and access</td>
<td>Improve comfort and access</td>
<td>Improve comfort and access</td>
<td>Improve comfort and access</td>
<td>Shift to other modes reduces delay</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C+ Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>EMS</th>
<th>Goods Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Increase accessibility</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### D+ Facilitate car sharing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>EMS</th>
<th>Goods Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>May shift transit passengers to driving</td>
<td>Increase accessibility</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### E+ Extend and modify HSR routes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pedestrians</th>
<th>Cyclists</th>
<th>Transit Passengers</th>
<th>Drivers</th>
<th>EMS</th>
<th>Goods Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Improve comfort and reduce delay for some passengers</td>
<td>Shift to other modes reduces delay</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>About 30% of the study area is within 400 m of transit service Route deviation may not be as convenient as current service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Solution</td>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>Cyclists</td>
<td>Transit/Passengers</td>
<td>Drivers</td>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>Goods Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Add local HSR circulator route</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Improves comfort and access for some passengers. About 50% of the study area is within 400 m of transit service. Circuitous routing may not decrease delay.</td>
<td>Shift to other modes reduces delay</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1</td>
<td>Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road</td>
<td>Improves comfort by providing buffer between travel lanes and sidewalks.</td>
<td>Improves comfort and access. Centennial recently reconstructed so opportunity is very long term. Adds 5.1 km to the bikeway network.</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Reconfigure Nash (14,000 vehicles per day) and Lake (25,000 vehicles per day) from four lanes to three with bike lanes. Operates well when traffic volumes are less than 20,000 vehicles per day. Shift to other modes reduces delay.</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N' Ride</td>
<td>Improves comfort and access.</td>
<td>Improves comfort and access to GO Station.</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Shift to other modes reduces demand for parking. Reduction in surplus parking may result in additional circulation to find space.</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1</td>
<td>Implement the multi-use recreational trails from the Recreational Master Plan: Project 5-4 in Bow Valley Open Space and Lawrence Avenue Park, just west of Lake Avenue. Project 5-9 connecting Potruff Road near Eugene Street across the RHVP to the Red Hill Valley Recreational Trail.</td>
<td>Improves comfort and access to parks, open space and Red Hill Valley Recreational Trail. Adds an additional 1.2 km to the multi-use trail network.</td>
<td>Improves comfort and access to parks, open space and Red Hill Valley Recreational Trail. Adds an additional 1.2 km to the multi-use trail network.</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>Improve the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the RHVP.</td>
<td>Improves comfort, and access to Red Hill Valley Recreational Trail and adjacent comments west of RHVP.</td>
<td>Improves comfort, and access to Red Hill Valley Recreational Trail and adjacent comments west of RHVP.</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan

**Evaluation of Alternative Transportation Solutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Social interaction</th>
<th>Transportation equity and access</th>
<th>Active transportation</th>
<th>Collision reduction</th>
<th>Air quality</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue / Opportunity: Capacity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Extend the B-Line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (within 15 years west of Centennial &amp; beyond 25 years east of Centennial)</td>
<td>Improves access to jobs Increases sense of attachment to neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Provides affordable, new mode of transportation Supports growth in HSR local service, further increasing transportation choices</td>
<td>Increases trips by walking or bicycling to/from transit stops</td>
<td>Shift to transit reduces collision potential</td>
<td>Shift to transit improves air quality</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Implement S-Line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to OED Station (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>Improves access to jobs Increases sense of attachment to neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Provides affordable, new mode of transportation beyond secondary plan horizon Supports growth in HSR local service, further increasing transportation choices</td>
<td>Increases trips by walking or bicycling to/from transit stops beyond secondary plan horizon</td>
<td>Shift to transit reduces collision potential</td>
<td>Shift to transit improves air quality</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic, HOV or transit-only lanes (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>Wider roadway decreases cohesion between destinations on opposite sides of the street</td>
<td>Supports more driving instead of other mode choices</td>
<td>Supports more driving instead of more active transportation</td>
<td>Increases potential for more drivers to be exposed to risk of collisions</td>
<td>Supports mode driving and decrease in air quality</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Improve traffic signal timings including pedestrian walk times</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Improves pedestrian comfort supporting more trips by walking</td>
<td>Reduces risk of violating traffic signals</td>
<td>Improves efficiency of traffic flow improving air quality</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections</td>
<td>Wider interaction decreases cohesion between destinations on opposite sides of the street</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Widens intersections making walking and cycling less comfortable</td>
<td>Widens intersections with the potential of increasing risk of conflicts</td>
<td>Improves efficiency of traffic flow improving air quality</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Improves transportation choices through more efficient transit services</td>
<td>Increases trips by walking or bicycling to/from transit stops as ridership increases with more efficient transit service</td>
<td>Shift to transit reduces collision potential</td>
<td>Shift to transit improves air quality</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issue / Opportunity: Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds</td>
<td>Lower operating speeds make streets more comfortable for all users increasing the potential for improved social interaction</td>
<td>Improves transportation choices by improving comfort of non-motorized transportation choices</td>
<td>Improves pedestrian and cyclist comfort supporting more trips by walking and cycling</td>
<td>Reduces the severity of injuries and risk of fatal crashes for all road users</td>
<td>Speed moderation supports improved air quality</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue</td>
<td>Lower operating speeds make local streets more comfortable for all users increasing the potential for improved social interaction</td>
<td>Improves transportation choices in neighbourhoods by improving comfort of non-motorized transportation choices</td>
<td>Improves pedestrian and cyclist comfort supporting more trips by walking and cycling on these local streets</td>
<td>Reduces the severity of injuries and risk of fatal crashes for all local road users</td>
<td>Speed moderation on local streets supports improved air quality</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas</td>
<td>Supports more pedestrian activity on these streets</td>
<td>Improves transportation choices by improving comfort of pedestrians on these streets</td>
<td>Improves pedestrian and cyclist comfort supporting more trips by walking and cycling on these streets</td>
<td>Reduces the risk of crashes by providing a sidewalk for pedestrians instead of walking in the roadway</td>
<td>Shift to walking supports improved air quality</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan

#### Issue: Public Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Public Health</th>
<th>Social Interaction</th>
<th>Transportation Equity and Access</th>
<th>Active Transportation</th>
<th>Air Quality</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections</td>
<td>Supports more pedestrian and cycling activity and reduced conflicts with motor vehicles</td>
<td>Supports pedestrian and cycling activity and access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian and cyclist comfort supporting more trips by walking and cycling</td>
<td>Speed moderation on local streets promotes improved air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supports walking and cycling connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supports less pedestrian and cycling activity in the area</td>
<td>Improves transportation choices to access Confederation Park</td>
<td>Improves transportation choices to access Confederation Park</td>
<td>Improves pedestrian and cyclist comfort supporting more trips by walking and cycling</td>
<td>Reduces the risk of crashes by providing a multi-use trail for pedestrians and cyclists instead of using the roadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May encourage more people to access and use these facilities</td>
<td>Improves pedestrian and cyclist comfort supporting more trips by walking and cycling</td>
<td>Improves pedestrian and cyclist comfort supporting more trips by walking and cycling</td>
<td>Shift to walking and cycling supports improved air quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduces the severity of injuries and risk of fatal crashes for all local road users</td>
<td>May encourage more people to access and use these facilities</td>
<td>May encourage more people to access and use these facilities</td>
<td>Shift to walking and cycling supports improved air quality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More people walking and cycling decreases their crash rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More people walking and cycling decreases their crash rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Rating:
- Excellent
- Good
- Neutral
- Poor
- Fair

---

### Issue: Opportunity: Urban Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Manage access to new, large developments to reduce surface lots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve pedestrian connections through new developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alleviate congestion at bus stops, targeting providing sheds at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improves quality and comfort of pedestrian access to developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve accessibility and aesthetics as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve accessibility and aesthetics as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve accessibility and aesthetics as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve accessibility and aesthetics as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve accessibility and aesthetics as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve accessibility and aesthetics as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve accessibility and aesthetics as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve accessibility and aesthetics as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve accessibility and aesthetics as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve accessibility and aesthetics as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improve accessibility and aesthetics as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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## Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan
### Evaluation of Alternative Transportation Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Social interaction</th>
<th>Transportation equity and access</th>
<th>Active transportation</th>
<th>Collision reduction</th>
<th>Air quality</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets</td>
<td>Design that accommodates all users comfortably improves social interaction in the community</td>
<td>Design that accommodates all users comfortably improves transportation choices and access</td>
<td>Design that accommodates all users comfortably makes walking and cycling more viable</td>
<td>Design that accommodates all users comfortably reduces potential conflicts</td>
<td>Shift from driving to other modes supports improved air quality</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issue / Opportunity: Mobility Choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Opportunity: Mobility Choices</th>
<th>Social interaction</th>
<th>Transportation equity and access</th>
<th>Active transportation</th>
<th>Collision reduction</th>
<th>Air quality</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Supports activity in the study area</td>
<td>Provides low cost, maintenance-free bicycles</td>
<td>Provides low cost, maintenance-free bicycles supporting more trips by cycling</td>
<td>More people cycling decreases their crash rate</td>
<td>Shift to cycling supports improved air quality</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances</td>
<td>More people walking and cycling for short trips improves social interaction</td>
<td>Shorter trips are more viable by a variety of travel modes</td>
<td>Shorter trips are more viable by walking or cycling</td>
<td>More people walking and cycling for short trips decreases their crash rate</td>
<td>Shorter trips are more variable by walking, cycling and transit supporting improved air quality</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools</td>
<td>More people walking, cycling and taking transit increases social interaction</td>
<td>Increases awareness of travel options</td>
<td>Increases trips by walking and bicycling and to / from transit</td>
<td>More people walking, cycling and taking transit decreases their crash rate</td>
<td>Shift to walking, cycling, transit and car pooling improves air quality</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate car sharing</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Provides alternative to individual car ownership</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>May result in more trips by car increasing the crash rate</td>
<td>May result in more trips by car decreasing air quality</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend and modify HSR routes</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Supports growth in HSR local service, increasing transportation choices</td>
<td>Increases trips by walking or bicycling to / from transit stops</td>
<td>Shift to transit may reduce crash rate</td>
<td>Shift to transit improves air quality</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add local HSR circulator route</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Supports growth in HSR local service, increasing transportation choices</td>
<td>Increases trips by walking or bicycling to / from transit stops</td>
<td>Shift to transit may reduce crash rate</td>
<td>Shift to transit improves air quality</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road</td>
<td>Supports activity on these streets</td>
<td>Improves transportation choices by improving comfort of cyclists on these streets</td>
<td>Improves cyclist comfort supporting more trips by cycling on these streets</td>
<td>Reduces the risk of crashes by providing bike lanes instead of riding in the roadway</td>
<td>Shift to cycling supports improved air quality</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N Ride</td>
<td>Supports activity to the GO Station</td>
<td>Improves transportation choices by improving comfort of cyclists to the GO Station and provides multi-modal options</td>
<td>Improves pedestrian and cyclist comfort supporting more trips by walking and cycling to the GO Station</td>
<td>Reduces the risk of crashes by providing non-motorized access</td>
<td>Shift to walking and cycling supports improved air quality</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the multi-use recreational trails from the Recreational Master Plan Project 5-4 in Bow Valley Open Space and Lawrence Avenue Park just west of LaRue Avenue; Project 5-9 connecting Pittuff Road near Eugene Street across the R-MVP to the Red Hill Valley Recreational Trail</td>
<td>Supports greater use of the recreational trail system and associated parks and open space</td>
<td>Creates off-road linkages making walking and cycling more viable</td>
<td>Improves pedestrian and cyclist comfort supporting more trips by walking and cycling in these parks and participation in recreation at these facility creates off-road linkages attracting more users as an alternative to on-road routes</td>
<td>Reduces the risk of crashes by providing off-road linkages</td>
<td>Shift to walking and cycling supports improved air quality</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan

**Evaluation of Alternative Transportation Solutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Social Interaction</th>
<th>Transportation equity and access</th>
<th>Active transportation</th>
<th>Collision reduction</th>
<th>Air quality</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J1</td>
<td>Improve the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the RHVP</td>
<td>Supports better connections to the community, services and destinations west of the RHVP</td>
<td>Supports better walking and cycling connections to the community, services and destinations west of the RHVP</td>
<td>Improves pedestrian and cyclist comfort supporting more trips by walking and cycling connecting to services and destinations west of RHVP</td>
<td>Reduces the potential for conflicts and reduces the risk of severe injuries and fatal crashes</td>
<td>Shift to walking and cycling supports improved air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Environment</td>
<td>Natural environment: landscape, parks, open space, waterfronts, and shorelines</td>
<td>Cultural, heritage and archaeological resources</td>
<td>Public Realm: streetscape and public spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATING</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan

#### Evaluation of Alternative Transportation Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Extend Bomb B-Line Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (within 15 years west of Centennial &amp; beyond 25 years east of Centennial)</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets</td>
<td>Improve quality and location of bus stops, including providing shelters at 30% to 50% of stops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Implement S-Line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>Reduce traffic at signalized intersections</td>
<td>Reduce traffic at signalized intersections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic, HOV or transit-only lanes (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>Enhance pedestrian access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>Improve accessibility and pedestrian connectivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Improve traffic signal timings including pedestrian walk times</td>
<td>Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce density and improve connectivity</td>
<td>Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce density and improve connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections</td>
<td>Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections</td>
<td>Improve quality of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50% of stops</td>
<td>Improve quality and location of bus stops, including providing shelters at 30% to 50% of stops.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan

### Evaluation of Alternative Transportation Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Natural environment: landscape, parks, open space, watercourses, and shorelines</th>
<th>Public Realm: streetscape and public spaces</th>
<th>Cultural, heritage and archaeological resources</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian connections through new developments</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Streetscape / landscape associated with pedestrian connections will contribute to urban design of public realm</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
<td>Streetscape and gateways would enhance the landscape and street trees</td>
<td>Streetscape / landscape will contribute to urban design of public realm</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Implement cycle tracks on Centennial, and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape options</td>
<td>Some street trees may be impacted by constructing cycle tracks; mitigate with street tree replacement plan in same or nearby location</td>
<td>Improved quality of cycling facilities will contribute to urban design of public realm</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets</td>
<td>Some street trees may be impacted by implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets; mitigate with street tree replacement plan in same or nearby location</td>
<td>Improved quality of facilities for all users will contribute to urban design of public realm</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issue / Opportunity: Mobility Choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Opportunity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Physical Environment</th>
<th>Cultural, heritage and archaeological resources</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Place SoBi bicycle parking racks in areas where they do not impact the natural environment</td>
<td>Integrate SoBi bicycle parking into public realm and urban design / streetscape</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Increases pedestrian activity, animating public spaces</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Increases walking, cycling and transit activity, animating public spaces</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Facilitate car sharing</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Extend and modify HSR routes</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Increases pedestrian activity to transit stops, animating public spaces</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Add local HSR circulator route</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Increases pedestrian activity to transit stops, animating public spaces</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road</td>
<td>For Lake and Nash, retrofit bikeways to existing roadway to avoid impacting street trees and landscape in the boulevard For South Service Road and Warrington, widen existing road to provide bike lanes / paved shoulders may impact roadside vegetation</td>
<td>Increases cycling, animating public spaces</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N’ Ride</td>
<td>May impact vegetation along the roadside and railway</td>
<td>Increases pedestrian activity to GO Station, animating public spaces</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Solution</td>
<td>Physical Environment</td>
<td>RATING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natural environment: landscape, parks, open space, watercourses, and shorelines</td>
<td>Cultural, heritage and archaeological resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Implement the multi-use recreational trails from the Recreational Master Plan: Project 5-4 in Bow Valley Open Space and Lawrence Avenue Park just west of Lake Avenue; Project 5-9 connecting Potruff Road near Eugene Street across the RHVP to the Red Hill Valley Recreational Trail</td>
<td>Impacts the natural environment in the Bow Valley Open Space, Lawrence Avenue Park and Red Hill Valley</td>
<td>Increases pedestrian activity and recreational amenities in the Bow Valley Open Space, Lawrence Avenue Park and Red Hill Valley</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Improve the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the RHVP</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Poor
- Fair
- Neutral
- Good
- Excellent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Opportunity: Capacity</th>
<th>Economic Benefits</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Implement</th>
<th>Operate / maintain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Extend B-Line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Eastgate Square (within 15 years west of Centennial &amp; beyond 25 years east of Centennial)</td>
<td>Supports transit-oriented development (redevelopment and intensification)</td>
<td>Portion of $0.8B (2011 Dollars, as per Cost Estimate Report)</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Implement S-Line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>No cost to implement R&amp;D</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>No cost to protect ROW</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Improve traffic signal phasing, including pedestrian walk times for additional traffic, HOV or transit-only lanes (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>Some additional lanes to maintain</td>
<td>As part of on-going signal monitoring and improvement program</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections Centennial and sections of Barton and King recently reconstructed; high cost due to property and utility constraints</td>
<td>Some additional lanes to maintain</td>
<td>As part of on-going signal monitoring and improvement program</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Opportunity: Safety</th>
<th>Economic Benefits</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Implement</th>
<th>Operate / maintain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets</td>
<td>Lower operating speeds support more livable community and higher real estate values</td>
<td>Lower operating speeds support more livable community and higher real estate values</td>
<td>Lower operating speeds support more livable community and higher real estate values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lakes, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas</td>
<td>Snow removal by adjacent property owners</td>
<td>Completed sidewalk network supports more livable community</td>
<td>Completed sidewalk network supports more livable community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATING
- Poor
- Fair
- Neutral
- Good
- Excellent
## Evaluation of Alternative Transportation Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Economic benefits</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections</td>
<td>Implement: 7.2 km of greenways at $75K/km: $0.5 M Combine with Safety Alternative B</td>
<td>Operate / maintain: Minor increase in repair and maintenance efforts</td>
<td>Improved walking and cycling environment supports more livable community and higher real estate values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>May affect vehicular access to specific developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong> Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>$1.8 to 1.9M</td>
<td>New multi-use trail to repair / rehabilitate, sweep and remove snow / ice</td>
<td>Enhance economic and recreational value of Confederation Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issue / Opportunity: Urban Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Opportunity</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Economic benefits</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong> Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Reduction in parking available offset by enhanced commercial areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong> Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50%</td>
<td>Part of potential, city-wide bus stop improvement program</td>
<td>Some additional costs for shelter repairs / replacements</td>
<td>Improved pedestrian environment supports more livable community and higher real estate values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong> Improve pedestrian connections through new developments</td>
<td>Developer responsibility through site plan review</td>
<td>Issues concerning private public share</td>
<td>Enhanced access to commercial areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong> Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
<td>Cost share with BIAs</td>
<td>Cost share with BIAs</td>
<td>Enhanced image of community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong> Implement cycle tracks on Centennial, and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape options</td>
<td>Centennial recently reconstructed so no cost efficiency of implementing with road reconstruction May have some cost efficiency of implementing with road reconstruction when Queenston is reconstructed (year unknown) 2.0 km of cycle tracks on Centennial at $800K/km: $1.2 M 0.8 km of cycle track on Queenston with road reconstruction at $400K/km: $0.3 M</td>
<td>Increase in repair / rehabilitate and maintenance efforts</td>
<td>Enhanced access to commercial areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue / Opportunity: Mobility Choices</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Solution</td>
<td>Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets</td>
<td>Support live / work / play development so people don’t have to travel long distances</td>
<td>Promote travel options to employees, new immigrants and schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic benefits</td>
<td>Road ROW widening obtained from some redeveloped properties on former ROW</td>
<td>Program administration, bicycle and bicycle risk repair and replacement costs subsidized by membership and sponsorship revenues</td>
<td>Part of on-going Smart Commute Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>No-cost to protect ROW</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATING</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>No-cost to protect ROW</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement</td>
<td>No-cost to protect ROW</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>Road ROW widening obtained from some redeveloped properties on former ROW</td>
<td>Program administration, bicycle and bicycle risk repair and replacement costs subsidized by membership and sponsorship revenues</td>
<td>Part of on-going Smart Commute Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>No-cost to protect ROW</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RATING</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan
### Evaluation of Alternative Transportation Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Operate / maintain</strong></td>
<td><strong>Economic benefits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road</td>
<td>4.2 km of bike lanes retrofit to existing road at $50K/0.2 M, 0.9 km of bike lanes through road widening at $70K/0.8 M</td>
<td>No impact for Nash and Lake, additional road width to repair / rehabilitate and maintain for Warrington and South Service Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N' Ride</td>
<td>Construct as part of GO Transil Bus and Train stations</td>
<td>Some additional routes to repair / rehabilitate and maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement the multi-use recreational trails from the Recreational Master Plan: Project 5-4 in Bow Valley Open Space and Lawrence Avenue Park just west of Lake Avenue; Project 5-9 connecting Pottruff Road near Eugene Street across the RHVP to the Red Hill Valley Recreational Trail</td>
<td>Cost not provided in the RMP but estimated at $600K/km plus pedestrian bridge over RHVP at $15K/m: 2.9 M</td>
<td>New multi-use trail to repair / rehabilitate, sweep and remove snow / ice (may not be maintained in winter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the RHVP</td>
<td>Estimated at $25K for signage, pavement markings and improved ramp crossings per interchange: $75 K</td>
<td>Additional infrastructure to operate and maintain is not significant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D: Preferred Transportation Solutions including Approximate Costs, MCEA Schedule and Implementation Timeframe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR STREETS</th>
<th>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</th>
<th>APPROX. COST (IF KNOWN)</th>
<th>MCEA SCHEDULE (SEE NOTE 1)</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (IF KNOWN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City-wide Policies</strong></td>
<td>1. Support future designs of streets to reflect desirable operating speeds through the City-wide Transportation Master Plan (2016) <strong>Complete Livable Better Streets</strong> policy (see Section 5.1.1 for a description of Complete Livable Better Streets)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>As streets in the study area are reconstructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City-wide Activities &amp; Programs</strong></td>
<td>2. Protect right-of-way (no cost) as per <em>Urban Official Plan, Schedule C-2 – Future Road Widening (October 2015)</em> for <strong>Complete Livable Better Streets</strong> on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for increased capacity, on Centennial for future LRT, and on all arterials for HOV, transit-only lanes, cycle tracks or bike lanes, wider pedestrian sidewalks and amenities, and/or enhanced streetscaping.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>As streets in the study area are reconstructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City-wide Activities &amp; Programs</strong></td>
<td>3. Improve traffic signal co-ordination and timings, including pedestrian walk times. Review the implementation of recommendations from the Traffic Signal Operations Study (2012) and determine if additional adjustments are required.</td>
<td>Existing activities / programs</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City-wide Activities &amp; Programs</strong></td>
<td>4. Implement traffic calming on local streets where speeding, cut-through traffic volumes, collisions and safety concerns are ascertained; future studies are required. Implement with community and Councillor’s support.</td>
<td>Costs vary from about $2 K to $10 K per traffic calming device</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City-wide Activities &amp; Programs</strong></td>
<td>5. Continue to promote travel options to employers and schools through the Smart Commute program and Active and Sustainable School Transportation (ASST) initiatives (Transportation Demand Management).</td>
<td>Existing City activities / programs</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City-wide Activities &amp; Programs</strong></td>
<td>6. Co-ordinate communication of travel options available for new residents in various languages aligned with settlement activities (Transportation Demand Management).</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Years 2017 to 2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR TRANSIT</th>
<th>APPROX. COST (IF KNOWN)</th>
<th>MCEA SCHEDULE (SEE NOTE 1)</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (IF KNOWN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>City-wide Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Determine appropriate transit priority measures and funding. A transit priority study is recommended for Centennial Neighbourhoods following adoption of a potential new transit priority policy under the City-wide Transportation Master Plan.</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Schedules A+ or B, (depending on potential for environmental effects)</td>
<td>Years 2017 to 2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City-wide Activities &amp; Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. New guidelines are being developed for bus stop placement and design, including installing passenger amenity features. More transit shelters throughout the HSR bus route system is a key element for improving the customer experience, helping to grow transit ridership. Apply these guidelines to the study area routes.</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td>Years 2017 to 2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Through the City-wide Annual Transit Service Plans, consider extending or modifying HSR bus routes in the study area. Review the potential for improving connections between the LRT terminus and the new Confederation GO Station until rapid transit is extended to this destination.</td>
<td>Modification or extension of local bus routes generally require purchase of additional buses and increases in operating budget. Cost of rapid transit extensions have not been determined.</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City-wide Projects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extend the B-line LRT from Queenston Traffic Circle to Eastgate Transit Hub. Subsequent to the consultation and preparation of this report, the LRT extension from the Queenston Traffic Circle to Eastgate was included in the Environmental Project Report addendum, and endorsed by council.</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Transit Project Assessment Process</td>
<td>As per City’s B line implementation plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Extend rapid transit from the Eastgate Transit Hub to the Confederation GO Station.</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Transit Project Assessment Process</td>
<td>As per City’s Rapid Transit expansion Plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## FOR ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION (SEE NOTES 2 AND 3)

<p>| City-wide Projects | | | |
| 12. Implement Projects in the City of Hamilton’s Recreational Trails Master Plan (2016): | Recreational Trails Master Plan does not include any estimated construction costs (to be determined) Project 5-10 approx. value $2 M | Trail projects under $3.5 M are exempt from the MCEA Those that cost between $3.5 M and 9.5 M are Schedule B Those over $9.5 M are Schedule C | The Recreational Trails Master Plan is intended for phased implementation of trail initiatives. Implementation timeframes for Projects 5-4 and 5-9 not identified. Project 5-10: see Recommended Solutions by Other Proponents No. 29 – implement as part of QEW / Centennial Parkway bridge rehabilitation scheduled by MTO anticipated for 2017 |
| - Project 5-4: multi-use trail in Bow Valley Open Space and Lawrence Avenue Park just west of Lake Avenue | | | |
| - Project 5-9: multi-use trail and bridge connecting Pottruff Road near Eugene Street across the RHVP to the Red Hill Valley Trails | | | |
| - Project 5-10: multi-use trail access to Confederation Park along Centennial Parkway and across the QEW to Goderich Road (see Recommended Solutions by Other Proponents). | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centennial Neighbourhoods Specific Projects</th>
<th>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</th>
<th>APPROX. COST (IF KNOWN)</th>
<th>MCEA SCHEDULE (SEE NOTE 1)</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (IF KNOWN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic and improve walking and cycling connections to create Complete Livable Better Streets. Improvements may consist of street furniture and amenities (e.g. seating, planters or gardens, public art, bicycle racks, pedestrian-scale lighting, water fountains, tree or shade canopies), way-finding signage and pavement markings, traffic speed and volume management (e.g. traffic calming, signs and pavement markings), bike lanes to narrow road width, and green stormwater infrastructure. A description of neighbourhood greenways is provided in Section 5.1.2 and the Glossary.</td>
<td>There are about 7 km of greenways recommended at a cost of about $75 K per kilometre to implement.</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>Co-ordinate with traffic calming initiatives (see Preferred Solutions for Streets No. 4 and Preferred Transportation Solutions to include in the Secondary Plan No. 24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Construct missing sections of sidewalk along Lake Avenue, Centennial Parkway and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas and schools.</td>
<td>There are about a total of 6 km of new sidewalks required at a cost of about $300 K per kilometre to construct</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>Phase in with road resurfacing / reconstruction projects or through development applications (see Secondary Plan Policies No. 26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 15. | Provide cycling facilities on Nash Road, Lake Avenue, Warrington Street and a section of the South Service Road in the future. Options to consider for cycling facilities are as follows:  
   - Nash Road—Re-stripe with bike lanes north of Barton Street in conjunction with permanent on-street parking along the west curb as well as auxiliary left-turn lanes at Kentley Drive to eliminate the 3-phase traffic signal design. Re-stripe with bike lanes south of Barton Street in conjunction with a centre two-way left-turn lane.  
   - Lake Avenue—Re-stripe with bike lanes in conjunction with a centre two-way left-turn lane.  
   - Warrington Street and a section of the South Service Road—Construct a multi-use trail on the south side from Lake Avenue to Centennial Parkway. | Nash Road: Approximately $80 K  
Lake Avenue: Approximately $90 K  
Warrington Street: Approximately $600 K | Schedule A+ | Consider implementing with future development to provide cycling infrastructure in response to growth in travel. Although wider rights-of-way for the arterial streets will be protected for potential cycle tracks in the long term (see Preferred Solutions for Streets No. 2), retrofitting these bikeways are an opportunity to develop a viable cycling network in the shorter term. |
| 16. | Improve the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the Red Hill Valley Parkway. A design study is recommended to determine issues and appropriate treatments. | The cost to improve signage, pavement markings and ramp crossings is estimated to be about $100 K per interchange | Schedule A | Year 2017 to 2022 |
17. Provide a pedestrian / cycling route to the Confederation GO Station (see Preferred Transportation Solutions by Other Proponents No. 30). Potential non-auto routing to be investigated includes:
   - A connection south of the railway along Bancroft Street to the Confederation GO Station, with access across the railway to the north side
   - Incorporating active transportation facilities on the potential extension of Goderich Road through the City’s Transfer Station lands to Kenora Avenue (see Preferred Transportation Solutions to include in the Secondary Plan No. 27)

   Pedestrian / cycling route along Bancroft Street is approximately $300 K
   Cost of extending Goderich Road to be determined
   Pedestrian / cycling route along Bancroft Street Schedule A+
   Further studies needed to identify class of EA for Goderich Road extension
   Implement with Phase 2 development of the Confederation GO Station by Metrolinx (see Preferred Solutions by Other Proponents No. 30)
   Timeframe to implement Goderich Road extension depends on further studies

18. Develop a pedestrian / cycling route between Confederation Park and Battlefield House Museum and Park. Signage should be consistent with the City of Hamilton’s City-wide Wayfinding project including pedestrian and cyclist oriented signage. There are two routes that can be explored:
   - Centennial Parkway multi-use trail over the QEW, future Goderich Road connection to Kenora Avenue (sidewalks and future bike lanes), Kenora Avenue / Greenfield Drive / Owen Place (future neighbourhood greenways), and King Street (sidewalks and bike lanes)
   - Centennial Parkway multi-use trail over the QEW, South Service Road (future multi-use trail), Warrington Street (future multi-use trail), Lake Avenue (sidewalks and future bike lanes), and King Street (sidewalks)

   Approximate cost for signage of existing and future routes is $10 K
   Exempt
   Implement following implementation of Preferred Transportation Solution for Active Transportation No. 12 (Recreational Trails Master Plan Project 5-10), No. 13 and No. 15.

---

**Secondary Plan Policy**

19. Manage access to larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety. Identify and implement access management as part of development applications for deeper properties.

20. Manage parking for developments to reduce surface lots. Identify parking requirements including "end-of-trip" cycling facilities such as bike parking, lockers, change rooms and showers for developments in the Secondary Plan.

21. Improve pedestrian connections through developments. Identify and implement pedestrian connections as part of development applications.

**TO INCLUDE IN THE SECONDARY PLAN (SEE NOTE 4)**

- **Secondary Plan Policy**
  - Developer funded
  - NA
  - NA
  - Developer funded
  - NA
  - NA
  - Developer funded
  - NA
  - NA
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</th>
<th>APPROX. COST (IF KNOWN)</th>
<th>MCEA SCHEDULE (SEE NOTE 1)</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (IF KNOWN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22. Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts. Gateways may include one or a combination of public art, way-finding signage, landscaping or streetscape / built form around the entryways to strengthen a sense of place. Signage should be consistent with the City of Hamilton’s City-wide Wayfinding project including pedestrian and cyclist oriented signage.</td>
<td>Address funding in the Secondary Plan.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Address implementation in the Secondary Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Support live / work / play development to encourage trips by active transportation and transit through the Secondary Plan land-use recommendations.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Facilitate car sharing through a City-wide initiative to consider policies required to support car-sharing and then apply to Centennial Neighbourhoods area. Identify opportunities for car-sharing when applying the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Land Use Guidelines to development applications.</td>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Identify traffic calming measures to reduce cut-through traffic, speeding, collisions or safety concerns as part of development applications. Implement with community and Councillor support.</td>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Require missing sidewalks adjacent to new developments to be constructed as part of the development.</td>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Through future re-development of adjacent lands that support the Confederation GO Transit mobility hub, extend Goderich Road (with bikeway and sidewalks) to Kenora Avenue to support direct access to the area and Confederation GO Station and to provide improved road, pedestrian and cycling network connectivity. This solution would require relocating the City of Hamilton’s Transfer Station.</td>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td>Schedule A</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BY OTHER PROONENTS</th>
<th>APPROX. COST (IF KNOWN)</th>
<th>MCEA SCHEDULE (SEE NOTE 1)</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (IF KNOWN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sobi Hamilton</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. City to approach SoBiHamilton bike share to undertake a study to determine the feasibility of serving the Centennial Neighbourhoods study area.</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Year 2017 to 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ministry of Transportation, Ontario</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. City to request that MTO include the multi-use trail (Project 5-10 of the Recreational Trails Master Plan) through the QEW / Centennial Parkway interchange as part of MTO’s initiative for rehabilitation of the bridge. The multi-use trail is recommended to be a minimum of 3.0 m wide plus appropriate offsets to railings and hazards.</td>
<td>$315,000 for the construction of the MUP on the deck</td>
<td>MTO is proponent (Class Environmental Assessment for Provincial Transportation Facilities)</td>
<td>QEW / Centennial Parkway bridge rehabilitation scheduled by MTO anticipated for 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metrolinx</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. City to request that Metrolinx create non-auto (walking and cycling) “last mile” access to the Confederation GO Station, and provide bicycle parking and right-sized Park N’ Ride at the Confederation GO Station (see Preferred Solutions for Active Transportation No. 17).</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Metrolinx is proponent (GO Transit Class Environmental Assessment)</td>
<td>To be determined by Metrolinx</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. **Schedule A and A+ Projects:** Consultation for these projects has been completed through the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (CNTMP). These may proceed to implementation.
2. **Schedule B Projects:** Issue Notice of Completion to review agencies and public. The Project File (this document) is made available for review. If no Part II Order requests are received within 30 days of the Notice of Completion, projects may proceed to implementation.
3. **Schedule C Projects:** Additional study and mandatory consultation required for these projects.

### Additional Notes:

2. These recommendations will be guided by the City of Hamilton’s Pedestrian Mobility Plan (2012) and Cycling Master Plan (2009), and associated updates to these plans.
3. Refer also to Preferred Solutions for Streets No. 2 to protect rights-of-way as per Urban Official Plan for Complete Livable Better Streets. This includes allowing for the provision of cycle tracks, pedestrian facilities and amenities on arterial roads such as Barton Street, Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road at such time that these roads are reconstructed.
4. These recommendations will be guided by the City of Hamilton’s Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Guide for Development (2015).
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INTRODUCTION
1.1 BACKGROUND

The Centennial Neighbourhoods area is about to undergo considerable change. Today, the area is home to one of the City’s largest commercial hubs, which includes Eastgate Square shopping mall and a number of big box and arterial commercial retail uses stretching along Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road. The area also includes a major industrial park, as well as a mix of established and diverse residential neighbourhoods, parks and community facilities. In the coming years, there will be two major transit investments which will impact the area. Firstly, Metrolinx is planning to build a new GO bus and rail station called the Confederation Station, named for the nearby Confederation Park. Construction is planned to begin in 2017, with a target completion date for 2019. The second major transit improvement is part of the City’s light rail transit (LRT) plan. The first phase of the LRT is expected to connect McMaster University to the Queenston Road traffic circle through downtown Hamilton along King Street East. Three additional stations (Parkdale, Nash Road and Eastgate Square) are expected to be part of the second phase of the LRT, which has a completed environmental assessment, but no funding or timing has been determined to complete Phase 2 of the LRT which includes the transit hub at Eastgate Square Mall\(^1\). (see Figure. 1.1).

\(^1\) Note that there are currently no plans to link the City’s LRT network with the Confederation GO station. Additional commentary on this is provided in this report.
The City’s Official Plan identifies the lands around Eastgate Square as a Sub-Regional Service Node. Eastgate Square is one of three major urban nodes – with the Downtown Urban Growth Centre being the preeminent Node, and Eastgate Square and Limeridge Mall planned as secondary Nodes. The expectation is that the two Sub-Regional Service Nodes will continue to have a major retail/shopping function but, that over time, they will also be planned to accommodate a wider range of uses including transit-supportive, mixed use development. To assist with the transition, Policy 2.3.2.11 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan states that “detailed secondary plans shall be undertaken for the Sub-Regional Service Nodes to provide greater direction on mix of uses, heights, densities, built form, and design, and shall be coordinated with rapid transit planning projects”.

The goal of the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan project is to create a new long term land use plan which capitalizes on the planned major transit improvements and provides more detailed guidance for built form and public infrastructure improvements.
1.2 STUDY AREA

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Study Area is illustrated on Figure 1.2. Generally, the limits of the Study Area are bounded by the Queen Elizabeth Expressway (QEW) to the north, the Red Hill Valley Parkway to the west, Lake Avenue to the east and Heather Road, Secord Drive, Glen Echo Drive, Dover Drive, Cromwell Crescent, Meadowvale Avenue and Neil Avenue to the south. The limits of the Secondary Plan Area are based on the potential area of influence in and around the Sub-Regional Node, taking into account opportunities for redevelopment, proximity to existing high density residential development, transitional development areas and natural and physical barriers (such as the Red Hill Valley Parkway and QEW). The Study Area is approximately 388 gross hectares. Although outside the Plan Area, it is important to note Confederation Park and Lake Ontario are immediately north of the Plan boundary.

Figure 1.2 also illustrates the limits for the Centennial Neighbourhood Transportation Management Plan which was undertaken in parallel to the Secondary Plan and where the limits overlap the Old Town Secondary Plan area.
FIGURE 1.2: SECONDARY PLAN STUDY AREA AND CNTMP PLAN AREA
1.3 PURPOSE

1.3.1 REPORT PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to document the overall secondary plan process as well as the analysis, key findings and recommendations which underpin the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan. This report is intended to provide a summary of the major elements included in the Secondary Plan, including land use, public realm, urban design and infrastructure. This report includes policy recommendations for the Secondary Plan and a summary of transportation analysis, options and recommendations is provided in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan document. Transportation policies in the Secondary Plan will be based on the recommendations in this document.
1.3.2 WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF A SECONDARY PLAN?

Secondary Plans are part of the Official Plan and provide more detailed guidance for areas which are expected to undergo significant change or have a specific set of issues which require more detailed policy direction. Typically, most secondary plans include:

- Land use plan and policies;
- Transportation plan and policies;
- Built form and urban design policies;
- Site specific policies; and,
- Implementation policies.

1.4 SECONDARY PLAN PROCESS

The Secondary Plan process is illustrated below on Figure 1.3. The Secondary Plan process is divided into four main phases. Phase 1 included the project launch, background review of issues and opportunities and a draft vision statement. Phase 2 examined a series of alternative land use, streetscape and public realm improvement options for the Secondary Plan. This report represents the completion of Phase 3 and includes the recommended land use, streetscape and public realm plans for the area. Phase 4 will be led by the City and involves policy development based on the recommendations in the Secondary Plan Study and will include additional public and stakeholder engagement.
As illustrated in Figure 1.3, the Secondary Plan process also included a series of three public open house events. A detailed summary of consultation events, activities and feedback is provided in Chapter 4 of this report. Focus group sessions were held before each Public Information Centre (PIC) with a small group of landowners, business owners and interested parties.

1.5 ORGANIZATION

This report is divided into six main chapters. This first chapter provided an introduction, outlining some of the drivers for the Secondary Plan, as well as the Study Area and Secondary Plan process. The second chapter is intended to provide the general policy context for the Secondary Plan. Chapter 3 describes the existing conditions, as well as issues and opportunities for the Study Area. The fourth chapter summarizes the consultation activities undertaken for this study and the fifth chapter describes the various land use, public realm and streetscape options considered. The sixth and final chapter presents the key recommended elements for the Secondary Plan and includes policy recommendations.
2 POLICY CONTEXT, SUPPORTING STUDIES AND GUIDELINES
2.1 PROVINCIAL PLANS

Land use planning in Ontario is undertaken in a top-down, policy-led approach, whereby the Province of Ontario provides policy direction to municipalities who in turn are responsible for implementing the policy directions into local Official Plans, Zoning by-laws and other planning tools. There are two main Provincial planning documents which are of relevance for the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan:

- Provincial Policy Statement (PPS, 2014); and,

A brief summary of key policies and policy directions is provided below. A more detailed overview of the Provincial planning framework is provided in the Background Report.

2.1.1 PROVINCIAL POLICY STATEMENT (2014)

Some of the key policies from the PPS which provide direction for the Secondary Plan from the PPS are as follows:

- Land use patterns and settlement areas should be planned to support densities and mix of uses which efficiently use land, support active transportation and are transit-supportive (where transit is available, policy 1.1.3.2);
- Municipalities are expected to plan for intensification by identifying appropriate areas for intensification (policy 1.1.3.3);
- Municipalities shall establish minimum targets for intensification (policy 1.1.3.5);
- Municipalities shall establish phasing policies to ensure targets are achieved (policy 1.1.3.7);
- Municipalities shall provide a mix of housing choices and densities (policy 1.4.1);
- Development of new housing should be directed to locations where appropriate levels of infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available to support current and projected needs (policy 1.4.3); and,
- Significant built heritage and cultural heritage landscapes shall be preserved (policy 2.6.1).

2.1.2 GROWTH PLAN FOR THE GREATER GOLDEN HORSESHOE (2006)

The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe provides a high-level urban structure plan and policies for municipalities which are located in the Greater Golden Horseshoe. The policies of the Growth Plan built upon the PPS policies and provide specific policies intended to help build healthy, balanced and complete communities. The Places to Grow Act requires that all
decisions under the Planning Act conform to the Growth Plan. Some of the key policies which provide direction for the Secondary Plan from Places to Grow are as follows:

- By the year 2015 and for each year afterwards, municipalities are to plan to achieve an intensification target of 40% (policy 2.2.3);
- Major transit areas and intensification corridors will be designated in Official Plans and planned to achieve higher residential and employment densities and a mix of uses (policy 2.2.5.1);
- Major transit station areas will be planned to support active transportation and integrate with various modes of transportation (policy 2.2.5.2);
- Intensification corridors will be planned to accommodate and support local services (policy 2.2.5.3);
- Major office development should be planned for the Urban Growth Centre, as well as Major Transit Station Areas and Intensification Corridors (policy 2.2.6.4);
- Municipalities may permit conversion of employment lands to a non-employment use only through a comprehensive review (policy 2.2.6.5); and,
- Community infrastructure, land use and community infrastructure investment will be coordinated to implement the policies of the Plan (policy 3.2.6).

At the time of the preparation of this report the Province was undertaking a comprehensive review of the Growth Plan. There are a number of changes proposed for the Growth Plan which could have implications for the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan. Some of the key changes of relevance include:

- Intensification rate: the intensification rate of 40% is proposed to be increased to 60%;
- Densities: at present the density targets within the Growth Plan apply to designated greenfield areas and the draft Growth Plan is proposing to include minimum density targets for lands along transit corridors (160 people and jobs per hectare along LRT/BRT corridors) and areas served by GO rail services (150 people and jobs per hectare);
- Employment lands: a more detailed policy framework is proposed for employment lands which distinguish between two types of employment lands.

The expectation is that the once the final version of the Growth Plan is issued (targeted for 2017), the City will begin its own policy alignment process and identify changes to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and where appropriate, secondary plans.
2.2 CITY OF HAMILTON URBAN OFFICIAL PLAN (2013)

2.2.1 URBAN STRUCTURE

The City of Hamilton’s Urban Official Plan provides a long-term urban structure for the City, which envisions intensification of the City’s Built-Up Area along key nodes and corridors. The direction for the nodes and corridors urban structure was determined back in 2006 through the City’s growth management planning study (Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy, GRIDS) and subsequently implemented into the Official Plan through an Urban Structure Study (and official plan amendment). The nodes and corridors framework is based on a hierarchy of nodes and corridors:

Nodes

1. Downtown Urban Growth Centre;
2. Sub-Regional Service Nodes (Limeridge and Eastgate Mall);
3. Community Nodes.

Urban Corridors

1. Primary Corridors (Queenston); and,
2. Secondary Corridors (Centennial).

SUB-REGIONAL SERVICE NODE: EASTGATE SQUARE

The Urban Hamilton Official Plan Schedule E – Urban Structure designates the area around Eastgate Square as a Sub-Regional Service Node. As the Sub-Regional Service Node, Eastgate Square is to be planned to achieve a density of between 100 and 150 people and jobs per hectare (see policy E.2.3.2.7 of the Urban Official Plan)\(^2\). Eastgate is planned to function as the eastern rapid transit terminus for the City’s future LRT and is planned to accommodate a significant portion of residential intensification. Ultimately, there is rapid transit planned to extend further, connecting the Sub-Regional Node to Fruitland Road and Fifty Road over the long term\(^3\).

---

\(^2\) The density targets provided in the Urban Hamilton Official were determined through the City’s Urban Structure Study project, which identified the policy framework for implementing GRIDS.

\(^3\) The 2007 Transportation Master Plan (TMP) recommended that transit node at Eastgate be connected to a hub at Fruitland/Fifty Road via rapid transit (see Exhibit 7.1 from the 2007 TMP for more details). The City is currently undertaking a review of the 2007 TMP.
Note that the Sub-Regional Service Node area identified on Schedule E of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan does not include the Confederation GO Station, as the identification and confirmation of the GO station occurred after the adoption of the City’s Official Plan.

**PRIMARY CORRIDOR: QUEENSTON ROAD**

As a Primary Corridor, Queenston Road forms the eastern link to the Downtown and McMaster University in the west end of the City. Primary Corridors are to be planned for higher order transit services and should include densities and built form which are transit-supportive and a street environment which is pedestrian-focused.

**SECONDARY CORRIDOR: CENTENNIAL PARKWAY**

As a Secondary Corridor, Centennial Parkway forms a link to the planned Confederation GO Station, connecting Eastgate Square with a regional transit service. Secondary Corridors are to be planned for higher order transit services (i.e. transit which operates on a separate right of way) and should also include densities and built form which are pedestrian-friendly and transit supportive.

As intensification corridors, both the Primary and Secondary Corridors should also feature development which is compatible with adjacent built form, providing appropriate transitions in height, scale and massing.

**NATURAL HERITAGE SYSTEM**

The eastern and western edges of the Study are bounded by the Red Hill Creek Valley and Battlefield Creek. Schedules B-2, B-6 and B-8 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan depict the extent of the natural heritage features along the edges of the Secondary Plan Study Area.

2.2.2 CURRENT OFFICIAL PLAN LAND USE

The current official plan land uses according to Schedule E-1 are reflected and presented on Figure 2.1. The predominant designation within the Study Area is the Neighbourhoods designation which accounts for 106 hectares of the net area (excluding roads). The intent of the Neighbourhoods designation is to provide residential uses and complementary facilities and services which are intended to serve the community including parks, schools, trails, recreation centres, places of workshop, retail, offices, restaurants and other services. As illustrated in Figure 2.1, the Official Plan does not identify detailed land uses within the Neighbourhoods designation. The two mixed-use designations, Mixed-Use High Density and Mixed-Use Medium Density account for 59 net hectares combine of the total designated area. The industrial lands
comprise 53 hectares (including the Business Park lands). The fourth largest group of lands is comprised of the two commercial designations – the District Commercial and Arterial Commercial designations which account for 40 hectares. Open Space areas represent 35 hectares (including parks, recreational areas, cemeteries and natural heritage areas) and institutional areas account for 5 hectares. Utilities represent a small portion of land, totaling 1 hectare.

2.2.3 OLD TOWN SECONDARY PLAN

A small portion of the lands covered by the Old Town Secondary Plan are included in the study area and these lands will be included in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, as they are designated as part of the Sub-Regional Service Node in the Hamilton Official Plan. An excerpt showing these lands is illustrated below on Figure 2.2.
2.3 HIGHER ORDER TRANSIT

2.3.1 THE BIG MOVE (2008)

Metrolinx is the Provincial agency responsible for planning, coordinating and delivering The Big Move: Transforming Transportation in the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area (GTHA). The Big Move is a Regional Transportation Plan which provides a long term vision, goals and objectives and policies for developing a comprehensive transportation network within the GTHA.

The Plan identifies fifty-two projects for improving the system, two of which have a significant impact on the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan:

- Rapid transit along the Main/King corridor (B-line); and,
- Rapid transit along Centennial Parkway to Rymal Road and across to Ancaster (S-line Corridor).

In addition to the above, GO transit completed an Environmental Assessment for extending rail services to Niagara Region with a future GO rail station along Centennial Parkway (Niagara Rail Service Expansion Class Environmental Study, 2011). The Confederation GO Station was part of this Environmental Assessment and as noted in the introduction, Metrolinx recently announced that the Confederation Station will be constructed between 2017-2019. This station will provide both rail and bus services.

2.3.2 BLAST NETWORK (2007)

The BLAST network is the City’s long term planned light rail transit plan, conceived as part of the City’s Transportation Master Plan. The long term plan includes five light rail transit corridors, including the B-line (15 years, priority), L-line (25 years), A-line (within 25 years), S-line (beyond 25 years), T-line (within 25 years). While the current plan shows the S-line terminating at Eastgate Square, the CNTMP has recommended that the line be extended to the GO rail Confederation Station. Figure 2.3 illustrates the latest version of the BLAST network.
FIGURE 2.3: BLAST NETWORK

Hamilton Long Term Rapid Transit System “B.L.A.S.T” (Conceptual Only)
2.4 OTHER RELEVANT PLANNING STUDIES AND GUIDELINES

In addition to the plans and policies discussed in this chapter there are also a number of other plans, studies and documents which have been considered in the preparation of the Secondary Plan Study.

2.4.1 ARTERIAL COMMERCIAL STUDY (2016)

The City of Hamilton recently completed a review of the Arterial Commercial designation in the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. The study examined the policies and land use within this designation to ensure it properly addresses the existing and proposed land uses and the planned character of the areas. One of those areas is located within the Secondary Plan study area on the north side of Barton Street on either side of the Centennial Parkway intersection running north to the railway lands. The Study provided the following recommendations for the Arterial Commercial lands located within the Study Area:

- Extend the “Secondary Corridor” north to future GO Transit Station (i.e. amend Schedule E Urban Structure the Urban Hamilton Official Plan to link the GO Transit Station with Eastgate Square);
- Permit additional land uses consistent with a “Secondary Corridor”, such as:
  - Additional commercial uses; and
  - Potential for secondary residential uses, subject to a planning application to address compatibility (i.e. mixed uses).
- Prohibit uses that are inconsistent with the vision for the area (i.e. enclosed storage, contractor services / industrial supply);
- Promote intensification and encourage infill development of Arterial Commercial sites

The above-noted recommendations have been considered in developing the options and policies for the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan.

2.4.2 TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES (2010)

In 2010, the City completed its Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) Guidelines. The Guidelines are intended to promote transit-oriented development (i.e. compact, mixed use development near transit facilities with high quality pedestrian environments). The City of Hamilton adopted the Transit Oriented Development Guidelines to establish a set of principles to be followed for development at key transit station locations. The 10 guiding principles are:

- Promote Place Making: Creating a Sense of Place
- Ensure a Mix of Uses/Appropriate Land Uses
- Require Density and Compact Urban Form
- Focus on Urban Design
- Create Pedestrian Environments
- Address Parking Management
- Respect Market Considerations
- Take a Comprehensive Approach to Planning
- Plan for Transit and Promote Connections (for all models)
- Promote Partnerships and Innovative Implementation

2.4.3 CITY WIDE CORRIDOR PLANNING PRINCIPLES AND DESIGN GUIDELINES (2012)

The City Wide Corridor Planning Principles and Design Guidelines generally apply to areas within 400 metres of corridors identified in the Official Plan. The 400 metre zone is important to consider for long range planning purposes, as this area represents locations which are within walking distance to transit. The City Wide Corridor Planning Principles and Design Guidelines include several Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures intended to promote alternative modes of transportation (cycling, walking, transit, etc.). Both the Transit Oriented Development Guidelines and the Corridor Planning and Design Guidelines provide direction for the types of built form, uses and infrastructure investments which are required to create vibrant pedestrian, cycling and transit-oriented places.

2.4.4 CITY-WIDE TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLAN

The City is currently in the process of updating its Transportation Master Plan. The TMP considers and addresses:

- A balanced transportation system;
- A healthier city;
- Upper and Lower City connectivity;
- Complete communities;
- Complete Livable Better Street design;
- Improved transit services and connections;
- Improved cycling infrastructure for commuters and recreational users;
- Goods movement network connectivity; and,
- Better education tools for use of available transportation infrastructure, transit service and operating rules related to bicycle lanes, sidewalks, transit service, active transportation, mobility devices, etc.

The CNTMP speaks more directly to the integration of the Secondary Plan with the City-Wide Transportation Master Plan.
2.4.5 OTHER RELEVANT PLANS AND STUDIES

Listed below are the other studies reviewed as part of the work to prepare the plans. A more fulsome description of the following documents is provided in the Background Report:

- Vision 2020 (adopted in 1992);
- GRIDS (Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy, 2006);
- Kently Neighbourhood Plan (1970);
- Greenford Neighbourhood Plan;
- Riverdale East Neighbourhood Plan;
- Riverdale Neighbourhood Action Plan (2012);
- Hamilton Zoning By-Law No. 6593;
- Zoning By-Law No. 05-200;
- Stoney Creek Zoning By-Law No. 3692-92;
- Hamilton Transportation Master Plan Update (2016);
- Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (on-going);
- Truck Route Master Plan (2007);
- Shifting Gears (Cycling Master Plan, 2009);
- Transforming Hamilton Through Culture: Cultural Plan (2013);
- Step Forward: Hamilton Pedestrian Mobility Plan (2012);
- Main King Queenston Corridor Strategy (2012);
- Centennial GO Station Development (on-going);
- Confederation Park Master Plan (2010); and,

Information from these studies was compiled, reviewed and considered in the creation of the preferred plan and policy recommendations.
3 EXISTING CONDITIONS, ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES
3.1 LAND USE & BUILT FORM

3.1.1 EXISTING LAND USE

The existing land uses are illustrated on Figure 3.1 (page 24) and summarized in Table 3.1 below\(^4\). The area is fairly balanced, with a mix of land dedicated to residential (28%), commercial (26%) and industrial uses (14%). The area has two major park spaces, as well as a cemetery, several institutional uses and lands along the Red Hill Valley which makes up 12% of the total area. The remainder of the Study Area is comprised of roads (18%) and utility (3%) uses.

TABLE 3.1: EXISTING LAND USE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING LAND USE</th>
<th>AREA (HA.)</th>
<th>PERCENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential Low</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Medium</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential High</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total: Residential</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Office</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - General</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Recreational</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial - Automotive</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total: Commercial</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial - Light</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial - Medium</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total: Industrial</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Total: Community Uses</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4\) Existing land use categories based on City of Hamilton’s Land Use survey classifications. “Commercial-Recreational” refers to commercially operated recreational uses (e.g. fitness clubs). Note that the percentages may not add up due to rounding. Also note that this classification of existing land use is different from the summary information presented in Figure 2.1 in chapter 2, which classifies properties based on existing Official Plan designation.
Top: Sam Manson Park is the area’s largest park space, providing active recreational opportunities for people living in the area. Bottom: The area also includes several institutional uses, such as this place of worship.
Top: Eastgate Square is one of the major commercial destinations located in the Study Area. The area also includes a number of commercial uses, such as this auto dealership shown above (bottom).
3.1.2 EXISTING BUILDING HEIGHTS

Generally, the majority of existing development within the Study Area is two storeys or less in height. However, as noted above, there are also a couple of pockets of high rise development concentrated in two main locations. The first area stretches along most of the length of the Queenston Road corridor, which features a mix of taller residential buildings. The second pocket of higher density development is located on a block of land which is north of Queenston Road and south of Barton Street and to the east of Centennial Parkway. In addition to this, there are also several pockets of mid-rise development tucked in some of the local streets off of Queenston Road, Barton Street and Centennial. The existing building heights are illustrated on Figure 3.2.
3.1.3 AGE OF CONSTRUCTION

The majority of development within the Plan Area was constructed over the course of two decades, between 1950 and 1970 (see Figure 3.3). A number of the high-rise apartment buildings were built in the 1970s as part of larger high-density housing boom which had been occurring across the Greater Toronto and Hamilton Area around that time, also around the same time as when Eastgate Square opened (1973). In recent years, the area has seen a handful of neighbourhood infill projects (two developments since 2001) and some commercial redevelopment along Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway. The most recent commercial redevelopment has taken place north of Barton Street, along Centennial Parkway with the addition of a major big box retail development.

FIGURE 3.3: AGE OF CONSTRUCTION
Above: Looking north on Delawana Drive from Granville Avenue. Below: Looking east down Queenston Road. These images highlight some of existing high rise development in the Secondary Plan Area.
3.1.4 INTENSIFICATION & REDEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

A significant portion of the lands within the Study Area have been developed and are built-up. There are only six vacant infill lots located in the Area, two of which are in the industrial area (refer back to Figure 3.2 for details), meaning that intensification within the area will occur as the result of redevelopment and land consolidation. While the majority of the Study Area is built-out, there is underutilized land, in the form of older, single storey arterial commercial development and large surface parking lots.

The expectation is that the addition of higher-order transit to the area will encourage redevelopment of the remaining vacant and underutilized lands, and that the existing relatively stable residential neighbourhoods will see modest change. The majority of intensification is expected to occur along the Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway corridors, with the initial focus around the major transit hubs (Queenston Road/Centennial Parkway and Confederation Station). Figure 3.4 illustrates the concept for intensification – it is important to note that this concept aligns with the policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, which directs intensification to the Sub-Regional Node and along the Primary and Secondary Corridors. The lands along these corridors with physical potential for intensification comprise of approximately 125 hectares, although only a fraction of these lands would be available for redevelopment between now and 2031, as they are presently occupied with active commercial uses and it will take some time for the intensification market to mature.
3.2 EXISTING TRANSPORTATION

The following sub-section provides a review of the current transportation network within the Secondary Plan Area. The Neighbourhood Transportation Management Plan (2016) report provides a more detailed description of the network and should be reviewed in conjunction with this report.

3.2.1 ROAD NETWORK

The area is well served through a network of arterial and collector roads. Major arterial roads include Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road, with Barton Street functioning as a Minor Arterial Road. The area is also bounded by two major expressways, including the Red Hill Valley Parkway and the QEW which links the City of Hamilton to Niagara Region to the east and the Greater Toronto Area to the west. Kenora Drive, Nash Road, Lake Avenue and Delawana Drive function as collector roads, facilitating access to the neighbourhoods. The current road network is illustrated on Figure 3.5 (page 34).

3.2.2 TRANSIT NETWORK

Hamilton Street Railway currently runs bus transit along all of the arterial roads and collectors in the Study Area, including a major terminal at Eastgate Square. It is expected that Eastgate Square will continue to function as a major transit hub into the future. Currently there is a GO Bus stop at Nash Road and Barton Street, which will be relocated to the Confederation GO Station location. The current planned transit network is illustrated on Figure 3.6 (page 35). HSR will periodically re-evaluate routing to improve efficiency.
3.2.3 ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION

The Secondary Plan Area features several important active transportation connections and linkages. Generally, most of the streets include sidewalks, although there remain a few gaps in the network that were identified through the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (CNTMP). There are no separated bike lanes within the Study Area and cycling along arterial roads is a major challenge. Given the recent reconstruction of Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road, many of the CNTMP’s active transportation recommendations are focused on improving connectivity via Collector Roads (for example cycling routes are proposed for Nash Road and Lake Avenue). Refer to the CNTMP for additional detail.

5 The CNTMP identified gaps along Lake Avenue, portions of Centennial at the north and several of the local roads which serve the industrial/commercial lands north of Barton Street. Refer to the CNTMP for more details on the current and planned active transportation networks.
3.3 PUBLIC REALM

3.3.1 WHAT IS PUBLIC REALM?

The term public realm is used to describe publicly owned streets, sidewalks, pathways, right of ways, parks and plazas, publicly accessible open spaces and any public and civic building and facilities. From a design perspective, the public realm can be described in terms of the following three core elements:

- Parks, recreational areas and trails;
- Gateways;
- Streetscapes; and,
- Major civic facilities and institutions.
3.3.2 PARKS, RECREATION AND TRAILS

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Area is generally well-served through several parks, trails and recreational facilities. These facilities are internal to the neighbourhoods located off of main corridors and include the Sam Manson Park, Henry and Beatrice Warden Park, Riverdale Recreation Centre and several trails. The City’s Recreational Trails Master Plan identifies several improvements planned for the area, including trail improvements to Sam Manson Park, a trail crossing over the Red Hill Valley Parkway to link Roxborough Park (located on west side of the Red Hill Valley Parkway) to the Centennial Neighbourhood Area and trail improvements to the Battlefield Creek trails system (located along the eastern edge of the Secondary Plan Area).

While the City’s Recreational Trails Master Plan identifies some improvements for the area, it will be important to ensure that the current complement of parks, recreational and trails provide an appropriate range of programs in alignment with the growth levels contemplated in the Secondary Plan.
3.3.3 GATEWAYS

Gateways are major entranceways into an area and offer opportunities for improved wayfinding, signage, landscaping, lighting and enhanced private realm treatment (building orientation/height, façade treatment, entrance treatment, etc.). Gateways are typically planned to consider the lands around a major intersection, including the roadway area, sidewalk area, landscaping, street furniture and any private property frontages which interface with the public realm (i.e. both the public and private realm). There are several major gateways into the Secondary Plan Area, all of which are devoid of any wayfinding, signage or enhanced public realm treatments. The right-of-ways tend to be wide and have potential for improvement, as they are also places which are highly visible, exposed to a high volume of users and have comfortable setbacks. The types of improvements for gateway areas could include landscaping, tree planting, public art, wayfinding signage, with the type of treatment varying depending on the function of the gateway area. There are also many opportunities to introduce the new palette of directional and wayfinding signage proposed in the City’s Wayfinding Strategy which will help to further develop the character of the neighbourhood. Key gateways include:

- Barton Street and Red Hill Creek Parkway;
- Barton Street and Centennial Parkway;
- Centennial Parkway/QEW (near planned GO Station);
- Centennial Parkway/Queenston Road;
- Centennial Parkway/Red Hill Creek Parkway.

Above: Gateway treatments can help to provide a pedestrian focus for major streets.
Above: Gateway signage at Eastgate Square.
Top: Gateway at Barton Street/Red Hill Valley Parkway. Bottom: Gateway at Barton Street and Centennial. As illustrated above, the gateway areas could benefit from significant public realm improvements.
3.3.4 STREETSCAPES

The area’s three major streets are generally similar in character and have been developed with an emphasis on prioritizing vehicular movements. While there are similarities, there are also important distinctions which are described below.

CENTENNIAL PARKWAY

- There is a continuous sidewalk for most of the length of Centennial Parkway within the Secondary plan area. Sidewalks are provided on both sides of the street, with the exception of the area under construction north of Arrowsmith Drive, where the sidewalk extends on the east side of the street.
- Some intersections are congested. In particular, the main arterial road intersections can be intimidating for pedestrians to cross. However, it is important to note that there have been improvements made at the Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road intersection in an effort to improve safety.
- Generally there is inconsistent landscaping treatment in both the public and private realm, with much of the space devoid of trees and landscaping.
There is an absence of public art and formal public spaces along this corridor, as the overwhelming focus of the private realm is advertising and access to front yard parking.

QUEENSTON ROAD

- Portions of Queenston Road are heavily landscaped, with buildings setback between 10 and 20 metres, providing a more comfortable pedestrian setting compared to Centennial Parkway.
- The sense of place along Queenston Road varies, as there are stretches of corridor which are not as well treated. Some properties have grass boulevards and street trees and other landscaping with buildings fronting on the road, while others have large areas of parking located adjacent to the road with the building set far back from the road edge.
BARTON STREET

- Sidewalks are narrow in some locations (less than 1.8 metres) and located close to the street edge in a number of instances (without a landscaped buffer). The sidewalk runs the entire length of Barton Street, on both sides of the street.
- In general, there is very minimal landscaping along Barton Street, with a few small pockets of tree plantings on the south side of the street, where the corridor runs adjacent to residential neighbourhoods (at both the east and west ends of the corridor).
- There are portions of Barton Street where streetscape conditions are poor (no landscaping, no tree planting, wayfinding, sidewalks immediately adjacent to road without separation, etc.). These locations tend to be along the north side of the street adjacent to older industrial and commercial properties.

Streetscape concepts, including opportunities for improvement are addressed in Chapters 5 and 6.
3.4 MUNICIPAL SERVICING

A high level analysis of municipal servicing issues and opportunities was undertaken to support the Secondary Plan Study. The assessment examined current water, wastewater and stormwater servicing. As the area is already built up, the entire Study Area has access to existing municipal services. The development age varies throughout the Study Area and select infrastructure that has not been rehabilitated may be nearing the end of its service life. The City has made upgrades to a number of elements in recent years and some areas may have the ability to accommodate intensification without major improvements. The expectation is that the City will undertake further modeling and analysis of the infrastructure systems in the Study Area as part of the Secondary Plan process.

3.4.1 OVERALL NETWORK

The following section provides a review of high-level infrastructure issues and opportunities for the Study Area which generally applies to all three aspects of municipal infrastructure:

- Municipal infrastructure in the area is aged and some areas will need rehabilitation. Accordingly, there are opportunities to coordinate improvements associated with intensification and redevelopment and these opportunities will need to be reviewed and incorporated into the capital budget planning process.
- The existing infrastructure capacity will need to be reviewed for increased discharge or demands associated with intensification.
- As a built-up area, there is an existing road network which provides adequate space for municipal infrastructure corridors.
- Depending on the timing of Phase 2 of Hamilton Rapid Transit corridor, any impacts associated with the LRT on infrastructure will need to be assessed.
- Confirmation of impacts to utility servicing (gas, bell, hydro, cable) existing network should also be considered to ensure that all aspects of infrastructure are understood.
- Modeling of infrastructure should be completed to confirm network available capacity to support redevelopment and identify gaps.
3.4.2 WATER

**Figure 3.7** (page 47) shows the current extents of municipal water services in the Study Area. The following summarizes potential water issues and opportunities:

- The area is serviced through Pressure District H1, which covers the entire area.
- The existing network has the potential to provide good support for additional growth in this district.
- A limited number of new watermains may be needed such as on Queenston Road west of Lake Avenue.
- In general, water supply is not expected to be a significant barrier to intensification in the Study Area based on the levels of growth contemplated for the Secondary Plan area.
- Consideration should be given by the City to require or encourage new development or redevelopment to minimize required fire flows through the use of appropriate building materials, fire walls, maximum building separations, sprinkler systems where not required explicitly by Ontario Building Code.

3.4.3 SANITARY

**Figure 3.8** (page 48) and **Figure 3.9** (page 49) show the current extents of municipal wastewater services in the Study Area. The following summarizes the potential sanitary sewer issues and opportunities:

- The area is currently serviced through gravity sewers and planned improvements and may not require pumping station facilities;
- A capacity review of the sewers in the study area adjacent to intensification corridors should be undertaken to identify areas where the sewers can support increased flow and where there are opportunities to manage increased sanitary flows. This should be undertaken to identify the scope of improvements and costing for budgeting.
- There is a need to examine opportunities to redevelop with demand management methods to maintain or reduce sanitary peak flow to pre-redevelopment flows.
- System limitations with existing flows should also be addressed (i.e. trunk sewer system with high infiltration).
- Upstream and downstream sewer systems / sanitary flows that are flowing into the study area will need to be reviewed to identify external (to study area) limitations, which could be assessed as part of the City-wide review of sanitary services.
3.4.4 STORMWATER

Figure 3.10 (page 50) and Figure 3.11 (page 51) show the current extent of municipal stormwater services in the Study Area. The following summarizes potential for stormwater issues and opportunities:

- Some areas discharge directly to Red Hill Creek, Battlefield Creek or Stoney Creek outlets without stormwater management controls and there are opportunities to introduce some water quality control measures.
- Some storm sewer outfalls to Stoney Creek, Battlefield Creek and Red Hill Creek have been identified as erosion sites in the City of Hamilton’s Watercourse Erosion Assessment Study.
- Any increased discharges associated with redevelopment would need to address potential impacts to the environment.
- The intensification corridors (Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway) have a high make up of commercial development with high impermeable areas. Intensification in these areas may not have an increased loading on the storm system and opportunities to increase green space with redevelopment will assist with water quantity and quality.
- There is limited water quality features with aged storm sewers and existing development. This should be an area to focus on with redevelopment with low impact development opportunities.
- New development may provide opportunities for improved stormwater quality controls.
3.5 SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES

They following provides a brief summary of the key issues and opportunities:

- The Urban Hamilton Official Plan provides strong policy direction for the Sub-Regional Node, which is to be planned for intensification, mixed use development and achieve a density target of between 100 and 150 people and jobs per hectare over the long term.
- A number of the properties within the Plan Area have existing site specific permissions. Some of these permissions will need to be carried forward in the policies of the secondary plan.
- Major transit investments are planned for the area. The addition of GO rail services and the extension (in Phase 2) of the City’s LRT corridor will provide the basis for intensification.
- The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Area includes a diverse mix of existing uses. While most of the lands within the area have already been developed, there are opportunities for intensification and redevelopment. A large portion of the lands which front onto Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road feature surface parking lots and one storey buildings, some of which are aged and could be redeveloped.
- There will be a need to address the potential for land use compatibility, both in terms of building heights and also with respect to the existing established industrial areas.
- There are a number of opportunities to improve the public realm as the area intensifies. Streetscapes and key intersections/gateway areas offer the potential to positively improve the area’s sense of place and further help to support opportunities for intensification.
- The area includes two major parks and a major recreational facility which are well-used by current residents. As intensification occurs within the area, there will be a need to ensure that the spaces are improved to accommodate the needs of additional residents.
- The area is fully-serviced and there is a need to better understand the existing system’s ability to accommodate intensification.
4 CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT
4.1 CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT PROGRAM

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan included a robust program of community, stakeholder, and city staff engagement. The purpose of the following section is to provide a short summary of the key activities conducted in support of the Secondary Plan. A detailed summary of consultation activities and comments received is provided in Appendix A.

4.2 CONSULTATION WITH CITY DEPARTMENTS

At key intervals of the Secondary Plan process, planning staff, with support from the planning consultant, presented key findings to the City’s Technical Advisory Committee (TAC). To date, the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan has been presented to the City’s TAC four times:

- TAC #1: Presentation on background for project (presented by City planning staff);
- TAC #2 Phase 1: Presentation on existing issues and opportunities, February 11, 2015;
- TAC #3: Phase 2: Presentation on land use options, September 28, 2015; and,
- TAC #4: Phase 3: Presentation on recommended land use plan (presented by City staff February 23, 2016).
4.3 CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

The City formed a Focus Group comprised of representatives from the Secondary Plan Area. Members of the Focus Group included a mix of residents, business owners and developers. The Secondary Plan team met with the Focus Group at three intervals, approximately two to three weeks before major public events. The Focus Group provided valuable input on how to engage the public at large and also on a variety of the aspects of the Secondary Plan:

- Focus Group Meeting #1: Workshop on issues and opportunities, April 8th, 2015
- Focus Group Meeting #2: Workshop on land use and public realm options, November 10th, 2015;
- Focus Group Meeting #3: Workshop on recommended land use and public realm improvement plans, April 7th, 2016.

City staff also held a number of one-on-one meetings with interested stakeholders. A list of stakeholder meetings is also provided in Appendix A.
4.4 CONSULTATION WITH GENERAL PUBLIC

To date, three major public events have been held in conjunction with the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan.

4.4.1 PUBLIC EVENT #1: PHASE 1, ISSUES, OPPORTUNITIES AND VISION

The event occurred on Tuesday April 30th, 2015 between 6:00pm and 9:00pm at St. Gregory the Great Church. There were approximately 86 people in attendance. The project was introduced to the public through presentations of background information and their feedback was collected through an interactive activity providing participants with the chance to add their notes to large scale maps. The session focused on two key elements – confirming key issues and opportunities and discussing the key principles for the Secondary Plan.
4.4.2 PUBLIC EVENT #2: PHASE 2, LAND USE OPTIONS WORKSHOP
The second workshop occurred on Tuesday December 1st, 2015 between 6:30pm and 9pm at Lake Avenue Public Elementary School. There were approximately 33 people in attendance. The consultant team explained the purpose of the event and provided an update. Different options for the area were presented, broken down into four districts. Participants were asked to provide their feedback on the options, identifying what they liked about the options, what they wanted to change and also any potential additional options which should be considered.

4.4.3 PUBLIC EVENT #3: PHASE 3, RECOMMENDED OPTION
The third public event occurred on Thursday April 28th, 2016 between 6:30pm and 8:30pm at Lake Avenue Public Elementary School. There were 43 official participants who signed in at the event. The consultant team presented the purpose of the meeting, feedback from previous events, the rationale for the recommendations as well as elements of the Secondary Plan including draft schedules. Participants had the opportunity to provide their comments on the map schedules which were posted in the room for comment.

There were translators available at the events in order to expand the audience reached at the events. A summary of the Public Events can be found in Appendix A.

4.4.4 OTHER EVENTS
In addition to the above-noted scheduled events, which were advertised on the City’s social media, twitter, project website and in newspapers, City Staff conducted two pop-up events. The first event was held during the summer of 2015 on August 5th at Sam Manson Park. The second event was held on April 29th, 2016 at Eastgate Square. This enabled the project team to gather input from youth, parents and other community members who were not able to attend the formal public events.

City staff also met with the Riverdale Planning Team on a couple of occasions to provide updates to the Team and also to receive feedback plan’s progression.

In the event that people could not attend the events, or did and had notes and opinions afterwards, they had the opportunity to fill out a comment form on the City’s project website:

https://www.hamilton.ca/city-planning/planning-community/centennial-neighbourhoods
5 SECONDARY PLAN
VISION AND OPTIONS
5.1 VISION AND PRINCIPLES

The following summarizes the long term vision for the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan. The vision statement is based on the principles developed in Phase 1:

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Study Area is home to some of the City’s most vibrant shopping, recreation, living and mixed use spaces. The Area will feature two major transit hubs, which are supported by compact, mixed-use development along the Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway corridors. The Study Area’s existing, low-density residential neighbourhoods are safe, well connected and affordable. The area’s attractive and accessible public spaces, green spaces and streetscapes, along with its strong network of transportation infrastructure provide a unique sense of place that makes the Centennial Neighbourhoods one of the City’s most interesting and dynamic places.

The following key guiding principles were also identified as part of the Phase 1 public engagement exercises:

- Protect and enhance natural areas and green spaces;
- Create safe, vibrant streetscapes;
- Provide more places to meet, relax and socialize;
- Increase active transportation throughout the community;
- Provide opportunities for a greater variety of recreational choices;
- Promote mixed use development and intensification in strategic locations;
- Promote transit-oriented development;
- Provide sustainable infrastructure; and,
- Provide opportunities for a greater variety of housing choices.

5.2 APPROACH FOR OPTIONS

To better understand the potential for change within the Plan Area, a series of options was prepared based on background analysis and consultation results to test the range of possible choices related to land use, public realm improvement and streetscaping. To illustrate potential land use options, the Study Area was subdivided into four districts, focusing on areas of major change. Each district has been presented demonstrating current Official Plan land use, potential alternative land use options and a public realm demonstration plan. Independent of the land use and public realm options, two alternative streetscape concepts were prepared for both Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road. The following chapter presents the various Secondary Plan options.
5.3 LAND USE OPTIONS

5.3.1 LAND USE OPTIONS

Figure 5.1 illustrates the four districts where major land use change is contemplated.

FIGURE 5.1: DISTRICT ORGANIZATION, LAND USE OPTIONS

As illustrated in Figure 5.1, the Secondary Plan Area was subdivided into the following four districts to better understand the potential for land use change:

- District 1: Regional Gateway
- District 2: Eastgate Square and Centennial Parkway
- District 3: Queenston Road East
- District 4: Queenston Road West

When the land use options were prepared, the Secondary Plan Area did not include the employment areas north of Barton Street and west of Centennial Parkway (labeled as “Study Area Expansion”). Based on public engagement and stakeholder feedback, these lands were
recommended to be included in the Secondary Plan Area, although no major land use change is contemplated at this time since all lands are designated as employment uses and would only be eligible for conversion through a comprehensive review of the City’s Official Plan. Chapter 6 provides additional policy direction for these lands.

The residential neighbourhoods identified on Figure 5.1 are predominantly comprised of established lower density residential (although not exclusively). As previously noted in Chapter 3, the residential neighbourhoods may experience some modest infilling and intensification over time, but the expectation is that the lands within the four district areas will be the focus of major change. The following subsection presents the various land use options for each of the four district areas.

DISTRICT 1: REGIONAL GATEWAY

Figure 5.2 on the following page presents the land use options for District 1. The majority of existing land uses in District 1 are low density commercial. The area is bounded on both sides by relatively stable and established light/general industrial activities. The lands in District 1 could be subject to major change in the coming decades. The introduction of GO station rail and bus service, with potential improved local transit to connect the GO station to Eastgate Square, access to the QEW and opportunities to provide development with unobstructed views of Confederation Park and Lake Ontario, could provide the right mixture of conditions for major land use change. The three land use options consider:

- Option 1: Maintaining the current Official Plan land use;
- Option 2: Re-designating the arterial commercial lands to mixed-use medium density; and,
- Option 3: Re-designating all commercial lands (arterial commercial and district commercial) to mixed use, with a pocket of high density mixed use development around the intersection of Barton Street and Centennial Parkway, and the new Confederation GO station.
FIGURE 5.2: DISTRICT 1 LAND USE OPTION OPTIONS

OPTION #1 – CURRENT OFFICIAL PLAN

OPTION #2 – MIXED USE MEDIUM DENSITY

OPTION #3 – MIXED USE MEDIUM AND HIGH DENSITY
Key public and stakeholder commentary on the land use options for District 1 included:

- There was support for both higher densities and the introduction of a mix of uses in District 1. Some of the key opportunity areas include the big box and arterial commercial lands along Centennial, as well as the industrial area along Barton Street.
- Higher densities and taller buildings were said to be more effective if located closer to the highway for views of the lake and as a focal point from the highway, and also for access to the GO station.
- A few respondents expressed the need to add affordable housing to this area as it intensifies.
- The current landowner of the District Commercial site expressed an interest in maintaining the current commercial permissions, as a portion of the site has a Record of Site Condition for commercial uses.

**DISTRICT 2: EASTGATE SQUARE AND CENTENNIAL PARKWAY**

**Figure 5.3** shows the three land use options for District 2. The majority of existing land uses in District 2 are low density commercial uses along Centennial Parkway and including Eastgate Square shopping mall. The lands along the south side of Barton Street are presently developed as high density residential. While there are a number of underutilized commercial properties along Centennial corridor, these businesses are generally well-established and the expectation is that major redevelopment along this stretch of land would require a catalyst – such as the introduction of rapid transit. There is also the potential for intensification in and around the Eastgate Square shopping mall, although it is acknowledged that the right development format and market circumstances would need to be present to see major change on this site. The three land use options consider:

- Option 1: Maintaining the current Official Plan land use;
- Option 2: Re-designating the district commercial lands to mixed-use medium density and recognizing the established high density apartments along Barton Street; and,
- Option 3: Re-designating the district commercial lands as mixed-use high density and introducing medium density residential as infill.
FIGURE 5.3: DISTRICT 2 LAND USE OPTIONS

OPTION #1 – CURRENT OFFICIAL PLAN

OPTION #2 – MEDIUM AND HIGH DENSITY MIXED USE

OPTION #3 – CONCENTRATED DENSITY
Key public and stakeholder commentary on the land use options for District 2 included:

- Several respondents expressed their support for higher densities along Centennial Parkway however, it was also noted that there would be a need for appropriate transitions between the higher density areas and lower density existing neighbourhoods.
- It was also noted that the Secondary Plan and CNTMP would need to effectively plan for traffic management at entrances to the higher density areas (i.e. manage number of access points, include operational improvements where required, etc.).
- Higher densities and taller buildings should be attenuated closer to the street instead of the back of the lot (Eastgate). Also they should be focused at the transit hubs (Eastgate).
- A couple respondents expressed their desire to see more affordable housing options, one named townhouses as a typology.
- A couple respondents noted that the standalone parcel located at the southernmost part of the study area facing Centennial Parkway has longstanding issues with sanitary sewer backups.

DISTRICT 3: QUEENSTON ROAD EAST

**Figure 5.4** shows the three land use options for District 3. District 3 is the smallest of the four areas of major change and includes lands fronting on both sides of Queenston Road, east of Centennial Parkway. The character of the area is defined by a mix of commercial and residential uses, as the south side is generally comprised of low density commercial plazas and the north side is comprised of high-rise residential apartments. The eastern edge of the area is bounded by a valley system, offering opportunities for unique views and vistas. A small portion of the lands within this District are expected to be part of the Sub-Regional Node. The three land use options consider:

- Option 1: Maintaining the current Official Plan land use;
- Option 2: Extending the mixed-use medium density designation along both sides of Queenston Road; and,
- Option 3: Re-designation of a significant portion of the Queenston Road corridor for mixed-use high density development and introducing medium density as infill.
FIGURE 5.4: DISTRICT 3 LAND USE OPTIONS

OPTION #1 – CURRENT OFFICIAL PLAN

OPTION #2 – MEDIUM AND HIGH DENSITY

OPTION #3 – CONCENTRATED DENSITY
Key public and stakeholder commentary on the land use options for District 3 included:

- Overall, Option 2 was considered to be most favorable.
- Generally additional high density in this area was not supported. Comments were made pertaining to the shadows that would be cast with taller buildings.
- There was strong support for medium density mixed use for lands along Queenston Road.
- One respondent expressed their desire for affordable housing protection.

**DISTRICT 4: QUEENSTON ROAD WEST**

**Figure 5.5** shows the three land use options for District 4. District 4 extends along the western expanse of Queenston Road and includes lands on both sides of the corridor. These lands have the potential to undergo major change in the coming years, as the City’s rapid transit plans include two proposed LRT stations (at Nash Road and Eastgate Square). And while certain stretches of the corridor have well-established high density residential development which are not expected to change, there are also a number of opportunities for change along the corridor in the form of underutilized lots. The three land use options consider:

- Option 1: Maintaining the current Official Plan land use;
- Option 2: Extending the mixed-use high density designation along both sides of Queenston Road for the majority of the corridor; and,
- Option 3: Re-designation of a significant portion of the Queenston Road corridor for mixed-use high-density development and identifying certain locations for lower intensity development in the form of medium-density residential development.

Key public and stakeholder commentary on the land use options for District 4 included:

- Comments received did not indicate a clear preference for any one of the three options.
- Generally respondents liked the mix of high and medium density mixed use along the corridor, stating again that adequate transitions are needed between higher density / taller buildings and existing development. Also making sure that uses are complementary towards one another.
- One respondent noted that high density should be centered around the intersection of Queenston Road and Nash Road and that it should be a destination with outdoor use.
- A couple of respondents expressed the desire for new development to face the park for increased social interaction.
- It was noted that there are historical sewer back up issues in the area of the properties adjacent to Centennial Parkway south of Queenston Road.
FIGURE 5.5: DISTRICT 4 LAND USE OPTIONS

OPTION #1 – CURRENT OFFICIAL PLAN

OPTION #2 – MIXED USE MEDIUM AND HIGH DENSITY

OPTION #3 – CONCENTRATED DENSITY
5.3.2 POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH POTENTIAL

Most of the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan area was built-out between 1950 and 1980 and, while there has been fairly limited residential development since that time, there has continued to be a relatively steady stream of commercial development. The historical trends data does not provide an adequate forecast of what the future might hold for the area and, accordingly, to better understand the potential for intensification, a bottom-up analysis of intensification opportunities was undertaken. The estimate of growth potential concentrated on the areas of major change illustrated in Figure 3.3 (i.e. excluding residential neighbourhoods and industrial areas) and included a block-by-block assessment of intensification potential within four main districts. Each district was sub-divided into smaller development blocks (37 blocks total; 14 in District 1; 9 in District 2; 5 in District 3; and, 9 in District 4). In total, these areas represented 125 hectares.

Each block was assessed based on a range of factors including the current built form (quality/condition of buildings, amount of surface parking), adjacent land uses, proximity to future planned transit, etc. Based on the assessment, growth potential estimated the potential for intensification within the block by assigning a percentage (anywhere from 0% to 50%)\(^6\). The resulting net area was then multiplied by a density to generate an estimate of units and/or jobs. Units were then multiplied by a persons per dwelling unit (PPU) factor to generate population (1.76)\(^7\).

Further adjustments to the unit, population and employment forecast were made by looking at various targets – including the City’s intensification target, the GRIDS Traffic Zone data and the City’s official plan housing/population forecasts. Some of recent development trends in the area were also considered which show that there has been limited residential development/redevelopment in the area. Most redevelopment in the areas has been modest additions to vacant lots.

---

\(^6\) Percentages of redevelopment for individual blocks are based on block-specific factors (noted above) and also consider other factors, such as the overall intensification target for the City, recent development trends in the Hamilton market place and the timing of major transit projects.

\(^7\) The PPU of 1.76 was derived from the City’s Development Charges Background Study (2014).
Table 5.1 summarizes the growth potential associated with each land use option. Note that the figures presented in Table 5.1 were primarily developed for the purposes of testing the infrastructure needs associated with the various land use options.

<p>| TABLE 5.1: POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH POTENTIAL |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Population Growth Potential</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Employment Growth Potential</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4 PUBLIC REALM IMPROVEMENTS

Public Realm elements were identified by the focus group and public as very important to the overall success of the Secondary Plan. Many of these elements/opportunities were also identified in the CNTMP; further emphasizing their importance. To better understand where the specific emphasis should be placed, a series of public realm improvement opportunities was identified for each of the four Districts. Generally, the opportunities identified for each District build upon the findings from Phase 1 and identify potential improvements which are generally independent from the four land use options. The public realm improvements consider:

- Opportunities for streetscape improvement;
- Opportunities for new public spaces;
- Opportunities to enhance existing public spaces;
- Gateway improvement opportunities; and,
- Active transportation improvements.

Figure 5.6 presents the public realm improvement opportunities for each of the Districts.
FIGURE 5.6: PUBLIC REALM IMPROVEMENT OPPORTUNITIES

**DISTRICT 1**

1. Connect to and enhance Red Hill Valley Trail
2. Opportunities for New Public Open Space with New Developments
3. Arrival Gateway at Centennial Parkway
4. Open Space Improvements for Incarnation Parish
5. Access/Connections to Transit Hub

**DISTRICT 2**

1. Opportunities for New Public Open Space with New Developments
2. Arrival Gateway at Centennial Parkway
3. Public Realm Improvements at Transit Hub
4. Open Space Improvements for St. Gregory the Great Church
5. New Connections

**DISTRICT 3**

1. Opportunity for New Public Open Space with New Developments
2. Arrival Gateway at Queenston Road
3. Enhancements of Outdoor Space at Community Facilities
4. Enhancement of Existing Henry and Beatrice Warden Park When Triggered

**DISTRICT 4**

1. Opportunities for New Public Open Space with New Developments
2. Arrival Gateway at Queenston near Red Hill Valley
3. Enhancements of Existing Sam Manson Park When Triggered
4. Encourage Public Use Improvements and Amenities at Eastlawn Cemetery
5. New Connections Between District and Adjacent Communities and Improved Connections within District.
The following summarizes the key comments received from the public and stakeholders.

For District 1:

- Many of the comments received related to active transportation and the need for better facilities specifically along Nash Road (recognizing that recent road reconstruction had occurred along Centennial Parkway and that there would be limited opportunities for improvements within the road right-of-way).
- There was low interest in providing for shared public / private space enhancement at Incarnation Parish. This space, while technically considered a public space, was viewed as private space.
- Generally there was interest in gateways, streetscaping and active transportation improvements identified.

For District 2:

- There were few comments made about the District 2 Public Realm.
- Generally there was support for Gateways, Streetscaping and Active Transportation Improvements. A comment was made that the Gateway should be moved closer to King street, to the study boundary edge.
- A comment was made that improvements are not necessary at Eastgate.

For District 3:

- There was a concern about traffic generated from new development and if the infrastructure can accommodate the increase.
- Comments were made pertaining to the desire for connections between the parks in this District across Queenston Road for both walking and cycling as well as to the existing trail to Battlefield Park south of Queenston Road through the park to the other park on the other side of Lake Avenue.

For District 4:

- A comment was made that areas for socialization are needed such as a family centre, which could be both indoor and outdoor.
- One respondent expressed their desire to see cycling lanes on Queenston Road, Barton Street and King Street, although through the Focus Group sessions it was also discussed that Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway might not be ideal for cycling lanes due to the heavy volume of traffic.
- One individual wanted to see a greenway/corridor connection between the park and the Queenston Road Commercial area.
5.5 STREETSCAPES CONCEPTS

The Centennial Neighbourhood Transportation Management Plan examined a range of alternative transportation solutions including opportunities to increase road capacity (road widenings), improve transit services and enhance active transportation networks. One of the key interface areas between the Secondary Plan and the Transportation Management Plan was the function of major streets in the area. Streetscapes, which include pedestrian facilities, furniture, landscaping, lighting etc., are the primary public realm location for pedestrians. Streetscapes are a critical element in establishing a strong sense of place for the public realm, as these spaces have the potential to influence the character of a neighbourhood through thoughtful and functional design. The Secondary Plan examined opportunities for enhancing the public realm along the two major intensification corridors (Queenston Road and Centennial). The expectation is that the character of these streets will evolve as intensification occurs and the goal of the options was to better understand what the ideal character of the public realm should be.

Figure 5.7 presents the two streetscape options for Centennial Parkway and Figure 5.8 illustrates the two streetscape options for Queenston Road. Some of the key comments and feedback received on the streetscape options are noted below.

For the Centennial Parkway:

- Initially, there was some support for the cycle track cross section for Centennial Parkway with the centre turning lane and patios on either side.
- For the ‘Moderate Enhancement’ cross section there was no support for the parking/driving lanes between the road and the building, however there was support for an enhanced landscape buffer.
- Through the focus group sessions it was also noted that along Centennial Parkway that there could be an opportunity to blend the two options, allowing for wider setbacks and more green space along the corridor to provide a balance between traffic and pedestrians.
- Through the CNTMP exercise it was noted that there would be limited potential for cycling facilities along Centennial.

For Queenston Road:

- Initially, there was some support for cycle track facilities along Queenston Road.
- There was little to no support for on road bike lanes along Queenston Road.
- Through the CNTMP exercise it was noted that there would be limited potential for cycling facilities along Queenston.
FIGURE 5.7: CENTENNIAL PARKWAY STREETScape CONCEPTS

CENTENNIAL PARKWAY WITH CYCLE TRACK (URBAN CORRIDOR)

- Building frontage on lot line.
- Sidewalk / Property interaction
- Existing roadway to minimize construction
- Shade and ornamental trees
- Cyclist track for efficient cyclist movement

CENTENNIAL PARKWAY WITH MODERATE ENHANCEMENTS

- Maximized landscape buffer
- Existing roadway to minimize construction
- Parking relocated to rear, avoid street frontage parking

DILLON CONSULTING LIMITED
FIGURE 5.8: QUEENSTON ROAD STREETSCAPE CONCEPTS

QUEENSTON ROAD WITH LRT (AS PER ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT)

- Varying setbacks from building line to property line.
- Wider sidewalks for pedestrian comfort.
- Rapid transit infrastructure.
- Full street tree canopy.

QUEENSTON ROAD, EAST OF CENTENNIAL PARKWAY (URBAN STREET WITH CYCLE TRACK)

- Building frontage on lot line.
- Interaction between sidewalk and patio space.
- Cycle track for efficient cyclist movement.
- Shade and ornamental trees.
5.6 COMMENTARY AND DIRECTIONS

Based on feedback through the various consultation activities conducted with the Focus Group, City Staff and members of the public, as well as further analysis, the different options were further refined to develop a set of recommended plans and concepts which are presented in the next chapter. The following summarizes the key directions for the Secondary Plan:

- Define the Sub-Regional node boundary;
- Mixed-use intensification should be planned for along Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway corridors, as envisioned in the Urban Hamilton Official Plan;
- Concentrate higher density development around the main transit hubs (GO station, Centennial/Queenston Road and Nash Road/Queenston Road);
- Ensure that appropriate transitions in height and density are planned for between established lower density residential areas and higher density intensification areas;
- Transitions between industrial areas should also be considered;
- Maintain and, where possible, increase the supply of affordable housing;
- Provide active transportation improvements, focusing on pedestrian realm improvements/connections along Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway, and cycling connections along Nash Road and Lake Avenue;
- Manage traffic impacts associated with redevelopment;
- Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic and improve walking and cycling connections (neighbourhood greenways are streets designed with traffic calming and landscape features to reduce speeding, create a pleasant experience for residents and all users of the streets);
- Enhance the character of the streetscapes along Centennial, Queenston Road and Barton Street. Recognize that recent road improvements along Centennial and Queenston will mean that the timing of enhancements will take time to materialize.
- Streetscapes should feature appropriate building setbacks and green space; and,
- Focus public realm improvements along streetscape and established public spaces.
6 SECONDARY PLAN

DIRECTIONS
6.1 VISION

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Study Area is home to some of the City’s most vibrant shopping, recreation, living and mixed-use spaces. The Area features two major transit hubs, which are supported by compact, mixed-use development along the Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway corridors. The Study Area’s stable, low density residential neighbourhoods are safe, well connected and affordable. The area’s attractive and accessible public spaces, green spaces and streetscapes, along with its strong network of transportation infrastructure, provide a unique sense of place that makes the Centennial Neighbourhoods an interesting, dynamic and exciting place.
6.2 GUIDING PRINCIPLES

The guiding principles for the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan are to:

- Protect and enhance natural areas and green spaces;
- Create safe, vibrant streetscapes;
- Provide more places to meet, relax and socialize;
- Increase active transportation throughout the community;
- Provide opportunities for a greater variety of recreational choices;
- Promote mixed use development and intensification in strategic locations;
- Promote transit-oriented development;
- Provide sustainable infrastructure; and,
- Provide opportunities for a greater variety of housing choices.
6.3 LAND USE PLAN & POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

6.3.1 LAND USE PLAN RATIONALE

The recommended land use plan is depicted on Figure 6.1 (page 83). The intent of the Secondary Plan is to concentrate the majority of future higher density intensification in the Sub-Regional Node area (along the Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway corridors). Currently, these locations tend to have lower density, stand-alone commercial uses with the physical potential to accommodate mixed-use redevelopment. They are in proximity to future transit investments (GO Station and LRT Station Hub) which is expected to encourage higher density transit-oriented mixed-use development. The Sub-Regional Node boundary was refined to align the limits of the area with the most potential and opportunity for redevelopment. In most cases, the Node boundary is based on the location of the mixed use designations (Medium and High Density Mixed Use), which are intended to be the focus of future intensification. High Density Mixed Use areas are concentrated on larger parcels which are located near major intersections and future higher order transit stops. The Medium Density Mixed Use designations tend to be located on the smaller parcels of land and those areas which may need to address interfaces issues with existing low density residential development.

The areas of the Node which front onto Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway have been identified as Pedestrian Predominant Streets and generally align with parcels which are part of the Sub-Regional Node. This means that redevelopment of these areas will need to have specific focus on the improving the pedestrian environment.

Where there are existing pockets of high density residential development, the goal is to limit the amount of opportunity for redevelopment to ensure that an adequate supply of rental housing is maintained in the area (provided that the buildings remain structurally sound and that rental market remains constrained – see Policy B.3.2.5.6 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan for additional detail).

In select locations, medium density intensification is used in transitional locations to provide for a gradual change in building scale between the denser areas and the established lower density neighbourhoods.

Established employment areas to the north of Barton Street have been designated to recognize existing industrial zoning, concentrating light industrial uses on the edge, with the heavier general industrial uses in the middle of the park. Intensification along the northern stretch of

\[8\] The key factors in determining the limits of the Sub-Regional Node was proximity to major transit stations and opportunities for intensification.
Centennial Parkway needs to be sensitive to existing, established industrial uses, given the potential for land use compatibility issues. This approach respects the existing Provincial planning framework which allows municipalities to contemplate employment area conversions through a municipal comprehensive review.

Some commercial areas to the north of Barton Street on Centennial Parkway have been maintained as commercial areas, reflecting historic environmental constraints.

6.3.2 ALIGNMENT WITH URBAN OFFICIAL PLAN POLICIES
The policies of this Secondary Plan should be read in conjunction with the policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. In the event of a conflict between two policies, the more detailed policies contained within this Plan shall prevail.

6.3.3 SUB-REGIONAL SERVICE NODE
The limits of the Sub-Regional Service Node are depicted on Figure 6.1. The land use policies of this Secondary Plan have been prepared to meet a long term density target of 100 to 150 people and jobs per hectare within the Node. The limits of the Sub-Regional Service Node were identified to include lands which are in close proximity to planned future transit stop and lands with potential for higher density development and redevelopment. Generally, lands within established areas which have more limited potential for intensification were not included in the Node.

6.3.4 GROWTH POTENTIAL
The Secondary Plan has the potential to accommodate an additional 3,230 people and 1,100 jobs by 2031. The 2031 growth potential represents an intensification rate of 20% across the Sub-Regional Node area, which would achieve a gross density of 106 people and jobs per hectare by 2031.

There is physical potential for additional growth beyond 2031 and the expectation is that the City will examine additional opportunities for intensification when updating the City-wide growth management strategy (which will allocate growth up to 2041). It should be noted that the land use plan and policies of the Plan would allow the City to meet the upper limit of the density target by 2031 (150 people and jobs per hectare) should absorption occur at a higher rate than contemplated herein.

Table 6.1 summarizes the 2031 growth potential for the Sub-Regional Node.
Table 6.1: Population and Employment Growth Potential for Sub-Regional Node

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1,835</td>
<td>3,230</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>4,330</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>4,915</td>
<td>10,765</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN:
FIGURE 6.1: RECOMMENDED LAND USE PLAN
6.3.5 LAND USE DESIGNATIONS

RESIDENTIAL DESIGNATIONS

The Secondary Plan identifies five different types of residential development. Generally, the designations are consistent with the typologies described in the Official Plan, and include:

a) Low Density Residential 2
b) Low Density Residential 3
c) Medium Density Residential 2
d) Medium Density Residential 3
e) High Density Residential 1

**Low Density Residential 2**

a) The planned function of the Low Density Residential 2 designation is to recognize the existing low density residential development within the Secondary Plan Area.
b) The Low Density Residential 2 designation allows for singles, semis, duplexes and triplexes.
c) The planned density for Low Density Residential 2 designation shall be between 0 and 40 units per hectare.
d) Infilling and redevelopment of parcels within this designation should be modest in scale, and be sensitive to the established character (in terms of height, scale, massing, coverage, etc.) of adjacent properties.
e) The maximum height for Low Density Residential 2 buildings is 3 storeys.

**Low Density Residential 3**

a) The planned function of the Low Density Residential 3 designation is to recognize the existing low density residential development within the Secondary Plan Area.
b) The Low Density Residential 3 designation allows for singles, semis, duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, block and street townhomes at a higher density than the Low Density Residential 2 designation.
c) The planned density for Low Density Residential 2 designation shall be between 40 and 60 units per hectare.
d) Infilling and redevelopment of parcels within this designation should be modest in scale and be sensitive to the established character (in terms of height, scale, massing, coverage, etc.) of adjacent properties.
e) The maximum height for Low Density Residential 3 buildings is 3 storeys.
Medium Density Residential 2

a) The planned function of the Medium Density Residential 2 designation is to allow for a range of medium density residential development within the Secondary Plan Area. In some instances, lands designated as Medium Density are also intended to function as a transitional building typology to allow for a gradual change in density (between low density and high density).  

b) The Medium Density Residential 2 designation allows for street and block townhomes and low-rise apartments.  

c) The planned density for Medium Density Residential 2 designation shall be between 60 and 75 units per hectare.  

d) The maximum height for Medium Density Residential 2 buildings is 6 storeys.
Medium Density Residential 3

a) The planned function of the Medium Density Residential 3 designation is to allow for a range of medium density residential development within the Secondary Plan Area. In some instances, lands designated as Medium Density are also intended to function as a transitional building typology to allow for a gradual change in density (between low density and high density).

b) The Medium Density Residential 3 designation allows for block townhomes and low rise apartments at a higher density than the Medium Density Residential 2 designation.

c) The planned density for Medium Density Residential 2 designation shall be between 75 and 100 units per hectare.

d) The maximum height for Medium Density Residential 3 buildings is 6 storeys.

High Density Residential 1

a) The planned function of the High Density Residential 1 designation is to allow high density residential development within the Secondary Plan Area.
b) Generally, the lands designated on Figure 6.1 as High Density Residential 1 reflect existing, established high density residential development.

c) The High Density Residential 1 designation allows for mid and high-rise apartments, which are greater than 6 storeys. Specific height limits are illustrated on Figure 6.2 (page 95).

d) The planned density for High Density Residential 1 designation shall be between 100 and 200 units per hectare.
MIXED USE AND COMMERCIAL DESIGNATIONS

Mixed–Use Medium Density

a) The planned function of the Mixed-Use Medium Density designation is to provide opportunities for development in a mixed-use, medium density format. Permitted uses include commercial, residential, institutional and recreational uses.

b) Development is permitted in a mid-rise format, which generally should be no taller than 6 to 8 storeys. In some circumstances, a lower building height may be required to address the need for appropriate transitions in building scale and density based on proximity to lower density development. Refer to Section 6.3.6 for site specific building height limits.

c) The minimum height for new development shall be two storeys.

d) Low density residential development, such as singles and semi-detached dwellings, are not permitted.
e) The desired format for lands designated for mixed-use development is to have uses mixed within the same building. However, stand-alone uses, including expansions to existing uses, are also permitted, provided that the other applicable policies of this Plan are met.

f) Live-work opportunities are permitted and encouraged within this format.

g) The minimum density for the residential portion of a mixed-use development shall be 60 units per net hectare.

h) Where development is mixed within a building, the ground floor uses should be commercial at the street-level.

Mixed-Use High Density

a) The planned function of the Mixed-Use High Density designation is to provide opportunities for development in a mixed-use, high density format. Permitted uses include commercial, residential, institutional and recreational uses.
b) Development is permitted in a high-rise format, which is generally (although not exclusively) taller than 8 storeys, up to a maximum of 15 storeys. Refer to Figure 6.2 for specific building height limits (page 95).

c) The Plan envisions the tallest building to be at the main gateway intersection of Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway and allows for up to 20 storeys on the north-west corner where the future LRT transit hub is to be located.

d) In some circumstances, a lower building height may be required to address the need for appropriate transitions in building scale and density based on proximity to lower density development. Similarly, in some circumstances, a taller building height may also be permitted (subject to further study).

e) The minimum building height shall be two storeys.

f) Low density residential development, such as singles and semi-detached dwellings, and medium density development, such as townhomes and low rise apartments, are not permitted.

g) The desired format for lands designated for mixed-use development is to have uses mixed within the same building. However, stand-alone uses, including expansions to existing uses, are also permitted, provided that the other applicable policies of this Plan are met.

h) Live-work opportunities are permitted and encouraged within this format.

i) The minimum density for the residential portion of a mixed-use development shall be 100 units per net hectare.

j) Where development is mixed within a building, the ground floor uses should be commercial at the street-level.

k) Refer to Section 6.3.6 for site specific building height limits.

**District Commercial**

Sections E.4.7 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (District Commercial) shall apply to the lands designated District Commercial on Figure 6.2 Land Use Plan and reflect current designation and policies determined through an OMB settlement.

**Local Commercial**

Section E.3.8 of the City’s Official Plan (Local Commercial) shall apply to the lands designated Local Commercial on Figure 6.1 Land Use Plan and reflect current designation.

**Arterial Commercial**

Section E.4.8 of the City’s Official Plan (Arterial Commercial) shall apply to the lands designated Arterial Commercial on Figure 6.1 Land Use Plan.
INDUSTRIAL DESIGNATIONS

General Industrial

a) Section E.5.2 of the City’s Official Plan (Employment Area Industrial Land) shall apply to the lands designated as General Industrial on Figure 6.1 Land Use Plan (page 83). These lands represent the heavier industrial uses within the Secondary Plan Area.

b) The expectation is that lands designated as General Industrial will remain as employment uses until the City completes its next municipal comprehensive review, where at such time the City will comprehensively assess its long term employment land needs.

Light Industrial

a) The planned function of the Light Industrial designation is to recognize existing light industrial activities within the Secondary Plan Area and provide direction for land use compatibility.

b) The expectation is that lands designated as Light Industrial will remain as employment uses until the City completes its next municipal comprehensive review, where at such time the City will comprehensively assess its long term employment land needs.

c) Permitted uses include light industrial uses in an enclosed building, such as a limited range of light manufacturing, research and development, building or contracting supply establishment, tradesperson’s shop, warehousing, waste management facilities, private power generation, limited agricultural uses, office, and accessory uses. Ancillary uses which primarily support businesses and employees within the Employment Area shall also be permitted.

d) Uses which are accessory to the above-noted uses are also permitted.

e) Outdoor storage of raw materials and finished products are permitted. Outdoor storage should not be located in the front yard and should be screened from the street.

f) Major retail uses, along with residential and other sensitive uses, are not permitted.

g) Uses which are within the Light Industrial designation which are not in conformity to the policies of this plan will be allowed to continue as legal non-conforming uses.

h) The future Confederation GO rail station is currently designated as Light Industrial and is subject to site specific policies. Refer to section 6.5.3 for additional details.
INSTITUTIONAL AREAS

a) The planned function of the lands designated as Institutional on Figure 6.1 (page 83) is to recognize existing Community Facilities located in the Study Area.

b) Existing Community Facilities within the Secondary Plan Area include three schools (St. David's Catholic Elementary School, Lake Avenue Public School and St. Charles Adult and Continuing Education Centre), two places of worship (Incarnation of our Blessed Lord and St. Gregory the Great) and several community buildings (Dominic Agostino Riverdale Recreation Centre, Red Hill Library and the Ontario Early Years Centre).

c) As the area intensifies and grows over time, the expectation is that some of the above-noted facilities (and any facilities adjacent to the plan area) may need to be expanded to meet future demand. The City will undertake periodic reviews of city-run facilities to ensure that an appropriate level of service is provided.

d) As the long term plan for the Centennial Neighbourhoods is to grow and intensify, the City will work with the Hamilton-Wentworth School Board to ensure that an appropriate level of service is provided.
PARKS, RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE DESIGNATIONS

*General Open Space*

a) The planned function of the Open Space system is to provide for the protection of natural heritage features and also includes a variety of passive recreational opportunities, such as trails, for residents and visitors to the City.

b) The areas identified as Open Space are part of the City’s Major Open Space designation. Refer to policy E.2.8 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan for additional details.

c) The Eastlawn Cemetery is identified as Open Space on Figure 6.1 (page 83).

*Natural Open Space*

a) The planned function of the Natural Open Space system is to provide for the protection of natural heritage features which are part of the City’s Natural Heritage System.

b) Refer to the section C.2.0 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan for additional details.
Community Park

a) There is one Community Park located in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Area. The Sam Manson Park serves the neighbourhoods in and around the Secondary Plan Area, providing active recreation opportunities for the residents. This park will be maintained and enhanced when feasible (see Section 6.4 for more details).

b) Refer to policy B.3.5.3 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan for additional policies on Community Parks.

Neighbourhood Park

a) There is one Neighbourhood Park located in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Area. Henry and Beatrice Warden Park serves the east side of the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan Area and provides a range of small-scale active and passive recreational opportunities. This park will be maintained and enhanced when feasible (see Section 6.4 for more details).

b) Refer to policy B.3.5.3 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan for additional policies on Neighbourhood Parks.

6.3.6 BUILDING HEIGHTS

Generally, the maximum building heights depicted in the Plan have been derived based on the following considerations:

- The future planned land use and proximity to planned major transit station areas;
- Potential for negative sun/shadow impacts on surrounding land uses;
- Site specific considerations, such as property size, lot depth, lot width and potential for lot consolidation;
- Existing building heights within the surrounding area and the potential for context sensitive transitions; and,
- Public and stakeholder feedback received during through the various consultation and engagement sessions.

In addition to the above, several site specific assessments were undertaken to test the maximum building heights against the City-Wide Corridor Planning Principles and Design Guidelines. The site specific assessments included a series of building sun/shadow assessments to support policy development. The analysis was conducted for several sample sites and was not exhaustive. Also note that at the time of the preparation of this Study the City was in the process of finalizing a Tall Buildings Study for the Downtown. While the Tall Buildings Guidelines are specific to the Downtown, there may be some aspects of the Guidelines which could apply
to the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan. Refinements to the policy recommendations contained within this report will be undertaken by City Staff in Phase 4.

The planned maximum building heights are shown on Figure 6.2. The heights depicted on Figure 6.2 are intended to reflect the planned maximum heights based on the analysis completed for the Secondary Plan Study. The following policies shall apply:

a) On a site-by-site basis, the City may allow for marginally taller buildings where the findings of supporting studies, such as an urban design study and sun/shadow, can demonstrate that there are no negative impacts on adjacent properties.

b) The City may require a peer review for any studies which propose to exceed the planned building heights.

c) All developments which are proposed to be taller than 6 storeys shall require a sun/shadow study and an urban design study to demonstrate how the development fits within the context of the site and surrounding area.

The heights depicted on Figure 6.2 are based on the number of storeys per building and assume that the implementing Zoning by-law will identify precise building heights in metres.
CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN:
FIGURE 6.2: MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHTS
6.3.7 TRANSITIONAL AREAS

Transitional Areas are shown on Figure 6.3 (98). Transitional Areas are intended to provide additional guidance for development to ensure appropriate transitions are provided for between residential and industrial development, and also between denser forms of mixed-use/residential development. Note that the following policies are not intended to limit the application of other Urban Hamilton Official Plan policies within the Secondary Plan Area.

For lands within the Neighbourhood Transition Area, the following policies apply:

a) New development should minimize negative effects, such as extreme changes in building scale and character, shadowing and overview on adjacent properties, streets and public spaces.

b) Landscaped buffers should include a mix of trees, bushes and shrubs to soften transition between taller buildings and lower rise formats.

c) New development shall respect the existing built form of adjacent neighbourhoods by providing a gradation in building height and densities, and by locating and designing new development to include building step-backs and set-backs, site landscaping and appropriately locating parking, loading and service areas.

d) Fencing, where appropriate, should also be provided.

e) Parking areas should be located underground or in the rear of the building and should also include an appropriate amount of landscaping.
f) Service areas and garbage enclosure should be located at the rear of the building and attractively screened and located away from neighbouring residents.

g) The maximum building height should be derived from a the combination of a 45 degree angle build to plane from the street right-of-way and any adjacent single, semi or duplex residential dwelling.

For lands within the Industrial Transition Area, the following policies apply:

a) The lands within Industrial Transition Area are designated for Mixed-Use Development. Residential uses are permitted, subject to the applicant completing a land use compatibility study.

b) The land use compatibility study should consider the Ministry of the Environment’s D-6 Guidelines for industrial facilities, as well as any applicable Official Plan policies. The land use compatibility study should recommend any additional measures such as landscaped buffering and appropriate setbacks to minimize potential negative effects of residential uses on established light industrial uses.

c) Sensitive uses, including residential uses, should not be located in proximity to any noxious or potentially harmful activities within the area of influence. At the time of the Secondary Plan, there did not appear to any current uses which would limit the potential for residential development; however, this assessment should be confirmed at the time of development.
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FIGURE 6.3: TRANSITIONAL AREAS
6.4 PUBLIC REALM PLAN & POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

6.4.1 OVERALL PUBLIC REALM IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The overall public realm improvement program is illustrated on Figure 6.4 (page 102). The intent of the parks, open space and public realm improvement plan is to proactively identify areas which should be improved over the long term to both attract investment and also ensure that a high quality of public spaces and amenities are provided in line with the scale of intensification planned for the area. The key elements of the plan are:

- Gateway Improvement Areas;
- Streetscape Improvement Areas; and,
- Public Spaces (Improvement Areas/Potential New Public Spaces).

In addition to the above, the Plan for Centennial Neighbourhood includes a portion of land which is identified as a Pedestrian Predominant Street. Policy 2.3.2.13 of the Urban Official Plan states that “Secondary plans prepared for each Node shall identify pedestrian predominant streets. On pedestrian predominant streets, buildings shall be built to the streetline with store fronts and other active uses opening onto the street. New development in other areas of the Nodes shall be designed and built to create a comfortable pedestrian environment”.

The Pedestrian Predominant Street area for the Centennial Neighbourhood Secondary Plan depicted on the Land Use Plan has been identified to generally align with the limits of the Sub-Regional Node. The CNTMP also provides direction and recommendations for enhancing the public realm. This direction will be incorporated into the policies for the Secondary Plan.
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FIGURE 6.4: PARKS, OPEN SPACE AND PUBLIC REALM IMPROVEMENTS
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6.4.2 GATEWAY IMPROVEMENT AREAS

Gateways are the main entrance areas into the area. Today, most of the current gateway locations identified on the Plan do not have an overly positive sense of place. As intensification occurs, the expectation is that each of the Gateway Improvement Areas will be enhanced with signage, lighting, public art and landscaping to make the areas more attractive and provide a stronger sense of place for the Centennial Neighbourhoods area. Gateway Improvement Areas include the lands in and around the following locations:

a) Centennial Parkway/QEW/Confederation GO Station (major gateway);
b) Barton Street/Centennial Parkway intersection (major gateway);
c) Red Hill Valley Parkway/Barton Street intersection (minor gateway);
d) Red Hill Valley Parkway/Queenston Road (minor gateway); and,
e) Centennial Parkway/Queenston Road (major gateway).

The City should consider developing concepts for each of the Gateway Improvement Areas through the future urban design study. The concept should:

a) Consider appropriate range of applicable background and guiding documents, including the Secondary Plan, Urban Hamilton Official Plan, as well as the Public Art Master Plan and the Downtown Way-finding Study.
b) Identify themes, wayfinding/signage and other enhancements based on the role and function of the gateway, where major gateways are those locations which have a significant public and private realm improvement opportunity and minor gateways have mostly a public realm improvement opportunity;

c) Examine interface conditions with the private realm;

d) Consider timing and capital planning requirements for future road projects (as well as any collaboration opportunities with public and private utilities).

There may be a need to identify more detailed private realm urban design direction to emphasize the importance of massing and architectural treatment to help further define gateway locations. Direction for private realm urban design should be undertaken through an urban design study (refer to section 6.5.4 of this report for more details).

6.4.3 STREETSCAPE IMPROVEMENT AREAS

Streetscape Improvement Areas are identified to ensure that Barton Street, Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road through the Plan Area are improved in alignment with the scale of planned intensification. The expectation is that the streetscape environment along these three arterials will be enhanced to include wider sidewalks, consistent tree planting and landscaping, pedestrian scale lighting, street furniture and transit shelters. Each street should have its own unique sense of place and should consider different approaches to signage, paving, species selection, public art, etc.

The improvement of streetscapes within the right of way (ROW) will be the responsibility of the City and improvements outside of the ROW are the responsibility of private developers (see 6.4.4 for additional details).

The recommended streetscape concepts for Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway are shown in Figures 6.5 and 6.6.
Figure 6.7 provides an illustration of how the Centennial Parkway streetscape environment could evolve over time as intensification occurs. The image on the top illustrates the current conditions, with multiple access points and one-storey arterial commercial developments. The other two images show how the combination of mixed-use intensification and streetscape improvements could work together to improve the overall character of the area, while still maintaining the major transportation function of the street.
FIGURE 6.7: CENTENNIAL PARKWAY STREETSCAPE EVOLUTION
6.4.4 PEDESTRIAN PREDOMINANT STREETS

Pedestrian Predominant Streets are shown on Figure 6.1 (page 83). In addition to the Policy E.4.3 of the City’s Official Plan, the following policies shall apply to lands which are identified as Pedestrian Predominant and shall be designed to ensure:

a) Buildings are located relatively close to the street and incorporate a mix of hard and softscaping treatments to ensure a comfortable transition between public and private realm;

b) Where possible and appropriate, redevelopment along Queenston Road and Centennial Parkway should reduce the number driveways and consolidate access points;

c) Building entrances shall face the street;

d) Commercial uses should be located on the ground floor of buildings facing the street (residential permitted above).

e) 75% of the block face between two streets occupied by buildings;

f) A minimum of two storeys is required where infilling and intensification is proposed to take place;

g) Attractive streetscapes which include sidewalks, street furnishings, trees and high quality transit shelter/stops;

h) New drive-through facilities are not permitted;

i) A number of the specific design conditions for all major streets, such as set-backs and step-backs will be determined through an urban design study to be undertaken by the City as part of the Secondary Plan’s implementation. If required, the Design Study may result in an...
amendment to the Secondary Plan.

6.4.5 OTHER PUBLIC REALM IMPROVEMENTS

Conceptual future public spaces are associated with the two major transit hubs located within the Plan Area (at Eastgate Square and the Confederation GO Station). The expectation is that these locations, as highly visible and well-used public spaces will be pedestrian-friendly and attractively designed public spaces. The general size and location of new public spaces is intended to be conceptual and the expectation is that the urban design study will refine the design, size and location for new public spaces.

The City will work with Metrolinx to coordinate public realm improvements in the vicinity of the GO station. The public space as Eastgate Square will be developed as part of the overall re-development of the site.

Potential Public Space Improvement Areas are intended to recognize the long-term need to upgrade and improve the Plan Area’s three major public open spaces to ensure that they have the diversity of amenities and capability to accommodate additional residents moving into the area (as a result of intensification). The three public space improvement areas are Sam Manson Park (and the Red Hill Library), Henry and Beatrice Warden Park and the Domenic Agostino Community Centre. Specific plans and programs for each area will be developed through the urban design study at a later date as part of the Plan’s implementation strategy.

6.4.6 CAPITAL FUNDING

Capital funding for the majority of the above-noted improvements would be generated from development charges associated with the anticipated intensification for the Secondary Plan Area. The recommended urban design study discussed in Section 6.5.4 should include cost estimates for capital improvements. The City’s DC study should identify which portion of the improvements can be applied to development charges (i.e. growth related portion).

6.5 ADDITIONAL POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

6.5.1 AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The Centennial Neighbourhoods area currently includes a fairly large complement of affordable housing stock. As the area intensifies, it will be important for the City to ensure that an adequate supply of affordable housing is maintained. To support affordable housing, the City will consider:

a) Discouraging the conversion of rental units to condominium units within the Plan Area;

b) Providing Community Improvement Plan incentives for affordable housing;
c) Providing opportunities for bonusing in exchange for affordable housing; 
d) Where public lands are being sold and redeveloped for private development, the City will place a priority on affordable housing projects (for redevelopment purposes); and,  
e) As part of City-wide efforts, monitor the supply of affordable housing and consider new tools as they become available.

6.5.2 TRANSPORTATION AND ALIGNMENT WITH TRANSPORTATION MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management provides a recommended framework for improving the transportation network in the Plan Area (and beyond). The following policies are provided for summary purposes (refer to the CNTMP document for more details):

a) For streets, the City will protect right-of-way for Complete Liveable Better Streets, improve/optimize traffic signal timings (including pedestrian crossing timings), design and deliver traffic calming where needed with support, and promote Smart Commute and Active and Sustainable School Transportation programs.

b) For transit, the City will consider transit priority measures, work with HSR to ensure an sufficient level of bus service and bus stops are provided (including any extensions and modifications to existing HSR routes), proactively plan for the B-line Rapid Transit to Eastgate Square and beyond and the S-line Rapid Transit to GO Transit Station.

c) For Active Transportation the City will promote neighbourhood greenways, deliver the three previously identified projects in the Recreational Trails Master Plan, construct missing sidewalks, provide cycling facilities on Nash Road, Lake Avenue, Warrington and South Service Road, and work to improve pedestrian and cyclist Red Hill Valley Parkway interchange improvements.

The City will continue to work with Metrolinx, MTO, Sobi and other agencies/stakeholders to implement the recommendations of the Neighbourhood Transportation Master Plan.

6.5.3 SPECIAL POLICY AREAS

Special Policy Areas are illustrated on Figure 6.8.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA 1

Special Policy Area 1 applies to the Smart Centres Lands. There is an existing site specific policy within the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. The current site-specific policies should be maintained to recognize a number of permissions related to the development of the site as per the decision made by the Ontario Municipal Board (UHC-4).
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SPECIAL POLICY AREA 2

Special Policy Area applies the planned Confederation GO Rail and Bus Station. Lands within Special Policy Area 2 will be designed to support an integrated approach to mobility. While it is understood that the short term concept for the rail station is expected to concentrate on accommodating commuters, over time, the expectation is that there may be potential to further intensify the lands on the station site. The City will work with Metrolinx to monitor travel demands and adjust the long term land use and transportation vision for the site accordingly. Any redevelopment for the site will need to consider a variety of studies, including a noise and vibration study, as well as land use compatibility study and urban design study.

Long term policy considerations for Special Policy Area 2 include, but are not limited to the following:

- Opportunities to reduce surface parking and maximize the land area for highest and best uses which will support the transit function of the site, including potential for mixed-use redevelopment;
- Opportunities to enhance the station area design and connect the station to the surrounding lands, including those lands along Centennial which have been designated for Mixed Use High Density;
- Opportunities to connect the City’s rapid transit corridor and integrate the two systems (GO and HSR) on the site;
- Opportunities to address any potential land use compatibility issues; and,
- Opportunities to enhance the public realm within and around the station area.

The above-noted long term policy opportunities should be addressed either through a periodic review of the Secondary Plan and/or the City’s urban design study recommended in 6.5.4.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA 3

Special Policy Area 3 applies to Eastgate Square transit hub lands. The expectation is that Eastgate Square will continue to be a major, regional-scale shopping destination. The City encourages the proactive intensification of lands in and around the shopping centre and the inclusion of mixed-use development at an appropriate time. Through the urban design study and the future design of the rapid transit corridor extension along Queenston, the City will proactively work with the landowners to ensure any new rapid transit facilities which may be located on the site are designed to be pedestrian-friendly and transit-supportive.

Where redevelopment or expansion of commercial uses is proposed for the site, the City will require an updated site plan which demonstrates how the proposed redevelopment aligns with the vision and policies of the Secondary Plan and any other applicable plan or guideline.
SPECIAL POLICY AREA 4

Special Policy Area 4 applies to vacant lands on Centennial Parkway. The special policy should allow for up to 6 storeys within the Medium Density Residential-3 designation, with potential for up to 8 storeys where it is demonstrated that there will no negative sun/shadow/wind impacts associated with the additional height. Housing with supports should also be permitted.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA 5

Special Policy Area 5 applies to the lands which are designated for employment uses. The expectation is that these lands will be maintained as employment uses for the foreseeable future. During the next City-wide Municipal Comprehensive Review, the City should undertake a detailed assessment of lands within this area to confirm intensification opportunities and any other potential improvements/enhancements which would help to support the nearby planned transit infrastructure. The City will also consider the lands within Special Policy Areas 2, 7 and 9 when undertaking the detailed assessment of land uses within the industrial area.

Some of the longer term opportunities to be addressed in through the municipal comprehensive review process include, but are not limited to:

- Opportunities to leverage proximity and visibility along the QEW and the Red Hill Valley Parkway as well as proximity to the GO station to forms of employment uses, such as office uses, to the area;
- Opportunities to introduce transitional land uses along the edge of the industrial area; and,
- Opportunities to address any brownfield redevelopment issues.

The recommended urban design study which is to be completed as part of the implementation of the Secondary Plan should provide some guidance on how to physically improve area (streetscapes, connections, active transportation, buffering, way-findings, etc.).

Lands which are adjacent to Special Policy Area 5 will require a land use compatibility study to demonstrate how the redevelopment proposal implements the transitional area policies of this plan.
SPECIAL POLICY AREA 6
Special Policy 6 applies to a collection of parcels which front onto Queenston Road. The existing permissions allow for a selection of limited commercial uses which should be maintained. (UHN-10)

SPECIAL POLICY AREA 7
Special Policy Area applies to the City of Hamilton’s existing waste transfer facility. As part of the next municipal comprehensive review and city-wide waste management master plan, the City could consider re-locating the transfer facility, to maximize development opportunities in and around the Confederation GO station. The current site-specific policy allows for the transfer station and some modifications to the existing policy would be required to articulate the above-note direction (UCW-1C).

SPECIAL POLICY AREA 8
Special Policy Area 8 applies to St. David’s Catholic Elementary School. The purpose of this policy is to recognize existing site specific policies/permissions within the Old Town Secondary Plan which allows for medium density redevelopment on the current school site.

SPECIAL POLICY AREA 9
Special Policy Area 9 applies to a portion of lands north of Barton Street and west of Centennial Parkway which are currently designated for Arterial Commercial purposes. The special policy states that notwithstanding the current permissions within the Urban Official Plan that the lands are zoned to allow for the continuation of existing industrial or commercial uses that are compatible with surrounding non-employment land uses. Limited light industrial and commercial uses may be permitted provided they are compatible with surrounding non-employment land uses. At such time as the industrial uses(s) cease(s) and alternative land uses are proposed, the following criteria shall be met.

6.5.4 POTENTIAL IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS
The following should be considered for implementation:

a) Urban design study for the Secondary Plan Area to further refine the public realm improvement opportunities and also to provide additional guidance for private realm development, including the GO station area, the transit hub at Eastgate Square and the transit stop at Nash Road/Queenston Road and the properties which are part of the Pedestrian Predominant zone identified on the land use plan. The urban design study should also provide further guidance for transitional area development. The design study should include an analysis and assessment of built
form conditions within the established neighbourhood area and identify recommendations for zoning (building setbacks, coverage, etc., as these areas may experience re-development pressures in the future) to provide guidance for any small-scale redevelopment. As noted previously, the design study would also need to identify capital costs for all proposed improvements. The urban design study should also consider the City’s Development Engineering Guidelines, opportunities for additional green connections and greenways (e.g. Sam Manson Park/Red Hill Library/Eastlawn Cemetery and beyond) and other items deemed appropriate for consideration by the City. The City will be responsible for completing the urban design study. The urban design study’s recommendations may require an amendment to the Secondary Plan (depending on the nature of the recommendations). The design study should be completed in the short term, within the next 1-2 years.

b) Municipal servicing study to understand the specific water, sanitary and stormwater infrastructure gaps within the area to ensure that any growth-related improvements are captured in the City’s development charges by-law update. This study should be undertaken by the City, either before (if possible) or after the adoption of the Secondary Plan.

c) Upon completion of the urban design study, the City should update the zoning for lands within the Secondary Plan Area.

d) The City could consider the use of other development tools, such as Community Improvement Plan policies and bonusing to promote transit-supportive intensification.

6.6 NEXT STEPS

The next step in the process is to begin Phase 4, where City Staff will draft an Official Plan Amendment and present the draft Amendment to the City’s Planning Committee. The draft Amendment will then be presented to the public for additional commentary. Phase 4 will include:

- Draft Official Plan Amendment to implement the Secondary Plan;
- Presentation to City’s Planning Committee;
- Statutory Public Meeting and Open House under the Planning Act;
- Refinement of the Official Plan Amendment; and,
- Council Adoption.

The recommended action and implementation items noted in Section 6.4 and 6.5 would occur after Council adoption of the Secondary Plan.
APPENDIX A – PUBLIC CONSULTATION SUMMARY

Focus Group #1 Summary
Tuesday, April 8th, 2015 – Dominic Agostino Riverdale Community Centre – 1:00pm – 3:00pm

SUMMARY OF EVENTS

Focus Group participants met at 1:00pm at the Dominic Agostino Riverdale Community Centre. The City welcomed everyone and introduced the role of the Focus Group and the mandate as well as the code of conduct.

The consultant team from Dillon presented on the Secondary Plan, including the purpose, the context and process, the Arterial Commercial Study and upcoming community engagement.

The consultant team from IBI presented on the Transportation Management Plan including the study purpose, scope, study area, Environmental Assessment and process, links between land use and transportation, health information, problem and opportunity statement and next steps.

Next item on the agenda included a group discussion following questions and activity centering around the Secondary Plan (issues and opportunities, input on consultation activities), and then the Transportation Management Plan (Transportation Issues Mapping and evaluation of networks criteria.

Lastly, the next steps involved introducing the survey and notifying participants of the Public Information Centre on April 30th 2015.

Public Information Centre #1 Summary
Tuesday, April 30th, 2015 – St. Gregory the Great Church – 6:00pm – 9:00pm

SUMMARY OF EVENTS

The doors to the event opened at 6:00pm. Participants were encouraged to review the content provided on the panel boards and at the tables. There were approximately 86 people in attendance.

Presentations commenced at 6:30pm welcoming participants, introducing the City and consultant team, and going over the Overview of the Study. At 6:40pm, there were presentations to provide background information for both studies, Secondary Plan and Transportation Management Plan.

At 6:55pm there was an overview of the upcoming group activities including providing comments and sticky notes on the maps and ranking the proposed list of principles.
At 7:00pm the room was broken out into discussion group round tables for the activities. There was an opportunity for participants to switch tables at 7:45pm. The one side of the room related to the Secondary Plan the other revolved around the Transportation Management Plan. The secondary plan

At 8:30pm there were summary presentations, and at 8:50pm there was a wrap up, conclusion and thank-you to participants. The event adjourned at 9:00pm.

**ACTIVITY #1 SUMMARY OF STICKY NOTES COMMENTS**

**Active Transportation / Infrastructure Comments**

- Bike/Pedestrian connections across QEW to Lake Ontario / Confederation Park
- Need improvements to walkability (Barton / Centennial)
  - Sidewalk improvements / provision of sidewalks
- Need cycling infrastructure, should be multi-use (path vs. lane on road)
  - Connecting into Red Hill Valley, on Queenston, on Centennial

**Land Use / Urban Design Comments**

- Revitalization of industrial lands / waste transfer station (north) and vacant / underutilized land (south) e.g. vacant gas station could be redeveloped
- Some interest in public art / signage for area/Hamilton.
- Intensification in certain areas while maintaining stable neighbourhoods
- Streetscaping interest along Centennial
  - Benches, shade, plantings etc.
- Diversity in uses along Centennial
  - Fewer car oriented uses
  - Removal of unfavourable uses (adult novelty store)
  - Additional facilities
  - More local businesses, More opportunities for better non-franchised restaurants with patios

**Parks / Recreation Comments**

- Parkland is considered important, beautify existing areas
- Need to create green space / public plazas / multi-use parks
- Existing parks lack programming and could benefit from: tree planting, washrooms, benches, lighting, water features, picnic areas, bike storage, parking, signage etc.
- Interest in new recreation facilities: public tennis courts, recreation centre

**Transit Comments**

- Need for more frequent bus service and expanded connections (to Stoney Creek and recreation areas)
• Interest in rapid transit and immediate need for GO Station.

Other Comments

• Concerns about litter (Barton, Queenston)
• Tagging / Graffiti issues in the area
• Speeding is an issue (Riverdale / Lake Avenue Rd N)
• Snow clearing along Queenston
• Community facilities (Small Theatre, Farmers Market, Rec Centre)

For detailed comments refer to the Figures attached:

Figure 1: Active Transportation / Infrastructure Comments
Figure 2: Land Use / Urban Design Comments
Figure 3: Parks / Recreation Comments
Figure 4: Transit Comments
Figure 5: Other Comments

ACTIVITY #2 SUMMARY OF PRINCIPLES (LARGE & SMALL)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guiding Principle</th>
<th>Number of X’s from Activity Sheets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promote mixed use development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for intensification in strategic locations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support opportunities for high quality urban design and architecture</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create safe, vibrant streetscapes</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect stable residential neighbourhoods from incompatible development</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more places to meet, relax and socialize</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the public realm</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase active transportation throughout the community</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase and improve connections to transit</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote transit-oriented development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain the area’s strong commercial focus</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide opportunities for a greater variety of recreational choices</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus Group #2 Summary

Tuesday, November 10th, 2015 – Fortinos Community Room, Eastgate Square – 9:30am – 12:30pm

SUMMARY OF EVENTS

The focus group started at 9:30am. The City reviewed the role of the Focus Group and the mandate. The consultants from Dillon presented on the Secondary Plan. The first topic related to the feedback received from previous consultation events, presentation of the options for the 4 districts and the options for the streetscapes.

There was then a group discussion and workshop involving the focus group participants reviewing the options map. Providing comments and using coloured sticky dots express their approval (green dot) or disapproval (red dots) for the options.

After the break, the consultant from IBI presented on the Transportation Management Plan, including a summary of feedback received from previous consultations. They also reviewed the opportunity statement, the alternatives and next steps. There was a discussion on the TMP with an AIMM exercise including: Advantages (what makes sense); Impediments (why might not work); Maybes (what are the questions); and, Mitigation (suggestions for improving it to gain your support.)

The meeting adjourned at 12:30pm.

Public Information Centre #2 Summary

Tuesday, December 1st – Lake Avenue Public Elementary School – 6:30pm – 9:00pm

SUMMARY OF EVENTS

The doors to the event opened at 6:30pm. Participants were encouraged to review the content provided on the panel boards and at the tables. There were approximately 33 people in attendance.
Presentations commenced at 6:45pm welcoming participants, introducing the City and consultant team, and explaining the purpose of the public event which was to provide a brief status update on the Secondary Plan and provide the public with an opportunity to review, discuss and debate the Secondary Plan Options. Consultants provided presentations to update participants of what has happened since last Public Information Centre.

At 7:20pm, facilitators explained the workshop activities, and the workshop activities lasted between 7:30pm and 8:45pm.

Participants gathered at three tables where they discussed the worksheets which presented the land use options for Districts 1-4, the different options for Public Open Space Improvements and the Proposed Streetscape Cross Sections.

At 9:50pm, the workshop concluded and facilitators / hosts of the event thanks participants for their feedback and closed the meeting.

MAJOR COMMENTS

Detailed comments are documented in the Specific Map Comments from December 1st Public Information Centre #2 document set.

Some of main comments received at the session are noted below:

- Higher densities around transit hubs and key intersections (LRT / GO & Nash / Queenston)
- Greater attention to transitioning from high density to established neighbourhoods (perhaps the use of more finer grain densities)
- Policies are needed to introduce affordable housing into the neighbourhood to ensure that existing stock of affordable housing is maintained (particularly the stock of rental housing)
- Generally, there was support for mixed use development/redevelopment along Queenston and Centennial.
- Comments were made about the need to upgrade infrastructure that will handle the influx of new residents.
- Concerns were raised about increases in populations increasing congestion on already busy roads.
- Some concerns were also raised about some of the public realm improvement areas (particularly those that relied on the use of semi-public spaces, such as the cemetery and institutional areas).

A visual summary of the detailed comments received from the activity can be found in the figures listed below:

Figure 6 – District 1 – Regional Gateway Land Use Options

Figure 7 – District 2 – Eastgate Square / Centennial Parkway Land Use Options
Focus Group #3 Summary

Tuesday, April 7th, 2016 – Dominic Agostino Riverdale Community Centre – 12:30pm – 2:30pm

SUMMARY OF EVENTS

The City welcomed participants after the meeting commenced at 12:30pm. The consultants from Dillon presented the summary of feedback from the previous consultation. Next they presented the Draft Recommended Secondary Plan, and then next steps for the study.

Next the consultants from IBI presented for the Transportation Management Plan (TMP). They also presented the summary of feedback from previous consultations, and presented the Preferred Alternatives and next steps.

Lastly there was a group discussion on both the Secondary Plan and Transportation Management Plan.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30pm.

Public Information Centre #3 Summary

Thursday, April 28th, 2016 – Lake Avenue Public Elementary School – 6:30pm – 8:30pm

SUMMARY OF EVENTS

Doors opened for the event at 6:30pm. Participants were encouraged to walk around and visit the displays for both the Secondary Plan and the Transportation Management Plan. They also had the chance to speak with the City and consultants to ask questions. There were 43 official participants who signed in.

Presentations started at 7:00pm, the consultants from Dillon presented the purpose of the meeting, context and purpose of the study, the study process, feedback from previous consultations. The rationale for the recommendations was presented as well as the elements of the secondary plan, draft long term vision, goals and objectives and then the maps and elements for the Secondary Plan. Lastly implementation mechanisms was presented and then next steps.
The consultant from IBI then presented for the Transportation Management Plan. They also presented the study purpose, study area, opportunity statement, vision statement, project process, feedback from previous consultation, recommended solutions and next steps.

There was an open house between the hours of 7:30pm and 8:30pm. Participants also had the opportunity to comment on the Draft Secondary Plan maps which were posted in the room.

The event adjourned at 8:30pm.

Detailed comments received on the activity can be found in the figures below:

- Figure 13 – Preferred Land Use Option
- Figure 14 – Public Realm Plan
- Figure 15 – Special Policy Areas
- Figure 16 – Building Heights
- Need to provide infrastructure for cyclists
- People or scooters/wheelchairs should be able to use bike lanes (multi-use)
- Sidewalks not in good repair for walking
- Wider sidewalks, speed bumps?
- Trees between sidewalks at c roads
- Sidewalks on Centennial need to be improved
- Lessen lanes for less cars to widen sidewalk to get more foot traffic
- Sidewalks on Centennial are safe
- Sidewalks on Lake Ave N (Barton Street N)
- Centennial too busy for bikes. Alternate bike route on Lake Ave to the Lake
- Wider boulevard on Centennial in winter snow gets pushed onto sidewalk, pedestrians can't get through
- There are no curbs or sidewalks here, only ditches. Bar mcr Drive.
- Storm sewers are separated but sometimes there are issues
- Pit bike lanes beside sidewalk, not on road
- Queenston feels narrow for bike as a driver and a rider
- Cycling lanes or Queenston
- Pedestrian walkways in and out of mall
- Queenston Road is in rough shape
- Pedestrian Crossing
- Pedestrian Crossing
- Walking / bike riding access to the lake
- Pedestrian / Cycling Access to Water
- Barton isn’t walkable
- Centennial isn’t walkable
- Cycle lanes along Centennial
- Elevation of curbs to roads needs to be looked at in the whole area
- Need to keep a supply for public parking at strategic spots
- Parking capacity and fumes could be an issue

Note: The following map shows the specific public comments posted from our April 30th Public Event.
Note: The following map shows the specific public comments posted from our April 30th Public Event.
Note: The following map shows the specific public comments posted from our April 30th Public Event.
CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN STUDY
CITY OF HAMILTON
FIGURE 4
PIC #1 - ACTIVITY #1
ISSUES/OPPORTUNITIES IN STUDY AREA

Note: The following map shows the specific public comments posted from our April 30th Public Event.

- GO Station needs to come NOW
- Need transit to recreation areas
- Increase the number of times the Ryndal & #56 run
- Bus congestion into Eastgate fare designation for turning in
- Want rapid transit, would decrease travel time
- Raise LRT Alter Queenston
- Transportation lacking to Stoney Creek
- - Like Rapid Transit
- - More buses outside of peak hours, express to certain locations
- - Incentive for people who own cars to use buses
FIGURE 5
PIC #1 - ACTIVITY #1

IN STUDY AREA

- Community hub / rec centre needed near an east gate
- Possible WiFi Sharing Program/Hub in Upper Area
- Small Theatre for Plays
- Litter management
- Emergency preparedness, how do people move out of the area?
- Graffiti problem in the area
- Speeding along Lake Avenue Rd happens when congestion occurs on Queenston Centennial
- Speed is too fast on Riverdale, it’s gotten very busy
- Farmers market at Lake Ave. Public School or Domenic Agostino Rec. Centre
- Neighbourhood is close to the shopping mall and two parks
- Businesses along Queenston do not keep sidewalks clear of snow
- Litter management
- No Littering Zone and/or Major Cleanup - Adopt a Road Program

Note: The following map shows the specific public comments posted from our April 30th Public Event.
Look at other uses besides industrial along Barton Street over the long term.

Residential facing waterfront over long term would be a significant improvement. Take advantage of waterfront views and Confederation Park.

Long term vision should allow mixed-use and higher density.

Area should be studied in next Employment areas review and contemplated for conversion.

Need requirement for affordable housing (not >33% of income).

Where will people living here go if displaced?

Encourage more office uses in this area.

Higher density along route to the GO station.

Like high rise opportunity - mixed use.

Go high density. Should support the GO train.

The taller the buildings the better. Need to have a landmark building you can view from the highway.

No residential close to QEW.

General Comments about District 1
• This area: vision is seen as a gateway boulevard and destination.
• Opportunity for cycling lanes / track
• Combine increasing density and multi-modal options as they become available, (i.e. GO or Transit.)
• Affordable housing needed
• Dog Park wanted
• Affordable Housing (city housing, rent geared to income, build in 33% wage to housing as affordable housing.
• Need more appropriate option for road capacity we have now and in near future.

"Green Dots" - Like
"Red Dots" - Dislike

Neighbourhoods
High Density Residential
Medium Density Residential
Mixed Use - High Density
Mixed Use - Medium Density
Institutional
Open Space / Park
Neighbourhood Park
District Commercial
Arterial Commercial
Industrial
Business Park
Utility
Future Rapid Transit Corridor
Major Transit Hub
GO Station
Support higher density but need more attention to managing the edges bordering on residential (entrances/exits flow into residential).

Step this back (height).

Higher density here.

Outdoor market at Eastgate.

New housing (Toronto)
Address problems (current) with traffic for and from mall impacting on residential areas.
Like area for high density. It won’t create traffic issues down by Centennial and Queenston. Closer to GO Station.
Put tallest buildings here.
Sanitary sewer back ups for many years. Need infrastructure improvement if new construction occurs.

Austere would be problematic.
Alternate land uses on this site. Should be focused on Centennial and Queenston.

Too high.
Like more residential because of need, growing population in area.

General Comments about District 2
- Already a lot of people living here - higher density (Option 3) not preferred.
- Keep Eastgate - people need it.
- Spread out intensification preferred.
- Mix in town homes also as affordable.
- Affordable housing options.
- Missing? Hospital vs. Urgent care @ St. Joe. Need for “kids” urgent care.
- Gradation of heights on Eastgate Square site is needed. Lower heights getting closer to residential neighbourhood.
- More trees along Centennial.
OPTION #1 - CURRENT OFFICIAL PLAN

- Building lot (commercial) with open space adjacent.
- This is preferable density.
- Keep this separation between development and ravine.
- Should be coordinating plans for green spaces and then considering them together.

OPTION #2 - MEDIUM AND HIGH DENSITY MIXED USE

- Should be limited to medium rise lower density behind.
- Too close to ravine for higher density.
- Has Ball diamonds and Community Garden.
- Sewer backups in this area.
- Should be high density (orange)
- These could go medium density. Old properties.
- Too close to ravine for higher density.
- Vacant

OPTION #3 - CONCENTRATED DENSITY

- Too high. Overshadows residential in behind.
- Too much commercial.
- Save some sun exposure for residents on north side.
- Dog park wanted.

General Comments about District 3
- Some commercial near green spaces could be good to support using green spaces.
- Be careful that transportation system can support number of cars it brings in.
- Want more uses like walk in labs (medical.)
- More grocery stores (walking distance)
- Affordable housing protection.
FIGURE 9: DISTRICT 4 - QUEENSTON ROAD WEST LAND USE OPTIONS

SPECIFIC MAP COMMENTS FROM DECEMBER 1st PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2

CITY OF HAMILTON
CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN STUDY

“Green Dots” - Like
“Red Dots” - Dislike

Neighbourhoods
High Density Residential
Medium Density Residential
Mixed Use - High Density
Mixed Use - Medium Density
Institutional
Open Space / Park
Neighbourhood Park
District Commercial
Arterial Commercial
Industrial
Business Park
Utility
Future Rapid Transit Corridor
Major Transit Hub
GO Station

General Comments about District 4
• 40km/h should be implemented in residential neighbourhoods.
• Want bike lanes on Queenston, Barton, King.
• To support development, need LRT extension
• Areas for socialization needed. Family centre, indoor & outdoor.
• Follow the principle of complementary uses. Mixed use is ok as long as compatible. We should make sure to address shadow effects of bigger buildings.
• Lower heights needed abutting low density housing.
• Encourage hotels in the area.
• Mixed use is best.
• Like the mix of high and medium density mixed-use.
Comments
1. Extend active transportation improvements all the way up Nash connect to park here.
2. Gateway to battle of Stoney Creek war of 1812. Gateway to Confederation Park needed.
3. Traffic, maybe don’t want to hang out at Incarnation Parish. Accessibility not good. Potential on other side.
4. East-west (Barton) corridor was reconstructed without bike lanes. Need alternate/other streets to bike on.

Comments
1. Gateway should be closer to King Street.
2. More improvements not necessary at Eastgate.

Comments
1. Identified Gateway area could be a gateway. Not sure what it is a gateway of.
2. Dog Park wanted.

Comments
1. There should be a greenway/corridor connection between the park and Queenston Commercial Area provided.

General Comments for Public Open Space Improvements
- 50km/h should be 40km/h on community neighbourhood roads.
- Cycle lanes
- Streetscaping & beautifying is important. Bury utility lines on major streets (Barton/Queenston/Centennial).
- Not work investment for bike lanes everywhere.
- Some areas could be retrofitted for bike lanes at a low cost.
- Improvements at places of worship not a good idea.
- 4 gateways should be identical with common elements.
- Generally like opportunities for New Public Open Space with New Developments.
**QUEENSTON ROAD (WEST OF CENTENNIAL) - LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT APPROVED PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

- Put LRT along both curbs, not in centre.
- No bikes? They are needed.
- Shared bus/bike lane
- Need a bike lane to get us to/across the Red Hill.

**QUEENSTON ROAD (EAST OF CENTENNIAL) - CYCLE TRACK**

- Combined sidewalk bike lanes should be considered.
- Why is paved median necessary?
- Cycle track safer for cyclists.
- Sidewalk cafe.

**QUEENSTON ROAD (EAST OF CENTENNIAL) - BIKE LANES**

- None

**General Comments on Queenston Streetscape Options**
- Street furniture is important.
**CENTENNIAL PARKWAY - CYCLE TRACK**

- Building frontage on the line.
- Sidewalk / Bike Interaction.
- Existing roadway to minimize construction.
- Shade and ornamental trees.
- Curb extension for efficient cyclist movement.

**Comments**
- Where will LRT fit?
- Reserve some space for transit vehicles on Centennial over the long term.
- Love the trees, places to sit.
- Cycle path warranted on Centennial.
- Preferred for aspect of socializing.
- Underground parking vs. surface.

**CENTENNIAL PARKWAY - MODERATE ENHANCEMENT**

- Maximized landscape buffer.
- Existing roadway to minimize construction.
- Painting relocated to rear, avoid street frontage parking.

**Comments**
- Where are bikes?

**General Comments**
- Get trucks off Centennial Parkway south of Queenston.
- Street furniture is important.

---

**FIGURE 12: CENTENNIAL PARKWAY - STREETSCAPE OPTIONS**

- "Green Dots" - Like
- "Red Dots" - Dislike
CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS
SECONDARY PLAN STUDY
CITY OF HAMILTON

COMMENT MAP ACTIVITY FROM
APRIL 28th PUBLIC INFORMATION
CENTRE #3

FIGURE 13 - PREFERRED LAND USE OPTION

COMMENTS

1. The max height should align with
   Medium Density (Not 12 Storeys).
2. What about LRT Connection to GO
   Station? Perfect location for multi-
   modal hub and recreational hub
   (outdoor concerts). GO/LRT/Highway
1. Build a stairway from the baseball park to the street level. Please ensure bike access / trail will remain (bikes, strollers etc.) This is “blind” & narrow and not conducive to mixed use. Widen?

2. These parks are not connected (Goes over busy road.) Build an underpass?

3. Consider space for kiss’n’ride and/or parking in the event a future LRT stop is close by this intersection. Will allow easy access to LRT. Making it easy to access LRT = more people not driving! Example of poor planning = Finch Station in Toronto discourages out-of-town commuters to use public transit.

4. Exit from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Service Road will relieve Barton of some truck traffic on route to South Service Road between Centennial & Fruitland. Includes Postal Outlet, Beer Depot, etc.

5. Construction here planned? Please allow at minimum bike and pedestrian access between Centennial and residential street. (Bus stop and community access).
1. With MTO’s rebuilding of QEW / Centennial Interchange, is there an opportunity to build Red Hill Valley Parkway to South Service Road Offramp? This would relieve truck traffic going from RHVP to Barton to Centennial to the South Service Road. This is their only access to South Service road / North service road until the Fruitland Exit.

FIGURE 15 - SPECIAL POLICY AREAS

COMMENTS

1. Street Centres Lands
2. GO Station Lands
3. Eastgate Square Lands
4. Vacant Ptc on Centennial Parkway South
5. Harold Inukshuk Lands
6. Queenston Fencells
7. Existing Waste Management Facility
8. St. David’s Catholic Elementary School
9. 26 Arrowsmith Drive
Appendix “E” to Report PED18007

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN STUDY
CITY OF HAMILTON

COMMENT MAP ACTIVITY FROM APRIL 28th PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #3

FIGURE 16 - BUILDING HEIGHTS

COMMENTS

1. Reflect current heights (check).
   Existing heights are 16, 14 storeys
2. Existing heights are 9 storeys
3. Existing heights are 7-9 storeys
4. Open Kenora Avenue up all the way from Barton to Queenston.
5. Should be a medium density height! Beside Remax building, 12 storeys is not acceptable. Shouldn’t be more than 3-4 storeys.
   There are residents that are okay with this being taller! But should match or not exceed the size of buildings across the road.
6. Live on Neil Avenue and don’t want 15 storey building behind property.
7. There is construction going on here (near St. David’s) Please allow walking and bike access between the area and Centennial.
   Please lower the height here (4-6 storeys max.)
The following external agencies and groups were contacted as part of the Secondary Plan and Transportation Management Plan Process:

Bell Canada
Blue Line Taxi
Canada Coach
Canada Post Corporation
Canadian National Railway Properties Inc.
Canadian Pacific Railway
Citizens at City Hall (CATCH)
Cogeco Cable
Community Action Program for Children (CAPC)
Community CarShare
East Hamilton Soccer Club Inc.
Enbridge Pipelines Inc.
Environment Hamilton
French Catholic School Board
French Public School Board
GO Transit
Greyhound
Hamilton Cab
Hamilton Chamber of Commerce
Hamilton Community Energy
Hamilton Community Foundation
Hamilton Conservation Authority
Hamilton Halton Home Builder's Association
Hamilton Wentworth Council of Home and School Associations
Hamilton Wentworth District School Board
Hamilton Wentworth Separate School Board
Horizon Utility Corporation
Hydro One Networks Inc.
Imperial Oil
Lake Avenue Elementary School
Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (Provincial)
Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs and Northern Development-Environment Unit (Federal)
Ministry of Community and Social Services
Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing
Ministry of Natural Resources
Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal
Ministry of the Environment
Ministry of Transportation
Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport
Metrolinx
Municipal Property Assessment Corporation
Niagara Escarpment Commission
Ontario Power Generation
Ontario Provincial Police
Ontario Trucking Association
Realtor’s Association of Hamilton-Burlington
Red Hill Valley Neighbourhood Association
Riverdale Community Planning Team
Rogers Cable
Smart Commute Hamilton
Social Bicycle (SoBi)
Social Planning and Research Council (SPRC) – Riverdale Neighbourhood
Source Cable Ltd.
Southern Ontario Gateway Council
Southern Ontario Railway
St. Joseph’s Hospital
Stoney Creek BIA
Stoney Creek Seniors Club 60
Sun-Canadian Pipe Line
TransCanada Pipelines Limited
Trans Norther Pipeline
Union Gas
Warden Park Senior Citizens Club

First Nations and First Nations Non-Government Organizations
Association of Iroquois and Allied Indians
Canadian Metis Council
Council of Ontario Chiefs
De Dwa Da Dehs Nye>s Aboriginal Health Centre
Haudenosaunee Resource Centre
Huron-Wendat Nation Council
Indigenous Studies Program, McMaster University
Metis National Council
Metis Nation of Ontario Training Initiative
Mississaugas of New Credit First Nation
Mohawk College Aboriginal Student Services
Native Women’s Centre
Niwasa Aboriginal Early Learning Programs
Ontario Federation of Indian Friendship
Sacajawea Non-Profit Housing Inc.
Six Nations Eco-Centre
Six Nations of the Grand River
The Metis Nation of Ontario
Union of Ontario Indians, Nipissing First Nation
Urban Native Homes Inc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Azher Siddiqui</td>
<td>Expand the Red Hill Public Library and connect it to Sam Manson Park. At the moment, there is no back entrance to the Red Hill Public Library from Sam Manson Park and in fact there is a metal fence preventing flow of movement. There should be some entrance way made where the back parking lot currently exists. It would be nice if the City could install lights at Sam Manson Park to allow for evening soccer games, etc.</td>
<td>Comments refer to detailed design of a particular site and do not impact the proposed Secondary Plan. Comments have been provided to Recreation Planning regarding lighting for soccer fields and to Parks and Hamilton Public Library staff regarding access between the library and the park. Access would require the existing property owner’s permission as the library leases its site from a private property owner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Pawlowski</td>
<td>Include the railroad tracks and the Go Station in all of the maps. To reduce heavy east-west traffic on Barton and Queenston: • Approach provincial government for access to QEW at Millen Road, • Explore use of hydro-right-of-way east of Lake Avenue, • Expand width of North Service road, • Provide LRT to Eastgate, • Limit bike lanes on major roads that will inhibit traffic. Explore all possibilities to address the volume of north-south traffic on Centennial Pkwy</td>
<td>The station site and the railroad tracks have been identified on the first 4 of the maps. The Transportation Management Plan (TMP) provides transportation system recommendations. There are no plans to allow additional access to the QEW. The use of the hydro right-of-way is restricted. The review done by the TMP did not identify a road widening to North Service Road as part of the preferred solution. The LRT is now proposed to be built to Eastgate. The TMP proposes bike lanes on Nash Road and Lake Avenue instead of major arterial roads. “Neighbourhood Greenways” are also proposed on several local/collector roads which will also be designed to support cyclists. The Transportation Management Plan addresses this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The purpose of the Go Station should be to bring people to Hamilton and not to take them to jobs away from Hamilton.

Stop the establishment of further auto business or retail-car-lots on Centennial that have inherent limits on the number they employ.

Consider relocating the low-income-housing projects at Kenora and Barton. Most likely none of these residents will have any interest in the Go Station. Housing should be established for those who will utilize the facility.

Approach Universities and Colleges to promote the establishment of an academic institution near the GO Station. Attract people to Hamilton, especially students that most likely would make Hamilton their home after completing their internships here.

Move the Drivers Examination Centre to make the area available for high rise dwellings or office towers

Move recycling plant on Kenora to make the area available for high rise dwellings or office towers.

The station will provide better transportation options to and from the area, both of which are beneficial for the area.

The policies will not permit new auto oriented uses such as drive-throughs, gas stations, vehicle dealerships and car washes on Centennial Parkway.

The Secondary Plan only directs the form of housing and cannot determine who lives in what dwelling unit. The proposed Mixed Use – High Density Designation on Centennial near the GO Station will permit high density residential uses, which supports the GO station.

The Mixed Use – High Density Designation permits a wide variety of uses, and would permit the type of use suggested. Initiatives to attract businesses or institutions to different sites happen outside of the land use planning process, and are a function of the City’s Economic Development group.

The Secondary Plan cannot force a legally existing use to relocate.

The Secondary Plan includes policies that direct the City to consider moving this City facility, to address potential compatibility issues between this operation and residential uses which may be proposed on Centennial Parkway. The TMP also
## GSP Group (on behalf of 860 Queenston Road)

Client has filed an appeal to the OMB respecting its application for a 19 storey residential building on the subject site. The application was supported by Planning staff but was not approved by Council. Our client continues to request that the Secondary Plan provide a designation and policies that implement our client’s application as the most appropriate designation for the subject site.

The current designations do not implement the staff recommended development proposal for our client’s lands. This is despite the fact that a number of properties in the Secondary Plan area have densities that are proposed to increase from medium to high density within the draft Plan when compared to the current UHOP permissions. City should acknowledge that the subject site should be designated for high density.

The alternative that was brought forward in the May 2017 draft was to apply a site specific policy to recognize that the entire site is subject to an ongoing OMB appeal. This has been removed. At a minimum, our client requests that the site specific policy be reinstated for the entire site. The site specific policy recognizes that pending the OMB’s

| recommends the relocation of this site to allow Goderich Road to be extended to Kenora Avenue, to provide better access to the GO Station. |
|---|---|
| Through the Secondary Plan process, staff developed an overall vision for the area, identified the level of intensification needed to meet City targets, and developed a concept which shows a variety of levels of intensification in different areas. Key locations were identified for the highest densities based on a number of different factors. Additional density beyond what is proposed by the plan is not necessary to meet density targets. |
| Staff have applied a site specific policy area noting that the site is subject to an ongoing OMB process. However, staff note that identifying a property in a Secondary Plan as subject to an OMB decision, where a decision has not yet been made, cannot effectively place a “hold” on the designation and allow it to be changed when a decision is made. If the owner wishes to prevent |
disposition on the appeals, the site remains subject to the existing Official Plan designations.

The Secondary Plan relies upon redevelopment of the Eastgate Mall lands to achieve the minimum density target of 150 persons and jobs per hectare by 2031. However, the Eastgate Mall lands are recognized as transitioning over the long term, which does not ensure that the minimum targets will occur. Recently the City staff report reviewing the Existing Conditions and Development Trend Between 2006 and 2016 – GRIDS2 Background Report PED17010(a) indicated that “residential intensification to date in the Downtown and the other Nodes and Corridors has been underperforming.” The Report indicates the Centennial Node is currently at 64 persons and jobs per hectare. Significantly more development than what is proposed in the draft Secondary Plan is required in the immediate term, to support the minimum targets identified. Proposed intensification should be focused on the lands in and around the Major Transit Station Areas. Numerous properties in this area that are proposed to be designated Medium Density should instead be High Density, in recognition of the investment in transportation and to achieve Provincial policy direction.

the proposed land use designation from coming into effect, the owner will need to appeal the Secondary Plan as it relates to their lands. The appeal could be consolidated with the development application appeal so that the decision of the OMB, when it occurs, is reflected in the final Secondary Plan.

The minimum density that the area must achieve by 2031 is 100 persons and units per hectare, not 150. A 20% intensification rate was applied equally across the Node to establish a growth estimate. This represents a Node density of 106 persons and jobs per hectare. Staff note that the significant difference between the Mixed Use - Medium Density and the Mixed Use – High Density designations is the height limitations. Due to the fact that permitted uses include both commercial and residential, the designations do not prescribe residential density ranges. Significant densities can still be achieved at a moderate height, depending on the type and design of development. The Mixed Use – High Density designation recognizes key areas where the highest heights are appropriate based on a variety of factors.
The High Density Residential policies allow an increase in density, but restrict the overall height in a manner which may not practically permit increased density to be utilized (i.e. restriction to existing heights).

With respect to sites proposed as Mixed Use – High Density increases in density and height are permitted without amendment to the Plan, however height is capped at five additional storeys. No rationale is provided in support of this cap. We continue to question the ability of the land within the Secondary Plan area to achieve the necessary intensification to support the significant transit initiatives in this area.

Fred Pizzoferrato

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The designation of the property located at 103 Centennial Parkway South should be changed from “Low Density Residential 2” to “Medium Density Residential 3” for the following reasons:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The lots directly to the south are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The height restrictions for High Density Residential sites are intended to protect existing housing stock, which is important to the area. The limitations also serve to protect the stability of existing residential neighbourhoods. The additional densities will allow for additions to existing buildings, renovations to existing buildings that increase the number of units, and for new infill buildings.

Recommendations from Dillon Consulting noted that marginal increases to height permissions may be appropriate for Mixed Use – High Density areas, to allow for flexibility in building design. A number of sites were tested generally with regards to sun shadow impacts at proposed maximum heights, and although the heights are appropriate, it is recognized that some sites may be able to achieve a small amount of additional height depending on the design of a building. Limitations are needed to ensure that the area remains secondary in focus and level of development to the downtown, and that the spirit of the plan that was publicly endorsed is maintained. Limitations also ensure that heights do not exceed those permitted for the focal point of the Node, Eastgate Square Mall.

The designation for these lots has been changed to Low Density Residential 3 as requested.

To properly consider these comments, staff did a detailed review of lands surrounding this property, and of the lot sizes and depths for the properties.
designated “Medium Density Residential 3” and this lot is the same depth.
- The property is only 200 feet from a High Density designation.
- The property is 90 feet from the Low Density Residential 2 lands (across the street).
- Centennial Parkway south is a major road
- If designation is left as is, there is a concern with overshadowing on this property.

<p>| Zelinka Priamo Limited (on behalf of Canadian Tire Real Estate Limited, for 686 Queenston Road and 106 Centennial) | The lands at 686 Queenston Road are proposed to be split designed Mixed Use – Medium Density and Mixed Use – High Density with a Pedestrian Focus Street overlay. The proposed designation remains unchanged from the April 2017 draft Secondary Plan, whereby the boundary of the proposed split designation bisects the existing fronting Centennial Parkway South in this block (between Neil Ave and Meadowvale Ave). Based on the densities and type of development permitted in the Medium Density Residential 3 designation, lot consolidation of properties on this stretch of road would be appropriate to allow for future development. Although the property fronts onto Neil Avenue, which is a low density residential street, the design of a medium density development can achieve an appropriate interface with housing across the street. Therefore the proposed designation of this site has been amended to “Medium Density Residential 3” as requested. In addition to this change, staff also identified that the Medium Density Residential 3 designation applied to two small properties at the southernmost part of this block located at 67 and 69 Centennial Parkway South is too restrictive in terms of density requirements. A development meeting the required densities would be very difficult to achieve, even with consolidation of these lots. Therefore, the designation of these properties was changed to Low Density Residential 3. | A higher density/intensity of use, greater building heights and a pedestrian focus is appropriate for the front portion of this site, as it is located directly adjacent to Queenston Road, a major arterial road, and abuts a proposed LRT stop. As the site is very large, the southern half (approx.) of the site is positioned more in the interior of a low density neighbourhood and the same amount of |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkway North</td>
<td>parking lot and other buildings on site. In our submission the implementation of a split designation is difficult, whereby there would be differing land use permissions and tests under the Official Plan and Secondary Plan. We request confirmation that the existing gas bar will continue to be permitted under the proposed Mixed-Use – High Density designation notwithstanding Section 4.5.6 and the Pedestrian Focus Street overlay. Policy 6.7.5.1 j) should also reference Policy 6.7.7.5 b) in order to notwithstand the required minimum building height of 3 storeys for properties located on Queenston Road. The existing gas bar will continue to be permitted as a Legal Non-Complying use. New gas bars will not be permitted on the LRT route or within Pedestrian Focus Street areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fotenn (for 50 Violet Drive, 11 and 40 Grandville Ave. and 77 Delawana Drive)</td>
<td>Current policies will permit intensification of High Density Residential properties up to 300 units per hectare. Satisfied with the policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webb Planning Consultants (for Effort Trust, 697, 686 and 706 Queenston Road)</td>
<td>Generally satisfied that the policies are appropriate. Should further explore maximum building heights and Policy 6.7.5.1 j) that provides specific relief from minimum building heights and maximum setback requirements. Suggest that a site specific policy area be developed for the Queenston Mall site (686 Queenston) to reflect context of site and provide guidance for any major change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>密度和高度不适宜在这个区域。为了解决这些问题，工作人员已经将混合用途-高密度的指定扩展到整个园区，但在园区特定区域实施了一项特定政策，以保持原始政策的目的，即在园区南部降低密度和高度。工作人员注意到，这两个指定类似，一般允许相同的用途。修正已作。现有的加油站将继续作为合法的非符合使用被允许。新的加油站将不允许在LRT路线或人行道上。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The existing gas bar will continue to be permitted as a Legal Non-Complying use. New gas bars will not be permitted on the LRT route or within Pedestrian Focus Street areas. Correction made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Herlick, Laurier Group (for 826-840 Queenston)</td>
<td>The site is within the Major Transit Station Area boundary and essentially right on the LRT line and across the street from higher density. Our site should be designated with a density of greater than 12 storeys. No changes are recommended. Through the Secondary Plan process, staff developed an overall vision for the area, identified what level of intensification is needed to meet City targets, and developed a concept which shows a variety of levels of intensification in different areas. Key locations were identified for the highest densities based on a number of different factors. Mixed Use sites along Queenston Road on the edges of the Node have lower heights to provide a gradual transition out of the Node and to maintain heights similar to existing residential uses along these road segments. Additional density beyond what is proposed by the plan is not necessary to meet density targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkway Nissan (191 Centennial Parkway North)</td>
<td>Business is planning on doubling in size to approx. 25,000 square feet with a construction cost of $2-3 million which will allow them to hire 6 more people. The proposed land use change is unfair to us and our neighbourhood and is not in keeping with the spirit of the current use of the properties along Centennial Pkwy. Staff acknowledge that the direction of the plan represents a shift from historical development along Centennial Parkway. However, it is important to ensure that the area is appropriately planned for the long term, to ensure that development meets the requirements of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. Transit-supportive development within the Node and along higher order transit corridors is important to support transit investments occurring in the area. To address the concerns, staff have added policies to the plan allowing legal non-complying car dealerships to be recognized as existing uses in the Zoning By-law. Changes to the built form of these uses will require them to be brought into</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Solutions (for 71, 83 and 85 Centennial Parkway South)</td>
<td>There are concerns with draft policies i) and ii) of the site specific for the lands (Policy 6.7.18.2c)), as they prescribe building step-backs to the built form without an opportunity for an informed determination if such step-backs are necessary to establish compatibility. These prescriptive policies are onerous. There is a need to clarify the permitted density of units per hectare for both traditional multiple dwelling units and retirement home suites. It is our understanding that two retirement dwelling suites are typically interpreted to equate to one residential unit for the purpose of calculation of density and this should be reflected in the site specific policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policies noted have been removed. General urban design policies are sufficient to deal with transitions and appropriate design.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSP Group (for SmartREIT, 210 Centennial Parkway North and 502-560 Centennial Parkway North)</td>
<td>Request confirmation that Policy 6.7.5.1 K) would apply to a phased approach of redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy noted has been removed. Policy j) permits minor one storey development to be added to existing development or to be part of a new major redevelopment, and would apply to a phased approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy quoted is not in the September draft policies. Policy requires a minimum 2 storey height along Centennial Parkway, and 3 storeys along Queenston Road, which addresses this concern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Solutions (for 140 Centennial Parkway North)</strong></td>
<td>Suggest that Policy 6.7.5.1 k) permit limited 1 and 2 storey development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Solutions (for 140 Centennial Parkway North)</strong></td>
<td>A height of greater than 20 storeys should be considered for the site. Only Eastgate Mall permits 20 storeys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spears and Associates Inc. Planning Consultants (for Eastgate Mall)</strong></td>
<td>Policy 6.7.5.1 b) It is not clear what is intended by this Policy. It is not clear where the 5,000 square metres of commercial floor space comes from. Eastgate Mall is substantially larger, over 9 times this amount. One would think, that as part of any redevelopment proposal, the City could request various supporting studies. In other words, I don’t see the need for this policy and I do not understand the rationale or significance of the 5,000 square metres. The 5,000 square metres and the 30% reduction seem arbitrary and there is no reference to these thresholds in Volume 1. As an alternative, it would be much simpler to require a market study as part of a redevelopment proposal on a site by site basis. As the changing retail commercial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
market evolves the amount of commercial floor space may change.

The word “development” and “redevelopment” are defined terms in Chapter G – Volume 1 Glossary. However the words “redeveloped” and “major redevelopment” are not defined terms in Volume 1. Section 6.7.7.2 h) appears to introduce a new definition referred to as “major redevelopment” however “major” is not italicized. This is very confusing and a suggestion would be to include a definition. Are “major development” and “major redevelopment” the same? Is there a maximum lot area? How does the 5,000 square metres and/or the 30% threshold into it?

Section 6.7.7.2 h) i) and ii) are also very confusing. Policy refers to sites on 2.5 hectares or more and appears to now define “major redevelopment” as 30% of the land area of the property existing at the date of approval of the plan. This policy is problematic for Eastgate Square. If the owner wanted to partially demolish and reconstruct the shopping centre, would this be considered “major redevelopment” even if no new gross floor area was proposed?

Similarly, if the “redevelopment” of the shopping centre were to progress in phases, would a residential component be required when the combined area of the redevelopment of the proposals is greater

As most sites in the Secondary Plan are currently developed, major redevelopment has the same meaning as major development. Major redevelopment is not defined in Volume 1 as the reference to this term in the Secondary Plan policies is specific to the Secondary Plan. Policies describing what is considered to be major redevelopment have been amended to provide general guidance and allow determination of major redevelopment through the Zoning By-law and development applications.

Policy referred to has been rewritten to provide clearer direction, and reconstructions of portions of the mall have been exempted from having to provide a mix of uses.
than 30%? This policy does not work for Eastgate Mall. A suggestion would be to include a site specific policy in Areas F to exclude Eastgate Square from the 30% residential trigger.

Policy 6.7.7.4 c) Mixed Use – High Density is also confusing. Chapter E Section 2.3.2.14 Design refers to sites greater than 2.5 ha for redevelopment for mixed uses. Chapter E Policy 2.3.2.7 states that “Sub Regional Service Nodes shall generally have some higher densities with a target density of 100 to 150 persons and jobs per hectare across each node.” Volume 1 does not require a minimum density of 100 units per hectare for every site, it is a blended density across the entire Eastgate Node.

Policy 6.7.18.6 – Site Specific Policy – Area F Wording is confusing. What is meant by “Major redevelopment”? What is meant by the “majority of the site”? Also, it is not realistic to expect a major redevelopment of the majority of the site would be initiated by a single developer.

Draft 2 contains a lot of numbers related to percentages of commercial floor area (30%) and lot areas (2.5 hectares in some places, 2

Secondary Plans are intended to provide more detailed land use direction than Volume 1, and can implement more detailed policies. Where residential is proposed, the minimum density requirement ensures that the density is a high density, as intended by the Plan. In order to achieve the needed density across the node, a minimum density of development needs to be achieved on a site by site basis. The Secondary Plan establishes this density framework. Policy wording has been revised for additional clarification on intent.

Policy wording has been amended to provide more clarity and remove the term “Major Redevelopment”.

Policies 6.7.7.2 h) and i) reference sites 2.5 ha or larger, and are based on Volume 1 policies already established in the UHOP. Policies 6.7.5.1
Volume 1 E.2.3.2.10 states “The Sub-Regional Service Nodes shall be planned and encouraged to accommodate in excess of 100,000 square metres of retail floor space each. The words “planned” and “encourage” do not require each site to achieve this target. Eastgate Square is close to 50,000 square metres or half of the entire Eastgate Node’s requirements. The numbers and percentages appear arbitrary and there is no explanation for them or illustrations as to how to apply them if they are intended as a guideline. There is no explanation of the rationale behind these numbers. Upon closer review of the policies in Volume 1, there seems to be a disconnect between the Draft 2 policies and the Volume 1 policies in terms of planning and encouraging retail floor space. The draft 2 secondary plan also refers to commercial floor space, which does not necessarily mean retail floor space.

As a suggestion, as far as Eastgate Square is concerned the Site Specific Policy – Area F needs to include language that is appropriate to the continued commercial development and redevelopment of the shopping centre over the long term. The planned function should include the ability of the shopping centre to be subdivided into smaller parcels and at the time of development application, apply the policies in the plan to guide new.

b) and j)i) reference sites larger than 2 ha. This lot size has been applied specifically in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan in recognition of the size of existing large commercial plaza sites in the Sub – Regional Service Node.

Volume 1, Policy E.2.3.2.10 requires the City to plan to accommodate in excess of 100,000 square metres of retail floor space within the Node. The policies in the Plan apply this direction. Revisions to Policy 6.7.5.1 b) have been amended to consistently use the term “retail floor space.”

Policies clearly support the continued function and operation of the Mall in its current format. A policy has been added clarifying that nothing in the Plan is intended to prevent severances of portions of the existing mall site in the future.
| MHBC Planning (for 640 Queenston Road) | We are concerned with the lack of policy respecting short to medium term development and redevelopment potential of the subject land. Policies 6.7.5.1 j) and k) attempt to address these concerns by providing some allowances for reduced building heights for smaller commercial buildings and expansions to existing buildings on larger sites. We appreciate the flexibility that these policies offer with respect to built form but we believe that the subject lands, as well as other larger commercial sites in the proposed secondary plan area will be unduly constrained by the restriction imposed by Policies 6.7.7.2 j) and 6.7.7.3 e) which restrict the development of drive through facilities, gas bars and car washes. The redevelopment of large format commercial shopping centres requires flexibility in the policy framework to allow for incremental change to occur on site while minimizing disruption to the existing commercial operations which support the | The restriction on certain uses, including drive through facilities, gas bars and car washes, is applicable to all Pedestrian Focus Street areas and all properties on the proposed Light Rail Transit (LRT) route. These uses are auto oriented uses which are not consistent with the intent to establish uses along the LRT route (and on Pedestrian Focus Streets) that support higher order transit and provide a comfortable pedestrian environment. These uses also have the potential to interfere with the operation of the Light Rail Transit system and the associated traffic movements in the Light Rail Transit corridor, as they typically require full movement access. Staff do not recommend the creation of a site specific policy area that permits drive through facilities, gas bars and car washes on the site. No justification has been provided as to why this restriction is not appropriate. The same requirements have been applied in conjunction |
| Sub-Regional Node. As such, we require that the subject lands be placed in a Special Policy Area which addresses these issues. | with updated commercial zoning along the entire LRT corridor throughout Hamilton. |
### Chapter E

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Policies</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2.9 Notwithstanding Policies E.4.2.3 and E.4.2.6, four major commercial areas</td>
<td>That the policy is amended by adding “Volume 2 or” to the text as follows:</td>
<td>One of the 4 sites is within Secondary Plan. Site specific policies in Volume 3 for this site are being relocated to Volume 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exceed 25,000 square metres of retail and commercial service space, but are not</td>
<td>Notwithstanding Policies E.4.2.3 and E.4.2.6, four major commercial areas currently</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anticipated to evolve into mixed use areas during the life of this Plan. These</td>
<td>exceed 25,000 square metres of retail and commercial service space, but are not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four areas are not identified as Urban Nodes or Urban Corridors, are within the</td>
<td>anticipated to evolve into mixed use areas during the life of this Plan. These four</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood element of the Urban Structure on Schedule E – Urban Structure,</td>
<td>areas are not identified as Urban Nodes or Urban Corridors, are within the Neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>are designated District Commercial on Schedule E-1 – Urban Land Use Designations</td>
<td>element of the Urban Structure on Schedule E – Urban Structure, are designated District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and have area or site specific requirements contained in Volume 3. The amount or</td>
<td>Commercial on Schedule E-1 – Urban Land Use Designations and have area or site specific requirements contained in Volume 2 or Volume 3. The amount or type of retail uses in these locations shall not be expanded without an amendment to the Urban Structure. The four major commercial areas are located:”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>type of retail uses in these locations shall not be expanded without an amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to the Urban Structure. The four major commercial areas are located:”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2.9</td>
<td>That the address be changed to:</td>
<td>Address of site has changed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) at 480 and 500 Centennial Parkway North and 20 Warrington Street.</td>
<td>d) at 502 to 560 Centennial Parkway North.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3.1, Table 4.3.1</td>
<td>Add 2 street segments.</td>
<td>Streets in Centennial Secondary Plan which are intended to be “Pedestrian Focus Streets”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of all street segments which are “Pedestrian Focus Streets”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Street</strong></td>
<td><strong>From</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>Nash Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>South side of Queenston Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix "H" to Report PED18007

#### Page 2 of 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lands are part of Confederation GO station site. Change establishes a consistent designation across all the lands which are part of the GO station.</td>
<td>Redesignation identifies a higher density and a greater mixture of land uses along the corridor, and within the Node, which is more appropriate than the existing designations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Volume 1 – Schedules and Appendices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Schedule/Appendix</th>
<th>Proposed Schedule/Appendix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule E-1 designates subject lands as Arterial Commercial.</td>
<td>Schedule E-1 designates subject lands as Arterial Commercial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule E-1 (Schedule to Mixed Use)</td>
<td>Schedule E-1 (Schedule to High Density Designation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Images of maps with highlighted areas showing the proposed redesignations.]
<p>| Schedule E-1 | Schedule &quot;E-1&quot; designates subject lands as District Commercial. | Revise Schedule &quot;E-1&quot; to redesignate lands from District Commercial to Mixed Use – Medium Density Designation. (Subsection 4.1.2 a) iii) of OPA) | Redesignation identifies a greater mixture of land uses along the corridor and within the Node, which is more appropriate than the existing designations. |
| Schedule E-1 | Schedule &quot;E-1&quot; designates subject lands as Mixed Use – Medium Density. | Revise Schedule &quot;E-1&quot; to redesignate lands from Mixed Use – Medium Density to Mixed Use – High Density Designation. (Subsection 4.1.2 a) iv) 1), 2), and 3) of OPA) | Redesignations identify a higher density in key areas of the Node, which is more appropriate than the existing designations. |
| Schedule E-1 | Schedule “E-1” designates subject lands as District Commercial | Revise Schedule “E-1” to redesignate lands from District Commercial to Neighbourhoods Designation | Redesignation recognizes that lands are more appropriate as part of the neighbourhood, as they complement the existing neighbourhood uses and are outside of the Node. |
| Schedule E-1 | Schedule “E-1” designates subject lands as Mixed Use – Medium Density | Revise Schedule “E-1” to redesignate lands from Mixed Use – Medium Density to Neighbourhoods Designation (Subsection 4.1.2 a) vi) 1), 2), 3) and 4) of OPA) | Redesignation recognizes existing residential uses that are appropriate to remain as residential uses. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule E-1</th>
<th>Schedule “E-1” designates subject lands as Business Park</th>
<th>Revise Schedule “E-1” to redesignate lands from Business Park to District Commercial Designation (Subsection 4.1.2 a) vii) of OPA)</th>
<th>Minor boundary adjustment based on actual lot severance and build-out of lands.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule E-1</td>
<td>Schedule “E-1” designates subject lands as District Commercial</td>
<td>Revise Schedule “E-1” to redesignate lands from District Commercial to Business Park Designation (Subsection 4.1.2 a) vii) of OPA)</td>
<td>Minor boundary adjustment based on actual lot severance and build-out of lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule E-1</td>
<td>Schedule &quot;E-1&quot; designates subject lands as Mixed Use – Medium Density</td>
<td>Revise Schedule &quot;E-1&quot; to redesignate lands from Mixed Use – Medium Density to Open Space Designation (Subsection 4.1.2 a) viii) of OPA)</td>
<td>Recognizes lands which form part of Core natural area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule E-1</td>
<td>Schedule &quot;E-1&quot; designates subject lands as Industrial Land</td>
<td>Revise Schedule &quot;E-1&quot; to redesignate lands from Industrial Land to Open Space Designation (Subsection 4.1.2 a) ix) of OPA)</td>
<td>Recognizes lands which form part of Core natural area within Red Hill Valley.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule E-1</td>
<td>Appendix A identifies the Parks Classification and Secondary Plans</td>
<td>Revise Schedule &quot;E-1&quot; to redesignate lands from District Commercial to Mixed Use – High Density (Subsection 4.1.2 a) x) of OPA</td>
<td>Redesignation identifies a higher density and a greater mixture of land uses along the corridor and within the Node, which is more appropriate than the existing designations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| Schedule E-1 | Revise Appendix A to add Secondary Plan | Map needs to identify all Secondary Plans. |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix B</th>
<th>Appendix B identifies Major Transportation Facilities and Routes</th>
<th>Revise Appendix B to add Potential Rapid Transit Line on Centennial Parkway (shown in red), to change the HSR Terminal to a Multi-Modal Hub (shown in pink) and to add a new &quot;Proposed GO Station&quot; (shown in blue)</th>
<th>Recognition of the approved transportation projects in the area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume 2 - Text</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Policies</td>
<td>Proposed Amendment</td>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>That Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan be added</td>
<td>Secondary Plan provides detailed land use direction for areas in and around Centennial Sub-Regional Service Node</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume 2 - Chapter B B.6.7 Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Volume 2 – Chapter B
### B.7.2 Old Town Secondary Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amended Description</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.2 First Sentence</td>
<td>&quot;The Old Town Secondary Plan area is bounded by the rear lot lines of the properties fronting on north side Queenston Road, Gray Road to the East, the Niagara Escarpment to the South, to the west by the western property lines in line with Alpine Avenue just East of Centennial Parkway North, north of King Street East, as well as Centennial Parkway North, south of King Street.&quot;</td>
<td>Amend to read: &quot;The Old Town Secondary Plan area is generally bounded by the rear lot lines of the properties fronting on north side Queenston Road, Gray Road to the East, the Niagara Escarpment to the South, to the west by the western property boundaries in line with Alpine Avenue just East of Centennial Parkway North, north of King Street East, as well as Centennial Parkway North, south of King Street.&quot;</td>
<td>Extent of Secondary Plan area is changing, so description of boundaries needs to be updated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2.4.3 Mixed Use – High Density Designation</td>
<td>Delete Policy and renumber subsequent Policy 7.2.4.4 to 7.2.4.3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Specific Policy – Area C Policy 7.2.8.3</td>
<td>Delete Policy</td>
<td>Lands currently designated Mixed Use – High Density in Old Town Secondary Plan are being removed and included in Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan instead.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Specific Policy – Area C</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lands are being removed from Old Town Secondary Plan and included in Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan. Special policy requirements have been carried over to Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan as Special Policy Area G.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
existing single detached dwellings and future single detached dwellings fronting on Cromwell Crescent will be compatible; however somewhat higher buildings may be permitted on other portions of the site.

### Volume 2 – Mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Map</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix A shows the location of all Secondary Plans in the City.</td>
<td>Add Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan</td>
<td>All Secondary Plans should be shown on map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Town Secondary Plan contains lands which are proposed to be part of the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan</td>
<td>Delete lands from Old Town Secondary Plan</td>
<td>Lands cannot be located in two different secondary plans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### New Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Policies</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter B, Area Specific Policies, Policy UH-1(f) Applies to 333 and 347 Centennial Parkway North, 26 Arrowsmith Road, and 2411, 2415 and 2425 Barton Street East. Policy allows for the continuation of existing industrial or commercial uses that are compatible with surrounding non-employment land uses. Limited light industrial and commercial uses may be permitted provided they are compatible with surrounding non-employment land uses.</td>
<td>Delete Policy in its entirety.</td>
<td>Majority of properties contain commercial uses which will be permitted in Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, so special permissions for uses are not required. Uses located at 333 Centennial Parkway North (Car dealership) and 347 Centennial Parkway North (industrial use) are not consistent with policy direction for the Centennial Node and will become legal non-complying uses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Volume 3 - Special Policy Areas, Area Specific Policies and Site Specific Policies

**Chapter C, Urban Site Specific Policies, Policies UHN-10, UHC-4, UCW-1C 3.0 and UHE-7**

- **Delete Policies in their entirety**
- **Policies have been relocated to the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan as Special Policy Areas E, D, C, and K.**

**Chapter C, Urban Site Specific Policies UCW-1C Title**

- **Delete words “and 460 Kenora Avenue” and change comma to the word “and”**
- **Reflects that Policy 3.0 of UCW-1C, for 460 Kenora Avenue, has been deleted.**

### Volume 3 - Mapping

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Map</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map 1 - Area Specific Policies Key Map</td>
<td>Revise Map to delete “UH-1”</td>
<td>Policy is being deleted from Volume 3 so should be removed from map.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site specific policies for lands identified on map are being deleted from Volume 3 so map should be removed.

Site specific policies are being deleted from Volume 3 so should be removed from map.
January 5, 2018

Ms. Melanie Pham  
Planner, Community Planning & Design  
City of Hamilton  
71 Main Street West, 6th Floor  
Hamilton, ON, L8P 4Y5  

sent via email: melanie.pham@hamilton.ca

Re: Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan (September 2017)

Dear Ms. Pham:

We are pleased to have the opportunity to provide comments on the City of Hamilton’s Proposed Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan (September 2017). The purpose of this letter is to provide our comments on the Proposed Secondary Plan, as well as some background information about Bell Canada’s role in providing essential telecommunications services. We understand that the Secondary Plan will be added to Volume 2, Chapter B of the City’s Official Plan as a new Secondary Plan through an amendment to the Official Plan. We also understand that this document is being brought forward to a Statutory Public Meeting this month, and we request that our comments be considered as part of this public consultation process.

About Bell Canada

Bell Canada is Ontario’s principal telecommunications infrastructure provider, developing and maintaining an essential public service. The Bell Canada Act, a federal statute, requires that Bell supply, manage and operate most of the trunk telecommunications system in Ontario. Bell is therefore also responsible for the infrastructure that supports most 911 emergency services in the Province. The critical nature of Bell’s services is declared in the Bell Canada Act to be “for the general advantage of Canada” and the Telecommunications Act affirms that the services of telecommunications providers are “essential in the maintenance of Canada’s identity and sovereignty.”

Provincial policy further indicates the economic and social functions of telecommunications systems and emphasizes the importance of delivering cost-effective and efficient services:

- The 2014 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) requires the development of coordinated, efficient and cost-effective infrastructure, including telecommunications systems (Section 1.6.1).
- Section 1.7.1 k) of the 2014 PPS recognizes that “efficient, coordinated telecommunications infrastructure” is a component of supporting long-term economic prosperity.
- We note that the definition of infrastructure in the 2014 PPS is inclusive of communications/telecommunications, which is indicative of the importance in providing efficient telecommunications services to support current needs and future growth (Section 1.6.1).
- Furthermore, the 2014 PPS states that infrastructure should be “strategically located to support the effective and efficient delivery of emergency management services”
(Section 1.6.4), which is relevant to telecommunications since it is an integral component of the 911 emergency service.

To support the intent of the Bell Canada Act and Telecommunications Act and ensure consistency with Provincial policy, Bell Canada has become increasingly involved in municipal policy and infrastructure initiatives. Bell Canada is supportive of municipal infrastructure initiatives, official plans, zoning by-laws, design guidelines and other initiatives that:

- Recognize the role of modern telecommunications infrastructure in creating economically competitive communities;
- Provide flexibility in the permission of utility structures, which ensures that utilities can be designed, located and maintained in a cost-effective and efficient manner, and ensures that Bell’s technicians will have ease of access to maintain the infrastructure;
- Emphasize the need for municipalities, developers and Bell Canada to communicate and coordinate with one another to ensure the coordinated delivery of services; and
- Balance the desire to create attractive, uncluttered streetscapes with the need to provide cost-effective and efficient telecommunications services.

Comments on the Proposed Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, September 2017

We have reviewed the Proposed Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan and offer the following specific comments. Where applicable, our recommended additions are shown in bold underline.

We appreciate From Bell’s perspective, the inclusion of the term “where feasible” in policies that address burying infrastructure, which demonstrates that the City acknowledges that it is not always possible or appropriate to place all utility structures underground (e.g., above-ground pedestals and Outside Plant Interfaces). In this manner, the City acknowledges that these facilities must be placed above-ground as they require ready, continuous access for maintenance to ensure reliable telecommunications and 911 emergency services.

6.7.16 Infrastructure, Energy and Sustainability Policies

We appreciate the City’s commitment to the provision of adequate infrastructure, energy efficiency and sustainability principles as outlined in Section 6.7.16. Access to modern communications/telecommunications infrastructure is an important part of creating economically competitive, “intelligent” communities, as employers increasingly rely and thrive on reliable, high-speed internet access. This is consistent with Section 1.7.1 k) of the PPS, which recognizes that efficient, coordinated telecommunications infrastructure is a component of supporting long-term economic growth. Accordingly, we request the following addition to Policy 6.7.16:
Municipal services, such as sewers, water, stormwater systems and public/private utilities shall be provided, maintained and upgraded, as may be required, to accommodate the needs of existing and future development in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan area. The provision of infrastructure will require coordination with utility providers and other agencies as applicable.

6.7.17 Implementation

Section 6.7.17.a. states that the City shall undertake a Streetscape and Public Realm Design Study of the Streetscape Improvement areas identified conceptually on Map B.6.7-3-Centennial Neighbourhoods-Transportation and Connections. One of Bell’s main objectives is to become involved in planning processes. Doing so allows us to coordinate with the City on the provisioning of appropriate telecommunications infrastructure for new growth and development in a timely fashion. Accordingly, we request the following policy be added as Section 6.7.17.b.viii):

**Design direction for the placement of utilities in the public right-of-way shall be undertaken in consultation with utility providers.**

Bell Canada has developed an Urban Design Manual which speaks to the location and configuration of utility infrastructure to balance ease of access with design. We would ask that the Manual be considered in the preparation of any Urban Design or Streetscape and Public Realm Guidelines which may relate to the Secondary Plan. In particular, we wish to draw your attention to the following, which address matters related to the burial of telecommunications infrastructure and the visual screening of infrastructure from public view:

- Section 5.0 discusses issues with regard to urban design and public utilities. Section 5.1 of the UDM addresses municipal requests to bury public infrastructure. Section 5.2 discusses screening of public utilities. Bell is supportive of discreetly locating its above ground utilities and clustering utilities to minimize visual clutter; however, it is important to design the utilities to allow for safe access by Bell’s technicians.

- Section 6.0 provides techniques which can be used to minimize the visual prominence of telecommunications equipment in a number of different community scenarios, while still meeting telecommunications network requirements for resiliency, sustainability and growth.

The Urban Design Manual may be viewed online at:

Future Involvement

We would like to thank you again for the opportunity to comment on the City of Hamilton Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan. Please advise us of any further meetings, reports, drafts or decisions related to this matter. We request that all documentation be forwarded to:

Ms. Meaghan Palynchuk  
Manager - Municipal Relations  
Access Network Provisioning, Ontario  
20 Hunter Street West, Flr.3  
Hamilton, ON  
L8P 2Z2

If you have any questions, please direct them to the undersigned.

Yours truly,

Meaghan Palynchuk  
Manager, Municipal Relations  
Access Network Provisioning, Ontario

cc: Chris Tyrrell – WSP Canada Group Limited
TO: Chair and Members  
Planning Committee

COMMITTEE DATE: January 16, 2018

SUBJECT/REPORT NO: Proposed Transit Oriented Corridor Zones in Zoning By-law No. 05-200 - LRT Extension and Housekeeping Amendments (PED18012) (Wards 1, 3, 4, 5 and 9)

WARD(S) AFFECTED: Wards 1, 3, 4, 5 and 9

PREPARED BY: Madeleine Giroux  
Planner II  
(905) 546-2424 Ext. 2664

SUBMITTED BY: Steve Robichaud  
Director of Planning and Chief Planner

SIGNATURE:

RECOMMENDATION

(a) That approval be given to Official Plan Amendment (OPA) No. ___ to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) to amend policies, schedules and maps, to implement up-to-date mapping and policies for the extension of the Transit Oriented Corridor located along Queenston Road from east of Jefferson Avenue to Reid Avenue, on the following basis:

(i) That the Proposed Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED18012, be adopted by Council; and,

(ii) That the proposed Official Plan Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) 2014, and conforms to Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2017 (P2G).

(b) That approval be given to City Initiative CI-17-B to add the Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use High Density (TOC4) Zone to Zoning By-law No. 05-200, to zone certain lands located on Queenston Road between Jefferson Avenue and Irene Avenue as Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use Medium Density (TOC1) Zone, Transit Oriented Corridor Local Commercial (TOC2) Zone, Transit Oriented Corridor Multiple Residential (TOC3) Zone and Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use High Density (TOC4) Zone, to amend the existing TOC1, TOC2, and TOC3 Zones to incorporate housekeeping amendments, to add special exceptions to Schedule “C”, to add two new special figures to Schedule “F”, and to amend
general provisions and other administrative sections of the By-law, on the following basis:

(i) That the Proposed By-law, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18012 which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by Council; and,

(ii) That the proposed changes in zoning will be in conformity with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan upon approval of Official Plan Amendment No. ____.

(c) That Item 1 on the Outstanding Business List related to the range of local commercial uses to serve the immediate neighbourhood of King St E. between Barnesdale Avenue & Fairholt Street be removed.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of this City Initiative is to amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Zoning By-law No. 05-200. The amendment to the Official Plan is to extend the approved Area Specific Policy UH-6 in Volume 3 to additional lands along the extension of the LRT corridor, and to prohibit certain uses that are not supportive of the LRT system.

The changes to Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200 are to add a new Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use High Density (TOC4) Zone and to apply the existing Transit Oriented Corridor Zones (TOC1, TOC2, and TOC3) and the new TOC4 Zone to certain lands located on Queenston Road between Jefferson Avenue and Irene Avenue. These lands are part of the proposed Light Rail Transit (LRT) corridor which was extended from the Queenston Traffic Circle to Eastgate Square.

The proposed zoning will implement:

- The policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) Volume 1 for those lands located between Jefferson Avenue and Reid Avenue; and,

- The policies of both the UHOP Volume 1 and the proposed Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan (Volume 2) for those lands between just east of Pottruff Road and Irene Avenue.

Other administrative changes have also been included in this Report:

- To rename the existing TOC1, TOC2, and TOC3 Zones to differentiate between the CMU Zones;
To update the regulations and terminology to be consistent with the Commercial and Mixed Use zoning;

To permit minor expansions to legal non-conforming single detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings (TOC1 and TOC3); and,

To clarify the range of permitted commercial uses and associated regulations within the (TOC3) Zone.

The proposed TOC Zones Extension supports residential and commercial intensification that is beneficial to transit investment, establish regulations that do not impede the operation of the LRT System, that contribute to city building, and remove regulatory barriers for new investment and/or redevelopment opportunities in accordance with the City’s Open for Business mandate.

Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 14

FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial: N/A

Staffing: N/A

Legal: As required by the Planning Act, Council shall hold at least one Public Meeting to consider amendments to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

1.0 Transit Oriented Corridor (TOC) Zones

The TOC Zones initiative was considered by Planning Committee on October 4, 2016 (see PED16100(a)) and approved by Council on October 12, 2016. It applied to properties on Main Street from McMaster University to Hwy No. 403, King Street from Hwy No. 403 to the Delta, Main Street East from the Delta to the Queenston Traffic Circle, and Queenston Road from the traffic circle to Jefferson Avenue. The initiative included:

- Site specific (UHOP) policy and zoning by-law regulations to prohibit such auto related uses as drive through facilities, gas bars, car washes and motor vehicle service stations because they conflict with the proposed LRT system; and,
The addition of three new zone categories into Zoning By-law No. 05-200, including the Mixed Use (TOC1) Zone, the Local Commercial (TOC2) Zone, and the Multiple Residential (TOC3) Zone;

The zones implement the UHOP designations by increasing opportunities for more commercial and residential uses, prohibiting certain uses that would conflict with the operation of the LRT, and establishing a built form that supports a more pedestrian friendly environment. The zoning is in effect, except for three properties that remain under appeal.

2.0 Transit Oriented Corridor (TOC) Zones Extension

Council considered and endorsed the amended Hamilton LRT Environmental Project Report (EPR) Addendum on April 26, 2017. The Council-endorsed EPR Addendum for the B-Line included an extension of the project from the Queenston Traffic Circle to Eastgate Square.

The TOC Zone study area was accordingly extended from Jefferson Avenue to Irene Avenue. This extension is known as the TOC Zones Extension project.

3.0 Council Motion

On October 11, 2017, City Council passed the following Motion:

WHEREAS, the City of Hamilton adopted transit corridor zoning regulations in October, 2016 to support and encourage investment along the Light Rail Transit (LRT) corridor;

WHEREAS, the zoning for the lands on King Street East between Barnesdale Avenue and Fairholt Street, limits the non-residential uses to the uses existing as of October, 2016 but this area has been undergoing a renaissance;

WHEREAS, this area provides local commercial uses such as retail, restaurants, cafés, bars, and personal services that serve the immediate neighbourhood;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That staff be directed to review the current zoning and schedule a public meeting of the Planning Committee to consider changes to the zoning by-law to broaden the range of permitted uses to include new local commercial uses that serve the immediate neighbourhood.
The purpose of this motion is to consider expanding the list of permitted commercial uses within existing buildings for lands that are currently zoned TOC3.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS

1.0 Provincial Policy

The UHOP Amendment and Zoning By-law No. 05-200 amendments are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 and conform to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2017. A detail Policy review is included in Report PED16100(a).

In summary, the amendments:

- Introduce land use permissions that will accommodate an appropriate range and mix of residential and commercial uses along the planned major transit corridor; and,
- Promote a well-designed, compact built form by restricting auto-related uses, establishing maximum setbacks from the streetline, as well as establishing minimum and maximum building heights with appropriate stepbacks and transitions from adjacent lower density residential uses, among other provisions, to create a pedestrian focus.

2.0 Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP)

Report PED16100(a) provides detailed UHOP evaluation as it relates to the creation of the TOC1, TOC2 and TOC3 Zones.

2.1 Land Use Designations and Policies (Volume 1)

Only the policies of Volume 1 apply to the lands located between Jefferson Avenue and Reid Avenue. The following land use designations are implemented by the specific zones noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation (Urban Hamilton Official Plan)</th>
<th>Proposed Zone (Zoning By-law No. 05-200)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule “E-1” of Volume 1 (for lands located outside of the Secondary Plan area – Jefferson Avenue to Reid Avenue)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use – Medium Density Designation</td>
<td>Mixed Use(TOC1) Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Proposed Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan (Volume 2)

Certain lands within the TOC Zones Extension project area are subject to the proposed Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan. The policies of the Secondary Plan are described in Report PED18007/PW18005. The following land use designations within the Secondary Plan are implemented by the specific zones noted below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation (Urban Hamilton Official Plan)</th>
<th>Designation (Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan)</th>
<th>Proposed Zone (Zoning By-law No. 05-200)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule “E-1” of Volume 1</td>
<td>Map B.6.7-1 of Volume 2 (for lands located just east of Pottruff Road to Irene Avenue)</td>
<td>Multiple Residential (TOC3) Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhoods Designation</td>
<td>Medium Density Residential 2 Designation</td>
<td>Multiple Residential (TOC3) Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhoods Designation</td>
<td>Local Commercial Designation</td>
<td>Local Commercial (TOC2) Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use – Medium Density Designation</td>
<td>Mixed Use – Medium Density Designation</td>
<td>Mixed Use(TOC1) Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use – High Density Designation</td>
<td>Mixed Use – High Density Designation</td>
<td>Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use High Density (TOC4) Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2.1 Medium Density Residential 2 Designation

The TOC Zones Extension project area contains existing residential areas which are included in the TOC Zones instead of the future Residential Zones because these lands are in close proximity to the LRT extension and thereby result in redevelopment potential. The Multiple Residential (TOC3) Zone implements the Medium Density Residential 2 designation on Map B.6.7-1. These lands include 505-537 Queenston Road; a cluster of single detached dwellings that have existed for a number of years. A number of these properties have been converted to offices on the ground floor and will accordingly contain a Special Exception to recognize the existing uses in accordance with Site Specific Policy Area E on Map B.6.7-4 of the proposed Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan.

Lands located within the Medium Density Residential 3 and High Density Residential 1 designations on Map B.6.7-1 have not been included within the TOC Zone Phase 2 project and will be zoned through the future Residential Zoning project.
2.2.2 Local Commercial Designation

The Local Commercial (TOC2) Zone applies to lands designated Local Commercial on Map B.6.7-1. The zone allows for a range of commercial uses to provide for the daily and weekly needs of the neighbourhood. Residential permissions are also included in the TOC2 Zone; however, they have been restricted to maintain the planned retail and service commercial function set out in the Neighbourhoods Designation of Volume 1 and the Local Commercial Designation of Volume 2. The TOC2 Zone, which was approved in October, 2016 throughout the LRT Corridor will specifically be applied to 561 and 565 Queenston Road.

2.2.3 Mixed Use – Medium Density Designation

A portion of lands within the TOC Zone Extension project area is designated as Mixed Use – Medium Density on Map B.6.7-1 of the proposed Secondary Plan. The Mixed Use (TOC1) Zone will be applied to these lands to implement the Mixed Use – Medium Density policies.

2.2.4 Mixed Use – High Density Designation

A portion of lands along the LRT extension are designated as Mixed Use – High Density under the Urban Land Use Designations - Schedule E-1 (Volume 1) and under Map B.6.7-1 of the proposed Secondary Plan (Volume 2). Furthermore, these lands are identified as locating within the Eastgate Sub-Regional Service Node. The policies of this designation allow for a diverse development of the City’s nodes and corridors. A range of permitted uses, including service commercial, entertainment, retail, restaurants, office, and high density residential uses, and a variety of design standards, provide for a pedestrian oriented, mixed use area. The intent is for Mixed Use – High Density areas to appeal to a broad regional market and serve residents across the City and the surrounding area, as well as to provide day-to-day retail facilities and services to residents in the immediate area.

The proposed Secondary Plan identifies the majority of the lands designated Mixed Use – High Density along Queenston Road as being within a “Pedestrian Focus” Street. Accordingly the “Pedestrian Focus” policies of E.4.3 (Volume 1) and B.6.7.7.5 (Volume 2) have been integrated into the parent regulations of the proposed TOC4 Zone.

A Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use High Density (TOC4) Zone will be applied to lands designated Mixed Use – High Density in the UHOP. A full discussion can be found in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation Section of this Report.
2.3 Proposed Amendments

An amendment to Volume 3 of the UHOP is required to extend the Area Specific Policy “UH-6” (which was previously approved through the TOC Zones Phase 1) to Reid Avenue to prohibit drive-through facilities, gas bars, car washes and motor vehicle service stations and provide a special policy for drive-through facilities to be permitted if they can meet certain criteria.

The proposed amendments are consistent with the PPS, 2014, conform to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2017 and align the policies of the UHOP with the implementation of the LRT system. The proposed TOC Zones Extension implements the land use policies for each of the designations in Volumes 1 and 2.

A separate Amendment for the lands within the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan is included in Report PED18007.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION

The proposed regulations were circulated for review and comment to the following internal Divisions within the Planning and Economic Development Department:

- Building Engineering and Zoning Section, Building Division;
- Development Planning, Heritage and Design Section, Planning Division;
- Community Planning Section, Planning Division; and,
- Light Rail Transit Section, Light Rail Transit Division.

Individual letters were mailed out to property owners with lands in the TOC Zone Extension project area between September 15 and 27, 2017 advising them of the proposed changes. In addition, a Notice of Public Meeting was included in the December 15, 2017 edition of the Hamilton Spectator.

1.0 Property Owner Concern about Proposed Zoning

A primary concern received from property owners was the desire for applicable zoning to maintain existing permitted uses and existing built form regulations.

Staff are proposing to maintain the majority of existing permitted uses, introduce additional supporting uses, and eliminate certain uses that conflict with the proposed LRT system and the pedestrian focus of the area. Staff are not proposing to maintain the existing built form regulations because they were approved under a policy framework that is no longer applicable, does not achieve a mixture of uses or an appropriate density for a Sub-Regional Service Node, and does not achieve the principles of the Pedestrian Focus area (UHOP Volume 1), Transit Oriented
Development (TOD) Guidelines, or the Citywide Corridor Planning Principles and Design Guidelines.

Staff recognize the changing retail landscape and are proposing additional regulations to assist in the transition of larger commercial sites from low density single use sites to medium and high density mixed use sites. These proposed measures include permitting:

- Expansions of existing buildings up to 10% of the existing Gross Floor Area without conforming to the applicable regulations;

- New small-scale single use buildings under 650 square metres in GFA to be established without conforming to maximum setback or minimum building height regulations; and,

- Minor redevelopment (including demolitions and rebuilding, additions to existing buildings, and new construction) of the existing sites without triggering the requirement a mixed use component.

ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

1.1 Amendment to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan

An amendment to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan is required to extend Area Specific Policy UH-6 in Chapter B – Urban Area Specific Policies in Volume 3 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan by extending the lands from Jefferson Avenue to Reid Avenue South.

The purpose of the amendment is to include additional lands along the extension of the LRT into the Area Specific Policy UH-6 to prohibit those commercial uses that are not conducive to creating an attractive, safe, transit supportive and active pedestrian environment. Such prohibited uses include drive-through facilities, gas bars, car washes and vehicular service stations. These prohibited uses cater to motor vehicles that may impact pedestrian and cyclist safety, and do not create an animated and consistent streetscape and built edge. Furthermore, these uses generally do not contribute in a built form that creates an inviting and active pedestrian environment.

1.2 Application of Existing TOC Zones to the Extended Project Area

The three TOC Zones that were approved in October, 2016 will be applied to portions of the Queenston Road Corridor between Jefferson Avenue and Irene Avenue:
Mixed Use (TOC1) Zone;

Local Commercial (TOC2) Zone; and,

Multiple Residential (TOC3) Zone.

The purpose and intent of these zones is discussed fully in Report PED16100(a).

The TOC1 Zone will apply to properties designated Mixed Use – Medium Density on Schedule E-1 in Volume 1 and Map B.6.7-1 of Volume 2. The areas comprise the following:

- Outside the Secondary Plan includes properties located on Queenston Road between Jefferson Avenue and Reid Avenue; and,

- Inside the Secondary Plan area includes 558 Queenston Road, 600, 623-651 Queenston Road, Part of 686 Queenston Road, 711-771 Queenston Road, 816-822 Queenston Road, and 100 Centennial Parkway South.

The TOC2 Zone will only apply to those properties designated Neighbourhoods on Schedule E-1 in Volume 1 and Local Commercial on Map B.6.7-1 of Volume 2. These properties include 561 and 565 Queenston Road.

The TOC3 Zone will only apply to those properties designated Neighbourhoods on Schedule E-1 in Volume 1 and Medium Density Residential 2 on Map B.6.7-1 of Volume 2. These properties include 505-537 Queenston Road.

1.3 Addition of Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use High Density (TOC4) Zone

Staff are also proposing an additional TOC zone: the Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use High Density (TOC4) Zone.

The purpose of the proposed TOC4 Zone is to implement the Mixed Use – High Density designation on Schedule E-1 of Volume 1 and Map B.6.7-1 of Volume 2. The proposed TOC4 Zone applies to the majority of the lands in proximity to Eastgate Square (including Eastgate Square).

The TOC4 Zone allows for the development of a mixed use area that encourages an active, pedestrian oriented ground floor, and provides the opportunity for additional residential density. This flexibility will allow uses to be established more organically and allow the market to determine the best locations for stand-alone uses and mixed use buildings. To create a consistent street wall and additional density, the proposed TOC4 Zone requires that new development is built at a minimum building height of 11.0 m.
(three storeys) and allows for a maximum building height of 40.0 m (12 storeys). All lands proposed to be zoned TOC4 are identified as “Pedestrian Focus” in the UHOP; accordingly, the TOC4 Zone will implement the “Pedestrian Focus” policies. Additional built form regulations and use restrictions in the pedestrian focus area include:

- prohibition of residential uses at grade;
- prohibition of automotive-related uses including drive through facilities, motor vehicle dealerships, gas bars, rental establishments, service stations, and washing establishments;
- maximum building setbacks of 3.0m from the street;
- Queenston Road orientation of buildings;
- minimum amenity area requirements;
- parking lot restrictions to the rear of properties; and,
- building height stepback requirements when abutting residential or institutional zones.

Additional regulations have also been included to allow for short term incremental change: individual commercial buildings can expand by 10% and are exempt from certain built form requirements, and small-scale infill development under 650 square metres in GFA (pad stores) is not required to conform to minimum height and maximum building setback from a street.

1.4 Special Exceptions

A comprehensive review of all existing and recently approved site specific exceptions within the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 6593 and the City of Stoney Creek Zoning By-law No. 3692-92 was undertaken. Additional Special Exceptions were established to address the “Pedestrian Focus” policies of the UHOP, and the Site Specific Policy Areas established by the proposed Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan. Special Exceptions were also developed for large sites over 2.5 hectares in area to address transitional policies in the proposed Secondary Plan; these sites include 670-706 Queenston Road (Canadian Tire site) and 75 Centennial Parkway North (Eastgate Square).

In total, 12 Special Exceptions are proposed and are included in Appendix “B” of Report PED18012.

1.5 Other Changes to the By-law

In addition to the inclusion of the new TOC4 Zone provisions, amendments are required to the General Provisions and Parking Regulations to ensure that the TOC4 Zone nomenclature is properly referenced in all sections of the By-law.
2.0 Amendments and Revision to the Existing TOC1, TOC2 and TOC3 Zones

Since the approval of the initial TOC Zones, regulations and two additional uses have been included in the Commercial and Mixed Use (CMU) Zoning By-law which should also be included in the existing TOC Zones. These changes do not alter the intent of the TOC Zones but ensure consistency between them. Further, there are some minor amendments to correct errors and to clarify language and structure of the Zones.

2.1 Changes to TOC Zones Title

The Commercial and Mixed Use (CMU) Zones implemented the urban land use designations within the UHOP. As these land use designations are also located along portions of the LRT corridor, staff propose to rename the existing TOC1, TOC2 and TOC3 Zones to differentiate and avoid confusion in the titles between the TOC Zones and the CMU Zones. The proposed housekeeping changes are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Name</th>
<th>Proposed Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use (TOC1) Zone</td>
<td>Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use Medium Density (TOC1) Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Commercial (TOC2) Zone</td>
<td>Transit Oriented Corridor Local Commercial (TOC2) Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Residential (TOC3) Zone</td>
<td>Transit Oriented Corridor Multiple Residential (TOC3) Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2 Expansion of Single Detached, Semi-Detached and Duplex Dwellings Legally Existing At the Date of the Passing of the By-Law in the TOC 1 and TOC3 Zones

There are several single detached, semi-detached and duplex dwellings that were legally established along the length of the LRT corridor prior to the TOC zoning. These uses are now legal non-conforming. The long term intent is that legal non-conforming uses cease and are replaced by uses that conform to UHOP and the Zoning By-law. However in the interim it is appropriate to permit limited building alterations / expansions to a maximum of 10% of the existing gross floor areas.

2.3 CommercialUses within the TOC3 Zone (Council Direction)

The existing Multiple Residential (TOC3) Zone was developed as part of the original TOC Zones project, and currently applies to lands along King Street East between Arthur Avenue South and Proctor Boulevard, between Garfield Avenue and Hilda Avenue (Ward 3), and certain properties in Westdale (Ward 1).
Subsection 11.3.1 of the existing TOC3 Zone currently states that “existing uses shall also be permitted within the existing building.” This permission is unclear and often interpreted to mean that existing specific uses are permitted to continue, but should they propose to change to a new commercial use, then that new use would not be permitted.

The intent of Subsection 11.3.1 is to allow commercial uses to continue to exist, and to allow new commercial uses to establish only where legally established commercial uses have previously been located. The intent of the zone is to encourage redevelopment of properties into stand-alone multiple residential buildings. Until redevelopment occurs, the existing commercial spaces will be recognized on portions of the corridor that previously had commercial uses.

It should be noted that if an existing building has legally established a residential use within a former commercial space (i.e. the conversion of a storefront to a residential unit), then it has lost its as-of-right commercial permissions and therefore only residential uses are permitted.

Staff propose to amend Subsection 11.3.1 to allow many of the commercial uses permitted within the Local Commercial (TOC2) Zone to be located within the existing legally established commercial buildings. This change will address Council’s motion as described in Section 3.0 of Historical Background Section. Staff note, however, that the Council Motion speaks to lands located between Barnesdale Avenue and Fairholt Road. As the existing TOC3 Zone also exists between Arthur Avenue South and Proctor Boulevard, between Garfield Avenue and Hilda Avenue, and on certain properties located in Westdale, staff propose to include these lands in the amendment as well.

2.4 Updated Permitted Uses and Regulations Resulting from the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones

Minor amendments are required to ensure consistency in the by-law, correct errors and provide clarity. These amendments include:

- Adding Communications Establishment, Dwelling Unit in conjunction with a Commercial Use and Performing Arts Theatre, and renaming “Studio” to “Artist Studio”;
- Adding the requirement for amenity areas for residential uses,
- Removing redundant regulations; and
- Restructuring the TOC Zone to reflect CMU Zones.
ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION

That City Council not adopt the OPA and Zoning By-law amendment. The existing UHOP policies will remain in effect and the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 6593 and the City of Stoney Creek Zoning By-law No. 3692-92 will remain in effect for the lands along the LRT Corridor.

ALIGNMENT TO THE 2016 – 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN

Community Engagement & Participation
Hamilton has an open, transparent and accessible approach to City government that engages with and empowers all citizens to be involved in their community.

Economic Prosperity and Growth
Hamilton has a prosperous and diverse local economy where people have opportunities to grow and develop.

Built Environment and Infrastructure
Hamilton is supported by state of the art infrastructure, transportation options, buildings and public spaces that create a dynamic City.

APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED

Appendix “A”: Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment
Appendix “B”: Zoning By-law Amendment
Draft Urban Hamilton Official Plan
Amendment No. XX

The following text, together with:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix “A”</th>
<th>Volume 3, Map 1 – Area Specific Policies Key Map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appendix “B”</td>
<td>Volume 3, Map H-12 – Area Specific Policies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

attached hereto, constitutes Official Plan Amendment XX to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.

1.0 **Purpose and Effect:**

The purpose of this amendment is to extend the approved Area Specific Policy UH-6 in Volume 3 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan to implement new Transit Oriented Corridor Zoning.

The effect of this amendment to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan is to prohibit certain uses that are not supportive of an LRT system.

2.0 **Location:**

The lands affected by this Amendment are located on Queenston Road between Jefferson Avenue and Reid Avenue.

3.0 **Basis:**

The basis for permitting this Amendment is as follows:

- The changes ensure the City’s planning documents:
  - support residential and commercial intensification;
  - do not impede the operation of the LRT system;
  - incorporate the appropriate built form and urban design regulations; and,
  - remove regulatory barriers for new investment and / or redevelopment opportunities in accordance with the City’s Open for Business mandate; and,

- The Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.
4.0 Text and Schedule / Map Changes:

4.1 Volume 3 - Special Policy Areas, Area Specific Policies and Site Specific Policies

4.1.1 Text

a) That Area Specific Policy UH-6 in Chapter B - Urban Area Specific Policies be amended by

i. deleting the title “Certain lands located on King Street between Victoria Street and the Delta and Queenston Road between the Delta and just west of Parkdale Avenue” and replacing it with “Certain lands located on King Street East between Victoria Avenue and the Delta, Main Street East between the Delta and the Queenston Traffic Circle, and Queenston Road between the Queenston Traffic Circle and Reid Avenue South”; and,

ii. deleting the text “certain lands located on King Street between Victoria Street and the Delta and Queenston Road between the Delta and just west of Parkdale Avenue, shown as Area Specific UH-6 on Maps H-9 to H-11” and replacing it with “Lands located on King Street East between Victoria Avenue and the Delta, Main Street East between the Delta and the Queenston Traffic Circle, and Queenston Road between the Queenston Traffic Circle and Reid Avenue South, shown as Area Specific UH-6 on Maps H-9 to H-12”;

so that the Policy reads as follows:

“UH-6 Lands located on King Street East between Victoria Avenue and the Delta, Main Street East between the Delta and the Queenston Traffic Circle, and Queenston Road between the Queenston Traffic Circle and Reid Avenue South

1.0 The following policies shall apply to lands located on King Street East between Victoria Avenue and the Delta, Main Street East between the Delta and the Queenston Traffic Circle, and Queenston Road between the Queenston Traffic Circle and Reid Avenue South, shown as Area Specific “UH-6” on Maps H-9 to H-12:”
4.1.2 Volume 3 Maps

a) That Map 1 - Area Specific Policies Key Map be amended by identifying Area Specific Policy “UH-6”, as shown on Appendix “A” of this amendment.

b) That new Area Specific Policies Map H-12 be added to Chapter C - Urban Area Specific Policies, as shown on Appendix “B” of this amendment.

5.0 Implementation:

An implementing Zoning By-law Amendment will give effect to this Amendment.

This is Schedule “1” to By-law No. 18-XXX passed on the XX day of XXX, 2018.

The
City of Hamilton

__________________________  ____________________________
Fred Eisenberger           Rose Caterini
MAYOR                    CITY CLERK
CITY OF HAMILTON
BY-LAW NO. 18-___

To Amend Zoning By-law No. 05-200
To Extend New Transit Oriented Corridor Zones between Jefferson Avenue (Hamilton)
and Irene Avenue (Stoney Creek), Create One New Transit Oriented Corridor Zone,
and Amend Existing Transit Oriented Corridor Zones

WHEREAS the City of Hamilton has in force several Zoning By-laws which apply to
different areas incorporated into the City by virtue of the City of Hamilton Act, 1999,
S.O. 1999, Chap. 14;

WHEREAS the City of Hamilton is the lawful successor to the former Municipalities
identified in Section 1.7 of By-law No. 05-200;

WHEREAS the first stage of the new Zoning By-law, being By-law No. 05-200, came
into force on the 25th day of May, 2005;

WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton, in adopting Item XX of Report
PED18012 of the Planning Committee, at its meeting held on the 16th day of January,
2018, recommended that Zoning By-law No. 05-200 be amended as hereinafter
provided; and,

WHEREAS this By-law is in conformity with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, upon
approval of Official Plan Amendment No. XX.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:

1. That SECTION 2: INTERPRETATION of By-law No. 05-200 is hereby amended
   as follows:
To Amend Zoning By-law No. 05-200
To Extend New Transit Oriented Corridor Zones between Jefferson Avenue (Hamilton) and Irene Avenue (Stoney Creek), Create One New Transit Oriented Corridor Zone, and Amend Existing Transit Oriented Corridor Zones

1.1. That Section 2.1.g) be deleted and replaced as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&quot;g) Transit Oriented Corridor Zones</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use Medium Density</td>
<td>TOC1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Oriented Corridor Local Commercial</td>
<td>TOC2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Oriented Corridor Multiple Residential</td>
<td>TOC3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use High Density</td>
<td>TOC4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. That SECTION 4: GENERAL PROVISIONS of By-law No. 05-200 is hereby amended as follows:

2.1. That Subsection 4.12 VACUUM CLAUSE be amended by deleting Subsection e) and replacing it with the following new clauses:

"e) Transit Oriented Corridor Zones

i) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this By-law, any lot within the Transit Oriented Corridor Zones of this By-law, and the location thereon of any building or structure, existing on the effective date of this By-law, shall be deemed to comply with the regulations for any required setbacks, front yard, flankage yard, rear yard, lot width, lot area, and building height and are permitted by this By-law.

ii) In addition to Subsection i), and notwithstanding Subsections 11.4.3 a) i), 11.4.3 d) i), and 11.4.3 g) ii) and iii), within the lands zoned Corridor Mixed Use High Density (TOC4) Zone, an addition or alteration to an existing commercial building, to a maximum of 10% of the existing Gross Floor Area existing on the date of the passing of the By-law, shall be permitted."

2.2. That Subsection 4.18 c) TEMPORARY USES be amended by deleting the word "or" after TOC2, and by adding the words “or TOC4” after the word TOC3, so that it reads as follows:

“Temporary retailing in a Downtown D1, D2, D3 or D4 Zone or in a Transit Oriented Corridor TOC1, TOC2, TOC3, or TOC4 Zone, or in a Commercial and Mixed use C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, C5a, C6, and C7 Zone in accordance with the following provisions:”
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3. That SECTION 5: PARKING REGULATIONS of By-law No. 05-200 is hereby amended as follows:

3.1. That Subsection 5.6 h) be amended by deleting the word “and” after the word (TOC2), and by adding the words “and (TOC4)” after the word “(TOC3)”, so that it reads as follows:

“Notwithstanding Subsection e), for any use, except a Medical Clinic, within a Transit Oriented Corridor (TOC1), (TOC2), (TOC3) and (TOC4) Zone located in all or part of a building existing on the effective date of this By-law, no parking spaces are required, provided that the number of parking spaces which existed on the effective date of this By-law shall continue to be provided and maintained except a use shall not be required to provide additional parking beyond that which is required by Subsection 5.6.e) of this By-law. Where an addition, alteration or expansion of an existing building is proposed, the parking requirements of Subsection 5.6.e) shall only apply to the increased gross floor area of the building.”

3.2. That Subsection 5.7 e) be amended by deleting the word “and” after the word (TOC2), and by adding the words “and (TOC4)” after the word “(TOC3)”, so that it reads as follows:

“Notwithstanding Subsection b) and in addition to Subsection c), in the Transit Oriented Corridor (TOC1), (TOC2), (TOC3), and (TOC4) Zones, long-term bicycle parking shall be provided in the minimum quantity specified in accordance with the following requirements.”

3.3. That Subsection 5.7 f) be amended by deleting the word “above” after the words “Section c) and e), deleting the word “a” after the word “within” and before the word “the”, and by deleting the words “(TOC1), (TOC2) and (TOC3) before the word “Zones” so that it reads as follows:

“Notwithstanding Subsections c) and e), for any use within the Transit Oriented Corridor Zones or the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, located in all or part of a building existing on the effective date of this By-law, no bicycle parking spaces are required, provided that the number of bicycle parking spaces which existed on the effective date of this By-law shall continue to be provided and maintained except a use shall not be required to provide additional bicycle parking beyond that which is required by Subsection c) and e) of this By-law. Where an addition, alteration or expansion of an existing building is proposed, the bicycle parking requirements of Subsections c) and e) shall only apply to the increased gross floor area of the building.”

4. That SECTION 11: TRANSIT ORIENTED CORRIDOR ZONES be amended by:
4.1. That the title of SECTION 11.1 be amended by deleting “11.1 MIXED USE (TOC1) ZONE” and replacing it with “11.1 TRANSIT ORIENTED CORRIDOR MIXED USE MEDIUM DENSITY (TOC1) ZONE”;

4.2. That Subsection 11.1.1 be amended by deleting the word “Studio” and replacing it with “Artist Studio”;

4.3. That Subsection 11.1.1 be amended by adding the following new permitted uses:

“Communications Establishment
Performing Arts Theatre”

4.4. That Subsection 11.1 be amended by adding the following new Subsection:

“11.1.1.1 RESTRICTED USES
In addition to Subsection 11.1.1, the following use shall be permitted in accordance with the following restrictions:

i) Restriction of Uses within a building:

1. The finished floor elevation of any dwelling unit shall be a minimum of 0.9 metres above grade; and,

2. Notwithstanding Subsection 11.1.1.1 i) 1., a minimum of one dwelling unit shall be permitted in a basement or cellar.

ii) Residential Care Facility:

1. Maximum Capacity for Residential Care Facility is 20 residents.

iii) Emergency Shelter:

1. Maximum Capacity for Emergency Shelter is 50 residents.

iv) Emergency Shelter and Residential Care Facility:

1. Except as provided for in Subsection 2, every Emergency Shelter and Residential Care Facility shall be situated on a lot having a minimum radial separation distance of 300
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metres from any lot line of such lot measured to the lot line of any other lot occupied by a Residential Care Facility, Emergency Shelter, Corrections Residence, or Correctional Facility.

2. Where the radial separation distance from the lot line of an Emergency Shelter or Residential Care Facility existing as of the effective date of this By-law is less than 300 metres to the lot line of any other lot occupied by an existing Residential Care Facility, Emergency Shelter, Corrections Residence, or Correctional Facility, either of the existing Residential Care Facility or Emergency Shelter may be expanded or redeveloped to accommodate not more than the permitted number of residents permitted by the Zone in which it is located."

4.5. That Subsection 11.1.3 a) iii) be amended by deleting the word “maximum” between the words “a” and “setback” and replacing it with “minimum”;

4.6. That Subsection 11.1.3 a) v) be deleted;

4.7. That Subsection 11.1.3 c) i) be amended by adding the words “or lot containing a residential use” after the words “Institutional Zone”;

4.8. That Subsection 11.1.3 c) ii) be deleted;

4.9. That Subsection 11.1.3 d) be amended by adding the following new subsection:

“iv) In addition to the definition of Building Height, any wholly enclosed or partially enclosed amenity area, or any portion of a building designed to provide access to a rooftop amenity area shall be permitted to project above the uppermost point of the building, subject to the following regulations:

A. The total floor area of the wholly enclosed or partially enclosed structure
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belonging to an amenity area, or portion of a building designed to provide access to a rooftop amenity area shall not exceed 10% of the floor area of the storey directly beneath;

B. The wholly enclosed or partially enclosed amenity area, or portion of a building designed to provide access to a rooftop amenity area shall be setback a minimum of 3.0 metres from the exterior walls of the storey directly beneath; and,

C. The wholly enclosed or partially enclosed amenity area, or portion of a building designed to provide access to a rooftop amenity area shall not be greater than 3.0 metres in vertical distance from the uppermost point of the building to the uppermost point of the rooftop enclosure."

4.10. That Subsection 11.1.3 g) ii) and iii) be deleted and replaced with the following regulations:

"ii) For an interior lot or a through lot the minimum width of the ground floor façade facing the front lot line shall be greater than or equal to 75% of the measurement of the front lot line.

iii) For a corner lot the minimum combined width of the ground floor façade facing the front lot line and flankage lot line shall be greater than or equal to 50% of the measurement of all lot lines abutting the street."

4.11. That Subsection 11.1.3 g) be amended by adding the following new regulation:

"iv) In addition to Subsection 11.1.3 g) ii) and iii), the minimum width of the ground floor façade facing the front and flankage lot lines shall exclude access driveways and any required yards within a lot line abutting a street."

4.12. That Subsections 11.1.3 g) iv), v), vi) and vii) be renumbered to 11.1.3 g) v), vi), vii) and viii) respectively.
4.13. That Subsection 11.1.3 g) be amended by adding the following new regulation:

"ix) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.1.3, for properties designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, any alternative building design or building materials approved through the issuance of a Heritage Permit shall be deemed to comply with this Subsection."

4.14. That Subsection 11.1.3 h) be deleted and replaced with the following new regulations:

"h) Minimum Amenity Area for Dwelling Units and Multiple Dwellings

On a lot containing more than 10 dwelling units, the following Minimum Amenity Area requirements shall be provided:

i) An area of 4.0 square metres for each dwelling unit less than 50 square metres;

ii) An area of 6.0 square metres for each dwelling unit more than 50 square metres;

iii) In addition to the definition of Amenity Area, an Amenity Area located outdoors shall be unobstructed and shall be at or above the surface, and exposed to light and air and may include balconies and patios; and,

iv) In addition to the definition of Amenity Area, the required Amenity Area shall be provided exclusively for the residential component and shall be functionally separated from public areas associated with any commercial component."

4.15. That Subsections 11.1.3 k), l) and m) be deleted.

4.16. That SECTION 11.1 be amended by adding the following new subsection as Section 11.1.4 as follows:
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“11.1.4 SINGLE DETACHED, SEMI-DETACHED AND DUPLEX DWELLINGS EXISTING AT THE DATE OF THE PASSING OF THE BY-LAW (January, 2018-specific day to be included) In addition to Subsection 4.12 f) and in accordance with subsection 34(10) of the Planning Act, R.S.O.,1990, c.P.13, an addition or alteration to a single detached or duplex dwelling not permitted by the by-law but existing at the date of the passing of the by-law that increases the volume or size of the interior of the building shall be permitted as follows:

i) The increase shall not exceed a maximum of 10% of the Gross Floor Area of the building existing at the date of the passing of the by-law;

ii) Subsection 11.1.3 d) i) shall not apply; and,

iii) The existing side yard setbacks are maintained for the addition.”

4.17. That Subsections 11.1.4 Parking, 11.1.5 Accessory Buildings, 11.1.6 Urban Farmers Market, and 11.1.7 Regulations for Community Gardens and Urban Farms as Accessory Uses be renumbered to 11.1.5 Parking, 11.1.6 Accessory Buildings, 11.1.7 Urban Farmers Market, and 11.1.8 Regulations for Community Gardens and Urban Farms as Accessory Uses;

4.18. That the title of SECTION 11.2 be amended by deleting “11.2 LOCAL COMMERCIAL (TOC2) ZONE” and replacing it with “11.2 TRANSIT ORIENTED CORRIDOR LOCAL COMMERCIAL (TOC2) ZONE”;

4.19. That Subsection 11.2.1 be amended by adding the following new permitted uses in alphabetical order to the existing permitted uses:

“Artist Studio
Communications Establishment
Dwelling Unit in Conjunction with a Commercial Use
Performing Arts Theatre”

4.20. That Subsection 11.2.1 be amended by deleting the following permitted uses:

“Dwelling Unit(s)
Multiple Dwelling Studio”
4.21. That Subsection 11.2 be amended by adding the following new Subsection:

“11.2.1.1 RESTRICTED USES

In addition to Subsection 11.2.1, the following use shall be permitted in accordance with the following restrictions:

i) Uses Permitted Above the Ground Floor:

1. Notwithstanding Subsection 11.2.1, a Dwelling Unit(s) in Conjunction with a Commercial Use shall only be permitted above the ground floor.”

4.22. That Subsection 11.2.3 h) be deleted.

4.23. That Subsections 11.2.3 i) and j) be renumbered to Subsections 11.2.3 h) and i) respectively.

4.24. That the title of SECTION 11.3 be amended by deleting “11.3 MULTIPLE RESIDENTIAL (TOC3) ZONE” and replacing it with “11.3 TRANSIT ORIENTED CORRIDOR MULTIPLE RESIDENTIAL (TOC3) ZONE”;

4.25. That Subsection 11.3.1 be amended by:

i) deleting the phrase “Existing uses shall also be permitted within the existing building”; and,

ii) adding the following commercial uses in alphabetical order to the existing permitted uses:

“Artist Studio
Catering Service
Commercial School
Communications Establishment
Craftsperson Shop
Day Nursery
Financial Establishment
Office
Performing Arts Theatre
Personal Services
Repair Service
Restaurant
Retail
Tradesperson’s Shop”
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4.26. That Subsection 11.3 be amended by adding the following new Subsection

“11.3.1.1  RESTRICTED USES

In addition to Subsection 11.3.1, the following use shall be permitted in accordance with the following restrictions:

i) Restriction of Uses within a building:

1. The finished floor elevation of any dwelling unit shall be a minimum of 0.9 metres above grade; and,

2. Notwithstanding Subsection 11.3.1.1 i) 1., a minimum of one dwelling unit shall be permitted in a basement or cellar.

ii) Residential Care Facility and Emergency Shelter:

1. Maximum Capacity for Residential Care Facility is 20 residents.

iv) Emergency Shelter and Residential Care Facility:

1. Except as provided for in Subsection 2, every Emergency Shelter and Residential Care Facility shall be situated on a lot having a minimum radial separation distance of 300 metres from any lot line of such lot measured to the lot line of any other lot occupied by a Residential Care Facility, Emergency Shelter, Corrections Residence, or Correctional Facility.

2. Where the radial separation distance from the lot line of an Emergency Shelter or Residential Care Facility existing as of the effective date of this By-law is less than 300 metres to the lot line of any other lot occupied by an existing Residential Care Facility, Emergency Shelter, Corrections Residence, or Correctional Facility, either of the existing Residential Care
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Facility or Emergency Shelter may be expanded or redeveloped to accommodate not more than the permitted number of residents permitted by the Zone in which it is located."

4.27. That Subsection 11.3.2 a) iii) be amended by deleting the word “maximum” between the words “a” and “setback” and replacing it with “minimum”;

4.28. That Subsection 11.3.3 c) ii) be amended by renumbering it to 11.3.3 c) iii) and deleting the word “maximum” between the words “a” and “setback” and replacing it with “minimum” so that it reads as follows:

“iii) Notwithstanding ii), minimum 6.0 metres for that portion of a building providing an access driveway to a garage.”

4.29. That Subsection 11.3.2 e) be amended by deleting the words “with the exception of TOC3 Zone” after “Institutional Zone” and before “to a maximum of 22.0 metres” and by adding the following new subsection:

“iv) In addition to the definition of Building Height, any wholly enclosed or partially enclosed amenity area, or any portion of a building designed to provide access to a rooftop amenity area shall be permitted to project above the uppermost point of the building, subject to the following regulations:

A. The total floor area of the wholly enclosed or partially enclosed structure belonging to an amenity area, or portion of a building designed to provide access to a rooftop amenity area shall not exceed 10% of the floor area of the storey directly beneath;

B. The wholly enclosed or partially enclosed amenity area, or portion of a building designed to provide access to a rooftop amenity area shall be setback a minimum of 3.0 metres from the exterior walls of the storey directly beneath; and,

C. The wholly enclosed or partially enclosed amenity area, or portion of a building designed to provide access to a rooftop amenity area shall not be greater than 3.0 metres in vertical distance from the uppermost point of the building to the uppermost point of the rooftop enclosure.”

4.30. That Subsection 11.3.2 f) ii) and iii) be deleted and replaced with the following regulations:
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"ii) For an interior lot or a through lot the minimum width of the ground floor façade facing the front lot line shall be greater than or equal to 50% of the measurement of the front lot line.

iii) For a corner lot the minimum combined width of the ground floor façade facing the front lot line and flankage lot line shall be greater than or equal to 30% of the measurement of all lot lines abutting the street."

4.31. That Subsection 11.3.2 f) be amended by adding the following new regulation:

"iv) In addition to Subsection 11.3.2 f) ii) and iii), the minimum width of the ground floor façade facing the front and flankage lot lines shall exclude access driveways and any required yards within a lot line abutting a street."

4.32. That Subsections 11.3.2 f) iv), v) and vi) be renumbered to 11.3.2 f) v), vi) and vii) respectively.

4.33. That Subsection 11.3.2 h) be deleted and replaced with the following new regulations:

"h) Minimum Amenity Area for Dwelling Units and Multiple Dwellings

On a lot containing more than 10 dwelling units, the following Minimum Amenity Area requirements shall be provided:

i) An area of 4.0 square metres for each dwelling unit less than 50 square metres;

ii) An area of 6.0 square metres for each dwelling unit more than 50 square metres;

iii) In addition to the definition of Amenity Area, an Amenity Area located outdoors shall be unobstructed and shall be at or above the surface, and exposed to light and air and may include balconies and patios; and,

iv) In addition to the definition of Amenity Area, the required Amenity Area shall be provided exclusively for the residential component and shall be functionally separated from public areas associated with any commercial component."
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4.34. That Subsections 11.3.2 j) and k) be deleted.

4.35. That SECTION 11.3 MULTIPLE RESIDENTIAL (TOC3) ZONE be amended by adding the following new subsections as SECTIONS 11.3.4 and 11.3.5 and renumbering the subsequent Subsections:

**“11.3.4** SINGLE DETACHED, SEMI-DETACHED AND DUPLEX DWELLINGS EXISTING AT THE DATE OF THE PASSING OF THE BY-LAW (January, 2018-specific day to be included)

In addition to Subsection 4.12 f), an addition or alteration to a single detached or duplex dwelling not permitted by the by-law but existing at the date of the passing of the by-law that increases the volume or size of the interior of the building shall be permitted as follows:

i) The increase shall not exceed a maximum of 10% of the Gross Floor Area of the building existing at the date of the passing of the by-law;

ii) Subsection 11.3.3 e) i) shall not apply; and,

iii) The existing side yard setbacks are maintained for the addition.

**11.3.5** COMMERCIAL USES IN COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS EXISTING AT THE DATE OF THE PASSING OF THE BY-LAW (January, 2018-specific day to be included)

Commercial uses that were legally established within buildings existing at the date of the passing of the by-law may convert to any commercial use permitted in Subsection 11.3.1.”

4.36 That SECTION 11: TRANSIT ORIENTED CORRIDOR ZONES is amended by including the following new subsections:
To Amend Zoning By-law No. 05-200
To Extend New Transit Oriented Corridor Zones between Jefferson Avenue (Hamilton) and Irene Avenue (Stoney Creek), Create One New Transit Oriented Corridor Zone, and Amend Existing Transit Oriented Corridor Zones

"11.4 TRANSIT ORIENTED CORRIDOR MIXED USE HIGH DENSITY (TOC4) ZONE"

**Explanatory Note:** The TOC4 Zone is applied within the Centennial Sub-Regional Service Node, along the major arterial road that functions as a higher order transit corridor. The Zone provides for a mixture of service commercial and retail uses intended to serve a regional market and the day-to-day needs of residents in the immediate area. The intent of the built form requirements is to create a people place through the design and physical arrangement of service commercial, retail and high density residential uses to facilitate the function of the area as a major transit hub.

No person shall erect, or use any building in whole or in part, or use any land in whole or in part, within a Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use High Density (TOC4) Zone for any purpose other than one or more of the following uses, or uses accessory thereto. Such erection or use shall also comply with the prescribed regulations:

11.4.1 **PERMITTED USES**

- Artist Studio
- Beverage Making Establishment
- Catering Service
- Commercial Entertainment
- Commercial Recreation
- Commercial School
- Communications Establishment
- Craftsperson Shop
- Day Nursery
- Dwelling Unit(s) in conjunction with a Commercial Use
- Financial Establishment
- Hotel
- Laboratory
- Medical Clinic
- Microbrewery
- Office
- Performing Arts Theatre
- Personal Services
- Place of Assembly
- Place of Worship
- Repair Service
- Restaurant
- Retail
- Social Services Establishment
- Tradesperson’s Shop
- Urban Farmers Market
- Veterinary Service

11.4.1.1 **RESTRICTED USES**

i) In addition to Subsection 11.4.1, the following
use shall be permitted in accordance with the following restrictions:

1. Restriction of Uses within a Building

   A. Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.1, a Dwelling Unit(s) in conjunction with a Commercial Use shall only be permitted above the ground floor.

11.4.2 PROHIBITED USES

   i) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.1, the following uses are prohibited, even as an accessory use:

      Drive-Through Facility
      Motor Vehicle Dealership
      Motor Vehicle Gas Bar
      Motor Vehicle Rental Establishment
      Motor Vehicle Service Station
      Motor Vehicle Washing Establishment

   ii) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.1, the following use is prohibited, except if considered an accessory use to another permitted use:

      Garden Centre

11.4.3 REGULATIONS

   a) Building Setback from a Street Line

      i) Maximum 3.0 metres, except where a visibility triangle is required for a driveway access.

      ii) Notwithstanding Subsection i), a minimum setback of 6.0 metres for that portion of a building providing an access driveway to a garage.

      iii) Where a building(s) exists and complies with Subsection 11.4.3 g) ii) and iii), additional building(s) constructed on the lot shall not be subject to Subsection 11.4.3 a) i) and ii) as it relates to the setback from a lot line.
b) Minimum Rear Yard 7.5 metres.

c) Minimum Interior Side Yard 7.5 metres abutting a Residential Zone or Institutional Zone.

d) Building Height

i) Minimum 11.0 metres;

ii) Maximum 40.0 metres;

iii) In addition to Subsection 11.4.3 d) i) and notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 d) ii), any building height above 11.0 metres may be equivalently increased as the yard increases beyond the minimum yard requirement established in Subsection 11.4.3 b) and c) when abutting a Residential or Institutional Zone, to a maximum building height of 22.0 metres;

iv) Any portion of a building above 22.0 metres in height, to a maximum of 40.0 metres, shall be setback a minimum of 29.5 metres from the rear or interior side lot line when abutting a Residential or Institutional Zone;

v) In addition to the definition of Building Height, any wholly enclosed or partially enclosed amenity area, or any portion of a building designed to provide access to a rooftop amenity area shall be permitted to project above the uppermost point of the building, subject to the following regulations:

A. The total floor area of the wholly enclosed or partially enclosed structure belonging to an amenity area, or portion of a building designed to provide access to a rooftop amenity area shall not exceed 10% of the floor area of the storey directly beneath;

B. The wholly enclosed or partially enclosed amenity area, or portion of a building designed to provide access to a rooftop amenity area
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shall be setback a minimum of 3.0 metres from the exterior walls of the storey directly beneath; and,

C. The wholly enclosed or partially enclosed amenity area, or portion of a building designed to provide access to a rooftop amenity area shall not be greater than 3.0 metres in vertical distance from the uppermost point of the building to the uppermost point of the rooftop enclosure.

e) Maximum Gross Floor Area for Microbrewery

700.0 square metres.

f) Maximum Gross Floor Area for an Office Building

10,000.0 square metres.

g) Built Form for New Development

In the case of buildings constructed after the effective date of this by-law or additions to buildings existing as of the effective date of this by-law:

i) Rooftop mechanical equipment shall be located and/or screened from view of any abutting street.

ii) For an interior lot or a through lot, the minimum width of the ground floor façade facing the front lot line shall be greater than or equal to 75% of the measurement of the front lot line.

iii) For a corner lot, the minimum combined width of the ground floor façade facing the front lot line and flankage lot line shall be greater than or equal to 75% of the measurement of all lot lines abutting a street.

iv) In addition to Subsection 11.4.3 g) ii) and iii), the minimum width of the ground floor façade facing the front lot line shall exclude access driveways and required yards along a lot line abutting a street.
v) No parking, stacking lanes, or aisles shall be located between the required building façade and the front lot line or flankage lot line.

vi) A minimum of one principal entrance shall be provided:

1. within the ground floor façade that is setback closest to the street; and,

2. shall be accessible from the building façade with direct access from the public sidewalk.

vii) Notwithstanding the definition of planting strip, a sidewalk shall be permitted where required by Subsection vi).

viii) For commercial development existing at the time of passing of this by-law, Subsections 11.4.3 g) ii) and iii) shall not apply to new commercial buildings subject to the following:

1. The maximum Gross Floor Area of each building shall be 650 square metres; and,

2. Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 d) i), the minimum Building Height shall be 4.5 metres.

ix) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3, for properties designated under the Ontario Heritage Act, any alternative building design or building materials approved through the issuance of a Heritage Permit shall be deemed to comply with this Section.

x) The first storey shall have a minimum height of 3.6 metres and a maximum height of 4.5 metres.
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h) Minimum Amenity Area for Dwelling Units in Conjunction with a Commercial Use

On a lot containing more than 10 dwelling units, the following Minimum Amenity Area requirements shall be provided:

i) An area of 4.0 square metres for each dwelling unit less than 50 square metres;

ii) An area of 6.0 square metres for each dwelling unit more than 50 square metres;

iii) In addition to the definition of Amenity Area, an Amenity Area located outdoors shall be unobstructed and shall be at or above the surface, and exposed to light and air and may include balconies and patios; and,

iv) In addition to the definition of Amenity Area, the required Amenity Area shall be provided exclusively for the residential component and shall be functionally separated from public areas associated with any commercial component.

i) Planting Strip Requirements

Where a property lot line abuts a property lot line within a Residential Zone or an Institutional Zone and not a laneway, a minimum 1.5 metre wide Planting Strip shall be provided and maintained.

j) Visual Barrier

i) A visual barrier shall be required along any lot line abutting an Institutional Zone or Residential Zone in accordance with the requirements of Subsection 4.19 of this By-law.

ii) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 j) i), no visual barrier(s) shall be permitted between the building façade and the street.

k) Outdoor Storage

i) No outdoor storage of goods, materials, or equipment shall be permitted.

ii) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 k) i), the display of goods or materials for retail purposes accessory to a retail use shall only
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be permitted in a front yard or flankage yard.

11.4.4 PARKING In accordance with the requirements of Section 5 of this By-law.

11.4.5 ACCESSORY BUILDINGS

i) In accordance with the requirements of Subsection 4.8 of this By-law.

ii) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.5 i), accessory buildings and structures shall not be subject to 11.4.3 a).

11.4.6 URBAN FARMERS MARKET In accordance with the requirements of Subsection 4.28 of this By-law.

5. That Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps of By-law No. 05-200 is hereby amended by including the Transit Oriented Corridor Zone boundaries, as shown on the Maps numbered 1091, 1140-1143, 1193 and 1194, attached as Schedule “1” of this By-law.

6. That Schedule “C” – Special Exceptions of By-law No. 05-200 is hereby amended by adding additional Special Exceptions as follows:

“627. Within the lands zoned Transit Oriented Corridor Multiple Residential (TOC3) Zone, identified on Maps 1141 and 1142 of Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps, and described as 531 Queenston Road, the following special provisions shall apply:

a) In addition to Subsection 11.3.1, the following use shall also be permitted within the building existing on the date of passing of this By-law.

   Medical Clinic

b) Planting Strip A planting strip with an average width of 1.0 metre, but not less than 0.9 metres, shall be provided and maintained along the northerly lot line, commencing at the easterly lot line, westerly for a distance of at least 8.0 metres.

c) Visual Barrier Notwithstanding Subsection 4.19, a visual barrier not less than 1.2 metres in height and not more than 2.0 metres in height shall be provided and maintained along the entire northerly lot line.

628. Within the lands zoned Transit Oriented Corridor Multiple Residential (TOC3) Zone, identified on Maps 1141 and 1142 of Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps, and described as 535 and 537 Queenston Road, the following special provisions
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shall apply:

a) In addition to Subsection 11.3.1, the following uses shall also be permitted within the building existing on the date of passing of this By-law.

   Medical Clinic.

b) In addition to Clause a), the maximum Gross Floor Area of the use permitted in Clause a) shall be 65 square metres.

c) Notwithstanding Subsection 5.1.a) v) b), a 3.0 metre wide planting strip shall be required and permanently maintained between the street line and any parking spaces and aisles giving direct access to abutting parking spaces, excluding driveways extending directly from the street, only where an encroachment agreement has not been entered into with the City of Hamilton, for a minimum 3.0 m planting strip within the widened road allowance limits of Queenston Road.

d) Subsection 5.1.b) v) shall not apply for the existing building(s).

e) Subsection 5.1.b) ix) shall not apply for the existing building(s).

f) Visual Barrier

   i) Notwithstanding Subsection 4.19, a visual barrier not less than 1.2 metres in height and not more than 2.0 metres in height shall be provided and maintained along the entire northerly lot line for the lands located at 535 Queenston Road.

   ii) Notwithstanding Subsection 4.19, a visual barrier not less than 1.2 metres in height and not more than 2.0 metres in height shall be provided and maintained along the entire easterly and northerly lot lines for the lands located at 537 Queenston Road.

629. Within the lands zoned Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use Medium Density (TOC1) Zone, identified on Maps 1142, 1193, 1194 of Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps, and described as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Map Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>711 Queenston Road</td>
<td>Map 1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>714 Queenston Road</td>
<td>Map 1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>720 Queenston Road</td>
<td>Map 1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>724 Queenston Road</td>
<td>Map 1142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>727 Queenston Road</td>
<td>Map 1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732 Queenston Road</td>
<td>Map 1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>735 Queenston Road</td>
<td>Map 1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>736 Queenston Road</td>
<td>Map 1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744 Queenston Road</td>
<td>Map 1142 and Map 1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>750 Queenston Road</td>
<td>Map 1142 and Map 1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>754 Queenston Road</td>
<td>Map 1142 and Map 1193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>771 Queenston Road</td>
<td>Map 1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>816 Queenston Road</td>
<td>Map 1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>822 Queenston Road</td>
<td>Map 1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Clapham Road</td>
<td>Map 1142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following special provisions shall also apply:

a) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.1.1, only the following uses shall be permitted:

- Artist Studio
- Beverage Making Establishment
- Catering Service
- Commercial Entertainment
- Commercial Recreation
- Commercial School
- Communications Establishment
- Craftsperson Shop
- Day Nursery
- Dwelling Unit(s) in conjunction with a Commercial Use
- Financial Establishment
- Hotel
- Laboratory
- Medical Clinic
- Microbrewery
- Office
- Performing Arts Theatre
- Personal Service
- Place of Assembly
- Place of Worship
- Repair Service
- Restaurant
- Retail
- Social Services Establishment
- Tradesperson’s Shop
- Transportation Depot
- Urban Farmer’s Market
- Veterinary Service
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b) Notwithstanding Subsections 11.1.3 g),iii), and h), and in addition to Subsections 11.1.1, 11.1.3 d) and 11.1.3 g) ii) and iii) 2., the following regulations shall also apply:

i) Restricted Uses

In addition to Subsection 11.4.1, the following use shall be permitted in accordance with the following restrictions:

1. Restriction of Uses within a Building

A. Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.1, a Dwelling Unit(s) in conjunction with a Commercial Use shall only be permitted above the ground floor.

B. Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.1, a Day Nursery shall only be permitted above the ground floor.

i) Building Height

In addition to the definition of Building Height, any wholly enclosed or partially enclosed amenity area, or any portion of a building designed to provide access to a rooftop amenity area shall be permitted to project above the uppermost point of the building, subject to the following regulations:

A. The total floor area of the wholly enclosed or partially enclosed structure belonging to an amenity area, or portion of a building designed to provide access to a rooftop amenity area does not exceed 10% of the floor area of the storey directly beneath;

B. The wholly enclosed or partially enclosed amenity area, or portion of a building designed to provide access to a rooftop amenity area shall be setback a minimum of 3.0 metres from the exterior walls of the storey directly beneath; and,

C. The wholly enclosed or partially enclosed structure belonging to an amenity area, or
portion of a building designed to provide access to a rooftop amenity area shall not be greater than 3.0 metres in vertical distance from the uppermost point of the building to the uppermost point of the rooftop enclosure.

iii) Built Form for New Development

1. For a corner lot, the minimum combined width of the ground floor façade facing the front lot line and flankage lot line shall be greater than or equal to 75% of the measurement of the front lot line and flankage lot line; and,

2. In addition to Subsection 11.1.3 g) ii) and iii) 2., and in addition to Clause b) iii) 1., the minimum width of the ground floor façade facing the front lot line shall exclude access driveways and required yards along a lot line abutting a street.

iv) Minimum Amenity Area for Dwelling Units in conjunction with a Commercial Use

On a lot containing more than 10 dwelling units, the following Minimum Amenity Area requirements shall be provided:

1. An area of 4.0 square metres for each dwelling unit less than 50 square metres;

2. An area of 6.0 square metres for each dwelling unit more than 50 square metres;

3. In addition to the definition of Amenity Area, an Amenity Area located outdoors shall be unobstructed and shall be at or above the surface, and exposed to light and air; and,

4. In addition to the definition of Amenity Area, the required Amenity Area shall be provided exclusively for the residential component and shall be functionally separated from public areas associated with any commercial component.
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iii) Screening

Rooftop mechanical equipment shall be located and/or screened from view of any abutting street.

630. Within the lands zoned Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use High Density (TOC4) Zone, identified on Map 1142 of Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps, and described as part of 695 Queenston Road, the following special provision shall also apply:

   a) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 d) ii) and iv), the maximum Building Height shall be 22.0 metres.

631. Within the lands zoned Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use High Density (TOC4) Zone, identified on Maps 1142 and 1193 of Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps, and described as 7 & 9 Greenford Drive, 760 Queenston Road, and part of 770 Queenston Road, the following special provision shall also apply:

   a) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 d) ii) and iv), the maximum Building Height shall be 22.0 metres.

632. Within the lands zoned Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use High Density (TOC4) Zone, identified on Maps 1142, 1143, 1193 and 1194 of Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps, and described as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Address</th>
<th>Map Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of 770 Queenston Road</td>
<td>1142, 1143, 1193 &amp; 1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>792 Queenston Road</td>
<td>1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 Queenston Road</td>
<td>1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>817 Queenston Road</td>
<td>1143 &amp; 1194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following special provisions shall also apply:

   a) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 d) ii) and iv), and in addition to Subsection 11.4.3 d) i) and iii), the following regulations shall apply:

      i) Maximum Building Height shall be 47.0 metres; and,

      ii) Any portion of a building above 22.0 metres in height, to a maximum of 47.0 metres, shall be setback a minimum of 29.5 metres from the rear or interior side lot line when abutting a Residential or Institutional Zone.

633. Within the lands zoned Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use High Density (TOC4) Zone, identified on Maps 1142, 1143, and 1194 of Schedule “A” –
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Zoning Maps, and described as 75 Centennial Parkway North (Eastgate Square), shown as Figure 11 of Schedule “F” – Special Figures, the following special provisions shall also apply:

a) For the purposes of Special Exception No. 633, the following provisions shall apply to Area A as shown on Figure 11 of Schedule “F” – Special Figures:

A) In addition to Section 3, for the purpose of Special Exception No. 633, the following definition shall apply:

Block Townhouse Dwelling

Shall mean a dwelling divided vertically into three or more dwelling units, by common walls which prevent internal access between units and extend from the base of the foundation to the roof line and for a horizontal distance of not less than 35 percent of the horizontal depth of the building but shall not include a maisonette.

B) In addition to Subsection 11.4.1, the following uses shall also be permitted:

Dwelling Unit(s)
Multiple Dwelling
Street Townhouse Dwelling

C) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.1 and in addition to Subsection 11.4.2, a Block Townhouse Dwelling(s) shall not be permitted.

D) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.1.1, the residential uses contained in Subsection 11.4.1 and Clause A) shall be permitted on the ground floor.

E) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 d) the following Building Height shall apply:

i) Minimum 7.5 metres; and,

ii) Maximum 11.0 metres.

F) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 g) ii), iii), and iv), the following regulation applies:

i) For an interior lot or a through lot, the minimum width of the ground floor façade facing the streetline shall:
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1. Be greater than or equal to 40% of the measurement of the front lot line; and,

2. Comply with Subsection 11.4.3 a).

ii) For a corner lot or a lot where all lot lines are streetlines, the minimum combined width of the ground floor façade facing the front lot line and flankage lot line(s) shall:

1. Be greater than or equal to 50% of the measurement of the front lot line and flankage lot line; and,

2. Comply with Subsection 11.4.3 a).

b) For the purposes of Special Exception No. 633, the following provisions shall apply to Area B as shown on Figure 11 of Schedule “F” – Special Figures:

A) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 d) ii) and iv), and in addition to Subsection 11.4.3 d) i) and iii), the following regulations shall apply to new development:

i) Maximum building height shall be 62 metres; and,

ii) Any portion of a building above 22.0 metres in height, to a maximum of 62.0 metres, shall be setback a minimum of 89.5 metres from any lot line abutting a Residential or Institutional Zone.

B) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 d), a minimum height of 6.0 metres shall be permitted for any addition to the principal building existing on the date of the passing of this By-law.

C) In addition to Subsection 11.4.3, where the development or redevelopment occurs on the site, including demolitions with new buildings or additions, additions to existing buildings, or new buildings, which exceeds 50% of the total Gross Floor Area of the site existing on the date of passing of the By-law, being 61,525 square metres, the following regulation shall apply:

i) For each square metre of commercial or institutional use provided, 3.0 square metres of residential use shall be required.

634. Within the lands zoned Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use Medium Density (TOC1) Zone, identified on Map 1091 of Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps, and
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635. Within the lands zoned Transit Oriented Corridor Multiple Residential (TOC3) Zone, identified on Map 1141 of Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps, and described as 505 Queenston Road, the following special provisions apply:

a) In addition to Subsection 11.3.1, the following use shall also be permitted within the building existing on the date of passing of this By-law:

Office

b) In addition to Subsection 5.1 a) v), a minimum of 140 square metres of landscaped area shall be provided and maintained within the required front yard.

c) In addition to Clause a), a visual barrier shall be required along any lot line abutting an Institutional Zone or Residential Zone, with the exception of TOC3 Zone, in accordance with the requirements of Subsection 4.19 of this By-law.

636. Within the lands zoned Transit Oriented Corridor Multiple Residential (TOC3) Zone, identified on Map 1141 of Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps, and described as 509 Queenston Road, the following special provisions shall also apply:

a) In addition to Subsection 11.3.1, the following use shall also be permitted within the building existing on the date of passing of this By-law:

Denture Clinic

b) Notwithstanding Subsection 5.1 a) v), a 1.5 metre wide planting strip shall be required and permanently maintained between the street line and any parking spaces and aisles giving direct access to abutting parking spaces, excluding driveways extending directly from the street, only where an encroachment agreement has not been entered into with the City of Hamilton, for a minimum 1.5 metre planting strip within the widened road allowance limits of Queenston Road.

c) Subsection 5.1.b) iii) shall not apply for the existing building(s).

d) Subsection 5.1.b) ix) shall not apply for the existing building(s).
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e) Visual Barrier

i) Notwithstanding Subsection 4.19, a visual barrier not less than 1.2 metres and not more than 2.0 metres in height shall be required and maintained along the northerly lot line.

ii) Notwithstanding Subsection 4.19, a visual barrier not less than 1.2 metres and not more than 2.0 metres in height shall be required and maintained along the easterly lot line, commencing at the northerly lot line, southerly for a distance of at least 26.0 metres.

637. Within the lands zoned Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use High Density (TOC4) Zone, identified on Maps 1142 and 1193 of Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps, and described as 670, 674, 686, 692, 700 and 706 Queenston Road, shown as Figure 12 of Schedule “F” – Special Figures, the following special provisions shall also apply:

a) For the purposes of Special Exception No. 637, the following special regulations shall apply to Areas A and B, as shown on Figure 12 of Schedule “F” – Special Figures:

i) In addition to Subsection 11.4.3, where development or redevelopment occurs on the site, including demolitions with new buildings or additions, additions to existing buildings, or new buildings, which exceeds 50% of the total Gross Floor Area of the site existing on the date of passing of the By-law, being 17,403 square metres, the following regulation shall apply:

1) For each square metre of commercial or institutional use provided, 3.0 square metres of residential use shall be required.

ii) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 d) i), a minimum height of 6.0 metres shall be permitted for any addition to the principal building existing on the date of the passing of this By-law.

b) For the purposes of Special Exception No. 637, the following special provisions shall apply to Area B as shown on Figure 12 of Schedule “F” – Special Figures:

i) In addition to Section 3, for the purpose of Special Exception No. 637, the following definition shall apply:
To Amend Zoning By-law No. 05-200
To Extend New Transit Oriented Corridor Zones between Jefferson Avenue (Hamilton) and Irene Avenue (Stoney Creek), Create One New Transit Oriented Corridor Zone, and Amend Existing Transit Oriented Corridor Zones

Block Townhouse Dwelling  Shall mean a dwelling divided vertically into three or more dwelling units, by common walls which prevent internal access between units and extend from the base of the foundation to the roof line and for a horizontal distance of not less than 35 percent of the horizontal depth of the building but shall not include a maisonette.

ii) In addition to Subsection 11.4.1, the following uses shall also be permitted:

Conference or Convention Centre
Dwelling Unit(s)
Educational Establishment
Emergency Shelter
Lodging House
Long Term Care Facility
Multiple Dwelling
Residential Care Facility
Retirement Home

iii) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.1 and in addition to Subsection 11.4.2, a Block Townhouse Dwelling(s) shall not be permitted.

iv) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.1.1, residential uses contained in Subsection 11.4.1 and Clause b) i) shall be permitted on the ground floor.

v) In addition to Subsection 11.4.1.1, the following restriction of uses shall apply:

1) Residential Care Facility
   A. Maximum capacity for a Residential Care Facility is 20 residents.

2) Emergency Shelter
   A. Maximum capacity for an Emergency Shelter is 50 residents.

3) Emergency Shelter and Residential Care Facility:
   A. Except as provided in Clause b) iii) 3) B), every Emergency Shelter or Residential Care Facility shall be
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situated on a lot having a minimum radial separation distance of 300 metres from any lot line of such lot measured to the lot line of any other lot occupied by a Residential Care Facility, Emergency Shelter, Corrections Residence, or Correctional Facility; and,

B) Where the radial separation distance from the lot line of an Emergency Shelter, or Residential Care Facility existing as of the effective date of this By-law, is less than 300 metres to the lot line of any other lot occupied by an existing Residential Care Facility, Emergency Shelter, Corrections Residence, or Correctional Facility, the existing Residential Care Facility may be expanded or redeveloped to accommodate not more than the permitted number of residents permitted by the Zone in which it is located.

vi) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 a), d) ii), iii) and iv), g) iii), the following regulations shall apply:

1) Building Setback from a Street
   i) Minimum 3.0 metres for a building with residential units on the ground floor facing a street;
   ii) Maximum 4.5 metres, except where a visibility triangle is required for a driveway access;
   iii) Notwithstanding Clause b) iv) 1) i), a minimum setback of 6.0 metres is required for that portion of a building providing access to a driveway or garage; and,
   iv) Where a building(s) exists and complies with Subsection 11.4.3 g) ii) and iii), additional building(s) constructed on the lot shall not be subject to Clause b) iv) 1) i) and ii).

2) Building Height
   i) Maximum 22.0 metres;
   ii) In addition to Subsection 11.4.3 d) i) and notwithstanding Clause b) iv) 2) i), the minimum building height may
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be equivalently increased as the yard increases beyond the minimum yard requirement established in Subsection 11.4.3 b) and c), when abutting a Residential or Institutional Zone, to a maximum of 22.0 metres.

3) Built Form for New Development

i) For a corner lot, the minimum combined width of the ground floor façade facing the front lot line and flankage lot line shall be greater than or equal to 50% of the measurement of all lot lines abutting a street.

638. Within the lands zoned Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use Medium Density (TOC1) Zone, identified on Map 1142 of Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps, and described as 558 Queenston Road, the following special provisions shall also apply:

a) Notwithstanding Subsection 4.20 c) i), an outdoor commercial patio shall be permitted on a lot where any lot line abuts a Residential Zone; and,

b) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.1.3 b), no minimum rear yard setback is required."

7. That Schedule “F” – Special Figures of By-law No. 05-200 is hereby amended by adding Special Figure 11.0.

8. That the Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to proceed with the giving of notice of passing of this By-law in accordance with the Planning Act.

9. That for the purposes of the Building Code, this By-law or any part of it is not made until it has actually come into force as provided by Section 34 of the Planning Act.

10. That this By-law come into force in accordance with Section 34 of the Planning Act.

PASSED this __________ ___, 2018

____________________________   _______________________
F. Eisenberger          R. Caterini
Mayor                 City Clerk
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COMMITTEE DATE: January 16, 2018

SUBJECT/REPORT NO: Application to Amend the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200 for Lands Located at 43-51 King Street East and 60 King William Street, Hamilton (Ward 2) (PED18013)

WARD(S) AFFECTED: Ward 2
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(905) 546-2424 Ext. 4445

Tiffany Singh
(905) 546-2424 Ext. 1334

SUBMITTED BY: Steve Robichaud
Director, Planning and Chief Planner
Planning and Economic Development Department

SIGNATURE:

RECOMMENDATION

(a) That the amended application Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAR-17-047 by King William Residence Inc., Owner, for a change in zoning from the Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2) Zone and the Downtown Mixed Use (D3) Zone to the Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2, 626, H18) Zone, to permit a mixed use building consisting of two tower elements on a podium with a maximum building height of 94 metres (30 storeys) for lands located at 43-51 King Street East and 60 King William Street, Hamilton, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18013, be APPROVED on the following basis:

(i) That the Draft By-law, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18013, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council;

(ii) That the amending By-law, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18013, be added to Schedules 910, 911, 952 and 953 of Zoning By-law No. 05-200; and,
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Owner, King William Residence Inc., has applied for a Zoning By-law Amendment, as amended, for a change in zoning from the Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2) Zone and the Downtown Mixed Use (D3) Zone to a modified Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2) Zone, to permit a mixed use building consisting of a 4 (four) storey podium with two (2), 26 storey tower elements for a total maximum building height of 94 metres (30 storeys); containing 1,214 square metres of commercial retail space on the ground floor, and a multiple dwelling with a total of 525 units above. In addition, two (2) levels of underground parking, and four (4) levels of enclosed above grade parking are proposed.

The application has merit and can be supported because it is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014), conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017), and complies with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. The proposal is considered to be compatible with and complementary to the existing and planned development in the immediate area, represents good planning by providing a compact and efficient urban form, provides for new commercial uses at grade, and provides increased density that supports public transit investments in the Downtown.

Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 63

FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial: N/A

Staffing: N/A

Legal: As required by the Planning Act, Council shall hold at least one Public Meeting to consider an application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The subject site is located on the north side of King Street East, north of Gore Park. The subject site is approximately 0.39 ha (3,922.4 square metres) in size and is comprised of two assembled properties and a portion of the public alleyway that runs between 43 King Street East and 60 King William Street, resulting in an irregular L-shaped site having frontage on King Street East (approximately 27.2 m), Hughson Street North.
The portion of the lands municipally known as 43-51 King Street East were formerly occupied by S.S. Kresge Company Limited which in 1977 changed its name to Kmart. The department store closed down in 1994. The building was then occupied by the Delta Bingo Hall and has been vacant since they closed operations in 2014. 60 King William Street is currently utilized as a surface parking lot.

A demolition permit was issued for the former Kresge building on March 29, 2017, and the building was subsequently demolished on October 27, 2017. On June 5, 2017 a rezoning application for a mixed use building consisting of a six (6) storey podium with two (2) tower elements was submitted. Revised plans were submitted on September 15 and November 10, 2017.

The following is a summary of the three (3) submissions that have been made to date:

Submission 1 – June 5, 2017 (see Appendix “C” to Report PED18013):

- **Use - Mixed Use:**
  - Commercial ground floor;
  - Office located on second floor; and,
  - 528 residential units (all greater than 50 sq.m. in size) located on second floor to 34th floor.

- **Height:**
  - Two (2) tower elements proposed at a total height of 105 metres;
  - 25 storeys along King William Street; and,
  - 34 storeys along King Street East.

- **Parking:**
  - 420 parking spaces;
  - 0.79 spaces per unit parking rate; and,
  - Located within two (2) levels of underground parking and within, five (5) levels of enclosed above grade parking.

- **Design:**
  - Replicating the façade of the former Kresge building;
  - Six (6) storey podium;
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- Two (2) tower elements;
- Roof top amenity space located above the fifth level on the north-eastern portion of the subject site;
- Podium setback of 0.5 metres along south, west and north property lines, and no setback from the east property line;
- Tower setback of:
  - 2.5 metres from the south property line (King Street East);
  - 2.9 metres from west property line (Hughson Street North);
  - 4.5 metres from the north property line (King William Street);
  - 4.5 metres from east property line; and,
- Minimum on site tower separation distance of 21.6 metres.

Staff requested the applicant consider lowering the height to generally be no taller than the average height of the escarpment and to consider a design with more active street frontages.

Submission 2 – September 15, 2017 (see Appendix “D” to Report PED18013):

- Use - Mixed Use:
  - Commercial ground floor;
  - Office located on second floor; and,
  - 507 residential units (all greater than 50 sq.m. in size) located on second floor to 30th floor.

- Height:
  - Two (2) tower elements proposed at a total height of 89 metres;
  - 30 storeys along King William Street; and,
  - 30 storeys along King Street East.

- Parking:
  - 376 parking spaces;
  - 0.74 spaces per unit parking rate; and,
  - Located within two (2) levels of underground parking and five (5) levels of enclosed above grade parking.
• Design:
  - Replicating the two-storey façade of the former Kresge building;
  - Six (6) storey podium;
  - Two (2) tower elements;
  - Roof top amenity space located above the fifth level on the north-western portion of the subject site;
  - Podium setback of 2.0 metres along south, west and north property lines, and no setback from the east property line;
  - Tower setback of:
    - 3.5 metres from the south property line (King Street East);
    - 4.0 metres from west property line (Hughson Street North);
    - 6.5 metres from the north property line (King William Street);
    - 4.0 metres from east property line; and,
  - Minimum on site tower separation distance of 16.0 metres.

Planning staff advised the applicant that replicating the two (2) storey portion of the original building was not an acceptable conservation measure, as the approach was considered to be inconsistent with the Standards and Guidelines of Historic Places in Canada and best practices. Instead staff encouraged the applicant to either retain the original façade of the building or provide new construction that reflects technology, material and design ideas from the current era to create an evidently new building that includes materials, proportion and rhythms of the surrounding area for compatibility with the surrounding character.

Further, staff requested the applicant focus heavily on the treatment of the podium design, creating a modern podium design with the use of traditional building material such as brick and awnings, and to increase the glazing for more “eyes on the street” for the retail spaces along King William Street and King Street East. Staff also encouraged the applicant to consider design elements that break-up the frontage along King William Street using both vertical and horizontal articulation to create smaller retail store frontages emulating existing fabric and scale of this character retail street.

With regards to massing, staff requested a consistent four (4) storey podium height along all sides of the building, providing a consistent street wall along King Street East resulting in no setback from the street, and providing a 2.0 metre setback from Hughson Street North and King William Street for increased public realm space. Staff requested that the tower elements be shifted to create larger setbacks from King Street East and King William Street and to increase the separation distance between the two tower
elements, to create towers that visually read as separate elements from various angles, increase the sunlight penetration between the tower elements onto King William Street, and reduce the perception of a tall building from a pedestrian level onto King William Street and King Street East. Staff also requested that the design of the podium better address the public realm corners of King William Street and Hughson Street North as well as King Street East and Hughson Street North.

In order to move forward with the proposed application, the owner was requested to submit proof of ownership of the portion of the “L” shaped alleyway that runs between 43 King Street East and 60 King William Street at the Site Plan Control Stage.

Lastly, staff asked the applicant to consider creating more family-sized units.

Submission 3 – November 10, 2017 (see Appendix “E” to Report PED18013):

- **Use - Mixed Use:**
  - Commercial ground floor;
  - Office removed from the second floor; and,
  - 530 residential units (all greater than 50 sq.m. in size) located on second floor to 30th floor.

- **Height:**
  - Two (2) tower elements proposed at a total height of 92.4 metres;
  - 30 storeys along King William Street; and,
  - 30 storeys along King Street East.

- **Parking:**
  - 393 parking spaces;
  - 15 barrier free parking spaces;
  - 0.74 spaces per unit parking rate;
  - Located within two (2) levels of underground parking and within five (5) levels of above enclosed above grade parking; and,
  - 484 long-term bicycle parking spaces.

- **Design:**
  - Four (4) storey podium;
  - Two (2) tower elements;
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- Roof top amenity space located above the sixth floor on the north-western portion of the subject site;
- Podium setback of 2.0 metres along west and north property lines, and no setback from the south and east property line;
- Tower setback of:
  - 4.0 metres from the south property line (King Street East);
  - 4.5 metres from west property line (Hughson Street North);
  - 6.0 metres from the north property line (King William Street); and,
  - 4.5 metres from east property line.
- Minimum tower separation distance of 16.2 metres;
- New podium design using extensive amounts of brick masonry, traditional window fenestration patterns, awnings and vertical articulations to create smaller store frontages along both King William Street and King Street East; and,
- The podium at King Street East and Hughson Street North contains a notched corner with fenestration opening to the retail space facing the fountain at Gore Park.
- Extending the east-west portion of the existing alleyway to Hughson Street North under the proposed building at ground level and establish easements over a portion of the subject lands to ensure unobstructed access for neighbouring properties using the alleyway.

In order to facilitate the development, the applicant proposes a change in zoning from the Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2) Zone and the Downtown Mixed Use (D3) Zone to a modified Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2) Zone with the following site specific modifications:

- Increased maximum building height;
- Reduced minimum number of on-site parking spaces;
- Maintain the current parking stall dimensions of 2.6 metres in width by 5.5 metres in length;
- Reduced setback for an access driveway from a street line;
- Establish minimum tower stepbacks;
• Establish minimum tower separation; and,
• Increased minimum building setbacks.

Chronology:

June 5, 2017: Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAR-17-047 received.

June 16, 2017: Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAR-17-047 deemed complete.

June 30, 2017: Notice of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation was sent to 505 property owners within 120 m of the subject property.

July 7, 2017: Applicant launched public microsite with application details.


July 24, 2017: Public Notice Sign posted on site.

September 15, 2017: Second revised concept site plan and elevations submitted in response to comments.

November 10, 2017: Third revised concept site plan and elevations submitted in response to comments.

December 6, 2017: Public Notice Sign updated with Public Meeting date.

December 15, 2017: Circulation of the Notice of Public Meeting to 505 property owners within 120 m of the subject property.

Details of Submitted Application:

Owner: King William Residence Inc.

Applicant: King William Residence Inc.

Agent: Urban Solutions Planning & Land Development Consultants Inc. (c/o Sergio Manchia)
**Location:** 43 – 51 King Street East and 60 King William Street (see Appendix “A” to Report PED18013)

**Property Description:**
- **Lot Frontage:** 27.2 m (King Street East)  
  86.6 m (Hughson Street North)  
  64.2 m (King William Street)
- **Lot Depth:** 86.6 m
- **Lot Area:** 3922.4 sq m (0.39 ha)
- **Servicing:** Existing Full Municipal Services

**Existing Land Use and Zoning:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Property</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subject Property:</strong></td>
<td>Vacant – formerly commercial use</td>
<td>Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2) Zone (southern portion) and Downtown Mixed Use (D3) Zone (northern portion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Surrounding Land Uses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Mixed Use, Residential and Retail</td>
<td>Downtown Mixed Use (D3) Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2) Zone (southern portion) and Downtown Mixed Use (D3) Zone (northern portion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Public Open Space – Gore Park</td>
<td>Open Space (P4) Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Commercial – Retail,</td>
<td>Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2) Zone (southern portion) and Downtown Mixed Use (D3) Zone (northern portion)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS

Provincial Policy Statement (2014)

The Provincial Planning Policy framework is established through the Planning Act (Section 3) and the Provincial Policy Statement (2014). The Planning Act requires that all municipal land use decisions affecting planning matters be consistent with the PPS.

The mechanism for the implementation of the Provincial plans and policies is through the Official Plan. Through the preparation, adoption and subsequent Ontario Municipal Board approval of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, the City of Hamilton has established the local policy framework for the implementation of the Provincial planning policy framework. As such, matters of provincial interest (e.g. efficiency of land use, balanced growth and environmental protection) are reviewed and discussed in the Official Plan analysis below.

With respect to Cultural Heritage, the PPS provides the following:

“2.6.1 Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved.

2.6.2 Planning authorities shall not permit development and site alteration on adjacent lands to protected heritage property except where the proposed development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.

2.6.3 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved.”

The subject property is currently included in the City’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and / or Historical Interest as a non-designated property, and is within the Gore Park Cultural Heritage Landscape. It consisted of a two (2) storey brick commercial building built in 1930 for the S.S. Kresge Company Limited, whom changed their name to the more commonly known Kmart in 1977.

On December 8, 2016, the Owner submitted a Notice of Intention to Demolish and a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment (CHIA) prepared by Megan Hobson dated February 28, 2017 was submitted. On April 13, 2017 the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee (HMHC) considered the submitted CHIA and a recommendation by staff to designate the subject property under the Ontario Heritage Act. The HMHC
recommended that Council not designate the subject property. Council adopted the HMHC recommendation and a demolition permit was issued.

The subject property is also located adjacent to a number of properties designated under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act and considered a “protected heritage property” under the PPS. Further, the subject property is adjacent to a number of other built heritage resources included in the Register as non-designated properties, including 1 King Street East (Gore Park).

As such, a CHIA was required for the Zoning By-law Amendment Application. The previously submitted CHIA and addendum report dated September 14, 2017 were submitted to address deficiencies in the original CHIA as identified in staff’s comments. The Policy and Design Subcommittee of the HMHC also reviewed the revised CHIA at their meeting on October 19, 2017.

Staff are satisfied with the revised shape and form of the proposed building, the articulation of the podium, and the placement of the two towers that reduces shadowing on adjacent cultural resources and maintains the rhythm of the traditional street façade. Also, the inclusion of additional brick on the podium, use of fenestration patterns and awnings, colour variation and vertical articulations used to break-up the podium massing along King William Street, Hughson Street North, and King Street East creates a modern design that is compatible with the surrounding context in scale, proportions and materials. Further refinement of the design will be reviewed at the Site Plan Control stage. As such, it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of adjacent protected heritage properties and lands containing cultural resources will be conserved.

As the application for a change in zoning complies with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, it is staff’s opinion that the application is:

- consistent with Section 3 of the Planning Act; and,
- consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS).

_Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017)_

As of July 1, 2017, the policies of the recently released Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2017 apply to any planning decision. The Growth Plan supports mixed use intensification within built-up urban areas, particularly in proximity to transit. As noted in Section 2.1 of the Plan:

“Better use of land and infrastructure can be made by directing growth to settlement areas and prioritizing intensification, with a focus on strategic growth areas, including urban growth centres and major transit station areas, as well as
brownfield sites and greyfields....This Plan recognizes transit as a first priority for major transportation investments. It sets out a regional vision for transit, and seeks to align transit with growth by directing growth to major transit station areas and other strategic growth areas, including urban growth centres, and promoting transit investments in these areas."

The following policies, amongst others, are applicable to the proposed development:

"2.2.3.2 Urban growth centres will be planned to achieve, by 2031 or earlier, a minimum density target of:

b) 200 residents and jobs combined per hectare for each of the... Downtown Hamilton....urban growth centres;

2.2.4.3 Major transit station areas on priority transit corridors or subway lines will be planned for a minimum density target of:

b) 160 residents and jobs combined per hectare for those that are served by light rail transit or bus rapid transit;

2.2.4.9 Within all major transit station areas, development will be supported, where appropriate, by:

a) planning for a diverse mix of uses, including second units and affordable housing, to support existing and planned transit service levels;

b) fostering collaboration between public and private sectors, such as joint development projects;

c) providing alternative development standards, such as reduced parking standards; and,

d) prohibiting land uses and built form that would adversely affect the achievement of transit-supportive densities.

2.2.4.10 Lands adjacent to or near to existing and planned frequent transit should be planned to be transit-supportive and supportive of active transportation and a range and mix of uses and activities."

The subject site is located in Downtown Hamilton and will contribute to the density target for this identified urban growth centre (Policy 2.2.3.2). It should be noted that the Growth Plan defines major transit station areas as, “the area including and around any existing or planned higher order transit areas as, “the area including and around any existing or planned settlement area; or the
area including and around a major bus depot in an urban core. Major transit station areas generally are defined as the area within an approximate 500 metre radius of a transit station, representing about a 10-minute walk”. The subject site would be considered within a “major transit station area” pursuant to the Growth Plan, given that it is located approximately 100 metres away from an intersection that is an existing B-Line transit stop and is planned to have a future Light Rail Transit (LRT) stop. As such, the proposed high density development will contribute to the density targets for this identified major transit station area (Policy 2.2.4.3). The proposed mix of uses and reduced parking standards are supported by Policy 2.2.4.9. Lastly, the proposed high density development is transit-supportive, and the inclusion of 484 secured bicycle parking spaces supports active transportation (Policy 2.2.4.10). As such, the application conforms to the Growth Plan (2017) and, in particular, the policies relating to intensification, mixing of uses, and efficient use of transit infrastructure.

**Urban Hamilton Official Plan**

The subject property is identified on Schedule “E” - Urban Structure as being within the “Downtown Urban Growth Centre” and designated “Downtown Mixed Use Area” on Schedule “E-1” – Urban Land Use Designations. The subject property is also designated “Prime Retail Streets” along King Street East and “Specialty Commercial” along King William Street on Map B.6.1-1, Land Use Plan for the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan. Further, the subject property is identified as being within the Gore and Lister Development Permit Sub-Areas on Map B.6.1-6. The following policies, amongst others, apply to the proposed development.

*Urban Structure*

**E.2.3.1.2** The Downtown Urban Growth Centre shall be the pre-eminent node in Hamilton due to its scale, density, range of uses, function and identity by residents of the City as the Downtown and accordingly, it shall be planned for a broad range of uses appropriate to its role as the City’s pre-eminent node.

**E.2.3.1.6** The Downtown Urban Growth Centre shall function as a residential neighbourhood with a large and diverse population. A range of housing types, including affordable housing and housing with supports, shall be encouraged as set out in the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan and other associated secondary plans and policies of this Plan.

**E.2.3.1.8** The Downtown Urban Growth Centre shall function as a major transit hub for the City with a GO rail station and higher order transit systems extending out from the Centre.
E.2.3.1.9 The Downtown Urban Growth Centre shall generally have the higher density within the City with a minimum overall density of 250 persons and jobs per hectare. Overall density in excess of this target may be achievable and warranted. Increases to this density target shall be considered as part of a review of the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan. The density targets shall be evaluated based, in part, on the results of the Downtown Office Strategy and the impacts on existing infrastructure and transportation networks.

E.2.3.1.10 It is anticipated that the Downtown Urban Growth Centre will accommodate approximately 20% of the City-wide residential intensification over the time period of this Plan which equates to a range of 5,000 to 6,000 dwelling units.

E.2.3.1.11 The Downtown Urban Growth Centre shall be planned and encouraged to accommodate in excess of 100,000 square metres of retail floor space.

E.2.3.1.12 Detailed policies on permitted building heights and densities shall be set out in the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan, other secondary plans covering lands within the Downtown Urban Growth, and other policies of this Plan.

E.2.3.1.13 The Downtown Urban Growth Centre shall be designed with a strong pedestrian focus to create a comfortable and animated pedestrian environment.

E.2.3.1.15 Parking shall continue to be provided within the Downtown Urban Growth Centre to serve the needs of residents, employees, and consumers, and shall increasingly be provided in underground or above ground structures where feasible.

E.2.3.1.16 Reduced parking requirements shall be considered to encourage a broader range of uses and to support transit.”

Concerning the foregoing policies, the proposal is within the City’s primary urban node which supports a range of residential densities and uses. At a total of 525 units, the proposal would provide for a density of 1,338.4 units per gross hectare. Density however, is determined on an area wide basis for the Downtown as a whole rather than for individual development sites. The proposal is consistent with Policy E.2.3.1.9 to encourage the City’s highest densities in the Downtown to make this area more vibrant and livable by providing for a significant housing development in the core, and supporting planned transportation infrastructure investments as per Policy E.2.3.1.8.
In regards to Policy E.2.3.1.13, the proposal will encourage pedestrian activity along King Street East and King William Street through the creation of a multiple dwelling, and the re-establishment of street-oriented commercial uses.

The proposal supports transit, walking and cycling in the Downtown and adjacent neighbourhoods by proposing a reduced parking requirement, and 484 long-term bicycle parking spaces, which is generally encouraged in the Downtown. Additionally, parking will be developed in one (1) level underground area and within four (4) enclosed above grade floors accessed from Hughson Street North.

Pedestrian Predominant Streets

King Street between Wellington Street and Queen Street, has been identified as a Pedestrian Predominant Street in Table E.4.3.1: Pedestrian Predominant Streets.

“E.4.3.4 In addition to the policies of the specific Commercial and Mixed Use designations, the following policies shall apply to pedestrian predominant streets:

a) A minimum of 75% of the block face located between two roads shall be developed with buildings;

b) Buildings shall be built up to the streetline and parking, driveways or lanes shall not be permitted between the buildings and the street, except as set out in E.4.3.4 g);

c) Each building or store front shall face onto the pedestrian predominant street with the main entrance of each building or store and substantial fenestration facing on to the street;

d) Notwithstanding Policy E.4.6.9 Mixed Use – Medium Density Designation, residential uses shall not be permitted on the ground floor of a building facing on to a pedestrian predominant street; (OPA 64)

e) On-street parking shall be provided where feasible and appropriate;

f) A minimum height of two storeys shall be encouraged; and,

h) Sidewalks shall be required on both sides of the street and shall be of sufficient width to:

i) accommodate anticipated pedestrian volumes;
ii) comfortably and safely accommodate the needs of persons with disabilities and seniors;

iii) ensure sufficient space for coordinated street furnishings, public utilities, and tree plantings; and,

iv) accommodate sidewalk cafés, kiosks, and street vendors where possible."

With regards to item (a), the podium component will create a continuous street wall along King Street East. The proposed building will be built to the streetline along King Street East and the access driveway to the parking and loading areas is located off the Hughson Street North frontage along the west property line (item (b)). The proposal includes commercial at grade with significant fenestration facing directly onto King Street East (item (c)) with no residential use at grade (item (d)). No on-street parking is proposed along King Street East, as all parking will be provided within one (1) level of underground parking and four (4) floors of enclosed above grade parking (item (e)). The podium and overall building height proposed will be greater than two (2) storeys (item (f)). The existing 6.0 metre sidewalk along King Street East will be maintained, however details regarding the sidewalk design and landscaping will be reviewed at the Site Plan Control stage (item (h)).

Land Use

The general function and uses of the Downtown Mixed Use Area are set out in the following policies:

"E.4.4.2 The area designated Downtown Mixed Use shall also serve as a central focus for the City by creating a sense of place. Retail and service commercial uses are a key element in maintaining that function and ensuring the continued vibrancy of the Downtown. New commercial development shall be designed and oriented to enhance the streetlife of the Downtown.

E.4.4.3 Increasing the number of people who work and live in the Downtown shall enhance the day and night activity and contribute to its planned function as a vibrant people place.

E.4.4.4 The following uses shall be permitted on lands designated Downtown Mixed Use on Schedule E-1 – Urban Land Use Designations:

a) commercial uses such as retail stores, auto and home centres, home improvement supply stores, offices, including major offices, personal
services, live work units, artist studios, financial establishments, and restaurants;

b) institutional uses such as hospitals, universities, government offices, places of worship, and schools;

c) arts, cultural entertainment, and recreational uses;

d) accommodation such as hotels, motels, conference and convention centres; and residential uses; and,

e) residential uses."

The additional commercial space located at grade will add to the function and vibrancy of the Downtown (E.4.4.2). The proposal will increase the number of people who reside and work in the Downtown, which will enhance the daytime and nighttime activity levels of the core (E.4.4.3). The proposed multiple dwelling and street level commercial uses are consistent with the uses permitted in Policy E.4.4.4.

"E.4.4.7 Permitted density and heights shall be set out in the secondary plan for the lands designated Downtown Mixed Use.

E.4.4.8 Within the area designated Downtown Mixed Use, a higher density form of housing shall be encouraged, including affordable housing that may be integrated with business uses, including retail and service commercial establishments on the ground floor, as further set out in the Downtown Secondary Plan.

E.4.4.9 Permitted uses shall be located in both single and mixed use buildings."

As noted, density and height are addressed as policy requirements in the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan, however, higher density housing forms such as the subject proposal are particularly encouraged in order to achieve the higher density targets envisioned for the Downtown. Based on Secondary Plan policies, an increase in building height above that shown on Map B.6.1-4 – Downtown Hamilton – Building Heights, is subject to a comprehensive review of urban design requirements such as a wind assessment, sun-shadow study, and impact of views on streetscapes. This review is discussed in greater detail in the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan section.

"E.4.4.10 The Downtown Mixed Use area shall be designed as a pedestrian focused area with a high level of pedestrian comfort and amenities. Buildings shall generally be situated close to and oriented to the street. Retail buildings shall have store-fronts and other active uses opening onto the sidewalk. On
the pedestrian predominant streets, new development shall enhance pedestrian comfort and street activity and where possible increase the built block face. New development in other areas of the Downtown Mixed Use area should create a comfortable pedestrian environment.

**E.4.4.11** Building mass shall consider the pedestrian nature of the area designated Downtown Mixed Use. Massing techniques such as stepped back or terraced floors may be required.

**E.4.4.13** Streets within the Downtown Mixed Use area shall be designed to accommodate the automobile, transit and active transportation, including pedestrian and bicycle trips within the Downtown and from the surrounding Neighbourhoods. Along pedestrian predominant streets, sidewalk widths shall be maximized where possible and a broad range of sidewalk activities, permitted where space allows, to promote sidewalk cafés, sidewalk kiosks, street vendors, and performers.

**E.4.4.14** Reduced parking requirements shall be considered in recognition of the high level of transit service to the area designated Downtown Mixed Use."

The proposed podium will provide a 2.0 metre setback along King William Street and Hughson Street North (see Appendix “C” to Report PED18013). This will contribute to the enhancement of the streetscape and facilitate pedestrian activity and enjoyment connecting to the existing 6.0 metre wide sidewalks along King Street East. The proposal will provide a higher density form of housing with commercial on the ground floor as encouraged in Policy E.4.4.8. Increases in density and heights are further evaluated in the analysis of the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan policy requirements section of this Report (E.4.4.7 and E.4.4.9).

The proposed podium design creates a consistent smaller-scale commercial environment along King William Street through the use of contrasting curtain walls, fenestration patterns, and vertical and horizontal articulations that help break-up the massing and enhance this intimate pedestrian environment. The podium design along King Street East will provide a more expansive commercial store front (similar to the former Kresge building) with less vertical articulations than used on King William Street. The fenestration pattern and notched corner element at the Hughson Street North and King Street East intersection will enhance the existing pedestrian environment and create a seamless interface with the water fountain element of Gore Park by directing ones attention to this prominent cultural landscape when entering and exiting the building. Also, the notched corner is a nod to the former Kresge building design (E.4.4.10).
The proposed podium would have a consistent four (4) storey height on all sides with an additional two (2) storey podium for amenity space near the corner of King William Street and Hughson Street North, with stepbacks of 6.0 metres and 8.0 metres respectively. The north tower (Tower A) will be stepped back an additional 4.0 metres from the podium along King William Street and 3.0 metres from the easterly property line. Similarly, the south tower (Tower B) will be stepped back 4.0 metres from the podium along King Street East, and 4.5 metres from Hughson Street North (E.4.4.11).

Collectively the setbacks, stepbacks, horizontal and vertical articulation used on the podium, positioning of the slender tower elements, as well as the use of glazing will reduce the effect of the building massing at the street level (see Appendix “D” to Report PED18013).

The proposal complies with the City’s Travel Demand Management objectives and it has been developed on the basis of a reduced parking rate of 0.74 parking spaces per unit in recognition of the adjacency to existing public transit and also in anticipation of the future LRT system. In addition, the proposal will accommodate active transportation by including 484 long-term indoor bicycle parking spaces (E.4.4.13). With regards to Policy E.4.4.14, the subject site is on a pedestrian predominant street and a modified parking requirement is recommended as previously discussed.

Residential Intensification

The following Volume 1 policies pertain to residential intensification:

“B.2.4.1.4 Residential intensification developments shall be evaluated based on the following criteria:

a) A balanced evaluation of the criteria in b) through g) as follows:

b) The relationship of the proposal to existing neighbourhood character so that it maintains, and where possible, enhances and builds upon desirable established patterns and built form;

c) The development’s contribution to maintaining and achieving a range of dwelling types and tenures;

d) The compatible integration of the development with the surrounding area in terms of use, scale, form and character. In this regard, the City encourages the use of innovative and creative urban design techniques;
e) The development’s contribution to achieving the planned urban structure as described in Section E.2.0 – Urban Structure;

f) Infrastructure and transportation capacity; and,

g) The ability of the development to comply with all applicable policies.”

With respect to the above, the proposal would enhance the neighbourhood character (item b)) along all three street frontages by restoring the former expansive commercial frontage along King Street East, a pedestrian predominant street building upon the existing small-scale commercial environment along King William Street, and creating a wider public realm space along Hughson Street North. Further, the notched corner expression angled towards Gore Park at the King Street East and Hughson Street North intersection creates a connection with this significant cultural landscape. Lastly, the subject site is located within a Heritage Character Zone and the proposed podium would have a traditional main street presence through the use of brick, fenestration patterns and articulation that will complement the existing historic context and is similar in height to the surrounding context, which ranges between three (3) to four (4) storeys, while still providing modern tall buildings.

The proposal would contribute to the range of dwelling types in the Downtown (item c)) by providing high-rise multiple dwelling units directly adjacent to existing and planned transportation infrastructure and in close proximity to amenities and services.

The proposal would allow for compatible integration of a new mixed use building (item d)) by re-establishing commercial uses at grade along King Street East and King William Street, which will strengthen and unify these two important commercial corridors of the Downtown. The scale and massing of the proposed development has been designed to ensure that this high-rise building is compatible with adjacent low to mid-rise development and the streetscapes on King Street East and King William Street. The form and height of the proposed buildings will be greater than existing buildings in the immediate surroundings. However, staff are of the opinion that with the stepbacks, setbacks, and articulation of the proposed tower components, and podium design elements included in the proposed design, the building would represent an appropriate integration of a tall building that is compatible with this block. Also, with respect to building height, the immediate surrounding context has generally a low to mid-rise profile, but is in an area that contains a number of existing and approved taller buildings ranging from 15 to 36 storeys in height.

Achieving the planned urban structure (item e)) has been examined under the UHOP policies and the proposal would be consistent with these policies by encouraging
residential development downtown, higher densities, the support of transit, and reduced automobile use through supporting active transportation such as walking and cycling.

The proposal in terms of infrastructure and transportation capacity (item f)) would be appropriate. In particular, existing infrastructure for water and wastewater services are available to service the property. With respect to transportation, the proposal would provide support for the future LRT, and existing transit, bicycling and pedestrian infrastructure which are also important elements of the City’s Downtown Transportation Strategy.

Urban Design

The following Volume 1 urban design policies, amongst others, are applicable to the proposal.

“B.3.3.2.6 Where it has been determined through the policies of this Plan that compatibility with the surrounding areas is desirable, new development and redevelopment should enhance the character of the existing environment by:

a) complementing and animating existing surroundings through building design and placement as well as through placement of pedestrian amenities;

b) respecting the existing cultural and natural heritage features of the existing environment by re-using, adapting, and incorporating existing characteristics;

c) allowing built form to evolve over time through additions and alterations that are in harmony with existing architectural massing and style;

d) complementing the existing massing patterns, rhythm, character, colour, and surrounding context; and,

e) encouraging a harmonious and compatible approach to infilling by minimizing the impacts of shadowing and maximizing light to adjacent properties and the public realm.”

With respect to the foregoing policies, the proposal would support pedestrian activity along King Street East, Hughson Street North, and King William Street by re-establishing a commercial use at grade; increasing the public realm space along Hughson Street North and King William Street; and, redeveloping a surface parking lot.
Collectively these changes will contribute to the character of both King William Street and King Street East by creating a continuous street wall and animating it by encouraging new street level commercial uses.

The proposal would complement the surrounding heritage character of adjacent buildings along King Street East and King William Street (item b)) with the use of brick, colour variation, vertical articulations, fenestration patterns, and awnings that reflect the horizontal proportions of the adjacent buildings. Also, the tower elements are stepped back from the podium along both King Street East and King William Street to reduce the massing at the street level, minimize the impacts of shadowing and maximize light to adjacent properties and the public realm (see Appendix “E” to Report PED18013).

**Integrated Transportation Network**

"C.4.2.4. Transportation Demand Management measures shall be evaluated in all transportation related studies, master plans, environmental assessments, neighbourhood traffic management plans and new development plans including the degree to which it can help achieve transportation goals in accordance with Section C.4.1 – Policy Goals.

C.4.2.4.1 Transportation demand management measures may include:

a) provision of active transportation features including secure bicycle storage facilities and pedestrian and cycling access to the road network;

b) supporting transit through reduced parking standards for some land uses where appropriate and making provisions for car-sharing spaces through the site plan process where feasible and appropriate; and,

c) other measures detailed in the Transportation Master Plan and described in Section F.3.1.8 of the Master Transportation Plan.

C.4.2.5 Public transit shall be an integral component of planning for new development and development of residential uses and all new commercial, employment, institutional and mixed use centres within the urban areas of the City. Accordingly, new secondary plans shall include provisions for safe, convenient, accessible and direct access to the public transit network via active transportation."

The proposal provides Transportation Demand Management measures, such as secure bicycle storage facilities within the building and short-term visitor bicycle parking at
grade and is accessible to existing and planned LRT public transit facilities along King Street East ("B" Line). As noted, the proposal also includes a reduced parking rate to support transit usage.

Environmental Site Conditions

The following Environmental Site Condition policies are relevant to the proposed development:

"B.3.6.1.2 Where there is potential for site contamination due to previous uses of a property and a more sensitive land use is proposed, a mandatory filing of a Record of Site Condition is triggered as outlined in provincial guidelines. The Record of Site Condition shall be submitted by the proponent to the City and the Province. The Record of Site Condition shall be to the satisfaction of the City.

B.3.6.1.4 Where there is potential for site contamination due to a previous use or uses on lands subject to development or redevelopment proposals, and a mandatory filing of a Record of Site Condition is triggered, the City shall:

a) withhold final approval of an application until acceptance of a Record of Site Condition. In the interim, conditional approval may be considered; or,

b) defer or establish conditions of approval for applications involving official plan amendments, zoning by-law amendments, plans of subdivision, and site plan approvals where a Record of Site Condition is necessary."

Concerning the above, the subject property is recognized as a potentially contaminated site due to its former use as a commercial use. As such, the property was subject to environmental review to allow for the proposed multiple dwelling use. The applicant has undergone a Phase I and II Environmental Site Assessment. The applicant has submitted their findings to the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC), but has yet to receive an acknowledgement that the Record of Site Condition (RSC) has been filed appropriately satisfying MOECC. As such, a Holding Provision is required as the provision of an acknowledgment letter from the MOECC for the RSC is a requirement.

Noise Policies

The following Noise policies are relevant to the proposal:
“B.3.6.3.7 A noise feasibility study, or detailed noise study, or both, shall be submitted as determined by the City prior to or at the time of application submission, for development of residential or other noise sensitive land uses on lands in the following locations:

b) 400 metres of a major arterial road, as identified on Schedule C – Functional Road Classification;

c) 400 metres of a truck route.”

Concerning the above, staff note the proposed development is located along a major arterial road (King Street East) and is within 400 m of a truck route (King Street East). Therefore, a noise assessment is required for the proposal. The noise assessment should address both indoor noise levels for the arterial roads as well as the outdoor rooftop amenity area located above the fourth storey podium. A Noise Study has not been submitted for staff’s review. However, given the particular context of this site, a Noise Study shall be submitted at the Site Plan Control Stage, noise warning clauses must be included on all future purchase and / or lease agreements and that any noise control measures recommended be implemented at the Site Plan Control stage.

Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan (Volume 2)

The subject property is included in the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan. The subject property is designated “Prime Retail Streets” (along King Street East) and “Specialty Commercial” (along King William Street) on Map B.6.1-1, Land Use Plan for the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan. Further, the subject property is identified as being within the Gore and Lister Development Permit Sub-Areas on Map B.6.1 – 6. The following policies, amongst others, apply.

“B.6.1.5.3 In addition to the land uses described in Section B.6.1.5 – General Land Use Policies, the following uses shall be permitted throughout the Downtown:

a) public uses including schools;

b) social service facilities; and,

c) places of worship.

B.6.1.5.6 It is the intention that density of development be achieved through complete site coverage rather than through building height in accordance with this Plan. All new development in the Downtown shall be a minimum of two storeys in height and subject to height limitations as shown on Map
B.6.1.5.7 Building height limitations fall into three ranges:

a) Low rise - 2 to 4 storeys;

b) Mid rise - 6 to 8 storeys; and,

c) High rise - 12 to 15 storeys.

B.6.1.5.9 Building heights may be increased above that shown on Map B.6.1 – 4 – Downtown Hamilton - Building Heights, provided the upper storeys are massed, stepped back, or terraced in order to ensure that the additional height, above that permitted shall not result in: increased sun shadow impacts on public sidewalks or public spaces, and shall address the following:

a) coverage of the site, in accordance with this Plan, is achieved;

b) sun shadow impacts on public sidewalks or public spaces;

c) wind impacts on public sidewalks; and,

d) impacts on streetscapes and views of streetscapes, landmark structures or heritage buildings from the public sidewalks.

B.6.1.5.12 Proposed increases in height must demonstrate design consideration for the surrounding urban form.

B.6.1.6.3 New development and redevelopment shall be at a scale and density that supports public transit in the Downtown. It is a priority to provide public transit in the planning area and pedestrian access to public transit through: a) providing transit routes into and within Downtown Hamilton; b) ensuring transit accessibility is incorporated into street redesign; c) providing direct access between buildings and the public streets to transit stops; and, d) providing pedestrian scaled distances to transit stops within the Downtown.”

The proposed multiple dwelling and commercial uses are permitted. Also, increased density is proposed through site coverage and building height while locating the taller tower components furthest from the streets, and still achieving a tower separation
(Policy B.6.1.5.6 and B.6.1.5.9.a)). The provision of an outdoor amenity rooftop area on the podium is supported in the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan.

The proposed development is considered a high rise building (Policy B.6.1.5.7), and additional height has been sought through the submission supporting of studies addressing the items in Policy B.6.1.5.9. In reviewing the proposed tall building development, staff assessed the relationships to other tall buildings, including the cumulative effect of multiple towers in the Gore Park vicinity, with regards to shadowing of public spaces, sky view access, wind conditions, and effects on the prominence of Gore Park and the public realm.

With regards to sun-shadow impacts (Policy B.6.1.5.9.b)), Graziani + Corazza Architects Inc. prepared a sun shadow analysis (September 13, 2017) and a revised submission dated October 18, 2017 reflecting the modified design to demonstrate the sun shadow created by the location, massing and height of the proposed 30 storey towers on adjacent public open spaces and sidewalks. Staff agree that the configuration of the towers (94 metres excluding mechanical penthouse) with setbacks, stepbacks, and its north – south orientation, slender floor plates, and tower separation mitigates the creation of significant additional shadows on the public realm when compared to the current as-of-right permission of 22.0 metres. While the proposed development does shadow some public streets beyond the as-of-right permission, there are no public areas impacted by more than four hour intervals of shadowing, which is in fact the same amount of shadowing an as-of-right condition would create and on the same areas (north and south sidewalks along King William Street between Hughson Street North and John Street North. There is some shadowing that would occur on the future John / Rebecca Park beyond the as-of-right permission. It is expected that shadowing on John / Rebecca Park will occur at 4:00 pm during the September – March months only and when the sun itself is setting between 4:00 pm – 7:00 pm. Further, the proposal would result in no more than two hours of shadowing on a vibrant street, which is consistent with the draft Tall Building Guidelines. The guidelines state that there should be a minimum of five hours of sunlight throughout the day on March 21st / September 21st on Vibrant Streets (includes King Street East and James Street North). Furthermore, although King William Street has not been identified as a Vibrant Street in the draft Tall Building Guidelines, the proposed development would allow for approximately 6.2 hours of sunlight access on the north sidewalk along King William Street between James Street North and John Street North on March 21st / September 21st. The as-of-right built form would allow for just an hour more sunlight access (7.2 hours of sunlight).

With regards to wind impacts (Policy B.6.1.5.9.c)), the applicant’s wind assessment was prepared by Rowan Williams Davies & Irwin Inc. (RWDI) dated May 19, 2017. An addendum letter was prepared by RWDI dated September 11, 2017 and again on October 17, 2017 in response to the modified design to the towers proposed. Based on
the wind tunnel test results, meteorological data analysis of the Hamilton wind climate, and experience with similar developments in Hamilton, it is expected that wind conditions over all pedestrian sensitive grade-level locations within and surrounding the subject site will be acceptable for the intended uses during all seasonal periods. However, it was found that the northwest corner of the podium closest to the intersection of Hughson Street North and King William Street would experience a significant increase of wind speeds. The increase of wind activity created by the proposed development may be mitigated by the incorporation of a 3.0 metre wide wrap around canopy of the podium along the corner of King William Street and Hughson Street North. An increase in wind activity was also found along Hughson Street North closest to King Street East and may be mitigated by the incorporation of 3.0 metre tall wind screens with 20% - 30% porosity along the western edge of the rooftop terrace. Lastly, there are areas within the proposed podium rooftop amenity space that may experience less desirable wind conditions in the summer months. The use of wind screens along the perimeter of the entire outdoor amenity space as well as planters can be employed to control wind speeds to a desirable rate. The applicant will be expected to implement the wind mitigation recommendations outlined in the report, which will be reviewed in detail at the Site Plan Control Stage.

With respect to streetscape impacts and views (Policy B.6.1.5.9.d)), the applicant submitted a Visual Impact Study prepared by Graziani + Corazza Architects Inc. dated September 11, 2017. Staff are of the opinion that the proposed podium component would provide an enhanced pedestrian environment along King Street East, Hughson Street North, and King William Street through the development of the proposed podium which will introduce carefully articulated commercial spaces that will add to the existing traditional commercial street character of these corridors and further animate these significant established commercial corridors.

From a built form perspective, the subject site is an appropriate location for the proposed towers. It is located in the centre of the Downtown, on a street that has a 20.1 metre right-of-way and is adjacent to or nearby a number of other tall buildings that are completed, under construction or approved. The tower elements have been designed to effectively be a tall building, but feel like a mid-rise building from a pedestrian perspective at grade. The design of the podium helps achieve a compatible building with the surrounding low and mid-rise urban form (Policy B.6.5.12). It is staff's opinion that from a distance the tower elements will draw attention to the City structure of the downtown, and visually create a gateway with other existing and approved towers on the south side of King Street East, emphasizing the prominence of Gore Park.

As described previously, the proposed development is transit-supportive and supports active transportation (Policy B.6.1.6.3).
General Urban Design Policies

“B.6.1.7.9 New development in the Downtown, and redevelopment, shall address the urban design principles in this plan, and particularly, the following:

a) Achieving a comfortable and intimate pedestrian environment;

b) Ensuring that new development is compatible with existing adjacent structures and streetscapes in terms of design, scale, massing, setbacks, height, integration with the built form, and use;

c) Eliminating street level parking lots and vacant properties along major streets;

d) Creating a sense of place through the incorporation of public art and interpretive media;

e) Providing “eyes on the street” and an interesting pedestrian experience by ensuring that the ground floors of all buildings have windows and doors opening onto the street or public laneways where appropriate. Entrances are to be provided at grade;

f) Ensuring barrier-free access from grade level; and,

g) Eliminating expanses of blank walls along street frontages.”

Concerning item a) above, the inclusion of commercial uses at grade, a reduced setback from the streetline along King Street West, a 2.0 metre setback along Hughson Street North and King William Street, and a podium height that relates to the adjacent buildings located along King Street East and King William Street (4-6 storeys), will animate the streets, allow for more public realm space (Hughson Street North and King William Street) and contribute to the creation of a positive pedestrian environment connecting King William Street with King Street East and Gore Park.

Respecting item b), compatibility with existing adjacent structures and streetscapes, the design, scale and massing is intended to create a transition that is compatible with adjacent low to mid-rise development along King Street East and King William Street. This is achieved by maintaining a continuous street wall along all street frontages with the podium component that relates to adjacent existing buildings. Also, tower setbacks from the podium are provided to create slender tower components. Lastly, a continuation of commercial uses at ground level with residential uses located above will be compatible with the existing surrounding uses.
With regards to item c), the proposed development will eliminate a vacant site in the downtown along a major commercial strip. All parking is being provided either below grade or within the enclosed podium component above grade. Although the incorporation of public art has not been included, this will be reviewed further at the Site Plan Control stage.

The proposal includes windows along all street frontages with entrances at grade, providing barrier-free access and facilitating “eyes on the street” behaviour, creating social interaction and animation of the street.

“B.6.1.7.14 New development and redevelopment shall integrate roof design and function with the surrounding buildings and public spaces. This shall be achieved through:

a) Integrating the roof function, shape, surface materials, and colours with the building’s overall design concept;

b) Encouraging the size and placement of roof top mechanical equipment in discrete and unobtrusive locations to protect or enhance views of the Downtown from other buildings and the public street;

c) Developing rooftop terraces, gardens, and associated landscape areas for climate enhancement and for storm water management; and,

d) Incorporating best practices and appropriate technology to reduce energy consumption and improve air quality.”

The rooftop mechanical equipment is screened from view from any abutting street, and is designed to look like an additional floor to the building with glazing and spandrel panels to integrate with the building’s overall design. An outdoor amenity space is included on the rooftop of the podium located along the east and southern side of the building accessible to residents.

Prime Retail Streets

“B.6.1.8.7 The following policies, amongst others, apply to lands designated “Prime Retail Streets” in the Downtown Land Use Plan:

a) Ground floors shall predominantly be occupied by street oriented commercial uses. Upper floors of buildings along King and James are designated for mixed uses such as office, commercial, residential and live / work arrangements.
b) Buildings shall generally be built close to the street line and shall maintain the traditional building line and height at the street to provide an uninterrupted building line at the street level.

c) The following are to be provided for development proposals within the Prime Retail Streets area:

i) Access to buildings shall be at the street level. Ground floor façades shall have doors and windows open to the street.

ii) Buildings shall be built at the street-line with no setback from the property line.

iii) Accessory surface parking shall not be accommodated along the street frontage.

iv) New driveway access shall be at the rear of the property, and not on the public street. Laneway access at the rear shall be utilized.”

The proposed development would comply with the above-noted policies by providing street-oriented commercial uses along King Street East, with a residential use above. The proposal does not include any surface parking and driveway access would be located off Hughson Street North mid-block, furthest from either the King William Street or King Street East intersection. The proposed podium will maintain the traditional building line with no setback from the property line along King Street East, with access at the street level, and ground floor doors and windows.

**Specialty Commercial**

“B.6.1.8.8

**King William Street**

- Streetscape improvements shall be undertaken along King William Street as outlined in Section B.6.1.10 – Enhancing Street and Public Spaces. The street design shall incorporate generous sidewalks, special paving and extensive planting.

- New mixed-use development shall be achieved through the redevelopment of parking lots and the conversion of industrial and warehouse buildings for residential and commercial use. Conservation of the existing heritage character is a priority in all development.
Adaptive reuse is to be the primary redevelopment initiative for existing buildings.

i) New buildings shall be located along the street line. The height of new buildings and additions shall be consistent with the traditional street wall established by existing buildings and, therefore, shall maintain a height of three to four storeys at the street line, with the potential for decorative building elements stepped back from the street line when higher than four storeys. Increases above this height shall conform to Policies B.6.1.5.9 through B.6.1.5.12 – General Land Use Policies.

j) Buildings shall incorporate ground level pedestrian access to include the following: uses open to the public/accessible from ground level including doorways and windows; and, where possible, servicing from the rear of the property.

k) Signage shall be designed and located to respect the architectural integrity of the host building. Awning signs shall be encouraged.”

The proposed building will include a 2.0 metre setback from the property line along King William Street and Hughson Street North, allowing for generous sidewalks and increased public realm area for the smaller scale commercial units along King William Street for outdoor patios, plazas, and special landscaping treatment (item g)).

With regards to item h), the proposed mixed use development includes the redevelopment of an existing surface parking lot (60 King William Street) and a vacant site (43-51 King Street East).

The podium has been designed to create a consistent four (4) storey street wall, consistent with the surrounding context along King William Street, and will include similar decorative design elements from surrounding existing commercial uses, creating cohesion with the existing character of the street (item i)). Additional height will be adequately stepped back 4.0 metres from the four (4) storey podium along King William Street.

Significant fenestration, contrasting commercial curtain walls, awning signage, and the use of vertical and horizontal articulations along the four (4) storey podium will provide a continuous small-scale commercial environment to the north and west and help define the ground level pedestrian accesses (item j) and k)).

In staff’s opinion, the proposal would allow for a continuous intimate commercial environment and public realm space along King William Street.
“B.6.1.11.4 Gore Development Permit Sub-Area

a) The Gore DPA describes the area immediately surrounding Gore Park as shown on Map B.6.1-6 - Downtown Hamilton - Development Permit SubAreas. For over 150 years ‘The Gore’ has been the most important open space and public gathering place in Downtown Hamilton. The park, the adjacent sidewalks and streets define the open space. The surrounding buildings form the “walls” of The Gore. New development and redevelopment shall maintain the historic role and character of this space.

c) The following policies apply to building alterations, development and redevelopment projects for the Gore area:

I. Buildings shall be located along the front property line in order to provide a consistent frame for Gore Park and to retain the traditional building line. To that end, encroachments into the road allowance for outdoor dining areas may be permitted subject to applicable agreements.

II. Limited articulation of the front facades may be permitted in order to create sheltered areas at ground level or to allow for incorporation of architectural design element provided that the sense of enclosure is maintained and that the articulation does not detract from the retention of the traditional building line.

III. Buildings shall be constructed to the side lot line in order to maintain the sense of enclosure and avoid gaps in the streetscape. The City may permit upper storeys of the building to be stepped back or terraced from side lot lines providing that the sense of enclosure is maintained, that resulting building design harmonises with adjacent structures and that no adverse wind conditions are created.

IV. The height of new buildings and additions shall be consistent with the traditional street wall defined by existing buildings as a height of three to six storeys at the street line.

V. Permitted heights may be increased provided that the upper storeys are stepped back or terraced so as to achieve the following:
1. Additional height shall not result in adverse shadow or wind impacts on the King Street sidewalks as compared with the impact of a six-storey building.

2. Permitted heights may be increased for decorative building elements such as towers of cupolas provided the increase does not result in any of the adverse effects noted above.

3. Sun shadow impacts shall be measured on December 21st for the target areas of the north sidewalk on King Street East.

d) Buildings shall incorporate ground level pedestrian access to uses open to the public, windows and doorways that allow views into the building from the street and loading and services facilities at the rear of the structure.

e) To maintain the architectural and heritage character of The Gore, the facades of new buildings and additions facing Gore Park shall:

   I. Utilize traditional materials of stone, wood or brick. Other materials may be used provided that the resulting building design maintains a harmonious relationship with adjacent buildings; and,

   II. Reflect or complement the traditional patterns of fenestration, masonry units and decorative features of the upper storeys.

f) Design and location of signage shall respect the architectural integrity of the host building. Awning signage shall be encouraged.

g) The Gore area is part of the larger Downtown Community Improvement Area. The approved Community Improvement Plan shall be implemented to support enhancements to public spaces and the facades of historic structures.

While the Development Permit System has not been implemented, the policies for DPAs continue to be applied to development applications. It is staff’s opinion that the proposed development meets the above Gore Development Permit Sub-Area policies that aim to maintain the historic role and prominence of The Gore by:

- creating a podium that is built to the street line and adjacent shared property line (item a), item c) i.) and c) iii));

- using awnings and horizontal articulations creating the sense of enclosed sheltered spaces (item c) ii) and f));
• providing a 4 storey podium maintaining a traditional street wall (item c iv));

• including ground level pedestrian accesses along all frontages, with the parking and loading entrance being located as far as possible from either King William Street or King Street East (item d);

• There will be no increased shadow impacts on the north side of King Street East on December 21st (item c v)). Furthermore, the additional proposed height has been articulated to mitigate shadow and wind impacts as fully evaluated in the analysis of Policy B.6.1.5.9 described earlier in this Report. Further, there will be no increased shadow impacts on the north side of King Street East on December 21st (item c v));

• including significant use of brick that will create a harmonious relationship with adjacent buildings framing the north side of the park (item e I));

• reflecting adjacent horizontal and vertical cues through the use of horizontal and vertical articulations, colour variations in brick masonry, and fenestration patterns (item e II)); and,

• designing a notched corner at the King Street East and Hughson Street North intersection with openings to the commercial space directly angled towards the fountain in Gore Park. This design element will enhance the relationship of this site with the adjacent public space by directing views to the most prominent component of the park (item g) and is reminiscent of the former Kresge building design.

"B.6.1.11.5 Lister Development Permit Sub-Area (Lister DPA)

The Lister DPA is a specialty retailing and urban entertainment area shown on Map B.6.1-6 - Downtown Hamilton - Development Permit Sub-Areas. Redevelopment in this area should contribute to the existing street façade and uses . All proposals for development or redevelopment within the Lister DPA shall be subject to the policies in this section.

b) 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.

c) The height of new buildings and additions shall be consistent with the traditional street wall established by existing buildings and, therefore, should maintain a height of three to four storeys at the street line, with the potential for decorative higher building elements stepped back from the street line."
It is staff's opinion that the proposed development meets the above Lister Development Permit Sub-Area policies that aim to maintain the specialty retail and urban entertainment area of King William Street by:

- Redeveloping a vacant site and surface parking lot into a mixed use development containing commercial at grade (item b)); and,

- Providing a four (4) storey podium that will maintain the traditional street wall established by the adjacent existing buildings (item c)).

“B.6.1.11.5

f) The following policies shall apply to building alterations or the redevelopment of a site:

i) The building shall be situated along the front property line in order to provide an uninterrupted building line.

ii) The height of new buildings and additions at the street line should be low-to-mid rise in order to maintain and enhance pedestrian comfort at street level.

iii) The permitted height may be increased above the normally permitted height, provided the upper storeys are stepped back or terraced so as to achieve the following:

1. The additional height above the normally permitted height shall not exceed the preferred sun access as prescribed in the Downtown Hamilton Sun/Shadow Study.

2. The additional height above the normally permitted height shall not result in increased wind impacts on the public sidewalks.

3. The additional height should not result in a height and scale that dominates the landscape and skyline, including views from the Gore Park area.

4. The additional height shall incorporate the use of reflective materials to minimize the scale and massing of the building.

5. Sun shadow impacts are measured on March 21st for the target areas of the north sidewalk on King William Street and the west sidewalk on James Street North.
g) The building shall incorporate ground level pedestrian access that shall include the following: uses open to the public / accessibility from ground level including doorways and windows. Where possible, residential service areas should be designed to integrate with commercial retail / service space.

h) Despite the foregoing, residential uses may be permitted on the ground floor of a building where required to accommodate residential lobbies and service areas. Where possible, residential service areas should be oriented away from the front building façade.

i) Signage shall be designed and located to respect the architectural integrity of the host building. Awning signs shall be encouraged.

It is staff’s opinion that the proposed development meets the above Lister Development Permit Sub-Area policies as follows:

• The building will be situated along the front property line of King Street East, creating an uninterrupted building line with adjacent buildings (item f) i));

• The height of the new podium will be four (4) storeys and mid-rise in scale maintaining a similar height to adjacent buildings and enhancing the pedestrian experience at street level (item f) ii));

• The additional height proposed with the two tower elements are stepped back achieving the following:
  o Maintains the minimum preferred sun light access as described in the Downtown Hamilton Sun / Shadow Study (item f)iii) 1.);
  o Wind impacts generated from the proposed development will not result in undesirable conditions on the surrounding public sidewalks (item f)iii) 2.);
  o The additional height sought will integrate with the urban fabric already built around Gore Park creating a gateway to the most prominent part of the park for motorists travelling west along King Street East, while the tower stepbacks will diminish the appearance of the towers and reduce any obstruction of sky views from the pedestrian level. Further, the proposed tower elements are proposed to be 26 storeys (94 metres) in height and will not visually dominate the skyline of the escarpment (item f) iii) 3.);
Glazing is proposed on the modern tower elements, further minimizing the scale and massing of the proposed development (item f) iii) 4.); and,

As mentioned earlier, on March 21st the proposed development would allow for approximately 6.0 hours of sunlight access on the King William Street sidewalks between James Street North and John Street North; whereas an as-of-right built form would allow for just over an hour more sunlight access (item f) iii) 5.);

- Ground level pedestrian access is provided along all three street frontages to the commercial spaces of the proposed development (item g);

- The residential lobby entrance is well integrated into the design of the building, and is located away from the front building façade with access being provided off of Hughson Street North (item h); and,

- The concept renderings of the proposal includes awnings that could be used for signage. This finer detail element will be addressed at Site Plan Control stage.

Therefore, staff are of the opinion that the proposal complies with the UHOP and Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan.

**Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan Review (Draft – October, 2017)**

A review of the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan is currently underway and a review of the draft policies has been conducted. The updated Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan Review is expected to be presented to Planning Committee in Q1, 2018. The policies and discussion below is informative, not determinative, for the purpose of assessing the application.

Under the draft updated Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan the subject site is designated Downtown Mixed Use, identified as a Pedestrian Focus Street. In addition, a maximum building height of 30 storeys would be permitted as-of-right, subject to the following:

```
6.1.4.10 For lands identified on Map B.6.1.2 - Downtown Hamilton Building Heights, increases in height to a maximum of 12 storeys, may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan, subject to the following:

a) meeting the principles, objectives and policies of this Plan, in particular, Policy 6.1.4.9 and Policies B.6.1.4.24 through B.6.1.4.32.
```
b) demonstrating how the proposed building and site design relate to the existing and/or planned context of the area;

c) demonstrating how the proposed building and site relate to topography, the Niagara Escarpment, and other buildings in the area;

d) demonstrating how any net new increase to sun shadow impacts on public sidewalks, public spaces, and private amenity areas will be mitigated;

e) demonstrating how any net new increase to wind impacts on public sidewalks, public spaces, and private amenity areas will be mitigated;

f) demonstrating how any impacts on streetscapes and views of streetscapes, landmark structures or cultural heritage resources from public sidewalks or public spaces will be mitigated;

g) demonstrating how the proposed development mitigates impacts to on-site or adjacent cultural heritage resources; and,

h) in order to demonstrate the considerations listed above, proponents may be required to submit all of the following studies, in addition to any other studies identified as part of the Formal Consultation required under Section F – Implementation of Volume 1, as part of a development application:

   i) Shadow Impact Study;
   ii) Pedestrian Wind Impact Study
   iii) Visual Impact Assessment;
   iv) Traffic Impact Study;
   v) Infrastructure and Servicing Study;
   vi) Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment;
   vii) Urban Design Brief;

6.1.4.11 A Zoning By-law Amendment shall be required for any development proposal that seeks to increase height greater than 12 storeys, unless otherwise permitted by the Zoning By-law regulations existing at the time of adoption of this Secondary Plan, in accordance with the following:
a) building height shall be no greater than the height of the top of the Escarpment; and,

b) Policies B.6.1.4.10 a) through h) shall apply.

6.1.4.12 The siting, massing, height, and design of a building on one site will not necessarily be a precedent for development on an adjacent or nearby site.”

The subject site would be permitted a maximum building height of 30 storeys as identified on proposed Map B.6.1-2. Under this plan the proposed development would be permitted.

The following proposed policies would apply as the proposed development is for a tall building:

“Tall Buildings

6.1.4.13 The following policies shall apply to tall buildings:

a) a tall building is any building that is greater than 12 storeys in height;

b) new tall buildings shall be no greater than the height of the top of the Escarpment;

c) a tall building is typically defined as having a building base component (also known as podium), a tower component and tower top, however, Policies B.6.1.4.13 through B.6.1.4.17 shall also apply to other typologies of a tall building;

d) a building base is defined as the lower storeys of a tall building which are intended to frame the public realm and contains streetwall heights that respect the scale and built form character of the existing context through design, articulation, and use of the ground floor;

e) a tower is defined as the storeys above the building base; and,

f) the tower top is defined as the uppermost floors of the building including rooftop mechanical or telecommunications equipment, signage and amenity space. This portion of the building will have a distinctive presence in Hamilton’s skyline.
6.1.4.14 The Downtown Hamilton Tall Building Guidelines shall apply to tall building development and shall be used by City Staff when evaluating tall building development proposals.

6.1.4.15 In addition to Policy B.6.1.4.14 above, it is not the intent of the Downtown Hamilton Tall Building Guidelines to limit creativity. Where it can be demonstrated that an alternative built form achieves the intent of the Downtown Hamilton Tall Building Guidelines, alternative built forms may be permitted.

6.1.4.16 Tall building development shall require transition to low-rise and mid-rise built form adjacencies through the application of separation distances, setbacks, and stepbacks in accordance with Policies B.6.1.4.25 through B.6.1.4.27 of this Plan and as informed by the Downtown Hamilton Tall Building Guidelines.

6.1.4.17 Not every site in the Downtown can accommodate a tall building or is a suitable site for a tall building. Where sites are suitable for tall buildings, the following shall apply:

a) the building base shall be designed to:

i) fit harmoniously within the context of neighbouring street wall heights. Where there is no consistent street wall height context for the area, the street wall height shall be established in a manner that maintains a comfortable pedestrian scale and appropriate street proportion;

ii) reduce and mitigate wind impacts on the public realm, including streets, sidewalks, parks and open spaces, and privately owned publicly accessible spaces. Pedestrian level wind conditions should be suitable for sitting and standing, with higher standards applied to parks and open spaces and Pedestrian Focus Streets; and,

iii) minimize shadows, in accordance with Policies B.6.1.4.28 through B.6.1.4.32 of this Plan, to preserve the utility of sidewalks, parks, public and private open spaces, school yards and buildings, childcare centres, playgrounds, sitting areas, patios and other similar programs.

b) the building base may be required to setback at grade to achieve access to sunlight on sidewalks, parks, public and private open spaces, schoolyards and buildings, childcare centres, playgrounds, sitting areas, patios and other similar programs;
c) tall building development that occurs in the Downtown shall provide setbacks from the lot line to the building face of the tower. These lot line tower setbacks shall ensure that individual tall buildings within a block and the cumulative effect of multiple tall buildings within a block contribute to creating a strong and healthy neighbourhood by fitting in with the existing and / or planned context. Providing adequate space between towers will:

i) enhance the ability to provide a high-quality, comfortable public realm;

ii) protect development potential of other sites within blocks;

iii) provide access to sunlight on surrounding streets, parks, open spaces, school yards and other public or civic properties;

iv) provide access to natural light and a reasonable level of privacy for occupants of tall buildings;

v) provide pedestrian-level views of the sky between towers particularly as experienced from adjacent streets, parks and open spaces and views between towers for occupants of tall buildings;

vi) limit the impacts of uncomfortable wind conditions on streets, parks, open spaces and surrounding properties; and,

vii) provide appropriate transitions to adjacent lower-scale planned context, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes.

d) as building heights increase, greater setbacks may be required from the tower to the lot line to achieve the intent of Policy B.1.4.17 c); and,

e) the following studies may be required, in addition to any other studies identified as part of the Formal Consultation required under Section F – Implementation of Volume 1, for tall building development to demonstrate that the proposal meets the applicable design criteria of the Downtown Hamilton Tall Building Guidelines:

i) Shadow Impact Study;

ii) Pedestrian Wind Impact Study

iii) Visual Impact Assessment;

iv) Traffic Impact Study;

v) Infrastructure and Servicing Study;
vi) Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment;

vii) Urban Design Brief;


f) development proposals that do not meet the intent of Policy B.6.1.4.17 c), of this Plan, present significant concerns for building a strong healthy Downtown and as such shall not be approved for tall building development.”

With regards to proposed Policy 6.1.4.17 c) the proposal for the subject site has been evaluated by considering cumulative impacts, through a comprehensive review of the existing and approved tall buildings in the nearby surrounding area (see Table 1 below), staff are of the opinion that the cumulative effect of the proposed additional height:

- Will enhance the public realm creating a gateway to Gore Park and extend the existing commercial environment to the west connecting to the future John / Rebecca Park;

- Maintain the current development potential of other adjacent sites;

- Will increase shadowing on some public streets, but no public area will be impacted by more than four-hour intervals of shadowing, which is a similar situation that an as-of-right built form would create;

- Will provide residents of the towers with access to natural light and a reasonable level of privacy;

- Does not negatively impact any significant pedestrian-level views of the adjacent heritage buildings or cultural landscapes more than as-of-right permissions would create from adjacent public sidewalks;

- Will increase wind activity on the pedestrian sidewalks along Hughson Street North, but can effectively be mitigated through the mechanisms as described earlier; and,

- Will provide an appropriate transition to the lower-scale built heritage resources that are adjacent to the site with an effectively designed and scaled four (4) storey podium.
Table 1 – Nearby Existing, Under Construction, and Approved Tall Buildings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>COMMON NAME</th>
<th>STOREYS</th>
<th>APPROX. HEIGHT (m)</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Hughson St. S.</td>
<td>HSBC</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>130 King St. E.</td>
<td>Crowne Plaza</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 King St. E.</td>
<td>Royal Connaught Hotel</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 James St. S.</td>
<td>First Ontario</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Main St. W.</td>
<td>Piggott Building</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 James St. N.</td>
<td>William Thomas</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 King St. W.</td>
<td>CIBC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 King St. W.</td>
<td>CIBC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119 King St. W.</td>
<td>Ellen Fairclough Building</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 – 51 King St. E. &amp; 60 King William St.</td>
<td>King William Residence</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 King St. W.</td>
<td>Stelco Tower</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82-114 King St. W.</td>
<td>Royal Connaught Residences</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Under Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100 Main St. E.</td>
<td>Landmark Place</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Built</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, after evaluating the impacts of the proposal collectively with existing and approved tall building development nearby, it is staff’s opinion that the proposed 30 storey development still complies with the policies which allow for the consideration of an increase in building height. The revised design includes setbacks, stepbacks, vertical and horizontal articulations and tower placement configurations that are sensitive to the surrounding heritage context and the increase in density at this particular location will support the surrounding commercial environment and public transit investments in the downtown. Furthermore, the material identified in draft Policy 6.1.4.17 e) was submitted as part of this Zoning By-law Amendment application and reviewed by staff as mentioned earlier in this Report. Staff are of the opinion that the proposed height does not create any significant undesirable impacts in terms of shadowing, wind, views, cultural heritage, or servicing than the current as-of-right permissions would create.
Lastly, draft Policy 6.1.5.11 adds a new element to the analysis required for additional height proposed in the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan area. The proposed 30 storey (94 metres excluding mechanical penthouse) building would be no greater than the height of the Escarpment. Further, the subject site is located far enough from the Escarpment that the additional height proposed will respect and not challenge the visual prominence of the Escarpment.

Therefore, the proposal complies with the direction of the draft Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan (dated October, 2017).

City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200

The subject property is currently zoned Downtown Prime Retail Street (D2) Zone for the portion of the lands fronting onto King Street East and Downtown Mixed Use (D3) Zone for the portion of the lands fronting onto King William Street, to which both zones permit a range of commercial uses and also permit a multiple dwelling, but restricts the size and scale of development to a maximum height of 22 metres.

In order to implement the proposed development, the applicant has applied to modify the existing zoning by rezoning the portion of the property fronting onto King William Street from the Downtown Mixed Use (D3) Zone to a site specific Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2) Zone. Site specific modifications to the Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2) Zone for the entire site are required for the following:

- Increased maximum building height;
- Reduced minimum number of on-site parking spaces;
- Maintain the current parking stall dimensions of 2.6 metres in width by 5.5 metres in length;
- Establish a minimum number of bicycle parking spaces;
- Establish minimum tower setbacks;
- Establish minimum tower separation; and,
- Increased minimum building setbacks.

An evaluation of the proposed modifications is included in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation Section of this Report.
RELEVANT CONSULTATION

The following Departments and Agencies had no comments or objections to the applications:

- Alectra Utilities (formerly Horizon Utilities Corporation).

The following Departments and Agencies have provided comments on the application:

**Transportation Management, Public Works Department** has advised that a widening of the public right-of-way of up to 3.0 metres is required along King William street and up to 1.37 metres along Hughson Street North. A daylight triangle of up to 12.19 metres by 12.19 metres is required at the intersection of King Street East and Hughson Street North, and a up to 4.57 metre by 4.57 metre daylight triangle at the intersection of King William Street and Hughson Street North. Public right-of-way and daylight triangle dedications are implemented at the Site Plan Control stage. The City’s Official Plan contains policies that would permit the acceptance of lesser dedications for the public right-of-way or for daylight triangles where, in the opinion of the City, constraints including but not limited to, the nature of existing development, topographic and/or natural features, cultural heritage and design features or other constraints make it impractical. If the applicant proposes any reductions, the applicant will be required to submit a Right of Way Impact Assessment to be evaluated by the City as part of the Site Plan Control stage.

A minimum sidewalk width of 3.5m shall be required through the right of way and a sidewalk through the site with a minimum width of 1.5m is required. The required sidewalks and any transportation measures that are required as part of the Transportation Demand Management Options Report that must be submitted by the applicant will be implemented as part of the Site Plan Control Application.

**Health Protection, Public Health Services Department** has advised that if the development is to use a cooling tower for air conditioning or other cooling needs the cooling tower needs to be registered with Public Health Services prior to operating and must comply with Hamilton Cooling Tower Registry By-law No. 11-078.

**Corridor Management, Public Works Department** has advised that they have reviewed the Transportation Impact Study (TIS) dated April 2017, but noted that the TIS does not reflect the most up to date concept plan and therefore the TIS should be updated. Also, Corridor Management identified the following discrepancies and data that could not be verified:

1) No records have been found of pre-consultation with Corridor Management staff regarding scope of work to develop the TIS.
2) The scope of the TIS was limited to five (5) intersections whereas the scope should include an additional eight (8) intersections.

3) Unclear if a minimum one (1) hour field observation during peak hour was undertaken at each affected intersection to verify that traffic volumes reflect actual demand.

4) Analysis of existing traffic conditions for the AM and PM peak hours do not appear to conform to City guidelines. The TIS indicates some existing traffic operations may have been evaluated using optimized signal timings which is contrary to City of Hamilton TIS guidelines which requires existing signal timing. It is also unclear if the evaluated background traffic operations and total traffic operations used optimized or existing signal timings.

5) The existing speed limit on each road is 50 km / h, whereas the TIS lists and analysed some intersections / link with speed limits of 40 km / h which will create erroneous results in the existing, future background and total calculations for levels of service.

6) The TIS states existing transit service frequency “at better than 30 minutes”, with tables identifying between 10-30 minutes for the AM and PM peaks, while the schedules on the website indicate service frequency to be approximately 12-15 minutes. These are to be confirmed for the AM and PM peaks and incorporated into any findings in the revised TIS.

7) For the TIS, 2011 Transportation Tomorrow Survey data was used to estimate the travel modal split, trip distribution and assignment. This data could not be verified as the query criteria was not provided, and needs to be provided in the updated / revised TIS to enable the City to duplicate the results.

8) Corridor Management is having difficulty recreating the future site trip generation volumes provided in the TIS using Land Use Code for the Retail / Commercial component.

9) The TIS used trip generation estimates using residential condominium / townhouses rather than high-rise residential condominium / townhouses which is for buildings with three (3) or more levels.

10) The TIS should include several development approvals in the area in respect to traffic growth, specifically 10 James Street North, 46 James Street North, 112 King Street East, and 121-125 King Street East.
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11) The anticipated future traffic patterns associated with the LRT were taken into consideration, however the analysis does not represent the approved lane configuration. The study illustrates two (2) westbound lanes after the LRT is established whereas the most up-to-date plan for the LRT shows only one (1) westbound through / right turn lane. This discrepancy will significantly alter the future capacity analysis.

12) The future capacity of King Street East and Hughson Street North was analysed as a signalized intersection whereas this is intended to be removed and there will be no northbound through vehicle movement permitted north of the south branch of King Street East. As there is to be no northbound through vehicle traffic on Hughson Street North this will result in some alternate vehicular travel patterns on the roads surrounding this property.

13) The TIS did not review the viability of the site access with regards to its limited trip distribution road network, with King Street East having one lane of westbound traffic and Hughson Street North having no northbound through traffic through Gore Park.

14) Typically for development of this size and anticipated traffic volumes more than one (1) driveway access would be anticipated.

15) Collision and safety analysis was not reviewed.

16) The TIS recommends one inbound and one shared left / right lane, however Hughson Street North is one-way northbound which does not allow for an outbound left turn movements.

Corridor Management has also advised that there are currently properties fronting onto King Street East that utilize the “L” shaped alleyway that runs from John Street North to King William Street. Acceptable rear access to the properties fronting King Street East is to be maintained.

Corridor Management recommends that no private infrastructure be approved within any potential daylight triangle until utility requirements such as gas, water, fibre wire, hydro, LRT, amongst others are determined.

Corridor Management has advised that a driveway access width of 7.5m is required at the property line and 5.0m by 5.0m visibility triangles are required between the driveway limits and the road allowance limit.
The applicant will be required to provide an updated TIS as part of the Site Plan Control application to address these concerns and will be required to demonstrate that access driveway widths, visibility triangles and other traffic control measures are satisfactory.

**Hamilton Light Rail Transit** has advised that the proposed development is adjacent to the Main / King / Queenston B-Line LRT corridor. Metrolinx has identified the development of this rapid transit line in Hamilton linking McMaster University, Downtown and Eastgate Square as a top transit priority in the Regional Transportation Plan. Metrolinx advised that while there are currently four westbound lanes of traffic on King Street East, under the proposed LRT design this section of King Street East will be converted to a single lane of westbound traffic along the northerly side of the street. In addition under the proposed LRT design, Hughson Street North will not be a through street and will instead terminate at Gore Park and the only access to Hughson Street North between King Street East and King William Street will be from westbound traffic on King Street East turning right onto Hughson Street North.

Road widenings at this location are not anticipated as a result of the LRT implementation.

As there will only be a single westbound lane of traffic on King Street East, the turning movement of larger trucks from King Street East onto Hughson Street North is limited. The applicant is also advised that trucks cannot use the rail guideway to complete turning movements. Therefore the applicant should review turning movements at this intersection.

It is noted that stopping and deliveries along the LRT corridor is prohibited where it would negatively impact the flow of traffic, therefore all parking, stopping and loading activities for this site will not be permitted on King Street East. As a result through access for the rear alleyway should be maintained. Metrolinx noted that it appears that through access may no longer be possible should the north-south portion of the alleyway be closed. East-west through traffic will be achieved by establishing an easement to extend access out to Hughson Street North by traveling under the building.

To avoid disruption to the LRT corridor, all servicing connections where possible should be to Hughson Street North and / or King William Street and not to King Street East.

As part of the Site Plan Control application the applicant will be required to review the turning movements at the intersection of King Street East and Hughson Street North and demonstrate that the manoeuvring and access for any large trucks can be accommodated. The applicant will also be required to ensure that alleyway access is maintained for existing properties along King Street East so that stopping and deliveries can be accommodated off of King Street East. Finally the applicant will be required to
ensure adequate servicing connections are provided with preference being given to connections from Hughson Street North and King William Street.

**Hamilton Street Railway (HSR)** has advised that HSR currently operates various routes in the area. HSR advised that street entrances should be oriented to reduce walking distance between buildings and transit services and that high quality amenities like walkways and lighting should be utilized. HSR further advised that higher density mixed use development helps transit ridership and reduces net operating costs.

**Forestry and Horticulture Section, Public Works Department** identified that there are municipal tree assets on site and therefore a Tree Management Plan will be required, along with a Landscape Plan. All healthy trees on municipal property which are found to be in conflict with the proposed development and do not meet City criteria for removal are subject to a replacement fee. The Tree Management Plan and Landscape Plan will be undertaken as part of the Site Plan Control process.

**Recreation Planning, Public Works Department** has advised that they are supportive of the private indoor and outdoor amenity space that will be provided for the future residents of the development.

**Operations Support, Public Works Department** has advised that the property is eligible for weekly municipal waste collection of garbage, recycling, organics, and leaf and yard waste subject to compliance with specifications indicated by the Public Works Department.

**Design Review Panel**

The original proposal – Submission No. 1 was presented to the City's Urban Design Review Panel (DRP) on July 13, 2017, after making a formal Zoning By-law Amendment application. The mandate of DRP is to provide design advise to staff and the proponent. The DRP panel noted a number of recommendations with respect to the original design that were discussed with the applicant and staff which are summarized as follows:

**Scale and Compatibility**

The scale, form and character of the July, 2017 proposal was inappropriate as it does not respect the cultural landscape of the Gore and broader physical environment surrounding the development site and overwhelms the Gore and King William Street. Specifically, a redesign of the proposal to a mid-rise development with setbacks of at least 10m for any tower from King Street East and King William Street and a height of 12 to 15 storeys was suggested. An alternative suggestion was to maintain the 21m
separation between the towers and reduce the height of the tower along King Street East.

With respect to the recommendations pertaining to Scale and Compatibility, the proposal was revised. The placement of the proposed towers have been revised in order to establish a consistent four (4) storey podium along King Street East, Hughson Street North and King William Street and to establish larger stepbacks for the towers in order to better respect the cultural landscape of the Gore not overwhelm the Gore and King William Street. The building height was reduced but not to a height of 12 to 15 storeys advised by DRP, as it would require a large floor plate in order to be viable. The proposed stepbacks for the tower do not achieve the 10m recommended by DRP but provide an appropriate pedestrian scale for the podium and reduces the massing for the proposed towers. Therefore the two towers will be compatible.

Streetscape and Design

In respect to Streetscape and Design the panel noted that the first 5 storeys have many positive elements including the active uses at the ground floor and internalization of the parking, loading, and drop-off area. In addition, DRP advised that the heritage aspects should be carried throughout the entire site design so development reads as a single entity with unifying elements. Balconies appear to be close to the neighbours and should not face the Gore. Materials and colour palette should complement the buildings along King William Street. The panel also suggested a setback from Hughson Street North to permit pedestrian access and amenities.

With respect to the recommendations pertaining to Streetscape and Design, the revised proposal establishes a podium that reflects the heritage character of the area and better integrates the overall design. Exact materials and colours will be determined as part of the Site Plan Control application. The adjacent lands are commercial and therefore the proposed balconies will not create privacy impacts on the adjacent lands. The balconies are oriented to the east and the west with only a small portion wrapping around on the south elevation. The exact design of the balconies does not form part of the Zoning By-law Amendment and will be further reviewed and, where warranted, modified as part of the Site Plan Control process. Finally the proposed development is to include a 2m setback from Hughson Street North which will provide space for pedestrian access and amenities.

Cultural Heritage

In respect to Cultural Heritage, the panel noted that the old building façade is intriguing, and suggested that the original store front be incorporated into the podium. They also noted that the proposed scale, form and character does not respect the cultural heritage landscape of the Gore.
With respect to the recommendations pertaining to Cultural Heritage, proposed changes to the design have been undertaken. As previously discussed, it has been demonstrated that the heritage attributes of adjacent protected heritage properties and lands containing cultural resources will be conserved.

Use and Function

In respect to use and function the panel advised that Office uses should be relocated to King Street East, that indoor bicycle parking be provided and that vehicle circulation be improved.

With respect to the recommendations pertaining to Use and Function, the applicant is no longer proposing office uses. The applicant is also intending to provide ample long term and short term bicycle parking and has revised the proposal to improve vehicle circulation for the site.

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act and the Council approved Public Participation Policy, Notice of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation was sent to 505 property owners within 120 m of the subject property on June 30, 2017. A Public Notice sign was posted on the property on July 24, 2017, and updated on December 6, 2017, with the Public Meeting date. Finally, Notice of the Public Meeting was given in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act.

To date, eight (8) letters of correspondence were received respecting the proposed development. These letters will be further discussed in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendations section of the Report.

Public Consultation Strategy

The applicant prepared a Public Consultation Strategy. To engage with the public, the applicant met with the Beasley Neighbourhood Association on May 10, 2017. In addition a sign with the contact information of the applicant’s agent was posted on-site. A microsite was established and became active in June 2017, which included information respecting the proposed development including copies of the studies and reports that were provided to the City of Hamilton. The link to the microsite was provided to the Beasley Neighbourhood Association, the local ward councillor, City staff and the link was posted on the signage provided on-site on October 31, 2017. The microsite was accessed 368 times, and there were 700 downloads of the documents contained on the microsite as of October 6, 2017. A breakdown of the downloads is shown in Appendix “F” to Report PED18013.
ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment application has merit and can be supported for the following reasons:

   (i) The application is consistent with the PPS and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017), in terms of intensification and the development of complete communities;

   (ii) The application complies with the policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and the in force and effect Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan; and,

   (iii) The proposed development is compatible with existing land uses and heritage buildings in the immediate area and represents good planning by, among other things, establishing a high-rise building that has been effectively designed and massed to respect the existing predominately low-rise surrounding context, providing for the development of a complete community, and enhancing the commercial environment along King Street East and King William Street, making efficient use of existing infrastructure within the urban boundary, and supporting transportation infrastructure investments.

2. Zoning By-law No. 05-200

   Change in Zoning

   The applicant is seeking to change the portion of the property fronting onto King William Street from the Downtown Mixed Use (D3) Zone to the Downtown Prime Retail Street (D2) Zone and create a site specific (D2) Zone for the portion of the property fronting onto King Street East. The change in zoning will establish a single unified zoning for the subject lands instead of having two separate zones. The change in zoning from the D3 Zone will reduce the range of permitted uses. Specifically the following uses would no longer be permitted in the proposed site specific D2 Zoning applicable to the subject lands:

   - Community Garden;
   - Emergency Shelter;
   - Motor Vehicle Rental Establishment;
   - Residential Care Facility;
   - Retirement Home;
   - Social Services Establishment; and,
   - Urban Farm.
In addition, the D2 Zone restricts the location of dwelling units and multiple dwellings by not permitting these uses on the ground floor, whereas the D3 Zone does not include a restriction on these uses being located on the ground floor. The proposed change will direct and encourage street oriented commercial uses along King William Street which is consistent with the existing pedestrian nature along the street.

As the proposed development has frontage on two streets that maintain a strong pedestrian focus, the Downtown Prime Retail Streets Zone is an appropriate zone for the intended vision for these streets. Therefore the proposed change in zoning has merit and can be supported.

The following Site Specific modifications are required to implement the proposal.

**Maximum Building Height**

A modification is being requested to increase the maximum building height for this site which is restricted to a maximum height of 22 metres on Schedule F – Figure 1 of By-law No. 05-200.

As discussed in the UHOP policy section of this Report, based on the revisions to the proposed building and a review of the additional material respecting sun/ shadow impacts, wind impacts, and visual impacts, staff are satisfied that the proposed development meets the required policies of the UHOP to permit additional building height to 94 metres (excluding mechanical penthouse).

In order to integrate the building with the existing built form along King Street East, a podium is being proposed with a height of 4 storeys which will be consistent with the existing four (4) storey buildings located to the east and west of the subject lands. A portion of the fifth and sixth floors that connects the two (2) towers is stepped in from the four (4) storey podium. The tower containing the balance of the fifth and sixth storeys and the remaining 24 storeys will be setback 4 metres along King Street East, 4.5 metres along Hughson Street North, and 4.5 metres from the lot line to the east. The proposed setbacks will break up the massing of the building elements at the street level.

In respect to compatibility to the adjacent properties along King William Street, the properties to the east front onto John Street North and range in height from 2 to 3 storeys, to the west is a building that is 6 storeys in height but setback more than 10 metres from King William Street, and to the north are existing buildings that range in height from 2 to 4 storeys. In order to integrate the building with the existing built form along King William Street, a podium is being proposed with a height of four (4) storeys which will be compatible to the range of building heights.
along King William Street located to the north, east and west. A portion of the fifth
and sixth floors that connects the two (2) towers is stepped in from the four (4)
storey podium. The tower containing the balance of the fifth and sixth storeys
and the remaining 24 storeys will be setback 6 metres along King William Street,
approximately 22 metres from Hughson Street North, 12 metres from the lot line
to the south and 3 metres from the lot line to the east. The proposed setbacks
will break up the massing of the building particularly at the street, and thereby
ensure compatibility with the adjacent lands.

Therefore the modification for a maximum building height of 94 metres has merit
and can be supported.

**Maximum Setback from a Street Line**

A modification is required to permit an increase in the maximum setback from 0.5
metres to 2 metres from a street line for the second and third storey of the
proposed building. The proposed setback pertains to the setback from the
Hughson Street North lot line to the building and from the King William Street lot
line to the building. In addition a modification is also required in respect to the
maximum setback for the access driveway on Hughson Street North which is
restricted to 6 metres whereas the proposed access driveway is an open concept
with no garage doors.

The proposed increase in the maximum setback from a street line is to provide a
larger pedestrian realm along Hughson Street North and King William Street by
shifting the podium a total of 2 metres back from the street line.

As the existing pedestrian realm along King Street East is already very extensive,
the building will be located at the King Street East lot line, and does not require a
by-law modification.

Along Hughson Street North the proposed building will comprise the entire length
of the block between King Street East and King William Street. As the former
building on site has been demolished, there is no established building line,
therefore the proposed 2 metre setback will establish a new building line for this
section of the street. Along King William Street the proposed building will
comprise the majority of the length of the block between Hughson Street North
and John Street North and the only buildings along this length of the block are
the property at 29 John Street North which is oriented towards John Street North
and the rear portion of 23 John Street North, a T shaped lot on which the building
fronts onto John Street North and is setback approximately 11 metres from King
William Street. Therefore the proposed 2 metre maximum setback will not
disrupt an existing building line.
In respect to the setback for the access driveway, the proposal is for an open concept with no garage door along Hughson Street North. The intent of the maximum 6.0 metre setback provision is to maintain a consistent street wall, while allowing enough room for one average size vehicle to idle off-street while waiting for a garage door to open. The proposed open entrance design is intended to facilitate vehicular access across the site, reduce traffic delays on Hughson Street North, and connect to the existing alleyway from John Street North. The majority of the proposed building would be located less than 6m from Hughson Street North and therefore the proposed open concept for the access driveway will not disrupt the existing building line.

Therefore the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.

**Tower Setbacks**

Modifications are required in order to ensure that the proposed towers are stepped in from the podium in order to break up the massing of the building to establish an appropriate scale of development at the street level. The following table identifies the setbacks for each tower:

Table 2 – Proposed Tower Setback (all setbacks are in respect to the fifth storey unless otherwise specified):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Line</th>
<th>South Tower (King Street East)</th>
<th>North Tower (King William Street)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King Street East</td>
<td>4 metres</td>
<td>N / A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughson Street North</td>
<td>4.5 metres</td>
<td>4.5 metres, (23 metres above the sixth storey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King William Street</td>
<td>8 metres (41 metres above the sixth storey)</td>
<td>6 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easterly Lot Line (53 to 59 King Street East)</td>
<td>4.5 metres</td>
<td>N / A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easterly Lot Line (23 John Street North)</td>
<td>N / A</td>
<td>3 metres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southerly Lot Line (alleyway)</td>
<td>N / A</td>
<td>12 metres</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The setback requirements from the podium that are being created for the tower elements are new provisions that reflect incoming Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan direction. These tower setback requirements will ensure that an appropriate transition in building height is achieved between the towers and the adjacent lands. The required setbacks for the towers will also reduce the overall massing of the proposed building, as well as reduce sun shadowing and wind...
impacts on the surrounding streets and properties. Establishing the minimum setbacks for the towers as part of the site specific Zoning By-law will ensure that required setbacks for the towers are maintained.

Therefore the proposed modifications have merit and can be supported.

**Minimum Separation Distance Between Towers**

A modification is required to ensure that the two proposed towers maintain a minimum separation distance of 16.0 metre.

Maintaining a separation distance of at least 16.0 metre is required to ensure that the proposed building does not create negative sun shadow impacts and that adequate natural lighting and privacy is maintained for the units within both towers. The policy analysis respecting sun shadow in Policy Implication Section of this Report was based on the towers maintaining a separation distance of at least 16.0 metre and staff are satisfied that the proposed development will not create negative sun shadow impacts. In respect to natural lighting and privacy between the two towers the orientation of the two towers are perpendicular to each other and the 16.0 metre setback represents the closes point between the two towers and greater separation is achieved between the remainder of the tower. The orientation of the building will also protect the privacy of the residents as the units of the towers will instead be set at a 90 degree angle.

Therefore the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.

**Minimum Number of Residential Parking Spaces**

A modification is required to reduce the residential parking rate for a dwelling unit with more than 50 sq. m. of gross floor area from 1.0 space per dwelling unit to 0.74 spaces per dwelling unit.

Based on the current parking requirements a minimum of 525 parking spaces are required for the 525 residential dwelling units. A total of 393 parking spaces are being proposed for the subject property. The subject property is located in the middle of the downtown core and is within walking distance of commercial uses, places of employment, and amenities. A minimum of 484 indoor bicycle parking spaces are to be provided of which 10% are to be provided as short term bicycle parking. There are existing bus routes along King Street East, bus routes one block to the east and west on James Street North and John Street North, and the subject property is within approximately 250 metres of the MacNab Street Bus terminal. The subject property is also within approximately 400 metres of the GO
station located to the south, and is located along the proposed Light Rail Transit (LRT) route and is within 150 metres of a stop.

Furthermore, based on information collected from the Transportation Tomorrow Survey a parking rate of 0.66 space per unit for any unit greater than 50 square metres would be considered reasonable for this type of development located in the downtown core.

Therefore as the proposed development is located in a pedestrian friendly area, will provide ample bicycle parking spaces and is in proximity to multiple transit options, a parking ratio of 0.74 spaces per dwelling unit will meet the parking needs of the proposed residents.

Therefore the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.

**Bicycle Parking**

A modification is required in order to ensure that sufficient long-term and short-term bicycle parking is provided to meet the needs of the proposed development.

It is noted that as part of the proposed Commercial and Mixed Use Zoning and proposed Downtown Zoning, that will be presented to Planning Committee in Q1, 2018, the Zoning By-law will require a minimum number of on-site bicycle parking spaces to be provided. As the requirement for a minimum number of bicycle parking spaces is not yet in effect for the subject lands, a provision will be added to the site specific Zoning By-law in order to ensure that on-site bicycle parking is established and maintained for the subject lands. A minimum of 484 indoor bicycle parking spaces are to be provided of which 10% (49 spaces) are to be provided as short-term bicycle parking. The proposed bicycle parking establishes a ratio of 0.92 bicycle parking spaces per dwelling unit, of which long-term bicycle parking would be established at a ratio of approximately 0.82 bicycle parking spaces per dwelling unit.

It is the opinion of staff that the 484 indoor bicycle parking spaces of which 435 spaces are to be provided for long-term bicycle parking spaces and 49 short-term bicycle parking spaces will provide adequate alternative transportation options for the proposed development.

Therefore the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.
Parking Stall Dimensions

A motion from Planning Committee directed Planning staff to investigate the feasibility of increasing parking stall size for the City of Hamilton’s Zoning By-law No. 05-200. City Initiative CI-16-D proposes, among other things, that the Commercial and Mixed Use (CMU) Zoning include revised parking stall dimension requirements to increase the standard width from 2.6 metres to 2.8 metres, and increase the standard length from 5.5 metres to 5.8 metres. These changes were approved by Council on November 8th, 2017, but appealed. As these changes are before Council for approval the applicant has requested to include a modification for a minimum parking stall size of 2.6 metres x 5.5 metres.

As this application was submitted and under review before any recommendations to Council regarding the City initiated changes to parking stall sizes had been made, staff are supportive of this request to maintain the currently inforce regulations for parking stall sizes for lands within the Downtown zones.

3. An “H” Holding Provision is recommended to require that a signed Record of Site Condition (RSC) be submitted to the City of Hamilton and the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) for the subject property. This RSC must be to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, including a notice of acknowledgement of the RSC by the MOECC, and submission of the City of Hamilton’s current RSC administration fee. This is required to evaluate the impacts of the former commercial uses on the property given the proposed change to include residential uses (a sensitive land use).

4. There is a 300 mm watermain along King Street East, a 200 mm watermain along Hughson Street North, and a 200 mm and 500mm watermain along King William Street to service the development. A combined system is available on Hughson Street North, King Street East, and King William Street for collection of wastewater and storm water.

A 3.0 metre road widening is required along King William Street and a 1.37 metre road widening is required along Hughson Street North in order to meet the prescribed road width requirements identified in the Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan Volume 2, Chapter B, Table B.6.1.14.3 and Volume 1, Chapter C. In addition a 12.19 metre by 12.19 metre daylight triangle is required at the intersection of King Street East and Hughson Street North and a 4.57 metre by 4.57 metre daylight triangle is required at the intersection of Hughson Street North and King William Street.
If the applicant proposes any reductions to the road widening and daylight triangle, the applicant will require a Right of Way Impact Assessment that has been approved by the City of Hamilton.

As part of the review of the Zoning By-law Amendment application, a Functional Servicing Report and preliminary grading and servicing plan were provided and, Development Engineering staff are generally satisfied. However, at the Site Plan Control stage, the proponent shall update the Functional Servicing Report including domestic and fire flow demand in order to demonstrate that servicing requirements have been satisfied. In addition as part of the Site Plan Control application, a detailed review in respect to grading and drainage, stormwater management, and servicing will be undertaken.

In accordance with the Functional Servicing Report there are existing manholes, catch basins and utilities that are located within the alleyway. As the applicant is proposing to close a portion of the alleyway, the applicant will be required to demonstrate as part of the Site Plan Control application how these services will be relocated. Any services that are placed on private property will require the establishment of easements to ensure that access to undertake maintenance of the services is maintained.

The applicant is proposing to control storm water within the site according with City Standards to reduce the impact to neighbouring properties and City infrastructure.

5. The applicant is proposing to purchase the north-south portion of the alleyway in order to include the lands as part of the development. The applicant will be required to acquire the alleyway lands prior to the Site Plan Control application in order to include them in the application. The existing alleyway is accessed and utilized by multiple properties along King Street East and in the absence of alternative options, the closure of the north-south portion of the alleyway would restrict access to the alleyway to John Street North only. In order to ensure that two access points are maintained and vehicles can navigate the alleyway in a forward manner the applicant is proposing to extend the east-west portion of the alleyway to Hughson Street North but have the alleyway extend under the proposed building at ground level. The applicant will need to purchase the lands comprising the north-south portion of the alleyway from the City of Hamilton. In order to purchase these lands the applicant will be required to satisfy the City of Hamilton that the functionality of the east-west portion of the alleyway is maintained. Should the purchase of the alleyway be approved, the applicant will be required to establish easements over a portion of the subject lands to ensure access.
6. Following the Notice of Complete Application, staff received eight (8) letters of correspondence (see Appendix “G” to Report PED18013). Issues raised in the letters of correspondence include:

**Height**

A concern was raised that the height of the proposed development was too high and was not compatible with the existing character and particularly concern was raised in respect to King William Street.

The applicant has revised the height of the tower along King Street East lowering the height from 34 storeys to 30 storeys but has raised the height of the tower along King William Street from 25 to 30 storeys.

As discussed in the Policy Implication Section of this Report a well-articulated podium that is terraced back from all street frontages will read as a four storey street wall along King William Street and four storey street wall along King Street East which is consistent with the surrounding buildings immediately adjacent to the site. The proposed stepbacks between the podium and the proposed towers will establish a transition in building height and massing from the existing built form to the towers being proposed. Based on a well-articulated podium being established, the massing of the proposed 30 storey towers will be broken up and will be less apparent from the street level and the proposed height will be compatible with the existing character of the area.

**Sun Shadow and Wind Impact**

A concern was raised that the proposed development would create sun shadow and wind impacts. The concern included impacts on both Gore Park as well as on King William Street.

As discussed in the Policy Implication Section of this Report, the sun shadow and wind impacts of the proposed development have been reviewed and staff are of the opinion that the proposed additional height does not create a significant undesirable net increase in impacts in terms of shadowing and wind, than as-of-right permissions would create.

**Scale at Street**

A concern was raised that the proposed development would not be of an appropriate scale at the street, and that the proposed development would be of such a size and scale as to not be a human scale of development.

---

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully,
OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.
OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.
As discussed, the proposed development will be required to establish a well-articulated podium with a height of four (4) storeys along King William Street and King Street East with a height and massing at the street level that will be compatible with the height and massing of existing buildings along both King Street East and King William Street and constitute a human scale of development.

Heritage & Design

A concern was raised with respect to the heritage impact of the proposed development, specifically that the proposed development does not resemble the art deco style of building and the proposed building does not complement the existing historic style.

In respect to buildings that have cultural heritage value, the preference is for the buildings to be preserved and adaptively re-used. In a situation where the building is to be removed the preference is to not to have the new building attempt to replicate the previous building. As such, staff has recommended that the previous building not be recreated.

The proposed building has been reviewed with respect to compatibility and the heritage character of the area. The proposed podium is to be established at a scale that is in line with the existing built form and comprised of materials and a design that are characteristic of the area. The full details in respect to design will be reviewed and implemented at the Site Plan Control stage.

Density

A concern was raised with respect to the density of the proposed development and the impact that the scale of development would have in respect to the issues of traffic and services.

As part of the application, a Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was submitted and reviewed. As part of the Site Plan Control process, the applicant will be required to update their TIS and implement any traffic mitigation measures. The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment establishes the maximum scale of development permitted on-site. As part of the Site Plan Control process the applicant will be required to demonstrate that the scale of development that is being proposed can function and all concerns are addressed to proceed and receive final Site Plan approval.

As part of the application a Functional Servicing Report (FSR) was submitted and reviewed. Through the review of the FSR, staff are generally satisfied. With
respect to sanitary and storm sewers staff note that there are existing combined sewers along King Street East, King William Street, and Hughson Street North, to support this development. However as part of the Site Plan Control application, a detailed review in respect to grading and drainage, stormwater management, and servicing will be undertaken.

**Alleyway Closure**

A concern was raised in respect to the closure of the alleyway both to permit the development and wanting to ensure that alleyway access would be maintained and be unobstructed both during the construction phase of development and after the development has been completed.

The applicant is seeking to close the section of the alleyway that extends to King William Street, incorporate the lands as part of the proposed development, and extend the section of the east-west portion of the alleyway out to Hughson Street North under the proposed building on the ground floor level and would be over private property. The applicant will need to purchase the lands comprising the north-south portion of the alleyway from the City of Hamilton. In order to purchase these lands the applicant will be required to satisfy the City of Hamilton that the functionality of the east-west portion of the alleyway is maintained. Should the purchase of the alleyway be approved, the applicant will be required to establish easements over a portion of the subject lands to ensure access.

**Commercial**

A concern was raised that insufficient commercial space is being provided and particularly there is a lack of service commercial (such as a big name grocery stores, home furnishing store, and / or drug store) and that the redevelopment of the site represents an opportunity to provide for commercial space that would cater to service commercial uses.

The ground floor of the proposed building fronting onto King Street East and King William Street are to be for commercial uses. Along Hughson Street North, except for parking access and lobby space, the portion of the ground floor fronting onto Hughson Street North is to be for commercial uses. A range of commercial uses are permitted in the Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2) Zone however the specific commercial uses are not known at this time.
ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION

Should the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment application be denied, the subject property could be utilized in accordance with the Downtown Prime Retail Street (D2) Zone and Downtown Mixed Use (D3) Zone.

ALIGNMENT TO THE 2016 – 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN

Community Engagement & Participation
Hamilton has an open, transparent and accessible approach to City government that engages with and empowers all citizens to be involved in their community.

Economic Prosperity and Growth
Hamilton has a prosperous and diverse local economy where people have opportunities to grow and develop.

Healthy and Safe Communities
Hamilton is a safe and supportive city where people are active, healthy, and have a high quality of life.

Clean and Green
Hamilton is environmentally sustainable with a healthy balance of natural and urban spaces.

Built Environment and Infrastructure
Hamilton is supported by state of the art infrastructure, transportation options, buildings and public spaces that create a dynamic City.

Culture and Diversity
Hamilton is a thriving, vibrant place for arts, culture, and heritage where diversity and inclusivity are embraced and celebrated.

APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED
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- Appendix “B”: Draft By-law and Schedule A Map
- Appendix “C”: First Concept Plan
- Appendix “D”: Second Concept Plan
- Appendix “E”: Third Concept Plan (Final)
- Appendix “F”: Microsite Activity
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Subject Property
43 - 51 King Street East & 60 King William Street
Change in Zoning from the
Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2) Zone and
Downtown Mixed Use (D3) Zone to the
Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2, 626, H18) Zone

Key Map - Ward 2
To Amend Zoning By-law No. 05-200
Respecting Lands Located at 43 - 51 King Street East, and 60 King William Street

WHEREAS the City of Hamilton has in force several Zoning By-laws which apply to the different areas incorporated into the City by virtue of the City of Hamilton Act, 1999, S. O. 1999, Chap. 14;

AND WHEREAS the City of Hamilton is the lawful successor to the former Municipalities identified in Section 1.7 of By-law No. 05-200;

AND WHEREAS the first stage of the new Zoning By-law, being Zoning By-law No. 05-200, came into force on the 25th day of May, 2005;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton, in adopting Item of Report 18- of the Planning Committee at its meeting held on the day of 2018, recommended that Zoning By-law No. 05-200, be amended as hereinafter provided;

AND WHEREAS this By-law is in conformity with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:

1. That Maps 910, 911, 952 and 953 of Schedule “A” - Zoning Maps of By-law No. 05-200 be amended by changing the zoning from the Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2) Zone and Downtown Mixed Use (D3) Zone to the Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2, 626, H18) Zone, for the lands, the extent and boundaries of which are shown on Schedule “A” annexed hereto and forming part of this By-law.

2. That Schedule “C” Special Exceptions of By-law No.05-200 be amended by adding an additional special exception as follows:

   “626. Within the lands zoned Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2, 626) Zone, identified on Maps 910, 911, 952 and 953 of Schedule “A” Zoning Maps
To Amend Zoning By-law No. 05-200  
Respecting Lands Located at 43 - 51 King Street East, and 60 King William Street

and described as 43 to 51 King Street East and 60 King William Street the following special provisions shall apply:

a) Notwithstanding Sections 5.2 b), 5.6 a), 5.7, and 6.2.3 a) ii), iii) and b) ii) the following special provisions shall also apply:

b) REGULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Maximum Building Setback from a Street Line (Podium)</th>
<th>i) 6.0 metres from the King William Street street line to the building, 3.0 metres from the easterly property line to the building, 12.0 metres from the southerly property line to the building and a minimum average setback of 8.25 metres, but not less than 6.5 metres from the Hughson Street North street line to the building, for any portion of the building above the fourth storey.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Building Height</td>
<td>ii) Maximum building height shall be 94 metres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Minimum Building Setback from a Street Line or Property Line (North Tower)</td>
<td>i) 2 metres for the second and third storeys from property line along Hughson Street North and King William Street; iii) That Section 6.2.3 a) iii) shall not apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Minimum Building Setback from a Street Line or Property Line (South Tower)</td>
<td>ii) In addition to the above, a minimum 23.0 metres from the Hughson Street North street line to the building, for any portion of the building above the sixth storey. i) 4.0 metres from the King Street East street line to the building, 4.5 metres from the easterly property line to the building, 8.0 metres from the King William Street street line to the building and a minimum average setback of 5.5 metres, but not less than 4.5 metres from the Hughson Street North street line to the building, for any portion of the building above the fourth storey. ii) In addition to the above, a minimum 41.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To Amend Zoning By-law No. 05-200
Respecting Lands Located at 43 - 51 King Street East, and 60 King William Street

metres from the King William Street street line to the building, for any portion of the building above the sixth storey.

e) Minimum Tower Separation

16.0 metre separation distance from a tower to another tower located on the same lot.

f) Parking

Parking for a Multiple Dwelling within a mixed use building shall be provided on the basis of:

i) 0.74 spaces per dwelling unit, except where a dwelling unit is 50 square metres in gross floor area or less, in which case, parking shall be provided at a rate of 0.3 spaces per dwelling unit.

ii) No parking space shall be less than 2.6 metres in width by 5.5 metres in length.

g) Bicycle Parking

Bicycle Parking for a Multiple Dwelling within a mixed use building shall be provided on the basis of:

0.92 Bicycle Parking spaces per dwelling unit of which 10% are to be provided as short term Bicycle Parking spaces.

3. That Schedule D – Holding Provisions, of By-law No. 05-200, be amended by adding the additional Holding Provision as follows:

Notwithstanding 6.2 of this By-law, within the lands zoned “Downtown Prime Retail Street (D2, 626) Zone, on Map 910, 911, 952 and 953 of Schedule A – Zoning Maps, and described as 43 – 51 King Street East, and 60 King William Street (Hamilton), the H Symbol applicable to the lands referred to in Section 1 of this By-law shall prohibit development of the lands and shall be removed condition upon:

(a) the applicant submitting a signed Record of Site Condition (RSC) to the City of Hamilton and the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC). This RSC must be to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, including a notice of acknowledgement of the RSC by the MOECC, and submission of the City of Hamilton’s current RSC administration fee.
To Amend Zoning By-law No. 05-200
Respecting Lands Located at 43 - 51 King Street East, and 60 King William Street

4. That Schedule F" – Figure 1 of By-law 05-200 be amended by identifying the lands shown in Schedule “A” with a maximum height of 94 metres.

5. That the Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to proceed with the giving of notice of the passing of the By-law, in accordance with the Planning Act.

6. That this By-law No. 18_____ shall come into force and be deemed to come into force in accordance with Sub-section 34(21) of the Planning Act, either upon the date of passage of this By-law or as otherwise provided by the said Sub-section.

PASSED this __________ ____ , 2018

________________________________________  ______________________________________
F. Eisenberger                                R. Caterini
Mayor                                         City Clerk
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To Amend Zoning By-law No. 05-200
Respecting Lands Located at 43 - 51 King Street East, and 60 King William Street

This is Schedule "A" to By-law No. 18-
Passed the .......... day of ....................., 2018

Schedule "A"

Map Forming Part of By-law No. 18-_____
to Amend By-law No. 6593

Subject Property
43 - 51 King Street East & 60 King William Street
Change in Zoning from the Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2) Zone and Downtown Mixed Use (D3) Zone to the Downtown Prime Retail Streets (D2, 626, H18) Zone

Scale: N.T.S.
File Name/Number: ZAR-17-047
Date: Dec. 1, 2017
Planner/Technician: DB/AL

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
**To Amend Zoning By-law No. 05-200**  
Respecting Lands Located at 43 - 51 King Street East, and 60 King William Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Office Use Only, this doesn't appear in the by-law - Clerk's will use this information in the Authority Section of the by-law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is this by-law derived from the approval of a Committee Report? No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee: Chair and Members Report No.: PED18XXX Date: 01/162017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward(s) or City Wide: Ward: 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prepared by: Daniel Barnett &amp; Tiffany Singh Phone No: 905-546-2424 ext. 4445</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For Office Use Only, this doesn't appear in the by-law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For landscaping, refer to landscape drawings.

For proposed grading, refer to landscape drawings and approved grading plan.

All perimeter existing information indicated taken from survey.

All work to be done in conformance with the 2012 Ontario Building Code (O.B.C., as amended).

A.T. McLaren Limited
69 John Street South, Suite 230
Hamilton, Ontario L8N 2B9
Ph: (905) 527 8559 Fax: (905) 527 0032
NOTE:
TOTAL UNIT COUNT: 525
TOTAL PARKING COUNT (INCLUDING BARRIER-FREE): 393
TOTAL BARRIER FREE: 15
TOTAL BIKES (2 BIKES STACKED): 484
NOTE:
PARKING COUNT (INCLUDING BARRIER-FREE): 110
BARRIER-FREE: 3
BIKE COUNT: 76

Nov. 9, 2017
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
43 King Street
HAMILTON, ONTARIO
B.GRAZIANI
R.LINCOLN
R.LINCOLN D.BIASE
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Page 836 of 1145
NOTE:
PARKING COUNT (INCLUDING BARRIER FREE): 23
BARRIER FREE: 1
BIKE COUNT (2 BIKES STACKED): 274

43 King Street
Hamilton ONTARIO

Nov. 9, 2017
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NOTE:

UNIT COUNT: 38
PARKING COUNT (INCLUDING BARRIER FREE): 80
BARRIER FREE: 2

Nov. 9, 2017
NOTE:
COUNT: 19
PARKING COUNT (INCLUDING BARRIER FREE): 41
BARRIER FREE: 2

RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
43 King Street
Hamilton, ONTARIO

B.GRAZIANI
R.LINCOLN
R.LINCOLN/D.BIASE

A/L Nov. 9, 2017

4TH FLOOR PLAN
1:200
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE NAME</th>
<th>RESOURCE FILE</th>
<th>FILE HITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Package</td>
<td>151-16-Architectural-Package_May.pdf</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>Survey-Plan.pdf</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading &amp; Servicing</td>
<td>151-16-Grading-Servicing.pdf</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning By-law Amendment Application</td>
<td>151-16-SIGNED-ZBA-application.pdf</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Design Brief</td>
<td>151-16-Urban-Design-Brief_June-4-2017.pdf</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised Sun Shadow Study</td>
<td>1388.16.sept._13.2017.shadow-studies..pdf</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL PAGE VIEWS: 368**
Hi Daniel,

I'm following up on a previous email sent to you with regards to a zoning map. Looking for some clarification on this matter.

Thank you,

Mathieu Szplitgieber.

----- Forwarded message from -----  ---
Date: Wed, 05 Jul 2017 14:10:12 -0400
From:  
Subject: File: ZAR-17-047
To: Daniel.Barnett@hamilton.ca

Hi Daniel,

we received a letter from Kimberley Harrison-McMillan today regarding file ZAR-17-047. The location map included with the letter shows the subject property as including part of the L shaped alleyway going from King William to John ST N.

We would like to know why the alleyway was included as part of the subject property as it is a city owned alleyway.

I look forward to your response.

Regards,

Mathieu Szplitgieber.

Claire St. Pierre, CPA, CGA, LPA
Licensed Public Accountant
15 John Street North
Hamilton, Ontario
L8R 1H1

----- End forwarded message -----
Claire St. Pierre, CPA, CGA, LPA
Licensed Public Accountant
15 John Street North
Hamilton, Ontario
L8R 1H1
just saw your revised elevations which don't show the original art deco elements above the windows, the ONE thing that separated it from being another boring brick box building - why did you get rid of it? It was what made that building unique - please re-revise and re-add it on!

We are following your progress in this thread on skyscraper city:


I found this picture which shows the original art deco elements:
also here is an example of one surviving made from the same mold used to make the original kresges ones before they were torn down that exists in victoria, BC:
Canadian Art Deco revival: Facade Detail, Victoria, British Columbia, Canada. This pattern "Fountain" was made using molds taken from art deco murals on the old Kresge building (Douglas and View), before it was torn down.

PLEASE preserve this art deco heritage feature - it's pretty much one of the only thing on the former Kresge's building that gives it historical value - please restore it for all of us that were not old enough to have originally seen it on the building.

-shawn-
Hello,

I am writing to express my comments in regards to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment File No. ZAR-17-047. **Please remove ALL personal information from my comments**

I am a resident of 80 King William Street and have lived in the neighbourhood since 2010. I have seen vast improvements to the area, and a lot of welcomed change. The area is in need of continual development and that is why I am partly for this new development with a mix of commercial and residential space. The rates of development in the downtown core however are not consistent across all areas, and with the rate of residential developments rising more rapidly than others (roads, services, commercial...) I am voicing my concerns about the proposed project.

To summarize what the rest of my comments will say: This proposed development is too big, and not the right "fit" for the area.

Reason 1: The sheer number of residents and the side effects of this

With the upcoming completion of the first 2 phases of the Connaught (and the planned 2 new towers), the new Acclamation residences on James St. N, and the new McMaster building on James St N. we have a huge influx on new residents coming to the area on the horizon. The volume of people coming to downtown Hamilton is increasing more rapidly than infrastructure and services can accommodate, and the neighbourhood isn't capable of handling all of these residents.

1a) Traffic
This new influx of residents is going to increase traffic. With the new LTR set to occupy King Street, where are the cars from the proposed 420 parking spaces supposed to go from this building? Hughson is a narrow one way street, as is that portion of King William. With King Street repurposed for LRT there is no where else for this traffic to go but north on the very narrow Hughson, or east on the very narrow King William. Even changing the streets to 2 way traffic, the roads are still very narrow and would be one lane. It also seems like there could be an abundance of construction all happening at once in a very small area between the LRT, Connaught and this development. Between large amounts of construction and more people moving in there is no where for them to go on the roads. There then also becomes all the added costs of having to change city infrastructure to accommodate all of this.

1b) Services
It is already near impossible to get a table at a restaurant in this area on a Friday or Saturday evening in the area. More and more restaurants are popping up regularly but the establishments in the area are all small, in keeping with the style of buildings that occupy the downtown core. I realize this is a very "first world
problem" but as I will elaborate on later, this makes the new proposal not the right fit for what the area needs.

Reason 2: It's not the "type" of building the area needs
Taking away a large corner lot designated as prime retail space and only including 1,869 sq m of commercial space is not what the area needs. When the Bingo hall was closing we had high hopes and aspirations on what could go in this space. The planned commercial space could fit, at best, a small restaurant or retail establishment. The downtown core is still lacking services and commercial businesses (for example: big name grocery, more home furnishing stores, drug store open outside the very limited hours of Jackson Square mall, restaurant space with designated patios not on the street/in an alley...) and with the number of people residing downtown already set to rise a significant amount these types of establishments will be more in demand.

Reason 3: The size is not in keeping with the rest of King William St.
This building is too big and imposing for the neighbourhood and look of King William St. The tower proposed for King Street is less concerning, however it is still very large in comparison to the appearance of the rest of the downtown core. King William is a beautiful, cobbled street with low rise buildings that ooze character. There are amazing small businesses. To build a massive 25 storey building not only ruins the look of the street but also affects the other buildings as well. The imposing look, shadows, and wind tunnel effect that happens with large buildings will make the street less desirable and will make the visiting the businesses less enjoyable.

Overall, my opinion is that the proposed project is too large. A smaller scale combination of commercial and residential space, in my opinion, is much more suited to look, structure, design, capabilities and need of the area.

Thank you for taking the time to listen,
Daniel Barnett  
City of Hamilton  
Planning and Economic Development  
71 Main St West 5th floor  
Hamilton, Ontario  
L8P 4Y5

July 10, 2017

RE: File 2AR-17-047

Mr. Barnett,
I am in receipt of your letter dated June 30th 2017 with regards to the Zoning By-Law Amendment application by King William Residence Inc.

The drawing that you supplied with your letter indicates the assumed alley located between the properties with access from King William St. exiting on John St. N is now property that is part of the King William Residence Inc. development. I am opposed to any changes in the By-law until the Assumed Alley issue has been resolved.

I want to be very clear that I expect free and clear unobstructed two way access to the rear of my property at ALL times during and after construction of the towers and I will not agree to any by-law changes until the official site plan indicate such.

I have been a property owner since 1988 and a commercial City property tax payer since 1978 and expect my concerns to be taken seriously.

Thank you,

Brian Jasson  
Owner 763230 Ontario Limited  
67-71 King St East  
Hamilton, Ontario  
L8N 1A5
Hi Daniel, I'm Paul, saw the zoning bylaw amendment for 43-51 King St East. Exciting news for the neighbourhood. Curious, will the existing building that fronts King St and Hughson be retained and incorporated into the podium design?

Also what is the target completion date of the project?

Thanks in advance,
Paul Vicari

Sent from my iPhone
Barnett, Daniel

From: Kathy Garay
Sent: August-02-17 7:29 AM
To: Barnett, Daniel
Subject: ZAR-17-047 Response to Application for Zoning By-law Amendment 43-51 King St E

Attn. Daniel Barnett, Planning Department, City of Hamilton:

I am traveling in Europe at present with limited email access, but wish to have placed on record my firm support of the submission made by Carol Priamo on behalf of the Friends of the Gore. As a member of the Municipal Heritage Committee, I am aware of concerns raised about the height of the proposed development from the very earliest stages. This proposal is, in my view, entirely incompatible with both the historic and human context of our city’s core. I urge the Planning Department to reject the current design and require the developer to significantly rework his plans.

Sincerely yours,

(Dr.) Kathy Garay,
Ward 8, City of Hamilton.
July 31, 2017

RE: Response to ZAR-17-047 Application for Zoning By-law Amendment for 43-51 King St E

To: Daniel Barnett, Planner, City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Development Department,
City of Hamilton

From: Carol Priamo, Heritage Projects Consultant
Friends of the Gore
80 King William Street, Hamilton L8R 0A1

We oppose the development proposal for 43-51 King Street East regarding height and appearance of the towers and any amendment to the Zoning By-law to support this proposal and design.

We support the recommendations of the Design Review Panel to the developer to redesign their proposed two tall building development to better conform with City planning policies and to add more of the Art Deco style of the Kresge’s recreated design of the base into the towers. The Panel expressed serious concerns about two elements of the development – the lack of setback from the eastern lot line and that the towers will shadow the future John and Rebecca park. “This needs to be completely rethought from a massing standpoint”, according to DRP member Tim Smith, a planner.

In the absence of published City of Hamilton planning guidelines for the introduction of high rise structures in identified heritage zones, we have looked at those used in such cases from Toronto, Philadelphia and Kitchener. “High-rise building developments should ensure that they will not jeopardize local environmental quality, existing patterns of street life and subcultures, the existing townscape, and the landscape. If the traditional topology of the
city consists of largely of a mat of the low-rise buildings as the city’s characteristic feature, then the new building’s massing should blend with the scale of existing buildings...” (from the Seoul Conference on Design Criteria for High Rise Buildings in Historic Cities 2011)

The following factors strongly support the case for greatly reducing the height and massing of the proposed development and for harmonizing it with the size, scale, material, and character of the remaining façade and the surrounding listed heritage structures along the King Street East streetscape and surrounding Gore Park.

HEIGHT
Building height is one of the strongest design guidelines for new construction; the height of adjacent buildings should dictate the height of new infill construction. The Zoning By-Law for Downtown zones states: “Maximum building height shall be in accordance with reference to the lot location and applicable building height maximum indicated on Figure 1 of Schedule “F” – Special Figures.”.
In the case of this property, maximum height is **22 metres** or approximately 70 feet. The height of the tallest tower of the proposed new development could exceed **100 metres** or well over 300 feet.

*Drawing of King Street East from James to Catharine Streets with proposed towers*

*Looking North from Gore Park*

*Rendering of Towers looking north from Gore Park*
City planners are urged to consider the human scale of a project that would be roughly five times taller than the recommended height for new buildings. The proposed development at 34 and 25 storeys would destroy the scale and the visual cohesion of this area and its towers introduce a looming presence over a major city park setting designed for the public’s enjoyment and relaxation.

SHADOW
The new proposal will impact the amount and quality of light falling on the surrounding area particularly Gore Park where the public walks and sits to enjoy the sunshine. The 34 storeys on King Street will unquestionably cause shade through the day and change the way the park is used and experienced. As well as its impact on daily activities, the shadow of this visual intrusion will be cast on public gatherings and important City events. Also the report regarding this site prepared by City staff (dated February 28 2017, presented at the HMHC meeting on March 16 2017) for the Municipal Heritage Committee indicates the impact of shade on the surrounding area, such as the designated Right House building across Hughson Street and several buildings on the south side of King Street East as well as one of the monuments in Gore Park. The shade will also impact the vegetation newly planted throughout the park.
HERITAGE CHARACTER ZONE & LISTED BUILDINGS

This site falls within a heritage character zone as identified by Figure 2 of Schedule F of the Zoning By-Laws of the City of Hamilton for Downtown. The Zoning By-laws for Downtown set out regulations for compatible use of building materials for new buildings. Style compatibility is an essential guideline for new construction in heritage zones. New buildings should compliment the existing historic styles supporting the historic context.

This development proposes a design and materials that bear no relation to the remaining 1930's Art Deco façade of this building and of the adjacent buildings. Design compatibility is especially important in this case where all the buildings on these historic commercial blocks are attached buildings forming a street wall.
The new development incorporates the façade of a 1930’s heritage building listed in the City of Hamilton’s Built Heritage Inventory. The report prepared by City staff (dated February 28 2017, presented at the HMHC meeting on March 16 2017) for the Municipal Heritage Committee describes in some detail the unique character of the Kresge building and, as a result, the developer has been required to respect and restore its historic frontage. This building is considered integral to this portion of the Gore Park streetscape, consisting of all the listed buildings on King Street East. It is an essential element in the cultural and historical identity of Hamilton. Any demolition, addition, or alteration of this protected streetscape should be very carefully examined. The proposed design of this new development will, in a most extreme manner, alter, disrupt and distort the character, scale and experience of this historic street. The setback of the tower from adjacent buildings and pedestrian routes need to be addressed to ensure retention of human scale at street level.

The height and setback of the new development needs to be complimentary to the existing street wall.
Good afternoon Daniel,

I recently received a letter by mail regarding a proposed zoning by-law amendment requested by the developer of 43-51 King Street East. Being a nearby resident who will be affected by this development, I wish to submit a comment for consideration regarding the by-law adjustment.

1) Building height on King William street:
I am greatly concerned by the height of the proposed tower which will front King William Street. It is currently designed as a 25 story tower. All of the neighboring structures on King William are between 2 to 6 stories tall. A tower that is 4 times taller than the highest building on this street will look out-of-character. But further to this, King William has become a very pedestrian-friendly street in recent years. It has only 1 lane of active traffic, and features many new and very popular restaurants. Such a tall structure risks creating a canyon effect on this street and ruining its pleasant atmosphere. If this building casts huge shadows across the street, will the restaurant's summer patios still be as enjoyable? Will it still be as desirable of a location if the view from the street is dominated by this building? I don't believe the street is wide enough to accommodate such a structure; it will make it feel more like an alley-way. I believe any new building considered on this street should respect the built form that surrounds it, not over-power it. Consider two recent new projects on the street that integrated perfectly with their surroundings - The Empire Times at 41 King William, and The Templar Flats, which is across the street. These are the types of buildings that should be considered for this site (low to mid-rise), not a massive tower.

Further to this, 420 new parking spaces are being proposed for this site. As I mentioned, King William is a single lane one way street. How will the addition of 420 vehicles to the local traffic patterns affect the quality of life on this street?

2) Building height on King Street:
The proposed height of the 34 story tower on King Street is less concerning to me than the King William tower. This is due to the taller height of surrounding buildings, and the busier nature of King Street. I would still suggest that a height which does not cast a shadow on nearby King William is better, for the reasons given in the above paragraph.

Beyond this, although I am not an expert in urban planning, I do strongly believe that a more beneficial strategy for city planning would be to spread out our structures instead of fulfilling such a large proportion of city-wide demand for new residential units with a few tall towers. There are many under-utilized sites spread throughout the downtown core, such as surface parking lots, or unoccupied buildings. We have a better chance of these lots being developed if demand for new units is not largely fulfilled by a single project.

Thank you,
"concerned Beasley resident"

Jonathan Deveau, P.Eng.
TO: Chair and Members 
Planning Committee
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RECOMMENDATION

(a) That Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment Application UHOPA-17-014, by Springbrook West Scarlett Inc., Owner, to establish a site specific policy area to permit twenty-nine (29) townhouse dwellings on a private condominium road having a minimum residential density of forty-two (42) units per hectare, for lands located at 154 and 166 Mount Albion Road, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18014, be APPROVED, on the following basis:

(i) That the draft Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18014, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council; and,

(ii) That the proposed Official Plan Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and conforms to the Places to Grow Plan.

(b) That Amended Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-16-002, by Springbrook West Scarlett Inc., Owner, for a change in zoning from the “AA” (Agricultural) District to the “C/S-1755” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified (Block 1) and “RT-30/S-1755” (Street – Townhouse) District, Modified (Blocks 2 to 6) in order to permit a maximum of twenty-nine (29)
townhouse dwellings and two (2) single detached dwellings, for lands located at 154 and 166 Mount Albion Road, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18014 be APPROVED, on the following basis:

(i) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED18014 which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council;

(ii) That the amending By-law be added to Section 19B of Zoning By-law No. 6593 as “RT-30/S-1755” and “C/S-1755”; and,

(iii) That this By-law is in conformity with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, upon approval of Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment No. .

(c) That upon finalization of the amending By-law, that Blocks 3-9, as shown on Appendix “D” to Report PED18014, be re-designated from "Single and Double" and “Institutional” to “Attached Housing” in the Red Hill Neighbourhood Plan.

(d) That Draft Plan of Subdivision Application 25T-201613, by Springbrook West Scarlett Inc., Owner, to establish a Draft Plan of Subdivision known as The Towns of Red Hill, on lands located at 154 and 166 Mount Albion Road, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18014 be APPROVED, subject to the following:

(i) That this approval apply to the Draft Plan of Subdivision known as “The Towns of REDHILL”, as redline revised, 25T-201613, prepared by B.A. Jacobs Surveying Ltd., and certified by Bryan Jacobs O.L.S dated August 9, 2016, showing two (2) lots for single detached dwellings (Lots 1 and 2), one block for a private condominium road and visitor parking (Block 3), six (6) townhouse blocks (Blocks 4 to 9), and one block for a daylight triangle (Block 10) subject to the owner entering into a Standard Form Subdivision Agreement, as approved by City Council, and with the special conditions attached as Appendix “E” to Report PED18014.

(e) That payment of Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland will be required, pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act, and will be calculated in accordance with the City’s Parkland Dedication By-law, and shall be based on the value of the lands on the day prior to the issuance of each building permit.

(f) With regard to the twenty-nine (29) lots for townhouse dwellings and two (2) single detached dwelling, a parkland dedication at a ratio of 0.6 hectare per 300
dwellings units, will be required for the proposed townhouse dwellings all in accordance with the Financial Policies for Development and the City’s Parkland Dedication By-law, as approved by Council.

(g) That Draft Plan of Condominium (Common Element) Application 25CDM-201619, by Springbrook West Scarlett Inc., Owner, to establish a Draft Plan of Condominium (Common Element) consisting of a condominium road and visitor parking for twenty-nine (29) townhouse dwellings, on lands located at 154 and 166 Mount Albion Road, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18014 be APPROVED, subject to the following:

(i) That this approval apply to the Draft Plan of Condominium (Common Element), 25CDM-201619, prepared by B.A. Jacobs Surveying Ltd. and certified by Bryan Jacobs O.L.S, dated August 9, 2016, showing a private condominium road and visitor parking, subject to the owner entering into a Standard Form Condominium Agreement, as approved by City Council, and with the special conditions attached as Appendix “G” to Report PED18014.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
The applicant has applied for approval of an Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, Draft Plan of Subdivision, and Draft Plan of Condominium (Common Element) for lands located at 154 and 166 Mount Albion Road, Hamilton. The applicant is seeking to construct twenty-nine (29) townhouse dwellings that are accessed from a private condominium road, and two (2) single detached dwellings that are accessed from Mount Albion Road and are not associated with the proposed Common Element Condominium.

The applications have merit and can be supported as they are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) (2014), conform to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017) and comply with the policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) subject to the recommended amendment. The proposal is considered to be compatible with the existing development pattern in the area and represents good planning by establishing compatible infill development.

Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 39

FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial: N/A

Staffing: N/A

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.
OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.
OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.
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Legal: As required by the Planning Act, Council shall hold at least one Public Meeting to consider applications for an Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, Draft Plan of Subdivision and Draft Plan of Condominium (Common Element).

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The subject lands are located at the north-west corner of Mount Albion Road and Albright Road. There is an existing single detached dwelling located at 154 Mount Albion Road while the lands at 166 Mount Albion Road are vacant.

The applicant initially submitted an application in December, 2015 for a Zoning By-law Amendment only. The proposal was seeking to establish twenty-five (25) freehold townhouse dwellings on a private condominium road, three (3) street townhouse dwellings fronting onto Albright Road, and two (2) freehold single detached dwellings fronting onto Mount Albion Road.

Subsequently, in November, 2016 the applicant submitted an application for a Draft Plan of Subdivision in order to develop freehold townhouse dwellings, a Draft Plan of Condominium in order to establish a common element condominium road. In March, 2017, an Official Plan Amendment to establish a site specific policy area to permit a reduced minimum net residential density to permit townhouses on a common element condominium road at a density less than 60 units per hectare was submitted.

In addition, the applicant has revised the layout and orientation of the proposed townhouse dwellings to address concerns regarding the establishment of a driveway access in close proximity to the intersection of Mount Albion Road and Albright Road.

The changes to the layout of the property are as follows:

Original Proposal (December, 2015) (See Appendix “H” to Report PED18014)

The original proposal was seeking to establish two (2) single detached dwellings, five (5) blocks of townhouse dwellings containing a total of twenty-five (25) freehold townhouse dwellings on a private condominium road, and one block containing three (3) freehold street townhouse dwellings fronting on Albright Road for a total of 28 townhouse units. A total of nine (9) visitor parking spaces were proposed as part of the original proposal.
Second Proposal (November, 2016) (See Appendix “I” to Report PED18014)

Based on the comments received, the applicant revised the proposed development pattern. Three (3) freehold townhouse dwellings continued to front onto Albright Road but proposed provides vehicle access at the rear of the dwelling units. The proposed change thereby established a dead end laneway located to the rear of the proposed three (3) townhouse dwellings in order to provide the units with vehicle access. The revised concept plan also increased the total number of townhouse dwellings by one (1) additional unit for a total of twenty-nine (29) townhouse dwellings. Nine (9) visitor parking spaces were again proposed.

Third Proposal (August, 2017) (See Appendix “J” to Report PED18014)

The applicant provided a third concept plan to identify the building envelope of the two proposed single detached dwellings, to provide internal sidewalks that maintain a minimum width of 1.5m, and to address comments limiting the access points of the subject property to a single access from Mount Albion Road. The number of units and the orientation of the units were not changed from that of the second proposal. The third proposal also decreased the number of visitor parking spaces from nine (9) spaces to eight (8) spaces in order to provide a barrier free visitor parking space.

Based on the amended proposal, the requested applications consist of an Official Plan Amendment to recognize the proposed density, a Zoning By-law Amendment in order to provide for appropriate zoning to facilitate the proposed development, a Draft Plan of Subdivision to create two (2) lots for single detached dwellings, six (6) blocks for the creation of twenty-nine (29) lots for townhouse dwellings, a block for the private condominium road and visitor parking and a block for a daylight triangle, and a Draft Plan of Condominium in order to establish a Common Element Condominium which will provide access and servicing for the twenty-nine (29) townhouse dwellings and visitor parking.

Chronology

December 4, 2015: Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-16-002 received.

December 15, 2015: Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-16-002 deemed complete.

December 22, 2015: Notice of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation for Zoning By-law Amendment Application
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ZAC-16-002 sent to 98 property owners within 120m of the subject lands.

January 8, 2016: The public notice sign was posted on the subject property.


March 2, 2017: Official Plan Amendment Application UHOPA-17-014 received.

March 17, 2017: Official Plan Amendment Application UHOPA-17-014 deemed complete.

March 28, 2017: Notice of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation for Official Plan Amendment Application UHOPA-17-014 sent to 94 property owners within 120m of the subject lands (revised circulation list reduced the number of property owners).

November 8, 2017: The Public Notice Sign was updated to reflect the date and time of the Public Meeting, to note the Draft Plan of Subdivision, the Draft Plan of Condominium, and Official Plan Amendment applications, and the changes to the proposal.

November 17, 2017: Notice of Public Meeting was mailed to 94 property owners within 120m of the subject property.
Existing Land Use and Zoning:

DETAILS OF SUBMITTED APPLICATIONS

Location: 154 and 166 Mount Albion Road, Hamilton

Owner: Springbrook West Scarlett Inc. c/o A. DiSilvestro and J. Chun

Agent: GSP Group Inc. c/o Brenda Khes

Property Size:
- Lot Area: 7,625 sq. m.
- Frontage: 122 m
- Depth: 62.9 m

Servicing: Full Municipal Services Available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Land:</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling (154 Mount Albion Road), Vacant (166 Mount Albion Road)</td>
<td>“AA” (Agricultural) District</td>
<td>&quot;AA” (Agricultural) District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrounding Land:</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North: Single Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>&quot;C/S-1309&quot; (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East: Single Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>&quot;AA” (Agricultural) District and “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South: Institutional Use – Place of Worship and St. Luke Elementary School</td>
<td>“I1” (Neighbourhood Institutional) Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West: Institutional Use – Red Hill Learning Centre</td>
<td>“AA” (Agricultural) District</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS

Provincial Policy Statement (2014):

The Provincial Planning Policy framework is established through the Planning Act (Section 3) and the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS 2014). The Planning Act requires that all municipal land use decisions affecting planning matters be consistent with the PPS.

“1.1.3.1 Settlement areas shall be the focus of growth and development, and their vitality and regeneration shall be promoted.

1.1.3.2 Land use patterns within settlement areas shall be based on:

a) densities and a mix of land uses which:

1. efficiently use land and resources;

2. are appropriate for, and efficiently use, the infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available, and avoid the need for their unjustified and/or uneconomical expansion; and,

5. are transit-supportive, where transit is planned, exists or may be developed.

b) a range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment in accordance with the criteria in policy 1.1.3.3, where this can be accommodated.

1.1.3.3 Planning authorities shall identify appropriate locations and promote opportunities for intensification and redevelopment where this can be accommodated taking into account existing building stock or areas, including brownfield sites, and the availability of suitable existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities required to accommodate projected needs.”

The proposed development is located within the Settlement Area and efficiently uses land for new residential development that is compatible with the area. Adequate infrastructure and services are available to service the subject lands and the proposed development will be supported by existing transit service along Mount Albion Road.
Therefore the proposed development is consistent with the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement.

With respect to Cultural Heritage, the PPS provides the following:

"2.6.2 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved."

An archaeological assessment was undertaken and the provincial interest in archaeology was signed off in a letter dated March 15, 2014. Therefore the Provincial Interest in archaeology has been addressed.

**Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017):**

The policies of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017) apply to any Planning decision. The following policies, amongst others, apply to the proposal:

The Growth Plan supports intensification within built-up urban areas, particularly in proximity to transit. As noted in Section 2.1 of the Plan:

"To support the achievement of complete communities that are healthier, safer, and more equitable, choices about where and how growth occurs in the GGH need to be made carefully. Better use of land and infrastructure can be made by directing growth to settlement areas and prioritizing intensification, with a focus on strategic growth areas, including urban growth centres and major transit station areas, as well as brownfield sites and greyfields. Concentrating new development in these areas provides a focus for investments in transit as well as other types of infrastructure and public service facilities to support forecasted growth, while also supporting a more diverse range and mix of housing options. However, to protect public safety and prevent future flood risks, growth should generally be directed away from hazardous areas, including those that have been identified as Special Policy Areas in accordance with the PPS."

Furthermore as noted in Section 2.2.1.2 (d):

"Development will be directed to settlement areas, except where the policies of this Plan permit otherwise."

The subject property is located within a settlement area and is located on an existing transit route. The proposal represents a form of intensification that makes use of
existing infrastructure and provides a diverse range and mix of housing options. Therefore the proposal conforms to the policies of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

**Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP)**

The subject property is identified as “Neighbourhoods” on Schedule “E” – Urban Structure and designated “Neighbourhoods” on Schedule “E-1” – Urban Land Use Designations in the UHOP. The following policies, amongst others, apply with respect to the subject applications:

```
“E.3.2.1 Areas designated Neighbourhoods shall function as complete communities, including the full range of residential dwelling types and densities as well as supporting uses intended to serve the local residents.

E.3.2.3 The following uses shall be permitted on lands designated Neighbourhoods on Schedule E-1 – Urban Land Use Designations:

a) residential dwellings, including second dwelling units and housing with supports.

E.3.2.4 The existing character of established Neighbourhoods designated areas shall be maintained. Residential intensification within these areas shall enhance and be compatible with the scale and character of the existing residential neighbourhood in accordance with Section B.2.4 – Residential Intensification and other applicable policies of this Plan.

E.3.2.7 The City shall require quality urban and architectural design. Development of lands within the Neighbourhoods designation shall be designed to be safe, efficient, pedestrian oriented, and attractive, and shall comply with the following criteria:

b) Garages, parking areas, and driveways along the public street shall not be dominant. Surface parking between a building and a public street (excluding a public alley) shall be minimized.

c) Adequate and direct pedestrian access and linkages to community facilities/services and local commercial uses shall be provided.

d) Development shall improve existing landscape features and overall landscape character of the surrounding area.
```
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The proposed single detached and townhouse dwellings are permitted uses in the Neighbourhoods designation.

The proposed residential buildings are two (2) storeys in height which is similar in height to the one to two storey single detached dwellings that exist to the north and east of the subject lands. The existing dwellings north of the subject lands along Mount Albion Road will be buffered from the proposed townhouse dwellings by the two proposed single detached dwellings. Furthermore a 3m side yard setback between the townhouse dwellings and the rear lot line of the existing single detached dwelling to the north-west on Rouge Hill Court proposed and will provide a buffer to the adjacent land uses. Therefore the proposed development is compatible with the scale and character of the existing residential neighbourhood.

The proposed garages, visitor parking areas and access driveways for the townhouse dwellings will be accessed from the proposed private condominium road. The proposed visitor parking will be setback approximately 4m from Albright Road and will be buffered by landscaping. Therefore, garages, visitor parking, and access driveways will not dominate along the public street. Existing municipal and internal private sidewalks will provide pedestrian access to and from the townhouse dwellings. Landscaping will be provided along Mount Albion Road and Albright Road and throughout the site thereby improving the existing landscape features and overall landscape character of the surrounding area.

Low Density Development

"E.3.4.3 Uses permitted in low density residential areas include single-detached, semi-detached, duplex, triplex, and street townhouse dwellings.

E.3.4.4 For low density residential areas the maximum net residential density shall be 60 units per hectare.

E.3.4.5 For low density residential areas, the maximum height shall be three storeys."

The proposal includes two lots for single detached dwellings, which are considered to be a Low Density Residential use. The proposed two (2) single detached dwellings will have a net residential density of 24.6 units per hectare and a maximum building height.
of two (2) storeys and will therefore comply with the maximum residential density of 60 units per hectare and maximum building height of three (3) storeys.

"E.3.4.6 Development in areas dominated by low density residential uses shall be designed in accordance with the following criteria:

a) Direct access from lots to adjacent to major or minor arterial roads shall be discouraged.

b) Backlotting along public streets and in front of parks shall be discouraged. The City supports alternatives to backlotting, such as laneway housing and window streets, to promote improved streetscapes and public safety, where feasible.

c) A mix of lot widths and sizes compatible with streetscape character; and a mix of dwelling unit types and sizes compatible in exterior design, including character, scale, appearance and design features; shall be encouraged. Development shall be subject to the Zoning By-law regulations for appropriate minimum lot widths and areas, yards, heights, and other zoning regulations to ensure compatibility."

The single detached dwellings are located within the interior of the Red Hill Neighbourhood on a collector road and front directly onto Mount Albion Road. The proposed lot width, lot area, front yard and side yard setbacks conform to the By-law requirements of the "C" District and are consistent with the existing single detached dwellings to the north. The applicant is requesting a reduction in the rear yard setback from the parent By-law provisions of 7.5 m to 7.0 m. The proposed rear yard setback will maintain adequate setback from adjacent lands and adequate amenity area and therefore is consistent with the existing single detached dwellings to the north. Also the proposed two storey building height will serve as a transition from the adjacent one and half storey single detached house to the north and the proposed two storey townhouse dwellings along Mount Albion Road. Therefore the proposed single detached dwellings comply with the policies for development in Low Density Residential areas.

Medium Density Development

"E.3.5.2 Uses permitted in medium density residential areas include multiple dwellings except street townhouses."
E.3.5.7 For medium density residential uses, the *net residential density* shall be greater than 60 units per hectare and not greater than 100 units per hectare.

E.3.5.8 For medium density residential uses, the maximum height shall be six storeys.”

The proposed use is considered to be block townhouse dwellings (multiple dwellings); the use is considered to be a medium density residential development.

Medium density residential areas are to have a net residential density of between 60 units per net hectare and 100 units per net hectare. The proposed twenty-nine (29) townhouse dwellings and associated private road and parking area have a net residential density of 42.5 units per net hectare and is therefore less than the minimum density of 60 units per net hectare. An amendment to the policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan is therefore required in order to facilitate the proposed development. The analysis of the amendment is discussed in greater detail in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendations section of this Report.

The proposed twenty-nine (29) townhouse dwellings will maintain a building height of two (2) storeys and will therefore comply with the policies that establish a maximum building height of six (6) stories.

“E.3.5.9 Development within the medium density residential category shall be evaluated on the basis of the following criteria:

a) Developments should have direct access to a collector or major or minor arterial road. If direct access to such a road is not possible, the development may gain access to the collector or major or minor arterial roads from a local road only if a small number of low density residential dwellings are located on that portion of the local road.

b) Development shall be integrated with other lands in the Neighbourhoods designation with respect to density, design, and physical and functional considerations.

c) Development shall be comprised of sites of suitable size and provide adequate landscaping, amenity features, on-site parking, and buffering if required. The height, massing, and arrangement of buildings and structures shall be *compatible* with existing and future uses in the surrounding area.
d) Access to the property shall be designed to minimize conflicts between traffic and pedestrians both on-site and on surrounding streets.”

The proposed townhouse dwelling units will have access to Mount Albion Road which is a collector road. The proposed two (2) storey building height for the townhouse dwellings will be compatible with the building height of the existing one (1) to two (2) storey single detached dwellings that exist in the neighbourhood. Adequate amenity space will be provided for each townhouse dwelling in the form of rear yard amenity areas and landscaping will be provided at the front of each townhouse dwelling and within the common element. The townhouse dwellings will consist of lots that will be able to provide adequate on-site parking to meet the needs of the residents, and eight (8) visitor parking spaces will also be provided along the internal condominium road.

Visual barriers along with a 3m side yard setback from the northerly most townhouse dwelling unit to the existing single detached dwelling to the north-west will provide adequate buffering between the proposed development and the adjacent residential lands.

Vehicle access to the site is to be restricted to one access point from Mount Albion Road which is located away from the intersection of Mount Albion Road and Albright Road thereby minimizing the potential for traffic conflicts, and focus traffic toward Mount Albion Road which is a collector road which complies with the policies respecting having direct access to a collector road.

Based on the proposed maximum building height of two (2) storeys as well as the orientation and setback of the proposed dwellings, it is not expected that the development will result in overshadowing or privacy impacts on existing residential properties.

Therefore the proposed townhouse dwellings comply with the policies for development in Medium Density Residential areas.

Residential Intensification

“E.2.4.1.4 Residential intensification developments shall be evaluated based on the following criteria:

a) a balanced evaluation of the criteria in b) through g) as follows;

b) the relationship of the proposal to existing neighbourhood character so that it maintains, and where possible, enhances and builds upon desirable established patterns and built form;
c) the development’s contribution to maintaining and achieving a range of dwelling types and tenures;

d) the compatible integration of the development with the surrounding area in terms of use, scale, form and character. In this regard, the City encourages the use of innovative and creative urban design techniques;

e) the development’s contribution to achieving the planned urban structure as described in Section E.2.0 – Urban Structure;

f) infrastructure and transportation capacity; and,

g) the ability of the development to comply with all applicable policies.

E.2.4.2.2 When considering an application for a residential intensification development within the Neighbourhoods designation, the following matters shall be evaluated:

a) the matters listed in Policy B.2.4.1.4;

b) compatibility with adjacent land uses including matters such as shadowing, overlook, noise, lighting, traffic, and other nuisance effects;

c) the relationship of the proposed building(s) with the height, massing, and scale of nearby residential buildings;

d) the consideration of transitions in height and density to adjacent residential buildings;

e) the relationship of the proposed lot(s) with the lot pattern and configuration within the neighbourhood;

f) the provision of amenity space and the relationship to existing patterns of private and public amenity space;

g) the ability to respect and maintain or enhance the streetscape patterns including block lengths, setbacks and building separations;

h) the ability to complement the existing functions of the neighbourhood;
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The adjacent neighbourhood is comprised of single detached dwellings to the north, north-west and east, with existing townhouse dwellings further to the north and south along Mount Albion Road as well as to the west on Harrisford Street. Institutional uses are located to the west and south of the subject lands. The existing institutional use to the west is the Red Hill Learning Centre, which is located 30m from the westerly lot line of the proposed development and separated by an existing parking area. To the south, on the other side of Albright Road, is St. Luke’s Roman Catholic Parish Church.

The proposed twenty-nine (29) townhouse dwellings and two (2) single detached dwellings will be of a size and scale that is compatible with the scale of development in the area. Adequate servicing and transportation capacity is available in order to meet the needs of the subject property. Also the proposed townhouse and single detached development will be compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood as there are no anticipated shadowing, overlook, noise, lighting, and traffic issues. The height, massing and density of development will be similar to that of surrounding development and will maintain setbacks and building separations that will respect the streetscape pattern of the area.

Urban Design

"E.3.3.3.2 New development shall be designed to minimize impact on neighbouring buildings and public spaces by:

a) creating transitions in scale to neighbouring buildings;

b) ensuring adequate privacy and sunlight to neighbouring properties; and,

c) minimizing the impacts of shadows and wind conditions.

E.3.3.3.3 New development shall be massed to respect existing and planned street proportions.

E.3.3.3.5 Built form shall create comfortable pedestrian environments by:

a) locating principal façades and primary building entrances parallel to and as close to the street as possible;
b) including ample glazing on ground floors to create visibility to and from the public sidewalk; and,

d) locating surface parking to the sides or rear of sites or buildings, where appropriate."

The proposed development is appropriate in respect to the transition in scale to neighbouring buildings and the development is massed to respect the existing street proportions. Given that both the townhouse and single detached dwellings will be a maximum of two storeys in height, adequate privacy will be maintained and the proposed dwellings will not create adverse shadow and wind impacts. Parking for the single detached dwellings will be located on-site within the attached garage fronting Mount Albion Road, which is consistent with the character along the street. Parking for the townhouse dwellings will also be located on-site within the attached garage with visitor parking available within the interior of the property off the private condominium road. The front and sides of the dwelling units will address the public road with no dwelling backing onto the public road. Additionally the townhouse dwellings along Mount Albion Road are oriented to be consistent with the existing single detached dwellings on the east side of Mount Albion Road, between Red Hill Avenue and Albright Road, which have a side yard along the road. The proposed development will include ample space both on-site and on the City Boulevard for landscaping, which will improve the overall design of the proposed development.

The detailed façade treatment and design of the townhouse dwellings will be undertaken as part of the Site Plan Control application.

Noise

“B.3.6.3.1 Development of noise sensitive land uses, in the vicinity of provincial highways, parkways, minor or major arterial roads, collector roads, truck routes, railway lines, railway yards, airports, or other uses considered to be noise generators shall comply with all applicable provincial and municipal guidelines and standards.

B.3.6.3.2 Any required noise or vibration study shall be prepared by a qualified professional, preferably a professional engineer with experience in environmental acoustics, in accordance with recognized noise and vibration measurement and prediction techniques, to the satisfaction of the City, and in accordance with all applicable guidelines and standards.”
The subject property is located approximately 350m from the Red Hill Valley Expressway, a potential noise source. As part of the applications, the applicant submitted a Noise Feasibility study which reviewed the potential noise impacts from the Red Hill Valley Expressway as well as from Mount Albion Road and Albright Road. The findings of the Noise Feasibility study determined that noise levels from the potential noise sources did not exceed the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) requirements and therefore no noise mitigation measures are required.

Natural Heritage

“C.2.5.5 New development and site alteration shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to the natural heritage features and areas identified in Section C.2.5.2 to C.2.5.4 unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that there shall be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions.”

Trees have been identified on the subject lands and the City recognizes the importance of trees to the health and quality of life of the community and encourages sustainable forestry practices and the protection and restoration of trees and forests. A General Vegetation Inventory (GVI) and Tree Protection Plan (TPP) were submitted and reviewed as part of the development applications. A total of sixteen (16) trees have been identified for removal from the site. To ensure that tree cover is maintained, the City requires 1 for 1 compensation for trees that have a diameter at breast height of 10 cm or greater that are to be removed. Implementation of the tree protection fencing, tree compensation, municipal trees, and shared trees is required and addressed as conditions of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval as Conditions Nos. 7 and 16 of Appendix "E" to Report PED18014.

Plan of Subdivision

“F.1.14.1.2 Council shall approve only those plans of subdivision that meet the following criteria:

a) the plan of subdivision conforms to the policies and land use designations of this Plan;

b) the plan of subdivision implements the City’s staging of development program;

c) the plan of subdivision can be supplied with adequate services and community facilities;
d) the plan of subdivision shall not adversely impact upon the transportation system and the natural environment;

e) the plan of subdivision can be integrated with adjacent lands and roadways;

f) the plan of subdivision shall not adversely impact municipal finances; and,

g) the plan of subdivision meets all requirements of the Planning Act.”

The proposed Plan of Subdivision is to permit single detached dwellings and townhouse dwellings that are generally in conformity with the policies of the UHOP. The development has access to adequate services and can be integrated with the adjacent lands and roadways, does not impact upon the transportation system or the natural environment, and meets all the requirements of the Planning Act. The surrounding area has been largely developed and implements the City’s staging of development.

Neighbourhood Plans

“F.1.1.3 Amendments to this Plan, including secondary plans, shall be required to create, modify or expand land use designations and policies which do not comply with this Plan.

F.1.1.4 Amendments to this Plan shall be undertaken by the City:

a) to update this Plan to reflect new provincial or municipal planning policies at the time of Official Plan Five Year review or other appropriate time through a City initiative; or,

b) to update and streamline administration of municipal planning policies.

F.1.2.7 Neighbourhood plans are policies adopted by council resolution and do not form part of the Official Plan. Any proposal for development or redevelopment must conform to the designations, and policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.

F.1.2.8 Any amendment to the Neighbourhood Plan must be evaluated using the provisions of Policies F.1.1.3 and F.1.1.4 and shall require a formal Council decision to enact the amendment.”
As outlined below, the proposed townhouse development does not conform to the policies of the Red Hill Neighbourhood Plan, but will upon a change in the land use designation from "Single and Double" and "Institutional" to "Attached Dwelling."

The proposed development therefore complies with the policies of the UHOP, subject to the site specific amendment to policy E.3.5.7 regarding minimum density.

Red Hill Neighbourhood Plan

The subject property is designated “Single and Double” and “Institutional” in the Red Hill Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed two (2) single detached dwellings are located within the portion of the lands designated “Single and Double” and represent a use permitted on lands designated “Single and Double”. However, the proposed townhouse dwellings are located within the portion of the lands designated “Single and Double” and “Institutional” which do not permit townhouse dwellings. The Red Hill Neighbourhood Plan will therefore need to be amended to re-designate the lands shown on Blocks 3 to 9 on Appendix “D” to Report PED18014 from “Single and Double” and “Institutional” to “Attached Dwelling”. There are no policies in the Red Hill Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed re-designation constitutes good planning as the proposal is an appropriate form of intensification on a collector road.

City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 6593

The subject property is zoned “AA” (Agricultural) District, which permits a single detached dwelling as well as agricultural uses. An amendment to the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law is required to change the zoning to the “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District (Block 1) in order to permit two (2) single detached dwellings for a portion of the subject lands with the following site specific modifications:

- reduction to the rear yard setback; and,

- identification of the front lot line for the proposed through lots.

An amendment to the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law is also required to place the lands, shown as Blocks 2 to 6 on Appendix “C” to Report PED18014, in an “RT-30” (Street-Townhouse) District and modify the “RT-30” (Street-Townhouse) District provisions in order to implement the development proposal. As such, a number of site specific modifications have been requested by the applicant, as follows:

- modification to define the proposed condominium road as a public street for the purpose of the Zoning By-law;
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• Identification of the front lot line of the proposed through lots;
• reduction to the required lot area;
• reduction to the required front yard setback;
• reduction to the required side yard setback;
• reduction to the required rear yard setback;
• reduction to the required distance between buildings;
• prohibition in vehicle access to Albright Road;
• reduction in required visitor parking; and,
• reduction to the required manoeuvring space.

An analysis of the site specific modifications is included in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation Section.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION
The following internal Departments and external Agencies had no concerns or objections with respect to the proposed applications:

• Recreation Planning, Community and Emergency Services Department;
• Strategic Planning, Public Works Department;
• Hydro One; and,
• Alectra Utilities (formerly Horizon Utilities).

**Corridor Management, Public Works Department**, advised that only one access will be permitted as part of this development in order to reduce the number of conflict points by restricting multiple accesses. Two accesses are not required as there are less than 100 dwelling units and restricting the access to one access will prevent cut through traffic. Corridor Management recommended that the access off Albright Road be removed since there is less than 70m from the driveway access to the signalized intersection at Mount Albion Road and Albright Road. Also Corridor Management staff recommended that the three (3) townhouse dwellings, as shown on the original proposal with access directly from Albright Road, be re-oriented to not have vehicle access from Albright Road.
In order to ensure that the condominium road does not have access to Albright Road and that no driveway accesses are established to Albright Road, a site specific modification will be included in the amending By-law that will prohibit vehicle access to Albright Road.

Corridor Management staff advised that an access permit will be required and a 5m by 5m visibility triangle is required between the driveway limits and the road allowance. This requirement will be addressed through the detailed review undertaken as part of the Site Plan Control Application.

The applicant has revised the proposed development in order to establish rear yard vehicle access for the three (3) townhouse dwellings that were previously accessed directly from Albright Road, and removed the condominium road access to Albright Road, thereby restricting access to one access from Mount Albion Road only.

**Transportation Management, Public Works Department**, identified that a 9.14m by 9.14m daylight triangle at the intersection of Mount Albion Road and Albright Road is required. This requirement is being addressed as a condition of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval, and is included as Condition No. 10 of Appendix "E" to Report PED18014.

The applicant will be required to provide a Transportation Demand Management Options Report at the Site Plan Control stage. Transportation Management advised that provision for bicycle lanes along Mount Albion Road be required, street trees be provided, and that 2m wide sidewalks be provided within the right-of-way and 1.5m sidewalks throughout the site.

As part of the revised proposal provided by the applicant, the sidewalks internal to the site were increased in width from 1.2m to 1.5m in order to conform to the requirements for internal sidewalks. There are existing municipal sidewalks along both Mount Albion Road and Albright Road that are 1.5m in width. Except for the portion of the sidewalk that crosses the proposed access driveway, it is not intended that the existing sidewalk be removed. Requiring the sidewalk to be removed in order to establish a 2m wide sidewalk would be both onerous to the applicant and disruptive the pedestrians seeking to utilize the sidewalk during construction. In respect the provision of bicycle lanes the proposed development will not interfere with or preclude the potential for bicycle lanes along Mount Albion Road. Bicycle lanes should be established in a comprehensive basis rather than in small one off section in order to ensure that the bicycle lane operates and function efficiently and safely. Therefore requiring the applicant to establishing a bicycle lane along their frontage of Mount Albion Road is not appropriate. Street Trees are required as a standard condition of Draft Plan of Subdivision.
Any addition Transportation Demand Management requirements will be implemented as part of the Site Plan Control application.

**Urban Forestry and Horticulture, Public Works Department**, identified that a Tree Management Plan would be required. A landscape plan will be required for the placement of trees both on the subject property and on the City Boulevard. Urban Forestry and Horticulture staff noted that new development is required to provide payment for road allowance street trees. The landscape plan and the payment for street trees will be collected as part of the Site Plan Control application.

This requirement for a Tree Management Plan is being addressed as a condition of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval, and is included as Condition No. 7 of Appendix “E” to Report PED18014.

**Public Health Services, Health Protection Division**, identified a pest control plan focusing on rats and mice be developed and implemented for the construction / development phase. A dust mitigation plan will also be required to be formulated for the period starting at site clearance to final construction and lot development.

These requirements are being addressed as conditions of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval, and are included as Condition Nos. 17 and 18 of Appendix "E" to Report PED18014.

**Transit (HSR), Public Works Department**, advised that HSR currently operates a bus route past the subject property. Transit HSR advises that short walking distances between buildings and transit services are preferable and that higher density development is encouraged to help transit reduce operating costs.

**Hamilton Conservation Authority** identified that the subject property is located approximately 50 m south east of a tributary of the Red Hill Creek and its associated valley feature, which traverse the Red Hill Creek Escarpment Valley Environmentally Significant Area (ESA), an area designated as a Significant Woodland and Core Area in the City of Hamilton Official Plan. The entire property drains to the Red Hill Creek that outlets to Hamilton Harbour and ultimately Lake Ontario to the north. The storm water management of the subject lands and water quality control is of interest to the Hamilton Conservation Authority (HCA). The subject property is not located within an area affected by the HCA’s Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation, therefore the proposed development will not require a permit from the HCA. While the subject property is located within 50m of a watercourse and valley lands, it is not located within the flood and erosion hazard lands associated with these natural features.
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In order to ensure that the stormwater management design satisfactorily address quality control requirements and that appropriate on-site sediment and erosion control measures are implemented at the Draft Plan of Subdivision, HCA requires a number of conditions of Draft Plan approval including:

1) Erosion and Sediment Control Plan;
2) Grading and Drainage Plan; and,
3) Stormwater Management Plan.

These requirements have been included as Condition Nos. 4, 5, and 6 of Appendix “E” of Report PED18014.

**Union Gas** requested that as a condition of final approval the owner / developer provide Union Gas with the necessary easement and / or agreements in favour of Union Gas for the provision of gas services for this project in a form satisfactory to Union Gas. This requirement is being addressed as a condition of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval, and is included as Condition No. 14 of Appendix "E" to Report PED18014.

**Canada Post** advised mail delivery service to the development will be provided through a centralized Community Mail Box. Additionally prospective purchasers and tenants need to be advised that mail services will be provided by way of a centralized Community Mail Box and the location of this mail box. These requirements are being addressed as a condition of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval and Draft Plan of Condominium Approval as Condition Nos. 11 c), d) and 13 of Appendix “E” of Report PED18014 and Condition No. 4 c) and d) of Appendix “G” of Report PED18014.

**Bell Canada** did not provided comments at the time of preparation of this Report; however Condition No. 12 of Appendix “E” to Report PED18014 represents a standard condition from Bell Canada and has been included.

**Public Consultation:**

In accordance with Council’s Public Participation Policy, the proposal was circulated as part of the Notice of Complete Application to 98 property owners within 120 m of the subject lands on December 22, 2015. A public notice sign was also established on-site on January 8, 2016. An additional Notice of Complete Application respecting the additional applications was circulated to 94 property owners within 120m of the subject lands on March 28, 2017. A Notice of Public Meeting was circulated to 94 property owners within 120m of the subject lands on November 17, 2017.
Public Consultation Strategy

As the application for the Zoning By-law Amendment was submitted prior to July 1, 2016, the application pre-dated the requirement for a public consultation strategy to be undertaken. However, the Draft Plan of Subdivision and Official Plan Amendment were submitted after July 1, 2016 and therefore subject to the requirements of a public consultation strategy. As such, the applicant prepared a Public Consultation Strategy in which the applicant provided a public information newsletter to 165 property owners in the area on March 21, 2017.

In response to the City’s notice and the applicants public information newsletter, one response was provided. The concerns raised relate to the loss of open space and are discussed in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendations section of the Report.

ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposed Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, Draft Plan of Subdivision, and Draft Plan of Condominium have merit and can be supported for the following reasons:

   i) They are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conform to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe;

   ii) The addition of twenty-nine (29) townhouse dwellings and two (2) single detached dwellings will provide for additional residential uses that are compatible with the character and function of the area; and,

   iii) The proposal is compatible with the type and form of development in the surrounding neighbourhood.

2. The subject property is located on the north-west corner of Mount Albion Road and Albright Road. The existing property contains a single detached dwelling at 154 Mount Albion Road, which is proposed to be demolished, and vacant lands at 166 Mount Albion Road. The applicant is proposing to establish twenty-nine (29) townhouse dwellings and two (2) single detached dwellings (see Appendix “J” to Report PED18014).

   Official Plan Amendment

   The policies for lands designated “Neighbourhoods” in the Urban Hamilton Official Plan identify three (3) categories with respect to residential development
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“Low Density Residential Area”, “Medium Density Residential Area”, and “High Density Residential Area”. The policies for each of these three (3) categories outlines the types of residential uses permitted within each category as well as the density restrictions for development within each residential category.

The proposed single detached dwellings comply with the policies of the UHOP. Therefore, an Official Plan Amendment is not required with respect to the single detached dwellings.

Townhouse dwellings on a condominium road are deemed to be a multiple dwelling. The use is therefore considered to be a “Medium Density Residential Area” in the UHOP. The proposed twenty-nine (29) townhouse dwellings have a residential density of approximately 42 units per net hectare and therefore do not comply with the required residential density range of greater than 60 units per net hectare but not more than 100 units per net hectare in the UHOP. On this basis, an amendment to the policies of the UHOP is required in order to permit the proposed residential development.

The proposed residential density of 42 units per net hectare allows for the establishment of townhouse dwellings that are of a size and scale. The lots adequately function with an appropriate sized dwelling, along with adequate space for parking and amenity for each dwelling unit. The proposed townhouse dwellings will establish a development that is also compatible in size and scale with the character of the neighbourhood and the two proposed single detached dwellings will provide for a transition on the subject lands for the adjacent dwellings. Based on the size and shape of the subject lands townhouse dwellings that complied with the minimum residential density of 60 units per net hectare would create residential development that would be comprised of small lots and would not have sufficient space to meet the parking and amenity needs of the dwelling units, or would require an alternative form of development such as maisonettes or stacked townhouses and would result in townhouse dwellings that are of a size and scale that would not be compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood. While the residential density of the twenty-nine (29) townhouse dwellings is approximately 42.5 units per hectare, staff recommends that a minimum residential density of 42 units per net hectare be established in order to provide some flexibility. As the proposed residential density of 42 units per net hectare establishes dwellings of an appropriate size and form in both functionality and character of the area, the proposed amendment to the UHOP to permit a minimum residential density of 42 units per net hectare has merit and can be supported.
3. **Zoning By-law Amendment – C/S-1755 (Block 1)**

The proposed application for rezoning is for a change in zoning to the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 6593 from the “AA” (Agricultural) District to a site specific “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District (Block 1) and “RT-30” (Street-Townhouse) District (Blocks 2 to 6). Site Specific modifications are being requested in order to implement the proposal.

**Change in Zoning**

“C/S-1755” District

The two (2) proposed single detached dwellings comply with the policies of the UHOP. The scale of development represents an appropriate level of density for the area and an appropriate transition between the existing single detached dwellings located to the north and the proposed townhouse dwellings located to the south. The proposed single detached dwellings will provide adequate on-site parking and amenity space to meet the needs of each unit. Therefore the proposed change in use to permit two (2) single detached dwellings has merit and can be supported.

For the “C” (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District the modifications include a reduction to the rear yard setback.

**Modifications for the “C/S-1755” District**

**Rear Yard Depth**

The proposed modification is to reduce the required rear yard setback from 7.5m to 7m. The intent and purpose of requiring a minimum rear yard depth of 7.5m is to maintain adequate rear yard amenity space and maintain adequate buffering and separation from lands to the rear of the subject property.

The two (2) single detached dwellings will maintain approximately 95 sq. m. (1,022.6 sq. ft.) of rear yard private amenity space for each lot, which exceeds the 90 sq. m. of amenity space that would be provided for a 12m wide lot with a 7.5m rear yard, and therefore adequate amenity space will be provided. The proposed single detached dwellings back onto the proposed private condominium road and staff are of the opinion that the proposed 7m rear yard setback will still provide adequate buffering and separation for the lands located...
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to the rear of the subject property. Therefore, the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.

4. **Zoning By-law Amendment – RT-30/S-1755 (Blocks 2 to 6)**

For the “RT-30” (Street-Townhouse) District, the modifications include:

- modification to define the proposed condominium road as public street for the purpose of the Zoning By-law;
- Identification of the front lot line of the proposed through lots;
- reduction to the required lot area;
- reduction to the required front yard setback;
- reduction to the required side yard setback;
- reduction to the required rear yard setback;
- reduction to the required distance between buildings;
- prohibition in vehicle access to Albright Road;
- reduction in required visitor parking; and,
- reduction to the required manoeuvring space.

**Change in Zoning**

“RT-30/S-1755” District (Blocks 2 to 6)

The proposed change in zoning will permit twenty-nine (29) townhouse dwellings on smaller lots. The scale of development represents an appropriate level of density along a collector road that will be of a size and scale that is compatible with the surrounding area. The proposed townhouse dwellings will provide adequate on-site parking and adequate amenity space to meet the needs of each unit. With the exception of the density, the proposed twenty-nine (29) townhouse dwellings comply with the policies of the UHOP, including all other Medium Density Residential policies, residential intensification policies, and Urban Design.
policies. Therefore the proposed change in zoning to permit twenty-nine (29) townhouse dwellings has merit and can be supported.

Modifications for the “RT-30/S-1755” District (Blocks 2 to 6)

Definition of the Condominium Road as a Street (Blocks 2 to 6)

The applicant is proposing to establish twenty-nine (29) freehold townhouse dwellings. The townhouse dwellings will be accessed from a private common element condominium road. A modification to the parent By-law is required to state that a common element condominium road shall be deemed a street and visitor parking and landscaping shall be permitted within the common element condominium road. This modification is administrative in nature and therefore, the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.

Lot Line Identification (Blocks 3 and 4)

The four townhouse dwellings proposed on Block 3 have dual frontage on the private condominium road at both the front and rear of the proposed dwellings, and the three (3) townhouse dwellings in Block 4 have frontage on both Albright Road at the front of the proposed dwellings and the private condominium road at the rear.

In respect to through lots which have frontage on a road at both the front and rear of the lot, the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 6593 classifies both lot lines as front lot lines. Therefore a By-law modification is required in order to clarify which lot line is deemed to be the front lot line, as follows:

Block 3: the northerly lot line along the condominium road is deemed to be the front lot line, the lot line opposite from and furthest away from the front lot line is deemed to be the rear lot line, and all other lot lines are deemed to be side lot lines; and,

Block 4: the lot line along Albright Road is deemed to be the front lot line, the lot line opposite from and furthest away from the front lot line is deemed to be the rear lot line, and all other lot lines are deemed to be side lot lines.

These modifications are technical in nature and are required to properly define the lot lines, which assists in identifying the setback requirements from each lot line. Therefore, the proposed modifications can be supported.
Lot Area (Blocks 2 to 6)

The proposed modification is to reduce the minimum lot area requirement from 180 sq. m. for each townhouse dwelling to a minimum lot area of 150 sq. m.

The intent and purpose of requiring a minimum lot area of 180 sq. m. is to ensure that the proposed lots will be of sufficient size to accommodate a suitably sized dwelling unit, as well as provide adequate space for parking and amenity area.

For the end units, a minimum lot area of 192 sq. m. is to be provided and therefore the end units conform to the minimum lot area of 180 sq. m. and no modification is required for end units. The modification is therefore only for the interior units for which a lot area of 150 sq. m. is proposed. The proposed lot area for the interior units will maintain adequate space on-site to permit the establishment of dwelling units that have a Gross Floor Area of approximately 140 sq. m. (1,506 sq. ft.) and will provide lots that will maintain sufficient parking spaces for each unit to meet the parking requirements of the Zoning By-law, and will maintain a minimum of 36.6 sq. m. (394 sq. ft.) of outdoor private amenity space per dwelling unit. Therefore, the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.

Front Yard Depth (Blocks 2, 3, 5 and 6)

The proposed modifications for front yard depth are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Required Front Yard Depth</th>
<th>Proposed Front Yard Depth (For Dwelling)</th>
<th>Proposed Front Yard Depth (For Garage)</th>
<th>Proposed Front Yard Depth (For Curve Portion of the Front Lot Line)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6 m</td>
<td>4.5 m</td>
<td>5.8 m</td>
<td>2 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6 m</td>
<td>5.1 m</td>
<td>6 m</td>
<td>1.7 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6 m</td>
<td>4.5 m</td>
<td>5.8 m</td>
<td>N / A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 m</td>
<td>4.5 m</td>
<td>5.8 m</td>
<td>N / A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intent and purpose of requiring a minimum front yard setback of 6 m is to maintain the streetscape character of the area and to provide adequate space with which to provide adequate driveway access and landscaping.

In respect to the townhouse dwellings in Blocks 2 and 3 the dwelling units are located next to Mount Albion Road but are oriented away from Mount Albion...
Road and toward the private condominium road and the proposed townhouse dwellings in the opposite block. Based on the orientation of the townhouse dwellings the reduction to the front yard depth will not impact the streetscape character of the area along Mount Albion Road.

The proposed reductions for Blocks 2 and 3 in respect to the front yard depth from the curved portion of the front lot line is located within the interior of the proposed development and will not impact the streetscape character of the area.

In respect to the townhouse dwellings contained in Blocks 5 and 6 the dwelling units are contained within the interior of the proposed development and therefore the proposed reduction to the front yard depth will not impact the streetscape character of the area.

The proposed 5.8 m setback for the garage is in respect to garages for Blocks 2, 5 and 6 that are accessed from the internal private condominium road. The 5.8 m front yard depth will maintain adequate space with which to permit vehicles to park on the driveway. Therefore, the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.

**Side Yard Width (Blocks 2 to 6)**

The proposed modifications for side yard width are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Proposed Side Yard Width (Required Setback is 2 m)</th>
<th>Location of Proposed Reduced Side Yard Width</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8 m side yard</td>
<td>Between the easterly side of the building and Mount Albion Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8 m side yard</td>
<td>Between the easterly side of the building and Mount Albion Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.2 m side yard</td>
<td>Between the westerly side of the building and the lot line adjacent to the visitor parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5 m side yard</td>
<td>Between the south-east corner of the building and the hypotenuse of the daylight triangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.5 m side yard</td>
<td>Except for below, between an end unit of a building and a side lot line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.0 m side yard</td>
<td>Between the southerly most end unit and Albright Road (This setback conforms to the parent By-law setback)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side Yard Width</td>
<td>Requirement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5 m</td>
<td>Between the southerly end unit and a side lot line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.0 m</td>
<td>Between the northerly end unit and a side lot line (This modification represents an increase in the existing setback requirement)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intent and purpose of requiring a minimum side yard setback of 2 m is to maintain the streetscape character of the area and provide adequate space for access and drainage.

**Block 2 and 3**

In respect to the side yard width for the easterly end units of Blocks 2 and 3. The proposed 1.8 m side yard width along Mount Albion Road will maintain the streetscape character of the area and will maintain sufficient space with which to provide access and drainage. Therefore, the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.

**Block 4**

In respect to the side yard width for the westerly end unit for Block 4, the proposed 1.2 m side yard width is from the visitor parking spaces. The proposed 1.2 m side yard setback will provide sufficient separation between the dwelling unit and the visitor parking.

In respect to the side yard width for the easterly end unit for Block 4, the proposed 1.5 m side yard width is from the hypotenuse of the daylight triangle. A 3.6 m side yard width will be maintained between the easterly end unit for Block 4 and Mount Albion Road. The location of the easterly end unit for Block 4 will be setback further back from Mount Albion Road than the corner dwelling unit at 296 Albright Road. Therefore the proposed 1.5 m side yard width from the hypotenuse of the daylight triangle will maintain the streetscape character of the area and will maintain adequate space for access and drainage. Therefore, the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.

**Block 5**

In respect to the side yard width for the northerly and southerly end units for Block 5, the proposed 1.5 m side yard width is internal to the proposed
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development and not alter the streetscape character along either Mount Albion Road or Albright Road. The proposed 1.5 m setback is sufficient to provide adequate space to access the rear yard and allow for overland drainage.

As a minimum 2 m side yard width is to be provided between the southerly most end unit of Block 5 and the property line along Albright Road, no modification is required. In order to ensure that a 2 m setback is provided the By-law modification will specifically require a 2 m setback from the lot line along Albright Road. Therefore, the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.

Block 6

In respect to the side yard width of the southerly end unit for Block 6, the proposed 1.5 m side yard width is internal to the proposed development and therefore will not alter the streetscape character along Mount Albion Road and Albright Road. Furthermore the proposed 1.5 m setback will provide adequate space with which to provide access to the rear yard and allow for overland drainage.

In respect to the side yard width of the northerly end unit for Block 6, the proposed modification is to increase the minimum side yard setback between the northerly end unit and northerly lot line to 3 m. This is to provide a greater buffer between the townhouse dwelling and the rear yard of the property at 43 Rouge Hill Court. Therefore, the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.

Rear Yard Depth (Blocks 2 to 6)

The proposed modifications for rear yard depth are outlined in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Required Rear Yard Depth</th>
<th>Proposed Rear Yard Depth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.5 m</td>
<td>6 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.5 m</td>
<td>6 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7.5 m</td>
<td>7 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.5 m</td>
<td>6 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5 m</td>
<td>6 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The intent and purpose of requiring a minimum rear yard depth of 7.5 m is to maintain adequate amenity space to meet the needs of residents, provide sufficient room to accommodate grading and drainage and provide buffering and separation from adjacent lands.
The proposed rear yard depth of 6 m for Blocks 2, 3, 5 and 6 will establish a rear yard private amenity area of approximately 36.6 sq. m. (394 sq. ft.) per unit. The townhouse dwellings in Block 2 will abut the side yard of the proposed single detached dwelling and will therefore not impact any existing residential dwellings. The townhouse dwellings in Block 3 will abut the proposed private condominium road and therefore will not impact any adjacent residential dwellings. Furthermore the proposed rear yard depth along with a visual barrier will provide adequate buffering and separation from the adjacent lands. The rear yards of the remaining townhouse dwellings abut the private condominium road.

The proposed rear yard depth of 7m for Block 4 will establish a rear yard private amenity area of 21.6 sq. m. (233.1 sq. ft.) per dwelling unit. The rear amenity is located between the north side of the building and the condominium road but does not include the rear access driveway and not adjacent to Albright Road. In addition there is the existing Red Hill Neighbourhood Park that is located approximately 85 m to the west of the subject property which will supplement the amenity needs of residents. Therefore adequate amenity space is provided to meet the needs of residents. The proposed townhouse dwellings for Block 4 will abut the proposed private condominium road and therefore will not impact any adjacent residential dwellings. Therefore, the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.

Distance Between Townhouse Dwellings (Blocks 5 and 6)

The proposed modification is to reduce the minimum setback between townhouse dwellings from 3.5 m to 3.0 m for Blocks 5 and 6. The intent and purpose of requiring a minimum setback of 3.5 m between townhouse dwellings is to maintain the streetscape character of the area and adequate space for access and drainage.

The proposed 3 m setback between townhouse dwellings pertains to the separation between the townhouse dwellings for Blocks 5 and 6. These townhouse blocks are located in the interior of the proposed development and will therefore not impact the current streetscape character along either Mount Albion Road or Albright Road. Furthermore, the proposed 3 m setback between the buildings will permit a 1.5 m side yard width for each end unit and will provide sufficient space for access and drainage for the subject lands. Therefore, the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.
Prohibition of Vehicle Access to Albright Road (Blocks 2 to 6)

The proposed modification is to ensure that the private condominium road does not connect to Albright Road and that no individual driveways connect to Albright Road.

This modification is required to ensure that vehicle access from the site is not access onto Albright Road and that all access for the site occurs from Mount Albion Road. The modification implements the restriction of not having access on both Mount Albion Road and Albright Road which can lead to cut through traffic. Furthermore, the modification ensures that the access for the private condominium road is adequately setback from the intersection of Mount Albion Road and Albright Road. Therefore the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.

Visitor Parking (Blocks 2 to 6)

The proposed modification is to permit eight (8) visitor parking spaces whereas nine (9) visitor parking spaces are required for Blocks 2 to 6.

The intent and purpose of requiring a minimum of nine (9) visitor parking spaces is to ensure that the visitor parking needs of the subject property are met and do not cause traffic conflicts.

The applicant previously proposed nine (9) visitor parking spaces with no barrier free parking space. The revised concept plan provides one (1) barrier free parking space. This was achieved by combining two non-barrier free parking spaces and therefore reduced the overall number of visitor parking spaces by one (1). As such, a total of eight (8) visitor parking spaces for 29 units, or 0.27 spaces per unit whereas 0.3 spaces per unit is required.

The proposed modification represents a reduction of only one (1) visitor parking space. Additionally it is noted that while on-street parking is not permitted on Mount Albion Road, it is permitted on Albright Road in the evening. Also a bus stop is provided along the frontage of the subject lands on Mount Albion Road providing an alternative means of transportation for visitors. The visitor parking needs of the subject property will be met and will not cause traffic conflicts. Therefore the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.
Manoeuvring Space (Blocks 2, 5 and 6)

The proposed modification is to reduce the minimum on-site manoeuvring space from 6 m to 5.8 m for Blocks 2, 5 and 6.

The intent and purpose of requiring a minimum of 6 m of on-site manoeuvring space is to ensure that there is adequate ingress and egress into a parking space without creating traffic conflicts and serves as a second de-facto parking space per unit.

The proposed 0.2 m reduction in the on-site manoeuvring space is being requested in order to facilitate an increase in width of the internal sidewalk from 1.2 m to 1.5 m. The proposed parking spaces located within the attached garages of each townhouse dwelling are accessed from a private condominium road that only serves the proposed townhouse dwellings. Furthermore access to the subject property will be limited to a single access from Mount Albion Road and therefore will not lead to cut through traffic. As such, the potential traffic along the private condominium road is not expected to be significant. Therefore, the proposed modification has merit and can be supported.

5. The proposed Draft Plan of Condominium facilitates the proposed development by establishing a common element condominium for the private road, visitor parking and sidewalks which provide access and visitor parking for the proposed townhouse dwelling units.

6. There is a 300mm watermain, 300mm sanitary sewer, and 600mm storm sewer available on Mount Albion Road, and an existing 1500mm watermain, 600mm sanitary sewer, and 600mm storm sewer available on Albright Road to service the proposed development. Based on the preliminary review, the proposed 200mm watermain that will be established through the site will be looped connecting both streets and storm and sanitary sewers will be connected to Albright Road, however the existing connections cannot be reused and therefore must be abandoned and replaced at the owner's expense.

7. The preliminary grading plan does not demonstrate that a suitable drainage outlet for the two single detached dwelling lots is provided and therefore the applicant will be required to demonstrate that water runoff for the lots is directed to the existing storm sewers on Mount Albion Road. This requirement is being addressed as a condition of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval, and is included as Condition No. 1 of Appendix "E" to Report PED18014.
8. A 9.14m by 9.14m daylight triangle at the intersection of Mount Albion Road and Albright Road is required to be dedicated to the City of Hamilton. The daylight triangle is required to provide the City with space for any infrastructure improvements as well as to maintain sight lines for vehicles approaching the intersection. In addition the owner must acknowledge and agree that no private driveway shall encroach onto the daylight triangle. These requirements are being addressed as conditions of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval, and are included as Conditions Nos. 10 and 19 of Appendix “E” to Report PED18014.

9. The storm water management report and preliminary grading plans indicate that the runoff from the rear portions of units 11 to 18 inclusive is to be directed to drain through the School Board lands in accordance with an agreement between both parties. The City of Hamilton requires that the applicant demonstrate that the School Board grants and registers a drainage easement over their lands in favour of the subject property. Furthermore, based on existing topographical information it appears that water runoff will discharge through the rear portion of 30, 34, and 38 Rouge Hill Court prior to discharging to the existing watercourse. The City of Hamilton requires an additional assessment to be completed to clarify the pre-development and post development flows. These requirements are being addressed as conditions of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval, and are included as Conditions Nos. 2 and 9 of Appendix "E" to Report PED18014.

10. The applicant will be required to address with dust control and street cleaning throughout the construction of the subdivision. This requirement is being addressed as a condition of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval, and is included as Condition No. 3 of Appendix "E" to Report PED18014.

11. The applicant will be required to include in the engineering design and cost estimate schedule provision to abandon / install the private services connections for the site and restore the existing pavement, sidewalk and boulevard at their expense. This requirement is being addressed as a condition of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval, and is included as Condition No. 8 of Appendix "E" to Report PED18014.

12. As the proposed townhouse development is to include common access, drainage, and services, an easement will need to be established in order to permit the Condominium Corporation to undertake inspections and modifications to the surface drainage in accordance with the detailed drainage plan and overall drainage plan. Perspective purchasers will also need to be advised of the easement. These requirements are being addressed as conditions of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval and Draft Plan of Condominium Approval and are
13. In respect to on-site parking, it is noted that owners tend to use a garage for storage and not for parking. Therefore it is recommended that the applicant include a warning clause in their agreements of purchase and sale or lease advising that the garage space is for the parking of vehicles, that the owner is responsible for ensuring their parking needs are accommodated on-site, that on-street parking is not permitted on Mount Albion Road and restricted on Albright Road and that existing public parking in the surrounding neighbourhood cannot be guaranteed in perpetuity.

This requirement is being addressed as a condition of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval and Draft Plan of Condominium Approval and are included as Condition No. 11 a) of Appendix “E” to Report PED18014 and Condition No. 4 a) of Appendix “G” to Report PED18014.

14. The proposed townhouse dwellings will be accessed by a private common element condominium road which is not maintained by the City of Hamilton, nor does the City of Hamilton provide snow removal services for the private common element condominium road. In order to ensure that purchasers and tenants are aware that the City does not maintain the road or provide snow removal services, a warning clause will need to be included in all Purchase and Sale Agreements and Rental Leases. This requirement is being addressed as a condition of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval and Draft Plan of Condominium Approval and are included as Condition No. 11 b) of Appendix “E” to Report PED18014 and Condition No. 4 b) of Appendix “G” to Report PED18014.

15. Following the public information mailed out by the applicant as part of their public consultation strategy, the applicant received one (1) letter of correspondence which was forwarded to staff (see Appendix "K" to Report PED18014). The interested party expressed opposition to the development as the development would create a loss of green space in the neighbourhood, and the area is already heavily populated and does not need further burden to the existing infrastructure.

The existing green space that is described by the interested party consist of lands known municipally as 166 Mount Albion Road which is currently vacant and covered by grass. These lands are neither owned by the City of Hamilton nor designated to be used for a public park.
In respect to burdening the existing infrastructure, the proposed development has been reviewed in respect to whether there is sufficient municipal services and transportation capacity to accommodate the proposed development. Through this review, it has been determined that there are adequate municipal services and transportation capacity to service and meet the needs of the proposed development.

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION

Should the proposed Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, Draft Plan of Subdivision, and Draft Plan of Condominium (Common Element) applications be denied, the subject property could be utilized in accordance with the “AA” (Agricultural) District.

ALIGNMENT TO THE 2016 – 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN

Community Engagement & Participation
Hamilton has an open, transparent and accessible approach to City government that engages with and empowers all citizens to be involved in their community.

Economic Prosperity and Growth
Hamilton has a prosperous and diverse local economy where people have opportunities to grow and develop.

Healthy and Safe Communities
Hamilton is a safe and supportive city where people are active, healthy, and have a high quality of life.

Clean and Green
Hamilton is environmentally sustainable with a healthy balance of natural and urban spaces.

Built Environment and Infrastructure
Hamilton is supported by state of the art infrastructure, transportation options, buildings and public spaces that create a dynamic City.

Culture and Diversity
Hamilton is a thriving, vibrant place for arts, culture, and heritage where diversity and inclusivity are embraced and celebrated.
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DRAFT Urban Hamilton Official Plan
Amendment No. XX

The following text, together with Appendix "A" – Urban Site Specific Key Map – Volume 3: Map 2, constitutes Official Plan Amendment XX to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.

1.0 **Purpose and Effect:**

The purpose and effect of this Amendment is to establish Urban Site Specific Policy Area UHN-XX for the lands located at 154 and 166 Mount Albion Road, to allow townhouse dwellings on a common element condominium road with a minimum density of 42 units per hectare for the medium density residential development within the Neighbourhoods designation.

2.0 **Location:**

The lands affected by this Amendment are known municipally as 154 and 166 Mount Albion Road, in the former City of Hamilton.

3.0 **Basis:**

The basis for permitting this Amendment is as follows:

- The proposal satisfies all characteristics and requirements of the medium density residential policies, save and except the prescribed residential density range.

- The proposed Amendment is compatible with the existing and planned development in the immediate area.

- The proposed Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2017.

4.0 **Changes:**

4.1. **Text Changes**

Urban Hamilton Official Plan Volume 3 – Special Policy Areas, Area Specific Policies and Site Specific Policies

4.1.1 Urban Hamilton Official Plan Volume 3 – Chapter C – Urban Site Specific Policies is amended by adding a new site specific policy as
follows:

“UHN-XX  Lands located at 154 and 166 Mount Albion Road, former City of Hamilton

1.0  Notwithstanding Volume 1, Policy E.3.5.7, for lands located at 154 and 166 Mount Albion Road, the net residential density for medium density residential uses shall be greater than 42 units per hectare and not greater than 100 units per hectare.”

4.2  Mapping Changes:

Urban Hamilton Official Plan Volume 3: Map 2 – Urban Site Specific Key Map

4.2.1  Urban Hamilton Official Plan Volume 3 – Map 2 – Urban Site Specific Key Map be amended by adding “UHN-XX” to the subject lands, as shown on Appendix “A”, attached to this amendment.

5.0  Implementation:

An implementing Zoning By-law Amendment will give effect to the intended uses on the subject lands.

This is Schedule “1” to By-law No. ____ passed on the day of ____, 2018.

The City of Hamilton

_________________________  _______________________
Fred Eisenberger   Rose Caterini
MAYOR            CITY CLERK
CITY OF HAMILTON
BY-LAW NO.

To Amend Zoning By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton), Respecting Lands Located at 154 and 166 Mount Albion Road (Hamilton)

WHEREAS the City of Hamilton Act, 1999, Statutes of Ontario, 1999 Chap.14, Schedule. C. did incorporate, as of January 1st, 2001, the municipality “City of Hamilton”;

WHEREAS the City of Hamilton is the successor to certain area municipalities, including the former area municipality known as "The Corporation of the City of Hamilton", and is the successor of the former regional municipality, namely, “The Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth”;

WHEREAS the City of Hamilton Act, 1999 provides that the Zoning By-laws and Official Plans of the former area municipalities and the Official Plan of the former regional municipality continue in force in the City of Hamilton until subsequently amended or repealed by the Council of the City of Hamilton;

WHEREAS the Council of the Corporation of the City of Hamilton passed Zoning By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton) on the 25th day of July 1950, which By-law was approved by the Ontario Municipal Board by Order, dated the 7th day of December 1951, (File No. P.F.C. 3821);

WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton, in adopting Item of Report 18 - of the Planning Committee, at its meeting held on the day of , 2018, recommended that Zoning By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton), be amended as hereinafter provided;

WHEREAS this By-law will be in conformity with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan upon approval of Official Plan Amendment No. .

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:

1. That Sheet No. E87 of the District Maps, appended to and forming part of Zoning By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton) is amended, by changing from the “AA” (Agricultural) District to the "C/S-1755" (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified (Block 1) and “RT-30/S-1755” (Street-Townhouse) District, Modified (Blocks 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6) on the lands the extent and boundaries of which are shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule “A”. 
2. "C/S-1755" (Block 1)

That the "C" (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District provisions as contained in Section 9 of Zoning By-law No. 6593, applicable to the subject lands, be modified to include the following special requirements:

a) That notwithstanding Section 2 (2) (J) (xiii), Mount Albion Road shall be deemed the front lot line, the lot line opposite to and furthest from the front lot line shall be deemed the rear lot line, and all other lot lines shall be deemed a side lot line.

b) That notwithstanding Section 9 (3) (iii), a rear yard of a depth of at least 7.0 metres.

3. "RT-30/S-1755" (Blocks 2 to 6)

That the “RT-30” (Street-Townhouse) District provisions as contained in Section 10F of Zoning By-law No. 6593, applicable to the subject lands, be modified to include the following requirements:

a) That for the purposes of this By-law, a common element condominium road shall be deemed a street and visitor parking for the dwelling units fronting the common element condominium road and landscaping shall be permitted within the common element condominium road.

b) That notwithstanding Section 10F (6) (i), a lot area not less than 150 square metres for each single family dwelling unit shall be required for the lot of an interior unit and not less than 180 square metres for each single family dwelling unit that is an end unit.

c) That notwithstanding Section 18A (1) (b), a minimum of 8 visitor parking spaces shall be provided.

d) That no individual driveways or common element condominium road access shall be permitted to Albright Road.

4. “RT-30/S-1755” (Block 2)

That the “RT-30” (Street-Townhouse) District provisions as contained in Section 10F of Zoning By-law No. 6593, applicable to the subject lands, be modified to include the following special requirements:

a) That notwithstanding Section 10F (4) (a), a front yard of a depth of not less than 4.5 metres and 5.8 metres to a garage and a front yard depth of not less than 2.0 metres from the curved portion of the front lot line.

b) That notwithstanding Section 10F (4) (b), a rear yard of a depth of
not less than 6.0 metres.

c) That in addition to Section 10F (4) (c) (ii) of this By-law, a side yard width of not less than 1.8 metres between a townhouse dwelling and the side lot line adjacent to Mount Albion Road.

d) That notwithstanding Section 18A (1) (f), at least 5.8 metres of manoeuvring space shall be required for a 90 degree parking space.

5. “RT-30/S-1755” (Block 3)

That the “RT-30” (Street-Townhouse) District provisions as contained in Section 10F of Zoning By-law No. 6593, applicable to the subject lands, be modified to include the following special requirements:

a) That notwithstanding Section 2 (2) (J) (xiii), the northerly lot line shall be deemed the front lot line, the lot line opposite to and furthest from the front lot line shall be deemed the rear lot line, and all other lot lines shall be deemed a side lot line.

b) That notwithstanding Section 10F (4) (a), a front yard of a depth of not less than 4.5 metres and 6.0 metres to a garage and a front yard depth of not less than 1.7 metres from the curved portion of the front lot line.

c) That notwithstanding Section 10F (4) (b), a rear yard of a depth of not less than 6.0 metres.

d) That notwithstanding Section 10F (4) (c) (ii) of this By-law, a side yard width of not less than 1.8 metres between a townhouse dwelling and the side lot line adjacent to Mount Albion Road.

6. “RT-30/S-1755” (Block 4)

That the “RT-30” (Street-Townhouse) District provisions as contained in Section 10F of Zoning By-law No. 6593, applicable to the subject lands, be modified to include the following special requirements:

a) That notwithstanding Section 2 (2) (J) (xiii), Albright Road shall be deemed the front lot line, the lot line opposite to and furthest from the front lot line shall be deemed the rear lot line, and all other lot lines shall be deemed a side lot line.

b) That notwithstanding Section 10F (4) (b), a rear yard of a depth of not less than 7.0 metres.

c) That in addition to Section 10F (4) (c) (ii) of this By-law, a side yard width of not less than 1.2 metres between a townhouse dwelling and the property line adjacent to the visitor parking spaces and a side
yard width of not less than 1.5 metres between a townhouse dwelling and the lot line of the hypotenuse of the daylight triangle.

7. “RT-30/S-1755” (Block 5)

That the “RT-30” (Street-Townhouse) District provisions as contained in Section 10F of Zoning By-law No. 6593, applicable to the subject lands, be modified to include the following special requirements:

a) That notwithstanding Section 10F (4) (a), a front yard of a depth of not less than 4.5 metres and 5.8 metres to a garage.

b) That notwithstanding Section 10F (4) (b), a rear yard of a depth of not less than 6.0 metres.

c) That notwithstanding Section 10F (4) (c) (ii) a side yard width of not less than 1.5 metres, except for a side yard width of 2 metres from the lot line along Albright Road.

d) That notwithstanding Section 10F (5) (b), not exceeding two storeys in height, of not less than 3.0 metres.

e) That notwithstanding Section 18A (1) (f), at least 5.8 metres of manoeuvring space shall be required for a 90 degree parking space.

8. “RT-30/S-1755” (Block 6)

That the “RT-30” (Street-Townhouse) District provisions as contained in Section 10F of Zoning By-law No. 6593, applicable to the subject lands, be modified to include the following special requirements:

a) That notwithstanding Section 10F (4) (a), a front yard of a depth of not less than 4.5 metres and 5.8 metres to a garage.

b) That notwithstanding Section 10F (4) (b), a rear yard of a depth of not less than 6.0 metres.

c) That notwithstanding Section 10F (4) (c) (ii) a side yard width of not less than 1.5 metres for the southerly lot line and a side yard width of not less than 3.0m for the northerly lot line.

d) That notwithstanding Section 10F (5) (b), not exceeding two storeys in height, of not less than 3.0 metres.

e) That notwithstanding Section 18A (1) (f), at least 5.8 metres of manoeuvring space shall be required for a 90 degree parking space.

9. That no building or structure shall be erected, altered, extended, or enlarged, nor shall any building or structure or part thereof be used, nor
shall any land be used, except in accordance with the “C” District and “RT-30” District provisions, subject to the special requirements in Sections 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 of this By-law.

10. That By-law No. 6593 (City of Hamilton) is amended by adding this By-law to Section 19B as Schedule S-1755.

11. That Sheet No. E87 of the District maps is amended by making the lands referred to in Section 1 of this By-law as Schedule S-1755.

12. That the Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to proceed with the giving of notice of the passing of this By-law, in accordance with the Planning Act.

PASSED and ENACTED this day of , 2018.

________________________________________  __________________________________________
F. Eisenberger                          Rose Caterini
Mayor                                 Clerk

ZAC-16-002
UHOPA-17-014
Appendix "C" to Report PED18014
Page 6 of 7

This is Schedule "A" to By-law No. 18-
Passed the ......... day of ...................., 2018

--- Mayor ---
--- Clerk ---

Schedule "A"

Map Forming Part of
By-law No. 18——
to Amend By-law No. 6593

Subject Property
154 & 168 Mount Albion Road

- Block 1 - Change in Zoning from the "AA" (Agricultural) District, to the "CIS-1750" (Urban Protected Residential, etc.) District, Modified
- Block 2 - Change in Zoning from the "AA" (Agricultural) District, to the "RT-30/5-1755" (Street – Townhouse) District, Modified
- Block 3 - Change in Zoning from the "AA" (Agricultural) District, to the "RT-30/5-1755" (Street – Townhouse) District, Modified
- Block 4 - Change in Zoning from the "AA" (Agricultural) District, to the "RT-30/5-1755" (Street – Townhouse) District, Modified
- Block 5 - Change in Zoning from the "AA" (Agricultural) District, to the "RT-30/5-1755" (Street – Townhouse) District, Modified
- Block 6 - Change in Zoning from the "AA" (Agricultural) District, to the "RT-30/5-1755" (Street – Townhouse) District, Modified

Scale: N.T.S.
File Name/Number:
Date: Dec. 12, 2017
Planner/Technician:

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For Office Use Only, this doesn't appear in the by-law - Clerk's will use this information in the Authority Section of the by-law</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is this by-law derived from the approval of a Committee Report? Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee: Steve Robichaud          Report No.: PED18        Date: 12/05/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward(s) or City Wide: Ward: 5        (MM/DD/YYYY)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared by: Daniel Barnett          Phone No: 905-546-2424 ext. 4445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Office Use Only, this doesn't appear in the by-law</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conditions of Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval for 25T-201613, 154 and 166 Mount Albion Road

That this approval apply to the Draft Plan of Subdivision, 25T-201613, B.A. Jacobs Surveying Ltd., dated August 9, 2016, showing 2 lots for single detached dwellings (Lots 1 and 2), 29 townhouse dwellings (Blocks 4 to 9), one (1) block for a Common Element Roadway (Block 3), and one block for a daylight triangle (Block 10), subject to the Owner entering into a Standard Form Subdivision Agreement, as approved by City Council, and with the following special conditions:

Prior to Preliminary Grading:

1. That, prior to preliminary grading, the Owner demonstrates that the runoff from Lots 1 and 2 is directed to a suitable outlet, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director, Growth Management.

2. That, prior to preliminary grading, the Owner submits additional information prepared by a qualified professional to demonstrate that the post-development flows at a Node located to the north property line of the School Board property and the side yard property line of the private property at 38 Rouge Hill Court are less than pre-development peak flows for all storm events, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director, Growth Management.

3. That, prior to preliminary grading, the Owner agrees to provide a plan or procedure for dealing with issues concerning dust control and street cleaning throughout construction within the subdivision, including homes. This document will also include, first point of contact, a schedule for regular cleaning of streets that is specific to the methods to be used, the source of water, and the contractor or agent to be used to undertake the works as well as the contractor / agent to be used to undertake the works as well as the contractor / agent contact information so that the City can direct works to be completed as necessary, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director, Growth Management.

4. That, prior to preliminary grading, the Owner prepares and implements an erosion and sediment control plan for the subject property, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority and the Senior Director, Growth Management.

5. That, prior to preliminary grading, the Owner prepares and implements a lot grading plan to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority and the Senior Director, Growth Management.

6. That, prior to preliminary grading, the Owner prepares and implements a stormwater management plan for the subject lands to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority and the Senior Director, Growth Management.
7. That, **prior to preliminary grading**, the Owner updates the Tree Protection Plan, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner.

**Prior to Servicing**

8. That, **prior to servicing**, the Owner agrees to include in the engineering and cost estimate schedule provision to abandon / install the private services and restore the existing pavement, sidewalk and boulevard at 100% their costs, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director, Growth Management.

**Prior to Registration**

9. That, **prior to registration of the plan**, the owner demonstrates that a drainage easement in favour of the Draft Plan Lands is registered over the School Board lands at 300 Albright Road to the satisfaction of the Senior Director, Growth Management.

10. That, **prior to registration of the plan**, a 9.14 metre by 9.14 metre daylight triangle be established and provision made for dedication to the City of Hamilton, on the final plan of subdivision at the intersection of Mount Albion Road and Albright Road to the satisfaction of the Senior Director, Growth Management.

11. That, **prior to registration of the plan**, the Owner shall include the following warning clauses in the Subdivision Agreement and all Purchase and Sale and / or any Rental or Lease Agreements required for occupancy:

   To the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner:

   (a) Garages provided are intended for use as parking. It is the responsibility of the owner / tenant to ensure that their parking needs including those for visitors can be accommodated on site. Public, on-street parking is not permitted on Mount Albion Road and existing public parking in the surrounding neighbourhood cannot be guaranteed in perpetuity.

   (b) Purchasers / Tenants are advised that the City of Hamilton will not be providing maintenance or snow removal service for the private condominium road.

   To the satisfaction of Canada Post:

   (c) That the home / business mail delivery will be from a designated Centralized Mail Box.
(d) That the developer / owner be responsible for officially notifying the purchasers of the exact Centralized Main Box locations prior to the closing of any home sale.

12. That, prior to registration of the plan, the Owner shall agree in the Agreement, in words satisfactory to Bell Canada, to grant to Bell Canada any easements that may be required for telecommunication services. Easements may be required subject to final servicing decisions. In the event of any conflict with existing Bell Canada facilities or easements, the Owner / Developer shall be responsible for the relocation of such facilities or easements.

13. That, prior to registration of the plan, the Owner shall agree to the following to the satisfaction of Canada Post:

(a) Work with Canada Post to determine and provide a temporary suitable Centralized Mail Box location which may be utilized by Canada Post until the curbs, boulevard and sidewalks are in place in the remainder of the subdivision.

(b) Install a concrete pad in accordance with the requirements of, and in a location to be approved by, Canada Post to facilitate the placement of Community Mail Boxes.

(c) Identify the pads above on the engineering servicing drawings. Said pads are to be poured at the time of the sidewalk and / or curb installation within each phase of the Plan of Subdivision.

(d) Determine the location of all centralized mail receiving facilities in cooperation with Canada Post and to indicate the location of the centralized mail facilities on appropriate maps, information boards and plans. Maps are also to be prominently displayed in the sales office(s) showing specific Centralized Mail Facility locations.

14. That, prior to registration of the plan, the Owner shall agree in the Subdivision Agreement, in words satisfactory to Union Gas Limited, to grant to Union Gas Limited any easements that may be required for gas services. Easements may be required subject to final servicing decisions. In the event of any conflict with existing Union Gas Limited facilities or easements, the Owner / Developer shall be responsible for the relocation of such facilities or easements.

15. That, prior to registration of the plan, the Owner establish a blanket easement in favour of the Condominium Corporation that covers any and all shared services on the development over the Storm Water Management facility, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director, Growth Management.
16. That, prior to registration of the plan, the Owner agree to provide compensation for the removal of all Trees with a diameter at breast height of 10 cm or larger at a rate of 1 to 1, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner.

17. That, prior to registration of the plan, the Owner prepares and implements a dust mitigation plan for the period from site clearance to final construction, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Public Health Services, Health Protection Division.

18. That, prior to registration of the plan, the Owner prepares and implements a pest control plan, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Public Health Services, Health Protection Division.

19. That, prior to registration of the plan, the Owner acknowledges and agrees that no private driveway shall encroach into the daylight triangle at the intersection of Mount Albion Road and Albright Road to the satisfaction of the Senior Director, Growth Management.

City Cost Sharing:

It is not anticipated that there will be any City share for the proposed subdivision. However, if required cost share will be as per City’s Financial Policies.

Notes to Draft Plan Approval

- Pursuant to Section 51(32) of the Planning Act, draft approval shall lapse if the plan is not given final approval within three years. However, extensions will be considered if a written request is received before the draft approval lapses.

- That payment of Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland will be required for the development prior to the issuance of each building permit for the lots within the plan. The calculation of the Cash-in-Lieu payment shall be based on the value of the lands on the day prior to the day of issuance of the building permit; all in accordance with the Financial Policies for Development, and the City’s Parkland Dedication By-law, as approved by Council.

- That the proposed retaining wall will require approvals at the Subdivision Engineering submission and Site Plan stage to the satisfaction of the City.
Special Conditions of Draft Plan of Condominium Approval for 25CDM-201619, 154 and 166 Mount Albion Road

That this approval for the Draft Plan of Condominium (Common Elements) 25CDM-201619, prepared by B.A. Jacobs Surveying Ltd. and certified by Bryan Jacobs O.L.S, dated August 9, 2016, showing a 6 metre wide private condominium road with sidewalks and visitor parking spaces, labelled as “Common Elements” be received and endorsed by City Council with the following special conditions:

1. That the Final Plan of Condominium shall comply with all of the applicable provisions of the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 6593, as amended, or in the event the City of Hamilton has repealed and replaced the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 6593 with By-law No. 05-200, the final Plan of Condominium shall comply with all the applicable provisions of the Zoning By-law in force and effect at the time of the registration of the Draft Plan of Condominium.

2. That the Final Plan of Condominium shall comply, in all respects, with the Final Approved Site Plan Control Application, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Development Planning, Heritage and Design.


4. That the Owner shall include the following warning clauses in the Condominium Approval Agreement and Condominium Agreement and all Purchase and Sale Agreements and any rental or lease agreements required for occupancy:

To the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner:

(a) Garages provided are intended for use as parking. It is the responsibility of the owner / tenant to ensure that their parking needs including those for visitors can be accommodated on site. Public, on-street parking is not permitted on Rymal Road East and existing public parking in the surrounding neighbourhood cannot be guaranteed in perpetuity.

(b) Purchasers / Tenants are advised that the City of Hamilton will not be providing maintenance or snow removal service for the private condominium road.

To the satisfaction of Canada Post:

(c) That the home / business mail delivery will be from a designated Centralized Mail Box.
(d) That the developer / owner be responsible for officially notifying the purchasers of the exact Centralized Main Box locations prior to the closing of any home sale.

To the satisfaction of the Senior Director, Growth Management

(e) Purchasers / Tenants are advised that there is a blanket easement in favour of the Condominium Corporation that covers any and all shared services on the development over the Storm Water Management facility.

5. That the Owner shall agree to choose a street name from the City of Hamilton pre-approved street names list or submit a name for approval, prior to registration, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director, Growth Management.

6. That the Owner shall enter into a Development Agreement to ensure that the tenure of each of the proposed freehold dwellings having frontage on the condominium road has legal interest, in common, to the Common Elements Condominium, to the satisfaction of the City Solicitor.

7. That the Owner establish a blanket easement in favour of the Condominium Corporation that covers any and all shared services on the development over the Storm Water Management facility.

The following easement is created upon registration of this Declaration and Description pursuant to section 20 of the Condominium Act, 1998 in order to comply with condition (5) attached to the City of Hamilton’s final approval of this Declaration and Description:

Reserving unto the Condominium Corporation, it assigns, successors, servants, agents and employees, the right in the nature of an easement, to enter without charge in, over and along all of the Units and the Common Elements of the Condominium, for time to time, for the purposes of entering, inspecting and undertaking, at any time, modifications to the surface drainage of the said Units and the Common Elements of the Condominium in accordance with the Detailed Grading Plan and the Overall Grading Plan approved by the City of Hamilton.

To the satisfaction of the Senior Director, Growth Management.

8. That the owner shall satisfy all conditions, financial or otherwise, of the City of Hamilton.

**NOTE:** Pursuant to Section 51(32) of the *Planning Act*, draft approval shall lapse if the plan is not given final approval within three years. However, extensions will be considered if a written request is received before the draft approval lapses.
Kendra Murphy

From: Clem Pudjunas
Sent: Sunday, April 2, 2017 5:10 AM
To: chad.collins@hamilton.ca; Kendra Murphy
Subject: 154-166 Mt Albion Rd

Re: Proposed townhouse development at 154-166 Mt. Albion Rd.

As a Mt Albion Rd. resident for 20+ years, I am opposed to the development of this current 'green space' in my neighborhood. The Mt. Albion area is already heavily populated with apartment buildings, row housing, townhouses, and Low Income housing. We don't need any more people to burden the existing area infrastructure. It is pleasing to have a bit of contrasting 'open space' in the area.

Clement Pudjunas
2 Congress Cres
Hamilton

c.c. Chad Collins, Councillor Ward 5

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
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**RECOMMENDATION**

(a) That Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment Application UHOPA-15-03, by Hotz and Sons Limited, Owner, to amend the Mount Hope Secondary Plan to redesignate lands from “Institutional” and “Low Density Residential 3f” to “District Commercial”; from “District Commercial” and “Low Density Residential 3f” to “General Open Space”; from “Low Density Residential 2”, “Utility”, and “Natural Open Space” to “Neighbourhood Park”; from “Low Density Residential 2” and “Utility” to “Natural Open Space”; from “Low Density Residential 2” and “Low Density Residential 2c” to “General Open Space”; from “Low Density Residential 2” and “Low Density Residential 2c” to “Utility”; from “Low Density Residential 2” to “Low Density Residential 2c”; from “Low Density Residential 2c” and “Low Density Residential 3f” to “Medium Density Residential 3”; from “Low Density Residential 2c”, “Low Density Residential 3f”, “Utility”, and “Neighbourhood Park” to “Low Density Residential 2”; and from “Low Density Residential 2c”, Low Density Residential 3f”, and “Neighbourhood Park” to “Institutional”. The amendment will also add a special policy area for lands designated “Low Density Residential 2” in order to restrict uses to single detached dwellings and establish a maximum density of 40 units per net hectare; add a special policy area for lands designated “Low Density Residential 2c” to establish a density range of 30 to 55 units per net hectare; add a site specific policy area for lands designated “Medium Density Residential” in order to allow for a maximum height of four storeys; add a site specific policy area for lands designated “Institutional” in order to allow for multiple...
dwellings and to permit a maximum building height of four storeys; remove Core Areas; Linkages and Streams from the Natural Heritage System; remove wetlands and streams from the Natural Heritage Features; and, establish new local roads, for the lands known as 9255 Airport Road West (Glanbrook), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18017, be APPROVED on the following basis:

(i) That the draft Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18017, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council; and,

(ii) That the proposed amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017).

(b) That Rural Hamilton Official Plan Amendment Application RHOPA-18-002, by Hotz and Sons Limited, Owner, to amend the Schedule B-Natural Heritage System, Schedule B-4 - Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Hydrologic Features, and Schedule B-8 - Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Hydrologic Features Streams to remove the Key Hydrologic Features (Wetlands and Streams) and to apply a Site Specific Policy to allow for the development of a stormwater management facility to serve the adjacent urban area, for the lands known as 9255 Airport Road West (Glanbrook), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18017, be APPROVED on the following basis:

(i) That the draft Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED18017, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council; and,

(ii) That the proposed amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017).

(c) That Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-07-111 by Hotz and Sons Limited, Owner, for changes in zoning from the Deferred Development “DD” Zone and General Agriculture “A1” Zone to the Residential “R4-218(A)” Zone, Modified (Block 1); from the Deferred Development “DD” Zone and General Agriculture “A1” Zone to the Residential Multiple “RM2-194(A)” Zone, Modified (Block 2); from the Deferred Development “DD” Zone and the General Agriculture “A1” Zone to the Residential Multiple “RM3-284(A)” Zone and “RM3-284(B)” Zone, Modified (Blocks 3 and 4); and from the Deferred Development “DD” Zone and the General...
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Agriculture “A1” Zone to the Shopping Centre Commercial “C2-309” Zone, Modified (Block 5) in Zoning By-law No. 464; for lands located at 9255 Airport Road West (Glanbrook), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18017, be APPROVED on the following basis:

(i) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “D” to Report PED18017, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council;

(ii) That the proposed changes in zoning are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and conform to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017); and,

(iii) That the proposed changes in zoning comply with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan upon finalization of Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment No. 89.

(d) That Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-07-111 by Hotz and Sons Limited, Owner, for changes in zoning from the Deferred Development “DD” Zone to the Neighbourhood Park (P1) Zone; from the Deferred Development “DD” Zone and the General Agricultural “A1” Zone to the Open Space (P4) Zone; from the Deferred Development “DD” Zone and General Agriculture “A1” Zone to the Conservation / Hazard (P5) Zone; and from the Deferred Development “DD” Zone and General Agriculture “A1” Zone to the Conservation / Hazard Lands – Rural (P6) Zone, in Zoning By-law No. 05-200; for lands located at 9255 Airport Road (Glanbrook), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18017, be APPROVED on the following basis:

(i) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “E” to Report PED18017, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council;

(ii) That the proposed changes in zoning are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and conform to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017); and,

(iii) That the proposed changes in zoning comply with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan upon finalization of Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment No. 89 and Rural Hamilton Official Plan Amendment No. 15.
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(e) That approval be given to add a portion of the lands located at 9255 Airport Road West, Glanbrook, to Zoning By-law No. 05-200 and zone said lands District Commercial (C6) Zone in Zoning By-law No. 05-200, subject to the following:

(i) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “I” to Report PED18017, be held in abeyance until such time as the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones are in force and effect; and,

(ii) That staff be directed to bring forward the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “I” to Report PED18017, for enactment by City Council, once Zoning By-law No. 17-240, the by-law to establish the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, is in force and effect.

(f) That Draft Plan of Subdivision Application 25T-200723 by Hotz and Sons Limited, Owner, to establish a Draft Plan of Subdivision known as “Mountaingate”, on lands known as 9255 Airport Road West (Glanbrook), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18017, be APPROVED subject to the following conditions:

(i) That this approval apply to the Draft Plan of Subdivision “Mountaingate”, 25T-200723, prepared by Odan-DeTech Consulting Engineers and certified by Bruce MacLeod, O.L.S., dated September 12, 2017, consisting of a maximum of 217 lots for single detached dwellings (Lots 1 – 36, 71 – 159, 245 – 259, 284 - 360), a maximum of 143 lots for street townhouse units (Lots 37 – 70, 160 – 244, and 260 – 283), one block for 69 back-to-back and stacked decked townhouse units (Block 361), one block for institutional or 228 medium density residential units (conventional; back-to-back, stacked and / or stacked deck townhouse units) (Block 362), one commercial block (Block 363), one block for a future road widening (Block 364), one open space block (Block 365), one future servicing block (Block 366), one neighbourhood park (Block 369), three blocks for servicing corridor (Blocks 370, 371, and 372), two natural open space blocks (Blocks 373 and 376), two Stormwater Management Blocks (Blocks 374 and 375), and one future residential block (Block 377), one block for a 0.3 m reserve (Block 367), one block for a vegetation protection zone (Block 368), proposed Street “A”, Street “B”, Street “C”, Street “D”, Street “E”, Street “F”, proposed Mountaingate Road, the extension of Rosebury Way, and the extension of Provident Way, subject to the owner entering into a standard Form Subdivision Agreement, as approved by City Council, and with the Special Conditions attached as Appendix “G” to Report PED18017;
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(ii) Acknowledgement by the City of Hamilton of its responsibility for cost-sharing with respect to this development shall be in accordance with the City’s Financial Policies and will be determined at the time of development; and,

(iii) That pursuant to Section 51 of the Planning Act, 1.57 ha, being 5% of the subject lands and known as part of “Block 369” on the attached Draft Plan (Appendix “F” to Report PED18017), shall be dedicated to the City for Parkland purposes. A credit for parkland dedication will be provided for the over dedication of 0.63 ha of “Block 369” to be used for parkland purposes, which is above and beyond the required 5% subject to Section 51 of the Planning Act;

all in accordance with the Financial Policies for Development and the City’s Parkland Dedication By-law, as approved by Council.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the subject applications are to amend the UHOP, in particular the Mount Hope Secondary Plan, the Rural Hamilton Official Plan, the Town of Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464, Zoning By-law No. 05-200, and for approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision known as “Mountaingate”. The effect of the applications are to permit the development of:

- 217 single detached dwelling units;
- 143 lots for street townhouse units;
- 69 back-to-back and stacked townhouse units;
- one institutional or 228 medium density residential units (conventional; back-to-back, stacked townhouse units);
- one commercial block;
- one block for a future road widening;
- one open space block;
- one future servicing block;

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.
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- one neighbourhood park;
- three blocks for servicing corridor purposes;
- two natural open space blocks;
- two Stormwater Management Blocks;
- one future residential block;
- one block for a 0.3 m reserve;
- one block for a vegetation protection zone;
- seven proposed streets (Street “A”, Street “B”, Street “C”, Street “D”, Street “E”, Street “F”, and proposed Mountaingate Road);
- the extension of Rosebury Way; and,
- the extension of Provident Way.

An amendment to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan is required to redesignate lands, add site specific policies, and remove Natural Heritage Features from mapping from lands that fall within the Mount Hope Secondary Plan area.

An amendment to the Rural Hamilton Official Plan is required to remove the Key Hydrologic Feature Wetlands identification, Key Hydrologic Feature Streams identification and to apply a site specific policy allowing the development of a stormwater management (SWM) facility on the lands located at 9255 Airport Road West to serve the adjacent urban area.

Site specific modifications to the Zoning By-law are required to accommodate the back-to-back townhouse units, stacked townhouse units, street townhouse units, and single detached dwelling units.

The proposal has merit and can be supported as it is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017). The proposal will allow for an efficient use of land by permitting the development of a residential greenfield development with a total of 658 units at an...
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Overall density of approximately 49 units per hectare and will comply with the UHOP and RHOP upon approval of UHOP and RHOP Amendments.

New Commercial and Mixed Use (CMU) Zones in Zoning By-law No. 05-200 have been adopted by Council but the implementing zoning by-law (i.e By-law No. 17-240) has been appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board. Certain lands, including Block 363 of the subject property, were excluded from the CMU Zones as they were subject to existing planning applications. A draft by-law has been prepared with this report (attached as Appendix “I” to Report PED18017), to add Block 363 into Zoning By-law No. 05-200 at such time as the CMU Zones are in force and effect. The draft by-law will be held in abeyance until the CMU Zones are in force and effect, at which time the by-law will be brought forward to City Council for enactment. The subject property is to be rezoned a modified District Commercial (C6) Zone.

Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 74

FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial: The City’s cost-sharing with respect to this development shall be in accordance with the City’s Financial Policies and determined at the time of development.

Staffing: N/A

Legal: As required by the Planning Act, Council shall hold at least one Public Meeting to consider applications for an Amendment to the Official Plan, the Zoning By-law and for approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Proposal:

The subject lands are located east of Highway No. 6, north of White Church Road West, and south of Airport Road West. The lands are legally described as Part of Lot 4, Concession 5 (Township of Glanford), and municipally known as 9255 Airport Road West (see location map attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED18017).

The proposal is for 217 lots for single detached dwellings (Lots 1 – 36, 71 – 159, 245 – 259, 284 - 360), 143 lots for street townhouse units (Lots 37 – 70, 160 – 244, and 260 – 283), one block for 69 back-to-back and stacked townhouse units (Block 361), one
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block for institutional or 228 medium density residential units (conventional; back-to-back, stacked and / or stacked townhouse units) (Block 362), one commercial block (Block 363), one block for a future road widening (Block 364), one open space block (Block 365), one future servicing block (Block 366), one neighbourhood park (Block 369), three blocks for servicing corridor (Blocks 370, 371, and 372), two natural open space blocks (Blocks 373 and 376), two Stormwater Management Blocks (Blocks 374 and 375), and one future residential block (Block 377), one block for a 0.3 m reserve (Block 367), one block for a vegetation protection zone (Block 368), seven proposed streets (Street “A”, Street “B”, Street “C”, Street “D”, Street “E”, Street “F”, proposed Mountaingate Road), the extension of Rosebury Way, and the extension of Provident Way, for a maximum total of 657 residential units

Rural Hamilton Official Plan Amendment (RHOPA):

The development applications discussed in this report are subject to the Clergy Principal as they predated the inclusion of the policies contained in Volume 1, Section C.5 – Stormwater Management Facilities of the Rural Hamilton Official Plan. A Site Specific Policy to the Rural Hamilton Official Plan for the proposed stormwater management facility is appropriate.

As the applications were submitted prior to the RHOP approval in March 2012 they are to be reviewed against the Region of Hamilton - Wentworth Official Plan as it pertains to the Natural Heritage System. As no Natural Heritage Features are identified within Map No. 4 of the Hamilton - Wentworth Official Plan, an amendment to remove these features from the Rural Hamilton Official Plan is appropriate.

These amendments to the RHOP will ensure consistency throughout the Plan and guarantee that the Plan is kept up to date on a go forward basis.

Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment (UHOPA):

An application has been made to amend the Mount Hope Secondary Plan. Specifically, the applicant has applied to:

- Redesignating lands from “Institutional” and “Low Density Residential 3f” to “District Commercial”;

- Redesignating lands from “District Commercial” and “Low Density Residential 3f” to “General Open Space”;

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.
OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.
OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.
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- Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2”, “Utility”, and “Natural Open Space” to “Neighbourhood Park”;

- Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2” and “Utility” to “Natural Open Space”;  

- Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2” and “Low Density Residential 2c” to “General Open Space”;  

- Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2” and “Low Density Residential 2c” to “Utility”;  

- Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2” to “Low Density Residential 2c”;  

- Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2c” and “Low Density Residential 3f” to “Medium Density Residential 3”;  

- Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2c”, “Low Density Residential 3f”, “Utility”, and “Neighbourhood Park” to “Low Density Residential 2”;  

- Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2c”, Low Density Residential 3f”, and “Neighbourhood Park” to “Institutional”;  

- Add a special policy area to lands designated “Low Density Residential 2” in order to restrict uses to single detached dwellings and establish a maximum density of 40 units per net hectare;  

- Add a special policy area to lands designated “Low Density Residential 2c” to establish a density range of 30 to 55 units per net hectare;  

- Add a site specific policy area to lands designated “Medium Density Residential” to allow for a maximum height of four storeys;  

- Add a site specific policy area to lands designated “Institutional” to allow for multiple dwellings and permit a maximum building height of four storeys;  

- Remove Core Areas; Linkages and Streams from the Natural Heritage System;  

- Remove wetlands and streams from the Natural Heritage Features; and,
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- to establish new local roads.

The effect of the amendments is to allow for a Plan of Subdivision that includes residential, commercial, utility, neighbourhood park, institutional, and open space land uses. The proposed amendments are contained in Appendix “B” to Report No. PED18017.

Zoning By-law Amendment:

A Zoning By-law Amendment was submitted to rezone the subject lands, as shown on Appendix “D” to Report PED18017 from the Deferred Development “DD” Zone and the General Agriculture “A1” Zone to site specific Residential “R4” Zone; Residential Multiple “RM2” Zone; Residential Multiple “RM3” Zone; and, Shopping Centre Commercial “C2” Zones.

Each of the proposed zones will contain site specific provisions to implement the proposed development. The proposed site specific zoning regulations are described in greater detail in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation section of this Report.

A proposed Zoning By-law Amendment (Appendix “E” to Report PED18017) will also bring lands currently zoned Deferred Development (DD) Zone and General Agriculture (A1) Zone in Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464 into Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200 and zone them Neighbourhood Park (P1) Zone, Open Space (P4) Zone, Conservation / Hazard (P5) Zone, and Conservation / Hazard – Rural (P6) Zone.

Plan of Subdivision:

The proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision (see Appendix “F” to Report PED18017) is intended to create:

- 217 single detached dwelling units;
- 143 lots for street townhouse units;
- 69 back-to-back and stacked townhouse units;
- one institutional or 228 medium density residential units (conventional; back-to-back, stacked townhouse units);
- one commercial block;
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- one block for a future road widening;
- one open space block;
- one future servicing block;
- one neighbourhood park;
- three blocks for servicing corridor purposes;
- two natural open space blocks;
- two Stormwater Management Blocks;
- one future residential block (Block 377);
- one block for a 0.3 m reserve;
- one block for a vegetation protection zone;
- seven proposed streets (Street “A”, Street “B”, Street “C”, Street “D”, Street “E”, Street “F”, and proposed Mountaingate Road);
- the extension of Rosebury Way; and,
- the extension of Provident Way.

Access to the proposed development will be via a connection to Cargo Drive, and extensions of Spitfire Drive, Provident Way, and Rosebury Way. The total unit yield for this Draft Plan of Subdivision would be a maximum of 658 residential units.

CHRONOLOGY
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January 25, 2008: Circulation of Notice of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation for Applications OPA-07-035, ZAC-07-111, and 25T-200723 to 91 property owners within 120 m of the subject lands.

February 15, 2008: Initial Public Notice Sign was posted on the subject lands.


April 2016: Revised Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment and Draft Plan concept received.

December 2016: Revised Draft Plan concept received.

April 2017: Revised Draft Plan concept received.

September 2017: Revised Draft Plan concept received.

December 6, 2017: Public Notice Sign updated to include date of Public Meeting.


December 15, 2017: Circulation of Notice of Public Meeting to 91 property owners within 120 m of the subject lands and all residents who provided written comment.

December 20, 2017: Revised Circulation of Notice of Public Meeting to 91 property owners within 120 m of the subject lands and all residents who provided written comment.

**Details of Submitted Application**

**Location:** 9255 Airport Road West (Glanbrook)

**Owner:** Hotz and Sons Limited (c/o Martin Hotz)

**Agent:** Turkstra Mazza and Associates (c/o Scott Snider)
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**Property Description:**
- **Frontage:** 180.2 m (Airport Road West)
- **Lot Depth:** 1,251 m
- **Area:** 27.4 ha

**Services:**
- Municipal Piped Water System
- Municipal Sanitary Sewer System
- Storm Sewer

**EXISTING LAND USE AND ZONING:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Lands:</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deferred Development “DD” Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrounding Lands:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>North</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Detached Dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Residential “ER” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton Airport</td>
<td></td>
<td>Airport “U1” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Elementary School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Institutional “I” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Deferred Development “DD” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Open Space “OS2” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Detached Dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential 3 “R3” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Corridor</td>
<td></td>
<td>Private Open Space “OS1-148” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Detached Dwellings</td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential 4 “R4” Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td>Residential Multiple “H-RM3-147” Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS

Provincial Planning Policy Framework

The applications have been reviewed with respect to the PPS policies. The following policies, amongst others of the PPS, apply.

The applications contribute to the development of healthy, liveable, and safe communities as required by Policy 1.1.1, as discussed below.

“1.1.1 Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by:

c) Avoiding development and land use patterns which may cause environmental or public health and safety concerns.

1.1.3.1 Settlement areas shall be the focus of growth and development, and their vitality and regeneration shall be promoted.

1.1.3.2 Land use patterns within settlement areas shall be based on:

a) densities and a mix of land uses which:

1. Efficiently use land and resources;

2. are appropriate for, and efficiently use, the infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available, and avoid the need for their unjustified and/or uneconomical expansion;

3. Minimize negative impacts to air quality and climate change, and promote energy efficiency;

4. Support active transportation;

5. Are transit-supportive, where transit is planned, exists or may be developed;

6. Are freight-supportive; and,
b) A range of uses and opportunities for intensification and redevelopment in accordance with the criteria in policy 1.1.3.3, where this can be accommodated.

1.1.3.6 New development taking place in designated growth areas should occur adjacent to the existing built-up area and shall have a compact form, mix of uses and densities that allow for the efficient use of land, infrastructure and public service facilities.

1.4.3 Planning authorities shall provide for an appropriate range and mix of housing types and densities to meet projected requirements of current and future residents of the regional market area by:

a) permitting and facilitating:

1. all forms of housing required to meet the social, health and well-being requirements of current and future residents, including special needs requirements; and,
2. All forms of residential intensification, including second units, and redevelopment in accordance with policy 1.1.3.3;

c) directing the development of new housing towards locations where appropriate levels of infrastructure and public service facilities are or will be available to support current and projected needs;

d) promoting densities for new housing which efficiently use land, resources, infrastructure and public service facilities, and support the use of active transportation and transit in areas where it exists or is to be developed; and,

e) Establishing development standards for residential intensification, redevelopment and new residential development which minimize the cost of housing and facilitate compact form, while maintaining appropriate levels of public health and safety."

The applications are consistent with Policy 1.1.3.1 in that the proposal directs growth to Settlement Areas and implements Policy Nos. 1.1.3.2, 1.1.3.6, and 1.4.3 with respect to the promotion of densities which efficiently use land and resources. The subject proposal encourages a compact form of development that provides for a mix of housing types to meet the projected requirements of current and future residents.
Staff note that the proposed UHOP Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision are consistent with and complementary to the existing neighbourhood in terms of dwelling unit types, densities and street configuration.

“2.6.2 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved.”

The subject property meets four of the ten criteria used by the City of Hamilton and Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport for determining archaeological potential:

1) Within 250 metres of a known archaeological site;

2) Within 300 metres of water or prehistoric water, or 200 metres or a secondary watercourse;

3) Documentary evidence, local knowledge or oral history associates the property with historic activities, events or occupations; and,

4) Within 100 metres of a historic transportation corridor.

Staff received a Stage 1-3 and 4 (P013-325-2007; P013-382-2007) archaeological report for the subject property (9255 Airport Road West) that were submitted to the City and the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport. The Province signed off on the reports for compliance with licensing requirements in a letter dated April 21, 2008. Staff are of the opinion that the municipal interest in the archaeology of this portion of the site has been satisfied.

Based on the foregoing, the proposal is consistent with the policies of the PPS.

**Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017)**

The proposal conforms to the Guiding Principles, Section 1.2.1, as it provides for a range and mix of housing options to serve varying sizes, incomes, and ages of households.

The subject lands constitute a greenfield development as the lands are within the urban boundary but not within the built-up area.
Policy Section 2.2.1 provides direction on managing this growth whereby population and employment growth will be accommodated by, amongst other things:

   “a) feature a diverse mix of land uses, including residential and employment uses, and convenient access to local stores, services, and public service facilities;

   b) improve social equity and overall quality of life, including human health, for people of all ages, abilities, and incomes; and,

   c) provide a diverse range and mix of housing options, including second units and affordable housing, to accommodate people at all stages of life, and to accommodate the needs of all household sizes and incomes;”

In review, the subject lands are located within the Urban Boundary, in a settlement area where full municipal services are available, and will provide for a complete community through a compact design that includes a diverse range and mix of housing types and land use with easy access to local stores and services in the area.

Moreover, Policy Section 2.2.7 provides direction with respect to Designated Greenfield Areas; in particular, Policy 2.2.7.1 states that “new development taking place in designated greenfield areas will be planned, designated, zoned, and designed in a manner that:

   a) supports the achievement of complete communities;

   b) supports active transportation;

   c) encourages the integration and sustained viability of transit services.”

As mentioned above, the proposal will contribute to a complete community by providing a diverse range and mix of housing types as well as commercial uses.

Based on the foregoing, the proposal conforms to the policies of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017).

An application to amend the UHOP was submitted in 2015. The intent of this application was to update the land use designations as the UHOP had since been in full force and effect since the initial applications were made. The balance of the application (ie. Noise Exposure Forecast Contours, and the location of Stormwater Management Ponds) was
evaluated against, and complied with, the policy framework existing at the time of the original submission.

**Hamilton – Wentworth Region Official Plan**

The applications were submitted prior to the UHOP having come into force and effect on August 16, 2013. Accordingly, the Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment application was reviewed against the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan for the purposes of reviewing the proposed location of the Stormwater Management Ponds and evaluating the conformity to Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) contours with respect to the proximity of the proposed development to the airport.

In review, the subject lands are designated “Rural” and “Urban” on Map No. 1 – Regional Development Pattern; and as “Prime Agricultural Lands” on Map No. 2 – Agricultural Lands and Niagara Escarpment Plan Area.

There are no policies in Section 4 (Infrastructure) of the Regional Official Plan that would prohibit the proposed development. Also, Policy 4.3.5.3 of the Plan states that no sensitive land uses are permitted to be developed within areas exposed to noise disturbance levels greater than the 28 NEF, except where the lands are currently designated Urban. As the subject lands are designated as Urban on Map No.1 of the Regional Official Plan, the proposed development implements this policy. As such, staff are supportive of the proposed applications.

**Glanbrook Official Plan**

The applications were submitted prior to the UHOP having come into force and effect on August 16, 2013. Accordingly, the Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment application was reviewed against the Glanbrook Official Plan for the purposes of reviewing the proposed location of the Stormwater Management Ponds and evaluating the conformity to Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) contours with respect to the proximity of the proposed development to the airport.

The subject lands are designated “Residential” and “Agricultural” on Schedule “A” – Land Use Plan General Commercial; and, “Institutional”, “High Density”, “Medium Density”, and “Low Density” on Schedule “C” - Mount Hope Secondary Plan Land Use Plan.

“A.9.1 To ensure that municipal services, including piped municipal water and sanitary sewers and storm drainage facilities, and the required utilities are provided to the
growth areas as designated in this Plan and the Regional Official Plan commensurate with the demand for the development of these designated areas.”

The subject lands have been identified as a growth area within the Official Plan, as such, the location of the SWM ponds implement the intent of the Glanbrook Official Plan.

“F.1.1 It is the intent of this Plan that full municipal services, including municipal water and sanitary sewers, be provided to the Urban Areas of the Township, including, the Binbrook and Mount Hope Urban Settlement Areas, the Residential lands on Twenty Road, the North Glanbrook and Airport Industrial – Business Parks, the Rymal Road Secondary Plan Area and the lands designated Airport – Related Commercial adjacent to Highway No. 6 directly to the south of the former City of Hamilton / Township of Glanbrook Municipal boundary, as designated on Schedule “A” – Land Use Plan.”

The proposed SWM ponds will not just service the subject lands, but will service the larger Mount Hope community as well.

“F.2.1 All new development shall be provided with adequate storm drainage facilities, satisfactory to the Township and other appropriate agencies having jurisdiction.

F.2.4 In considering development proposals, the Township may require a detailed storm water drainage study and implementation plan which will consider the principles of storm water management. The implementation plan shall include major and minor drainage concepts which will recognize the dual functions of providing convenience as well as protecting property.

The problems associated with storm water quality and quantity in the storm management system itself, as well as in the receiving streams, will be recognized, and mitigating measures will be identified to adequately address these problems. These measures may include, but not necessarily be limited to erosion and sediment control during and after construction of new developments, storm and snow melt water detention devices with controlled inlet and outlet mechanisms where appropriate, and provisions for the infiltration where appropriate, and provisions for the infiltration of surface run-off to the ground to the greatest practicable extent. The measures recommended must be to the satisfaction of the Township, the appropriate Conservation Authority, the Ministry of Environment, and the Ministry of Natural Resources.”
A Stormwater Management Report was submitted, and subsequently revised through the application process. A revised report, in accordance with the City of Hamilton Drainage Policies, City of Hamilton Comprehensive Guidelines (2016) and the MOE&CC Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (2003) is required, and shall include the following:

- demonstrate a suitable pond outlet including an emergency spillway from the SWM facility block to the existing culvert on White Church Road;

- show how the pond shall be designed to meet the erosion flow exceedance target identified in the Fluvial Geomorphologic Assessment report;

- verify and confirm that the lesser of predevelopment flow or pond outflows can safely be conveyed through the existing culvert on White Church Road without an increase in flooding on adjoining lands;

- the pond geometry shall be as per City of Hamilton Comprehensive Development Guidelines (2016);

- the pond landscaping shall be as per City of Hamilton Landscape Design Guidelines for SWM facilities (2009); and,

- the stormwater management report shall demonstrate that 100-year HGL is located at or below the top of grade elevation at all inlet and rear-lot catch basin locations and that the 5-year HGL is within the sewer obvert based on 100-year and 5-year pond operating levels, respectively (Condition No. 16 of Appendix “G” to Report No. PED18017) will be required to ensure that adequate drainage can be provided.

**Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) and Rural Hamilton Official Plan (RHOP)**

The subject lands are identified as “Neighbourhoods” on Schedule “E” – Urban Structure, designated as “Neighbourhoods” on Schedule “E-1” – Urban Land Use Designations in the UHOP, outside of the Built Boundary on Appendix “G” – Boundaries Map; and “District Commercial”, “Institutional”, “Low Density Residential 2”, “Low Density Residential 2c”, “Low Density Residential 3f”, “Neighbourhood Park”, “Utility”, and “Natural Open Space” in the Mount Hope Secondary Plan of Volume 2. The lands where the proposed SWM Pond is to be located is in the rural area and designated as “Rural” on Schedule “D” – Rural Land Use Designations in the RHOP.

The following policies, amongst others, are applicable to the subject applications.
Noise

The UHOP contains relevant policies with respect to noise. Section B.3.6.3 indicates:

“B.3.6.3 Noise, vibration, and other emissions such as dust and odours from roads, airports, railway lines and stationary sources have the potential to negatively impact the quality of life of residents. The objective of the following policies is to protect residents from unacceptable levels of noise, vibration, and other emissions and to protect the operations of transportation facilities, commercial, and employment (industrial) uses.

B.3.6.3.1 Development of noise sensitive land uses, in the vicinity of provincial highways, parkways, minor or major arterial roads, collector roads, truck routes, railway lines, railway yards, airports, or other uses considered to be noise generators shall comply with all applicable provincial and municipal guidelines and standards.

B.3.6.3.2 Any required noise or vibration study shall be prepared by a qualified professional, preferably a professional engineer with experience in environmental acoustics, in accordance with recognized noise and vibration measurement and prediction techniques, to the satisfaction of the City, and in accordance with all applicable guidelines and standards.”

Furthermore, the subject lands are located within the 28 Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) Contours, as such, the following policy shall apply:

“C.4.8.10 Any permitted development, redevelopment or infill development at or above 25 NEF or within the Airport Influence Area shall be required to submit a detailed noise study, implement noise mitigative measures in accordance with provincial and federal guidelines/standards or municipal approaches that achieve the same objective, and include appropriate warning clauses in lease or rental agreements, agreements of purchase and sale, and within development agreements.”

HGC Engineering has prepared an environmental noise impact study titled “Noise Feasibility Study for 9255 Airport Road West (Hotz Lands), Hamilton, Ontario”, dated August 9, 2017, in support of the above noted developments. This study reviewed the acoustic requirements for this development with respect to road noise from Airport Road West, White Church Road and Highway 6; and, airport noise from the John C. Munro Hamilton International Airport.
Based on the results of the study, noise warning clauses, specific building materials, and acoustical barriers will be required and future owners will be responsible to maintain any and all noise barriers of infrastructure required within the approved noise study as per Section C.4.8.10 of the UHOP (Condition Nos. 1 – 5 and 32 of Appendix “G” to Report No. PED18017).

Natural Heritage

Based on mapping within Volume 1 of the UHOP and RHOP (Schedule B - Natural Heritage System) and Volume 2 of the UHOP (Mount Hope Secondary Plan Land Use Plan Map B.5.4-1), Core Areas have been identified within and adjacent to the subject property. The Core Areas include a pond (in the northwest corner), Significant Woodland (on adjacent lands abutting the eastern property boundary), a wetland (southeast and southwest portions of the property) and watercourses regulated by the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA). The pond, wetland and watercourses may be representative of fish habitat and the Significant Woodland has been identified as a feature to be preserved in the Mount Hope Secondary Plan (UHOP Volume 2 policy B.5.4.6.1 b).

“C.2.5.3 New development and site alteration shall not be permitted within fish habitat except in accordance with provincial and federal requirements.

C.2.5.4 New development and site alteration shall not be permitted within significant woodlands, significant valleylands, significant wildlife habitat and significant areas of natural and scientific interest unless it has been demonstrated that there shall be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions; and,

C.2.5.5 New development and site alteration shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to the natural heritage features and areas identified in Section C.2.5.2 to C.2.5.4 unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that there shall be no negative impact on the natural features or on their ecological functions.”

As a result of the above policies, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was required to be prepared to the satisfaction of the City and the NPCA. A draft EIS was prepared by Savanta Inc. (Sept. 2009) through consultation with NPCA; however City of Hamilton staff was not provided with this report and therefore no formal comments were issued. A revised EIS was prepared October 2013 and was reviewed by City staff. Due
to concerns, further revisions were required and a final EIS was prepared (Dec. 2014). This EIS identified:

- A 15 metre vegetation protection zone (VPZ) (measured from the surveyed dripline) to protect the Significant Woodland and its functions;

- The potential utilization of the property by Barn Swallow and Eastern Meadowlark, two Species at Risk (SAR) ("threatened");

- Removal of Core Areas (pond, watercourses and wetlands) since the function of these features would be replicated through the stormwater management ponds; and,

- Proposed trail creation within the Significant Woodland due to the disturbance of informal mountain bike trails.

An EIS Comment Response was submitted by Savanta Inc. (April 22, 2016) to address outstanding concerns with regards to Species at Risk (SAR) (discussions with Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry staff) and creation of a formalized trail. Staff are satisfied with this response.

The boundaries of Core Areas are general in nature. Major changes to boundaries, the removal and addition of Core Areas require an amendment to the UHOP and RHOP, (UHOP Volume 1, policy C.2.2.2 and RHOP Volume 1, policy C.2.2.3).

```
C.2.2.2 The boundaries of Core Areas and Linkages, shown on Schedule B - Natural Heritage System, are general in nature. Minor refinements to such boundaries may occur through Environmental Impact Statements, watershed studies or other appropriate studies accepted by the City without an amendment to this Plan. Major changes to boundaries, the removal or addition of Core Areas and Linkages identified on Schedule B - Natural Heritage System and Schedules B-1-8 – Detailed Natural Heritage Features require an amendment to this Plan.

C.2.2.3 The boundaries of Core Areas are shown on Schedule B - Natural Heritage System and key natural heritage features, key hydrologic features and any associated vegetation protection zones, provincially significant and local natural areas are shown on Schedules B-1 to B-8 - Detailed Natural Heritage Features. Minor refinements to such boundaries may occur through Environmental Impact Statements, watershed studies or other appropriate studies accepted by the City without an amendment to
```
this Plan. Major changes to boundaries, the removal or addition of Core Areas identified on Schedule B - Natural Heritage System, and Schedules B-1 to B-8 – Detailed Natural Heritage Features require an amendment to this Plan.”

As a result of these policies, the following mapping changes are required:

- **UHOP Volume 1 Schedule B (Natural Heritage System),**
  - Removal of Core Areas: Linkages and Streams that include the pond in the northwestern corner, wetland southwest of the woodland and wetland north of White Church Road West.

- **UHOP Volume 1 Schedule B-4 (Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Natural Heritage Feature and Key Hydrologic Feature Wetlands),**
  - Removal of the wetlands located southwest of the woodland and north of White Church Road West.

- **UHOP Volume 1 Schedule B-8 (Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Hydrologic Features Streams),**
  - Removal of the watercourse located north of White Church Road West.

- **RHOP Volume 1 Schedule B (Natural Heritage System),**
  - Removal of Core Areas: Hydrologic Features and Streams located north of White Church Road West.

- **RHOP Volume 1 Schedule B-4 (Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Hydrologic Feature),**
  - Removal of the wetlands located north of White Church Road West.

- **RHOP Volume 1 Schedule B-8 (Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Hydrologic Feature-Streams),**
  - Removal of the watercourse located north of White Church Road West.
As previously mentioned, a Core Area (Significant Woodland) has been identified adjacent to Block 369 (Neighbourhood Park). The Core Area and its functions are to be protected from the impacts of the proposed changes that will occur before, during and after construction. Generally, this protection is through the provision of a vegetation protection zone (VPZ). Within the EIS prepared by Savanta Inc. (Dec. 2014), it was identified that a 15 metre VPZ will be provided to protect the Significant Woodland. The VPZ (which will be located within Block 369) will be zoned as P5 (Conservation / Hazard Land). This zone would allow for both conservation (protection of the natural heritage feature and its functions) as well as limited recreation options (such as a formalized trail within the woodland).

"C.2.11.1 The City recognizes the importance of trees and woodlands to the health and quality of life in our community. The City shall encourage sustainable forestry practices and the protection and restoration of trees and forests."

Through the inventories within the EIS, hedgerows have been identified on the western and eastern boundaries of the subject property. These trees will be required to be removed to facilitate development. Since the City recognizes the importance of trees to the health and quality of life of the community and encourages the protection and restoration of trees, a Tree Protection Plan (TPP) will be required to be prepared by a tree management professional (i.e. certified arborist, registered professional forester, landscape architect) in accordance with the City's Tree Protection Guidelines (Condition No. 6 of Appendix "G" to Report PED18017).

Through this Plan, only trees that have a diameter-at-breast-height (DBH) of 10 cm or greater would be inventoried. It is important to note that the trees within the Significant Woodland would not need to be inventoried unless tree removal is proposed in the Significant Woodland.

Since the vegetation protection zone (VPZ) is currently an agricultural field, staff requires that the VPZ be enhanced to return it to a natural state. As a Condition of Draft Plan approval, staff requires the preparation of a restoration plan identifying the plantings proposed for the VPZ. This restoration plan should also provide landscaping opportunities within the stormwater management areas (Condition No. 7 of Appendix "G" to Report PED18017).

The EIS also identified that the removal of the pond would result in the loss of habitat for Green Frogs. To mitigate this loss, as a Condition of Approval, staff requires the applicant to submit a fish / wildlife relocation plan (Condition No. 8 of Appendix "G" to Report PED18017).
Finally, a Grading Plan and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will be required for the subject lands (Condition No. 9 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017).

Urban Design

The UHOP has detailed policies related to urban design. The following policy, amongst others apply:

“B.3.3.2.3 Urban design should foster a sense of community pride and identity by:

a) Respecting existing character, development patterns, built form, and landscape;

b) Promoting quality design consistent with the locale and surrounding environment;

e) Conserving, maintaining, and enhancing the natural heritage and topographic features of the City and its communities;

h) Respecting prominent sites, views, and vistas in the City;”

By way of yard setbacks, frontages, and lot area requirements in the amending By-law (see Appendix “D” to Report PED18017) the proposed development is similar in design to the existing development in Mount Hope located to the east of the subject lands, which has already received planning approvals and is currently built out. As such, the proposed “Mountaingate” development will respect the planned character, development patterns and building form in the area while promoting urban design that is consistent with the locale and surrounding environment.

“E.6.2.6 Notwithstanding Policy E.6.2.2, where institutional uses cease on lands designated Institutional, low density residential uses, parks and open space uses, or community facilities/services uses may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan, provided the uses are compatible with the surrounding area and are in keeping with the policies of this Plan.”

There is an “Institutional” Block located within the subject lands. When the Secondary Plan was prepared, this land was intended to be developed into a future separate elementary school. Discussions between the property owner and appropriate School Board officials regarding the proposed development have confirmed that the Hamilton-Wentworth Catholic District School Board is unsure as to whether or not these lands will
be required for a future school. As such, the School Board would like to retain the ability for these lands to be dedicated for school purposes. The institutional policies of the UHOP allow for low density residential uses as-of-right on institutional sites should the applicable school board declare the lands are not required. This is acceptable to the applicant, provided there is an opportunity to develop these lands for residential development if the School Board deems these lands to be surplus.

Mount Hope Secondary Plan:

The subject lands are situated along the western edge of the Mount Hope Secondary Plan area, east of Highway 6, south of Airport Road West, and west of the “Institutional – Elementary School” Block, as well as the “Natural Open Space” Block (located centrally within the Secondary Plan area).

The subject lands are designated “District Commercial”, “Institutional”, “Low Density Residential 2”, “Low Density Residential 2c”, and “Low Density Residential 3f”, “Utility”, and “Neighbourhood Park” on Map B.5.4-1 – Mount Hope Secondary Plan Land Use Plan.

The proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision proposes:

- 217 single detached dwelling units;
- 143 lots for street townhouse units;
- 69 back-to-back and stacked townhouse units;
- one institutional or 228 medium density residential units (conventional; back-to-back, stacked townhouse units);
- one commercial block;
- one block for a future road widening;
- one open space block;
- one future servicing block;
- one neighbourhood park;
• three blocks for servicing corridor purposes;
• two natural open space blocks;
• two Stormwater Management Blocks;
• one future residential block (Block 377);
• one block for a 0.3 m reserve;
• one block for a vegetation protection zone;
• seven proposed streets (Street “A”, Street “B”, Street “C”, Street “D”, Street “E”, Street “F”, and proposed Mountaingate Road);
• the extension of Rosebury Way; and,
• the extension of Provident Way.

“B.5.4.5.1 In addition to Section B.3.5 – Community Facilities/Services Policies, E.3.10 – Community Facilities and Services and E.6.0 – Institutional Designation of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply to the lands designated Institutional on Map B.5.4-1 – Mount Hope – Land Use Plan:

a) The Institutional designation recognizes existing institutional uses in the general area of the District Commercial designation, including the Mount Hope Elementary School, Mount Hope Post Office, Mount Hope Branch of Wentworth Libraries, Glanford Community Hall, Glanbrook Fire Station No. 2 and the Mount Hope United Church. This Plan encourages the retention of these existing institutional uses in recognition of their importance in establishing and maintaining the Mount Hope Urban Settlement Area as a community and as a development focal point.

b) Vehicular access to the Institutional lands adjacent to White Church Road shall be encouraged to be from the internal road network.”

There is an “Institutional” Block designated within the subject lands. When the Secondary Plan was proposed, this land was intended to be developed into a future separate elementary school. Discussions between the property owner and appropriate School Board officials regarding the proposed development have confirmed that the
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Hamilton-Wentworth Catholic District School Board is unsure as to whether or not these lands will be required for a future school. As such, the School Board would like to retain the ability for these lands to be dedicated for school purposes. This is acceptable to the applicant, provided there is an opportunity to develop these lands for residential development (back to back / stacked townhouse dwellings) if the School Board deems these lands to be surplus. As such, an amendment to the Mount Hope Secondary Plan has been proposed to clarify that the development of back to back / stacked townhouse dwellings is allowed. This land is proposed to be redesignated as a site specific policy area.

“B.5.4.6.1 In addition to Sections B.3.4.3 – Parkland Policies and C.3.3 – Open Space Designation Network of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply to lands designated Community Park, Neighbourhood Park, Natural Open Space and General Open Space on Map B.5.4-1 – Mount Hope – Land Use Plan:

a) The open space system planned for the Mount Hope Secondary Olan area includes the following:

i) Community Park;

ii) Neighbourhood Park;

iii) Natural Open Space; and,

iv) General Open Space.

b) The wooded area of approximately 1.0 hectares at the western end of Aberdeen Avenue is designated Natural Open Space. This woodlot shall be preserved.

c) Mount Hope Park (formerly Gord Oakes Park) located behind the Glanford Community Hall, approximately 3.1 hectares, shall be retained.”

The Secondary Plan also identifies a small portion of land within the proposed development as “Neighbourhood Park”. These lands, along with lands to the east, were to be used to provide park space for the Mount Hope Neighbourhood. The owner of the subject lands entered into an agreement to provide funds for the abutting lands and create a larger park on the subject lands. This park will be constructed by the applicant and then the ownership shall be provided to the City for public use. While situated in a new location, the proposed
Neighbourhood Park will be 1.96 hectares in size and will accommodate the needs of the Mount Hope Neighbourhood.

A Utility corridor (TransCanada Pipeline) bisects the subject lands, and is currently designated as “Utility” within the Secondary Plan. These lands will be incorporated into the proposed design of the subdivision and be consolidated with the proposed residential lots allowing for deeper lots to offset the constraints of the remaining easement. As such, lands will be redesignated from “Utility” to the residential designations which are proposed for the surrounding lands.

“In addition to Section C.4.0 – Integrated Transportation Network of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply to the Mount Hope Secondary Plan area:

a) The internal public road system shall provide an efficient, practical and safe transportation network to accommodate the movement of people and goods within the Mount Hope Secondary Plan area and accommodate a limited number of intersections with the existing public roads adjacent to Mount Hope.

b) All lands required for new internal public roads, road widenings for existing public roads and daylighting triangles, shall be dedicated free of charge and free of all encumbrances to the City.”

A realignment of the proposed collector road, which bisects the subject lands, and new local roads and daylight triangles, are proposed. A Traffic Impact Statement (TIS) was submitted, but will need to be updated in order to address the future impacts of the residential lots that may result from the eventual surplus school site.

(Condition No. 69 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

“The costs related to the design and construction of all new public roads and the upgrading of the adjacent existing public roads required as a result of the development of the Mount Hope Secondary Plan area shall be at the expense of the developer(s). The details regarding these works and costs shall be established in the subdivision agreement(s) and/or the development, maintenance and use (site plan) agreement(s) to be approved by the City and executed by the City and the developer(s).
d) An overall preliminary traffic study to assess the impact of development on adjacent provincial highways and roads, shall be required to the satisfaction of the Province and the City, prior to the formal submission of any draft plan of subdivision.”

The costs related to the design and construction of all new public roads, the upgrading of the adjacent existing public roads, and an overall preliminary traffic study to assess the impact of development on adjacent provincial highways and roads are reflected in Condition Nos. 25 to 29 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017.

“B.4.2.2 Low Density Residential

a) Notwithstanding Section E.3.4.3 and E.3.4.4 of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply to the lands designated Low Density Residential 2 on Map B.5.4-1 – Mount Hope – Land Use Plan:

i) The permitted uses shall primarily consist of single detached dwellings, duplex, semi-detached and triplex dwellings.

ii) The maximum density shall be 25 units per net hectare

b) Notwithstanding Sections E.3.4.3 and E.3.4.4 of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply to the lands designated Low Density Residential 2c on Map B.5.4-1 – Mount Hope – Land Use Plan:

i) The permitted uses shall be a variety of multiple dwelling unit types including townhouse dwellings and all other forms of horizontal multiple dwellings.

ii) The density range shall be from 26 to 40 units per net hectare.

c) Notwithstanding Sections E.3.4.3 and E.3.4.4 of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply to the lands designated Low Density Residential 3f on Map B.5.4-1 – Mount Hope – Land Use Plan:

i) The permitted uses shall primarily consist of low rise apartments.

ii) The density range shall be from 40 to 60 units per net hectare.”
The “Low Density Residential 2” designation in the Secondary Plan identifies a maximum density of 25 units per net residential hectare (uph), which primarily consists of single detached dwellings, duplex, semi detached and triplex dwellings. In regard to this development, the density of development on the lands proposed for single detached dwellings is calculated at 40 uph (maximum) and will be comprised of single detached dwellings. As such, an amendment to the Secondary Plan is necessary to permit the increased density and restrict the uses to single detached dwellings.

The “Low Density Residential 2c” designation in the Secondary Plan identifies a density range of between 26 and 40 units per net residential hectare (uph), and shall be comprised of a variety of multiple dwelling unit types including townhouse dwellings and all other forms of horizontal multiple dwellings. In regard to this development, the density range for the development on lands designated “Low Density Residential 2c” is between 30 and 55 uph and will be made up of a variety of multiple dwelling unit types. An amendment to the Secondary Plan will be necessary to allow for the increased density.

The “Low Density Residential 3f” designation in the Secondary Plan identifies a density range of between 40 and 60 units per net residential hectare (uph), and shall primarily consist of low rise apartments. In regard to this development, the lands previously designated as “Low Density Residential 3f” will be used for additional lands to be designated “District Commercial”, “Medium Density Residential”, for the purposes of multiple dwelling units, and “Low Density Residential 2”. As such, an amendment to the Secondary Plan is necessary to permit the changes in land use.

Medium Density

“E.3.5.1 Medium density residential areas are characterized by multiple dwelling forms on the periphery of neighbourhoods in proximity to major or minor arterial roads, or within the interior of neighbourhoods fronting on collector roads.

E.3.5.2 Uses permitted in medium density residential areas include multiple dwellings except street townhouses.

E.3.3.5 Medium density residential uses shall be located within safe and convenient walking distance of existing or planned community facilities, public transit, schools, active or passive recreational facilities, and local or District Commercial uses.
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E.3.5.7 For medium density residential uses, the net residential density shall be greater than 60 units per hectare and not greater than 100 units per hectare.

E.3.5.8 For medium density residential uses, the maximum height shall be six storeys.”

The “Medium Density Residential 3” designation in the UHOP identifies a maximum density of 100 units per net residential hectare (uph), which consist of a full range of housing forms, but not single detached or semi detached dwellings. In regard to this development, the density of development on the lands proposed for multiple dwelling units is calculated at 100 uph (maximum) and the proposed built form will be limited to multiple dwelling units at a height of six storeys. An amendment to the Mount Hope Secondary Plan will be required to bring the “Medium Density Residential 3” designation into the Secondary Plan as it currently does not exist. Furthermore an amendment to the Secondary Plan will also be necessary to limit the height to 4 storeys. This will be provided to ensure consistent height and density throughout all of the proposed amendments to the plan.

District Commercial

“B.5.4.4.1 In addition to Section E.4.7 – District Commercial of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply to the lands designated District Commercial on Map B.5.4-1 – Mount Hope – Land Use Plan:

a) Existing and future commercial uses within the District Commercial designation are intended to serve the existing and future residents of the Mount Hope Secondary Plan area as well as the surrounding rural area, the Hamilton Airport and the Airport Industrial-Business Park.

b) In addition to the uses permitted in Policy E.4.7.2 of Volume 1, permitted uses in the District Commercial designation shall include retail and service commercial, personal and business services, recreational and entertainment facilities, restaurants, taverns, hotels, and motels. Cultural facilities, community facilities/services, and institutional uses may also be permitted provided they do not interfere or conflict with the satisfactory development and operation of the District Commercial designation for the predominant general commercial uses.
c) Lands with District Commercial designation shall be encouraged to be redeveloped for District Commercial uses. It is recognized that the redevelopment of the existing residential lots for commercial uses will occur over a relatively lengthy period of time.

d) Development of commercial uses shall be planned and coordinated to limit the establishment of a continuous strip of individual developments.

e) Redevelopment shall consider and be sensitive to existing residential development and ensure that the bulk, scale, height and design of commercial developments and other permitted uses are compatible with adjacent residential uses.

f) The District Commercial designation adjacent to Airport Road West and Homestead Drive enjoys a high degree of visibility and provides a gateway to the John C. Munro International Airport. To ensure this area develops in a coordinated, well-designed and aesthetically-pleasing manner with adequate infrastructure and amenities, and to provide funding eligibility, the City shall investigate the designation of these lands as a Community Improvement Project Area.

g) All outdoor lighting shall be oriented away from residential areas and adjacent public roads, and shall not interfere with airport operations.

The enlarged area proposed to be designated “District Commercial” will increase the commercial opportunities for existing and future residents of the Mount Hope Secondary Plan area as well as the surrounding rural area, the Hamilton Airport and the Airport Industrial-Business Park. The uses proposed will not change within this area, nor will any of the policy requirements of the “District Commercial” designation be amended. The lands designated as such, will simply increase in size, as such, staff are supportive of this amendment.

City of Hamilton Staging of Development

Policy F.1.14.1.2 of Volume 1 identifies that: “Council shall approve only those plans of subdivision that meet the following criteria:
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a) the plan of subdivision conforms to the policies and land use designations of this Plan;

b) the plan of subdivision implements the City’s staging of development program;

c) the plan of subdivision can be supplied with adequate services and community facilities;

d) the plan of subdivision shall not adversely impact upon the transportation system and the natural environment;

e) the plan of subdivision can be integrated with adjacent lands and roadways;

f) the plan of subdivision shall not adversely impact municipal finances; and,

g) the plan of subdivision meets all requirements of the Planning Act.”

The proposed plan of subdivision has been identified in the City of Hamilton’s Staging of Development Plan. The proposal is consistent with the Criteria for Staging of Development in that utilities and services are available. This proposal supports a healthy growing economy, provides for additional assessment and Development Charges revenue, provides housing opportunities, will comply with the UHOP and the RHOP upon approval of the required amendments, will not adversely impact upon the transportation system; respects the natural environment and will integrate well with the existing development in the area, being the Mount Hope Neighbourhood Area.

Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464

The subject lands are currently zoned Deferred Development “DD” Zone and General Agricultural “A1” Zone in Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18017.

The Deferred Development “DD” Zone is a future development Zone and prohibits residential uses not existing at the date of the passing of the By-law (December 2000). As such, a Zoning By-law Amendment is required.

The General Agricultural “A1” Zone is an agricultural Zone which permits agricultural uses, and buildings, structures and uses accessory thereto, including one (1) single
detached dwelling for the farm owner or operator; one (1) single detached dwelling on one (1) lot, and buildings, structures and uses accessory thereto; greenhouse operations for horticultural purposes only, and uses buildings and structures accessory thereto including one (1) single detached dwelling for the greenhouse owner or operator; kennels; farm help house; seasonal farm produce stands; home occupations and home professions; home industries; bed and breakfast establishments; outside parking and storage of larger vehicles; and fish, wildlife and / or forest management.

The Zoning by-law Amendment will rezone the subject lands to the Residential “R4-218(A)” Zone, Modified; the Residential Multiple “RM2-194(A)” Zone, Modified; the Residential Multiple “RM3-284(A)” Zone, Modified and Residential Multiple “RM3-284(B)” Zone, Modified; and the Shopping Centre Commercial “C2-309” Zone, Modified.

The modified Shopping Centre Commercial “C2-309” Zone implements the District Commercial Policies of the UHOP. As such, staff will ensure that these uses are carried forward, by way of a Site Specific Zone, into the proposed C6 Zone forming part of the new Commercial Mixed-Use (CMU) Zones.

Each of the proposed zones will contain site specific provisions to implement the proposed development. The proposed site specific zoning regulations are described in greater detail in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation section of this Report.

City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200

An amending by-law will also be required to bring lands into By-law No. 05-200 and zone them Neighbourhood Park (P1) Zone, Open Space (P4) Zone, Conservation / Hazard (P5) Zone, and Conservation / Hazard – Rural (P6) Zone.

The proposed zoning regulations are described in greater detail in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation section of this Report.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION

The following Departments / Agencies have no comments or objections:

- Capital Budget Projects Division, Public Works Department; and,
- Capital Budget Project Coordination Division, Public Works Department.

The following Departments and Agencies have provided comments on the application:
**Enbridge Utilities** requested that future agreements of purchase and sale and/or lease include provisions prohibiting the landscaping, developing, or erecting of any buildings or permanent structures, including but not limited to, fences, decks, swimming pools or shed, over, under or upon the lands when an easement in favour of the utility exists, unless written approval is provided by Enbridge Pipelines Inc. These requirements are included as Condition No. 10 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017.

Enbridge has also advised that during the construction period, any proposed crossings of the right-of-way by roads, laneways, bike/walking paths, services and utilities are permitted in accordance with the regulations of the National Energy Board (NEB) Act and subject to approval by Enbridge’s Crossings Coordinator, Ann Newman at (519) 339-0503. The applicant will be required to enter Enbridge’s Standard Crossing Agreement.

During the entire construction phase, the Enbridge right-of-way shall be delineated with snowfence or equivalent material which is subject to Enbridge’s approval, where applicable. No work shall take place on Enbridge’s right-of-way without the presence of an Enbridge inspector and/or written approval including but not limited to grading, placing fill, operation of heavy equipment or landscaping.

Finally, Enbridge is regulated by the *National Energy Board* (NEB) Act. Section 112 of the Act states that “No person shall, unless leave is first obtained from the Board, construct a facility across, on, along or under a pipeline or excavate using power operated equipment or explosives within 30 metres of a pipeline”.

**Ministry of Transportation (MTO)** requested that all proposed permanent buildings and structures both above and below ground, utilities, frontage roads/fire routes, parking facilities, stormwater management ponds and associated berms, must be set back 14.0 metres (45 feet) from the Right-of-way limit of the Highway 6 Corridor. This setback requirement also implements the regulations found in the General Provisions (Section 7.23) of the Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464, which requires a setback of 13.7 metres, or a setback specifically required by the MTO. As demonstrated on the Draft Plan of Subdivision, attached to this report as Appendix “F”, Block 373 provides the necessary 14.0 metre setback to address this requirement.

Also, noise berms or grading of any kind will not be permitted on the Highway 6 Corridor property. The developer is solely responsible for all noise mitigation measures. In addition, all site illumination must be directed away from the Highway 6 Corridor.
The MTO will require the following be included as conditions of draft approval for the Plan of Subdivision:

1. That prior to final approval, the owner shall submit to the Ministry of Transportation for their review and approval, a stormwater management plan and report indicating the intended treatment of the calculated runoff and impacts on the Highway 6 New Right-of-way.

2. That prior to final approval, the owner shall submit to the Ministry of Transportation for their review and approval, a copy of a traffic impact assessment addressing the anticipated traffic volumes, resulting from the development, and their impact on the Highway 6 and Highway 6 New intersection.

(Condition Nos.11 and 12 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

The MTO also advised that the proposed subdivision is within their permit control, and Ministry Building and Land use permits for all buildings within permit control will be required prior to any grading and construction on this site. Separate building / land-use permits will be required for each stormwater management pond serving this subdivision. Sign permits will be required as well.

**Transport Canada** noted that the proposed development is in close proximity to the Hamilton Airport and appears to be under the Outer Surface of the Hamilton Airport Zoning Regulations (AZR). They advise that it is incumbent on the owner(s) or other persons in possession or control of the property, to ensure compliance with these regulations, if applicable.

The Hamilton AZR include a clause restricting the disposal of waste edible by or attractive to birds. Any waste from a new use of this land must be properly covered and managed such that it does not attract birds.

Finally, any temporary crane erections associated with or necessary for the construction of this development may require an exemption to the Hamilton Airport Zoning Regulations. Crane erections should be coordinated with the Hamilton Airport Manager and with Transport Canada. In advance of construction, an Aeronautical Obstruction Clearance Form must be submitted to Transport Canada for assessment.

(Condition Nos.72 and 73 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)
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Hamilton International Airport has advised that the proposed development falls within their noise influence area, and as a result they are not in favor of any of the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendments. The development of more homes in areas surrounding the Airport is not conducive to the future growth of the facility and they strongly object to these plans.

If the application is to be approved as submitted, they would like to make the following recommendations:

1. That visible signage is placed on the development indicating that it falls within the Airport’s noise influence area;

2. That documentation is placed on the Deed of these homes indicating that the property is located within the Airport’s noise influence area; and,

3. The proponent consider additional noise mitigating measures in the construction of the homes such as air conditioning, additional noise insulation and window glazing."

The necessary warning clauses and signage will be provided advising future residents that they are within the Airport Noise Influence Area. Also, once detailed grading information is available, a revised noise study will be required as well as architectural drawings to ensure that any noise impacts have been mitigated against.

(Condition Nos. 1 - 5 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

Union Gas has requested that the owner / developer provide to Union Gas the necessary easements and / or agreements required by Union Gas for the provision of gas services for this project, in a form satisfactory to Union Gas.

(Condition No. 1.21 of the City’s Standard Conditions of Subdivision Approval)

The Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA) has reviewed the “Scoped Environmental Assessment for the Proposed Mountaingate Community within the Township of Glanbrook” (October 2013) prepared by Sevanta Inc. Based on the submission, the NPCA is satisfied that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) demonstrates no negative impacts to the natural heritage features and their hydrological and ecologic functions under NPCA policies.

The NPCA requires that the mitigation measures outlined in the EIS be incorporated into the Subdivision Agreement and a work permit from the NPCA be obtained.
SUBJECT: Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, the Rural Hamilton Official Plan, Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464, Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200, and for Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision “Mountaingate” for lands known as 9255 Airport Road West (Glanbrook) (Ward 11) (PED18017) - Page 40 of 75

The NPCA also reviewed the submitted Functional Servicing Report (FSR) (October 30, 2013) and are satisfied that the proposed Stormwater Management blocks contain adequate area in order to construct a facility to provide the required level of storm water quantity, quality and erosion control for the contributing 112 hectare catchment.

Prior to construction, the NPCA will require that detailed grading, storm servicing, stormwater management, and erosion and sediment control drawings be circulated to them for review and approval.

(Condition Nos. 13 to 18 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017).

**Canada Post** advised that the proposed Mountaingate subdivision will receive mail service to centralized mail facilities provided through their Community Mailbox program.

They have requested to have included in all offers of purchase and sale, a statement that advises the prospective purchaser / lessor:

i) that the home / business mail delivery will be from a designated Centralized Mail Box.

ii) that the developers / owners be responsible for officially notifying the purchasers of the exact Centralized Mail Box locations prior to the closing of any home sales.

Canada Post has also requested that the owner further agree to work with Canada Post to determine and provide temporary suitable Centralized Mail Box locations which may be utilized by Canada Post until the curbs, boulevards and sidewalks are in place in the remainder of the subdivision. Also, to install a concrete pad in accordance with the requirements of, and in locations to be approved by, Canada Post to facilitate the placement of Community Mail Boxes. The owner shall also identify the pads above on the engineering servicing drawings. Said pads are to be poured at the time of the sidewalk and / or curb installation within each phase of the plan of subdivision. The location of all centralized mail receiving facilities shall be determined in co-operation with Canada Post and to indicate the location of the centralized mail facilities on appropriate maps, information boards and plans. Maps are also to be prominently displayed in the sales office(s) showing specific Centralized Mail Facility locations. Finally, Canada Post's multi-unit policy, which requires that the owner / developer provide the centralized mail facility at their own expense, will be in effect for buildings and complexes with a common lobby, common indoor or sheltered space.
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(Condition No. 19 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017 and Condition 1.22 of the City’s Standard Conditions of Subdivision approval)

Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board (HWCDSB) requested that prior to any final approval of the Plan of Subdivision, the applicant should make arrangements with the HWDSB for the acquisition, or reservation of future acquisition of Block 362 designated in the Draft Plan for elementary school purposes. Also, the clearing, grubbing, engineered filling, where required, and grading of Block 362 should be carried out to the satisfaction of the HWCDSB. This would include the removal of any and all buildings and structures, tanks and utility structures.

The HWCDSB also requested that the designation of Block 362 as an elementary separate school site is subject to the completion of a soils report, of which the findings would be addressed by the applicant, to the satisfaction of the HWCDSB.

(Condition No. 20 Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

Recreation Planning Division, Community Services Department have indicated that according to Section B.3.5.34(b) of the UHOP, a Neighborhood Park should have a minimum size of 2.0 hectares, thus the proposed Neighbourhood Park is of a sufficient size. They have also requested that the setback from the existing woodlot not be included in the parkland dedication amount.

Landscape Architecture Services Division and the Parks and Cemeteries Division, Public Works Department have advised that the proposed Neighbourhood Park is configured in an appropriate square formation, that allows for future recreational programming, and is appropriately located within the central area of the subdivision and adjacent to the woodlot.

The significant woodlot buffer should be included in the P5 Zone, and not as parkland, as this land will not permit active recreation uses. The woodlot buffer is proposed to be zoned Conservation / Hazard (P5) Zone (see Appendix “E” to Report PED18017). The woodlot will not be counted towards the parkland dedication. A parkland dedication credit will be provided for the lands above and beyond the required 5% dedication.

The Forestry and Horticulture Section, Public Works Department indicated that there are several Municipal Tree Assets located along the road allowance and therefore Tree Management will be required.

(Condition Nos. 6 and 39 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017).
A Landscape Planting Plan, prepared and signed by a certified Landscape Architect, will also be required. This plan, together with the Tree Management Plan, must be submitted for review and comments by the Forestry & Horticulture Section.

The condition of Street Tree Planting will be cleared upon receipt of a plan depicting new trees and a cash payment.

(Condition 2.8 of the City’s Standard Conditions of Subdivision Approval)

**Hamilton Street Railway (HSR)** advised that they currently operate the Route #20 (A-Line) buses past the subject lands with no planned changes in service. Furthermore, for transit to succeed in its role, it is essential that redevelopments along transit corridors incorporate mixed uses and higher densities and are built in a manner that puts people first. Finally, the HSR are of the opinion that the construction of higher densities and more mixed uses will help transit to reduce net operating costs.

**Public Consultation**

In accordance with the provisions of the *Planning Act* and the Council Approved Public Participation Policy, Notice of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation was sent to 91 property owners within 120 m of the subject property on January 25, 2008, for the proposed Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications.

On June 10, 2016 the revisions to the proposed Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications were circulated to 229 property owners within 120 m of the subject property.

To date, sixteen letters have been received from the public through this circulation. These letters are attached as Appendix “I” to Report PED18017, and summarized in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation section of this Report.

A Public Notice Sign was posted on the property on February 15, 2008, and updated on December 6, 2017, with the Public Meeting date. Finally, Notice of the Public Meeting was given in accordance with the requirements of the *Planning Act* on December 15, 2017.

---
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Public Consultation Strategy

As the Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment, and Draft Plan of subdivision applications were submitted before July 1, 2016, a Public Consultation Strategy was not required.

ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

1. The proposed UHOP and RHOP Amendments, Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications have merit and can be supported for the following reasons:

   (i) They are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement and conform to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, as they represent an opportunity for growth in settlement areas;

   (ii) They comply with the general intent of the UHOP and RHOP, subject to the approval of the UHOP and RHOP Amendments, as they are an extension of the approved developments to the east of the subject lands, add to the creation of a complete community, and address servicing needs of the Mount Hope area;

   (iii) The proposed development is considered to be compatible with the existing and planned development in the immediate area. It will provide a complete community, with a variety of land uses, and address the servicing needs of the Mount Hope Neighbourhood; and,

   (iv) The proposed development represents good planning by, among other things, providing a compact and efficient urban form, including a range of housing types and a mix of land uses. Furthermore, it acts as a natural extension of approved adjacent development, thereby providing servicing to the area. The form of development will be an efficient use of infrastructure.

2. As discussed in the policy section of this Report, an amendment to the UHOP is required to amend the Mount Hope Secondary Plan as follows:

   • Redesignating lands from “Institutional” and “Low Density Residential 3f” to “District Commercial”;
• Redesignating lands from “District Commercial” and “Low Density Residential 3f” to “General Open Space”;

• Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2”, “Utility”, and “Natural Open Space” to “Neighbourhood Park”;

• Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2” and “Utility” to “Natural Open Space”;

• Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2” and “Low Density Residential 2c” to “General Open Space”;

• Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2” and “Low Density Residential 2c” to “Utility”;

• Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2” to “Low Density Residential 2c”;

• Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2c” and “Low Density Residential 3f” to “Medium Density Residential 3”;

• Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2c”, “Low Density Residential 3f”, “Utility”, and “Neighbourhood Park” to “Low Density Residential 2”;

• Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2c”, Low Density Residential 3f”, and “Neighbourhood Park” to “Institutional”;

• Add a special policy area to lands designated “Low Density Residential 2” in order to restrict uses to single detached dwellings and establish a maximum density of 40 units per net hectare;

• Add a special policy area to lands designated “Low Density Residential 2c” to establish a density range of 30 to 55 units per net hectare;

• Add a site specific policy area to lands designated “Medium Density Residential” in order to allow for a maximum height of four storeys;
SUBJECT: Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, the Rural Hamilton Official Plan, Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464, Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200, and for Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision “Mountaingate” for lands known as 9255 Airport Road West (Glanbrook) (Ward 11) (PED18017) - Page 45 of 75

- Add a site specific policy area to lands designated “Institutional” in order to allow for multiple dwellings and to permit a maximum building height of four storeys;

- Remove Core Areas; Linkages and Streams from the Natural Heritage System;

- Remove wetlands and streams from the Natural Heritage Features; and,

- to establish new local roads.

As discussed in the policy section of this Report, an amendment to the UHOP is required to delete the subject lands from Volume 1 Schedule B (Natural Heritage System); from Volume 1 Schedule B-4 (Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Natural Heritage Feature and Key Hydrologic Feature Wetlands); from Volume 1 Schedule B-8 (Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Hydrologic Features Streams); and, from the Rural Hamilton Official Plan Volume 1 Schedule B (Natural Heritage System); from Volume 1 Schedule B-4 (Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Hydrologic Features); and from Volume 1 Schedule B-8 (Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Hydrologic Features Streams). These amendments reflect the findings of the EIS, as approved by staff and the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority.

Staff are supportive of the land use changes in the Secondary Plan as they create a community which is in conformity with the existing residences in Mount Hope. Low density detached homes will complement the existing large lots to the east. Also, residential densities gradually increase; moving further west into the site, with medium density townhouses intended to minimize potential adverse impacts from the adjacent airport employment uses. Medium density building types are also strategically located at the northern extent of the site, in proximity to Airport Road West, to support the commercial property to the north, the proposed school, and potential future transit routes.

The proposed Mountaingate Road forms the gateway to the community, with primary access from Airport Road West. A number of local roads, which include crescents and cul-de-sacs, branch out from this main collector road, providing connectivity to Provident Way, Rosebury Way, Spitfire Drive and the existing neighbourhoods to the east.
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Stormwater Management Pond

The proposal is for establishing a stormwater management pond in the rural area to service the subject lands located in the urban area. As the applications were submitted prior to the RHOP approval in March 2012 and amendment No. 5 of the RHOP, which prohibits storm water management facilities outside the urban area that support urban development, which came into effect in September 2014, the Zoning By-law Amendment application, and the Draft Plan of Subdivision application are to be reviewed against the Region of Hamilton - Wentworth Official Plan as it pertains to the proposed SWM Pond to be located in the rural area. In reviewing the proposed SWM Blocks, staff have determined that there are no policies in the Hamilton - Wentworth Regional Official Plan that would prohibit the construction of the SWM Pond in its proposed location. As such, staff are supportive of the proposed application and the amendment to the RHOP for the SWM facility.

The subject lands have been identified in the Glanbrook Official Plan as a growth area within the Official Plan, as such, the location of the stormwater management ponds implement the intent of the Glanbrook Official Plan policies. Furthermore, the proposed stormwater management ponds will not just service the subject lands, but will service the larger Mount Hope community as well. Staff are supportive of this amendment.

Natural Heritage System

As the applications were submitted prior to the RHOP approval in March 2012 the Zoning By-law Amendment application and the Draft Plan of Subdivision application are to be reviewed against the Region of Hamilton - Wentworth Official Plan as it pertains to the Natural Heritage System and the SWM facility. In reviewing Map No. 4 of the Hamilton - Wentworth Official Plan, staff have found that there are no Natural Heritage Features identified within the Plan on the subject lands. As such, staff are supportive of the proposed application and the amendment to the RHOP.

The amendments to the RHOP will ensure consistency throughout the Plan and guarantee that the Plan is kept up to date on a go forward basis.
Institutional

As previously discussed, there is an “Institutional” Block located within the subject lands. When the Secondary Plan was approved, this land was intended to be developed into a future separate elementary school. Discussions between the property owner and School Board officials regarding the proposed development have confirmed that the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board is unsure whether or not these lands will be required for a future school. The School Board would like to retain the ability for these lands to be dedicated for school purposes. This is acceptable to the applicant, provided there is an opportunity to develop these lands for residential purposes if the School Board deems these lands to be surplus, without requiring further amendments to the UHOP. An amendment to the UHOP has been proposed which will allow for flexibility in the permitted uses proposed for this Block. Specifically, this amendment will allow for back to back / stacked townhouse units to be permitted at a density range of 60 to 100 units per hectare. This land is proposed to be redesignated as “Site Specific Policy Area E”. The location of the Institutional Block has not changed. It has however increased in size to accommodate the development of residential units in the event the Block is declared surplus by the School Board. Staff are supportive of this amendment.

Medium Density Residential

The lands to the west of the “Institutional” block are proposed to be redesignated to “Medium Density Residential 3”. The proposed uses and density within this block will mirror the uses and density that would be allowed if the “Institutional” block to the east was to be declared surplus by the School Board and developed for residential purposes. While the Medium Density Residential policies set out in Section E.3.5 of the UHOP permit a maximum height of 6 storeys, an amendment has been included to limit the height on these lands to 4 storeys. This amendment is in keeping with direction staff received from Council for the restriction of height in “Mixed Use – Medium Density”, Area Specific Policy - Area D, located to the east of the subject lands. In this Area, the height has been restricted to 3 storeys. Staff are of the opinion that the proposed 4 storeys is in keeping with UHOP policies for new Medium Density Designated lands within greenfield areas throughout the City. Also, the 4 storey units will mainly be situated along the periphery of the site; and where they are internal to the site, these units will have sufficient setbacks to ensure adequate privacy and amenity areas can be provided. Furthermore, the Medium Density Blocks will be subject
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to the Site Plan Control process. As such, the specific design, orientation and height of the units can be further reviewed and scoped at that time.

Medium Density Residential blocks in the proposed development which is in keeping with a motion brought forward by Council for the Mount Hope community, and the requirements set out in the Commercial and Mixed Use Zoning, for lands that are to be designated Medium Density (OPA No. 69).

Furthermore, the proposed densities will implement both Provincial and Municipal intensification policies by permitting a variety of housing forms, as such, staff are supportive of this amendment.

**District Commercial**

A Retail Feasibility Study was submitted by the applicant (completed by J.C. Williams Group, November 2016) which concluded that additional commercial lands are needed within the Mount Hope Secondary Plan area. As such, lands currently designated as “Institutional”, “District Commercial”, and “Low Density Residential 3f” have been consolidated and proposed to be designated “District Commercial”. As these new commercial lands will provide additional retail services to the growing population of the Mount Hope Community, staff are in support of this amendment.

These additional Commercial lands have also created a need to amend Schedule E-1 of the UHOP to redesignate lands from “Neighbourhoods” to “District Commercial” (Appendix “B” to Report PED18017).

The proposed Commercial uses implement the District Commercial Policies of the UHOP. As such, staff will ensure that these uses are carried forward into the CMU Zoning, by way of a Site Specific Zone as outlined in the Zoning By-law Amendment component of the Analysis and Rationale Section of this report.

**Utility**

A Utility corridor (Enbridge) bisects the subject lands, and is currently designated as “Utility” within the Secondary Plan. These lands will be incorporated into the proposed design of the subdivision, resdesignated “Low Density Residential 2”, and merged into adjoining proposed residential lots with an easement established along the northerly portion of the rear yards. Warning clauses, at the request of Enbridge regarding the location of the easement, are included in the Draft Plan Conditions.
Neighbourhood Park

The Secondary Plan also identifies a small portion of land within the proposed development as “Neighbourhood Park”. These lands, along with lands to the east, were to be used to provide park space for the Mount Hope Neighbourhood. The owner of the subject lands entered into an agreement to provide funds for the abutting lands and create a larger park on the subject lands. This park will be constructed by the applicant and then dedicated to the City for public use.

Low Density Residential

The development proposes “Low Density Residential 2c” along the western portion of the subject lands. The lands within the designation will be used for street townhouse units. The proposed density of this area is 30 to 55 units per hectare; as such, site specific amendments to the Secondary Plan policies will be required to recognize the increased densities.

The low density development proposed to the east of the townhouse block will be designated “Low Density Residential 2”. This block will be restricted to single
detached dwellings only and the maximum density shall be 40 units per net hectare within the Mount Hope Secondary Plan. These modifications will require a UHOP amendment as the existing permitted maximum density is 25 units per net residential hectare and a variety of uses are permitted.

Staff are in support of these amendments as they will allow for greater flexibility in the way in which the subject lands are utilized. Also, the density proposed can be supported as it will act as a transition between the single detached dwellings central to the proposed development and the proposed block townhouses (to the north) and street townhouse units to the west, that make up the remainder of the proposed development.

Furthermore, UHOP policies focus on providing for a diversity of housing types. Given the prescribed density ranges within the UHOP as well as market demand, the proposed development contains an appropriate range of housing sizes and forms and aligns with other existing and proposed built forms in the neighbourhood.

Finally, the proposed development does not deviate significantly from the direction established in the Secondary Plan and complies with its broader policy vision; however, due to the differences identified and discussed above, amendments will be required to allow for the proposed development. Based on the foregoing, staff supports the proposed UHOP Amendments.

**Stormwater Management Pond**

Lands located at the most southerly portion of the subject lands are proposed to be redesignated from “Low Density Residential 2” and “Utility” to “General Open Space” to accommodate a proposed Stormwater Management Pond. This enlarged facility will accommodate the stormwater needs of the entire Mount Hope Neighbourhood. Furthermore, a Stormwater Management Report was submitted, and subsequently revised through the application process. The revised report will result in the design of a facility that is in accordance with the City of Hamilton Drainage Policies, City of Hamilton Comprehensive Guidelines (2016) and the MOE&CC Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (2003). As such, staff are in support of the proposed UHOP amendment.
**Natural Features**

As discussed in the policy section of this Report, an amendment to the UHOP is required to delete the subject lands from Volume 1 Schedule B (Natural Heritage System); from Volume 1 Schedule B-4 (Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Natural Heritage Feature and Key Hydrologic Feature Wetlands); from Volume 1 Schedule B-8 (Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Hydrologic Features Streams); and, from the Rural Hamilton Official Plan Volume 1 Schedule B (Natural Heritage System); from Volume 1 Schedule B-4 (Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Hydrologic Features); and from Volume 1 Schedule B-8 (Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Hydrologic Features Streams). The EIS prepared by Savanta Inc. (2016) to address the removal of these features from the City’s Natural Heritage System has been accepted by both the City and the NPCA. As such, Planning staff are supportive of this amendment.

3. The applicant has requested amendments to Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464 in order to implement the draft Plan of Subdivision known as “Mountaingate”. The applicant has requested that the Residential “R4-218” Zone, Residential “RM2-194” Zone, Residential Multiple 2 “RM2-194” Zone, Residential Multiple 3 “RM3-284” Zone, and Shopping Centre Commercial “C2-309” Zone, established through previous By-laws, in particular By-law Nos. 04-336, 09-047, and 14-243 be applied to the subject lands with some additional modifications. The provisions of these previously approved by-laws will be brought forward and applied to this proposal.

**Residential “R4-218(A)” Zone (see Appendix “D” – Block 1):**

To provide for a consistent and complimentary development as that on the adjacent lands, the applicant seeks to establish similar modifications for Mountaingate as approved by Hamilton Council under the Residential “R4-218” Zone, Modified, with some additional modifications with respect to the minimum lot frontage and minimum side yard setbacks to reflect current standards.

**Minimum Lot Frontage:**

The applicant has requested a minimum lot frontage of 9.0 metres, except on a corner lot, where the minimum frontage shall be 10.8 metres. Currently the “R4-218” Zone requires a minimum lot frontage of 9 metres, except on a corner lot where the minimum frontage shall be 11 metres. In this regard, the applicant intends on varying lot sizes throughout the proposed draft plan of subdivision,
thereby providing for additional built forms and housing types and tenures, with sufficient width to maintain good engineering practices. As such, this request for a reduction for corner lots is considered minor and appropriate as it is compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood and staff are supportive of this modification.

Restrictions:

A provision has been added to the site specific by-law to indicate that where an Enbridge Pipelines easement is located within a property, the owner of the property is prohibited from landscaping, developing, or erecting and building any permanent structures including, but not limited to: fences, decks, swimming pools which are located over, under or upon the Pipeline Lands. Furthermore, a 7.0 metre rear yard setback is required to the pipeline. These modification to the by-law will not restrict the residential development, as the pipeline runs through the rear of lots 71 – 91 and 94 - 115. These lands will provide additional amenity space, while still providing the necessary access to the utility for maintenance and upkeep. Staff are supportive of this modification.

Minimum Side Yard:

The applicant has requested modifications to the minimum required side yard to permit on a corner lot, a minimum side yard abutting the flanking street of 3.0 metres. A lot which flanks lands zoned Open Space shall have a minimum side yard setback of 2.4 metres. Finally, the minimum setback for any building or structure to a daylight triangle of visibility triangle shall be 0.3 metres.

The By-law requires a 1.2 metre setback, except on an interior yard where no attached garage or attached carport is provided, where the minimum side yard on one side shall be 4.2 metres; and, on a corner lot, the minimum side yard abutting the flanking street shall be 4.5 metres. Staff are satisfied that this request is considered minor, maintains good planning principles and can be supported to compliment similar compact development occurring to the east, in other residential areas within the Mount Hope community.

Residential Multiple “RM2-194(A)” Zone (see Appendix “D” – Block 2):

To provide for a consistent and complimentary development as that on the adjacent lands and elsewhere in Glanbrook, the applicant seeks to establish similar modifications as approved by Hamilton Council for other development proposals in Glanbrook, under the Residential “RM2-194” Zone, Modified, with
additional modifications relating to maximum lot coverage, minimum front yard, and minimum side yard setbacks.

Maximum Lot Coverage:

The applicant has requested an increase in the maximum lot coverage from the required 35 percent permitted in the by-law to 55 percent. The front yard and side yard setbacks, which follow in this report, establish a building footprint that is appropriate for this form of development and provide adequate outdoor amenity space. Also, similar forms of development exist to the east in other residential areas within the Mount Hope community. As such, staff are supportive of this modification as it maintains the existing character of the Mount Hope community.

Minimum Front Yard:

Modifications are also being sought for a minimum front yard setback, to the garage, to be increased to 8.0 metres for those lots abutting 9555 Airport Road. For all other lots the RM2-194 provisions shall apply. The City’s Engineering staff have requested this modification to ensure for additional parking opportunities on the individual lots. This increased setback will be provided by decreasing the right-of-way width for Mountaingate Road to meet current City standards and providing additional depth to the lots abutting 9555 Airport Road to accommodate the increased driveway lengths. As such, additional on-site parking opportunities will be provided to accommodate the modification to the right of way widths. Staff are satisfied with this modification.

Minimum Side Yard:

Modifications to the minimum required side yard are also being requested for each end dwelling unit not abutting a flanking street to have a minimum side yard of 1.2 metres; for a corner lot abutting a flanking street to have a setback of 3.0 metres; for an end dwelling unit abutting an area zoned Open Space shall have a setback of 2.4 metres; and any building or structure to a daylight triangle or visibility triangle shall have a side yard setback of 0.3 metres.

The By-law requires a minimum side yard setback of 1.2 metres except, on a corner lot the minimum side yard abutting the flankage street shall be 2.4 metres, except that an attached garage which fronts on the flankage street shall not be located within 6 metres of the flankage street line. Staff are satisfied that the reductions in side yard are considered minor and maintain good planning.
principles and can be supported as they complement similar compact development occurring to the east and in other residential areas within the Mount Hope community.

Residential Multiple 3 “RM3-284(A)” Zone (see Appendix “D” – Block 3):

To provide for a consistent and complimentary development as that on the adjacent lands, the applicant seeks to establish similar modifications for Mountaingate as approved by Hamilton Council, under the Residential “RM3-284” Zone, Modified, with some additional modifications relating to maximum density, minimum side and rear yards, maximum height, and definitions.

Maximum Density:

Due to the proposed built form and irregular lot shape, and to ensure a density that is supported by adequate infrastructure and community services, a maximum density of 100 units per residential hectare has been requested, whereas the maximum density permitted in the RM3-284 Zone is 63 units per hectare. Staff are supportive of this amendment as it is a product of constructing a unique form of development (i.e stacked townhouse units), resulting in a density that achieves and complies with the Secondary Plan policies.

Minimum Side and Rear Yards:

Modifications to the required yards will relate to the entire block. Specifically, 3.5 metres will be provided from the northern boundary of the block to the façade of a townhouse; 4.5 metres will be provided from the western boundary of the block to the façade of a townhouse; and, 3 metres will be provided from the south boundary of the block to the townhouse. All units will be oriented internally to the site and will have common amenity space in addition of private space amenity space in the form of a deck or balcony. The parent by-law requires 1.5 metres for a westerly side yard; 5m for an easterly side yard from the side façade of a townhouse; 7.5m for an easterly side yard from the rear façade of a townhouse; and, 6m for a rear yard. Staff are satisfied that this request is considered minor and maintains good planning principles as it allows for a more compact form of intensification which will implement municipal and provincial intensification policies. Furthermore, the modifications requested are consistent with zoning for other areas of Mount Hope.
Maximum Height:

The maximum height is proposed to be increased from the required 10.7 metres from the parent “RM3” Zone to 14.0 metres to accommodate four residential storeys and additional roof top mechanical equipment. The interface with the street townhouse units to the south will be mitigated by the proposed total setback of 5.0 metres between the buildings on abutting lots as well as design and landscaping treatments that will be reviewed through the Site Plan Control process for these lands. The subject lands will be surrounded by future employment lands to the west, open space to the north, and an 18.0 m right-of-way to the east. As adequate setbacks have been proposed for the height, and due to the fact that this block will require Site Plan Control approval, at which point enhanced landscaping will be evaluated, the proposal can be supported by Planning staff.

As previously discussed in this Report, the proposed amendment to the UHOP will permit multiple dwellings on this Block, but will restrict them to four storeys in height. As such, these modifications to the Zoning By-law will implement the amendment to the UHOP.

Definitions:

For the purposes of this by-law, the definition of “Dwelling, Block Townhouse” has been changed to mean a dwelling divided vertically and/or horizontally, with each unit separated by a common or party wall or walls and having two or more private entrances at grade. The only modification to the definition is to include the division of units in a horizontal manner. This will allow for stacked townhouse units, which is a built form not previously considered when By-law 464 was originally drafted. Staff are supportive of this modification, as it allows for additional housing forms.

Residential Multiple 3 “RM3-284(B)” Zone (see Appendix “C” – Block 5):

The Block proposed to be zoned “RM3-284(B)” Zone was previously intended to be developed into a future separate elementary school. In discussions between the property owner and School Board officials regarding the proposed development, the Hamilton-Wentworth Catholic District School Board is unsure as to whether or not these lands will be required for a future school. The School Board would like to retain the ability for these lands to be dedicated for school purposes. This is acceptable to the applicant, provided there is an opportunity to
develop these lands for residential if the School Board deems these lands to be surplus.

The proposed land use, if the lands are deemed to be surplus by the School Board, would be multiple dwelling units. This would be consistent with the lands to the west which are proposed to be zoned “RM3-284(A)” which allows for Block Townhouse units. If this block is not used for Institutional purposes, the same form of development is proposed as that on lands to the West. As such, the same modifications to the By-law found in the “RM3-284(A)” Zone have been applied to this block.

**Shopping Centre Commercial “C2-309” Zone (see Appendix “D” – Block 5):**

The applicant has also requested changes to the Shopping Centre Commercial “C2” Zone. The modifications are related to the minimum front yard setback as well as minimum side and rear yard setbacks.

**Minimum Front, Side and Rear Yards:**

The applicant has requested a reduction in the minimum front, side and rear yard setbacks from 15.0 metres (front) and 10.7 metres (side and rear), to 6.0 metres from the proposed minimum front yard and 5.0 metres for the minimum side and rear yards.

Staff are satisfied that this request is considered minor and maintains good planning principles as it allows for a more compact form of development. The modifications requested are consistent with zoning for similar new commercial developments throughout the City and will represent good urban design practices by bringing structures closer to the street edge to enhance pedestrian usability and streetscape. Therefore staff are supportive of the proposed modifications.

These modifications are appropriate for the subject lands, as they implement the District Commercial Policy of the UHOP. As such, staff will ensure that these uses are carried forward, by way of a Site Specific Zone, once the Commercial Mixed-Use (CMU) Zones (By-law No. 17-246) are approved by the Ontario Municipal Board, as they have been Council adopted, but appealed to the OMB.
4. Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200

The purpose of the Zoning By-law Amendment to Zoning By-law No. 05-200 is to remove portions of the subject lands which are zoned Deferred Development "DD" Zone and General Agriculture "A1" Zone in the Township of Glanbrook By-law No. 464 and add them to the Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200 to be zoned Neighbourhood Park (P1) Zone, Open Space (P4) Zone, Conservation / Hazard (P5) Zone, and Conservation / Hazard Lands – Rural (P6) Zone to permit the development of an elementary school, a neighbourhood park, stormwater management ponds, and natural buffers (refer to Appendix "E" to Report PED18017). The proposed development will conform to all of the requirements of the Neighbourhood Park (P1) Zone, Open Space (P4) Zone, Conservation / Hazard (P5) Zone, and Conservation / Hazard Lands – Rural (P6) Zone.

Staff are satisfied that the proposal complies with the intent of the relevant policies set out in the UHOP and are supportive of the Zoning By-law Amendment.

The subject lands to be zoned commercial will be incorporated into Zoning By-law No. 05-200 once the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones of Zoning By-law No. 05-200 are in force and effect. A draft by-law has been prepared to add the subject lands to Zoning By-law No. 05-200 and establish a modified District Commercial (C6) Zone, and will be held in abeyance until the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones are in force and effect, at which time the draft by-law will be brought forward to City Council for enactment.

The implementing By-law for Zoning By-law No. 05-200 attached as Appendix "I" to Report PED18017, proposes the District Commercial (C6) Zone which will implement the policies of the Mount Hope Secondary Plan and the UHOP. The lands proposed to be zoned C6 will prohibit Day Nurseries, Dwelling Units, and Multiple Dwellings. The proposed By-law Amendment will increase the area of lands to be zoned District Commercial, thereby providing more commercial opportunities to the Mount Hope Neighbourhood. A Retail Feasibility Study was completed (J.C. Williams Group, November 2016) which evaluated the current commercial opportunities within and surrounding the Mount Hope community. It concluded that the proposed Mountaingate development requires additional Commercial and Retail opportunities. As such, staff are supportive of the recommendations of the Retail Feasibility Study.
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5. The proposed Plan of Subdivision will consist of 217 lots for single detached dwellings (Lots 1 – 36, 71 – 159, 245 – 259, 284 - 360), 143 lots for street townhouse units (Lots 37 – 70, 160 – 244, and 260 – 283), one block for 69 back-to-back and stacked townhouse units (Block 361), one block for institutional or 228 medium density residential units (conventional; back-to-back, stacked townhouse units) (Block 362), one commercial block (Block 363), one block for a future road widening (Block 364), one open space block (Block 365), one future servicing block (Block 366), one neighbourhood park (Block 369), three blocks for servicing corridor (Blocks 370, 371, and 372), two natural open space blocks (Blocks 373 and 376), two Stormwater Management Blocks (Blocks 374 and 375), and one future residential block (Block 377), one block for a 0.3 m reserve (Block 367), one block for a vegetation protection zone (Block 368), proposed Street “A”, Street “B”, Street “C”, Street “D”, Street “E”, Street “F”, proposed Mountaingate Road, the extension of Rosebury Way, and the extension of Provident Way.

In review of Sub-section 51(24) of the Planning Act, to assess the appropriateness of the proposed subdivision, staff advise that:

(a) It is consistent with the PPS;

(b) Through the phasing of development within the Mount Hope Secondary Plan, the proposal represents a logical and timely extension of existing development and services, and is in the public interest;

(c) It complies with the applicable policies of the Rural Hamilton Official Plan and Urban Hamilton Official Plan as well as the proposed Rural Hamilton Official Plan Amendment and Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment;

(d) The lands can be appropriately used for the use for which it is to be subdivided;

(e) The proposed roads will adequately service the proposed subdivision and can connect with the current road system;

(f) The dimensions and shape of the lots are appropriate;

(g) Restrictions and regulations for the development of the subdivision are included in the implementing Zoning By-law Amendment, conditions of draft plan approval and Subdivision Agreement;
(h) No substantial natural resources are evident on site, and flood control will be addressed through stormwater management plans that will be required as standard conditions of draft plan approval;

(i) Adequate municipal services will be available, the particulars of which will be determined as part of the conditions of draft plan approval and Subdivision Agreement; and,

(k) Public land will be conveyed to create road rights-of-way, the particulars of which will be determined as part of the Standard Subdivision Agreement and final registration of the Plan of Subdivision.

Therefore, staff are supportive of the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision and recommend its approval.

6. With respect to Engineering, in accordance with City financial policies, the City will share costs with the owner for the proposed stormwater management facility as follows:

i) Construction costs shall be in accordance with the City’s Development Charge Policy for quality and quantity ponds;

ii) The land cost for Stormwater Management Block 374 will be in accordance with City’s Development Charge Policy for quality and quantity ponds; and,

iii) The land cost for Stormwater Management Block 375 will be based on an independent land appraisal.

Any other cost sharing provisions for this development shall be in accordance with the City’s Financial Policy, if any.

In order to allow for orderly development, the Owner shall show on the final plan a 0.3 m reserve along the west side of the future servicing Block 366, between Residential Condominium Block 361 and Open Space Block 365, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management (Condition No. 21 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017).

In order to maintain privacy and public safety, the Owner shall include in the Engineering design and cost estimates provisions for the construction a 1.5 m high
black vinyl coated heavy duty chain link fence, entirely at the owner’s expense, in the following locations:

a. along east and west boundaries of Block 371 from Provident Way to Street E;

b. continuously along the east property limit of Lot 125, across the rear property limits of Lots 125 to 134 (inclusive), and along the west property limit of Lot 134;

c. continuously along the west property limit of Lot 292, across the rear property limits of Lots 292 to 301 (inclusive), and along the east property limit of Lot 301;

d. along the south and north property limits of Block 372 from Street F to the west property limit of Block 372 except where noise barrier is required;

e. along the south property limit of Lot 1 from Rosebury Way to the west property limit of Lot 1 except where noise barrier is required;

f. along the east and west property limits of Block 370 from Street E to the North property limit of Block 370 and along the north property limit of block 370;

l. along the south property limit of Lot 350 from Street D to the east property limit of Lot 350; and,

m. along the east property limit of Block 374 from Rosebury Way to the south Property limit of Block 374 and continuing along the south property limit of Block 374 to the west property limit of Block 377, then north along the west limit of Block 374 to the south limit of Lot 1.

(Condition No. 24 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

The Owner will provide to the City a Dust Mitigation Plan and a Construction Management Plan.

(Conditions No. 38 and 45 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)
The necessary transfer deeds will be submitted to the City’s Legal Services to convey, to the City, adequate lands including Blocks 374 and 375 for the stormwater management facility. The land costs for Stormwater Management Block 374 will be in accordance with City’s financial policies and the lands value for Stormwater Management Block 375 will be based on an independent land appraisal all to the satisfaction of Senior Director of Growth Management (Condition No. 61 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017).

Block 377 and Lots 1 to 3 on the draft plan will remain undevelopable until the SWM pond design has been approved by the City, to the satisfaction of Senior Director of Growth Management.

(Condition No. 62 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

The existing temporary turning circles at the west ends of Rosebury Way and Provident Way shall be removed in their entirety at the owner’s expense to the satisfaction of the City.

(Condition No. 63 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

A detailed sump pump design shall be submitted and include a secondary relief / overflow on surface and back-up power unit.

(Condition No. 60 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

A maximum of 100 residential units of the final plan of subdivision shall be permitted to be constructed with only one (1) public road access to service each phase of the development. A second public road access to the subject lands is required, prior to development, beyond the initial one hundred (100) residential units to the City’s satisfaction.

(Condition No. 37 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

**Water**

Existing watermains adjacent to the subject lands include: a 200 millimetre diameter watermain stub at the existing west limit of Thames Way; a 200 millimetre diameter watermain stub at the existing west limit of Rosebury Way; and, a 300 millimetre diameter watermain stub at the existing west limit of Provident Way.
The existing sanitary sewer on Provident Way from the upper limit at the west end of Provident Way (approximately 42 m west of Penfold Court) shall be replaced, as required, to provide sufficient capacity for the proposed development while maintaining capacity for the existing Southampton Estates development.

(Condition No. 22 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

Wastewater

Existing sanitary sewers adjacent to the subject lands include: a 450 millimetre diameter sanitary sewer on Airport Road, that drains to the east and increases to 525 millimetre in diameter approximately 380 metres east of the airport entrance on Airport Road; a 250 millimetre diameter sanitary sewer stub at the existing west limit of Thames Way that drains east; a 250 millimetre diameter sanitary sewer stub at the existing west limit of Rosebury Way that drains east; a 300 millimetre diameter sanitary sewer stub at the existing west limit of Provident Way that drains east; and, a 300 millimetre diameter sanitary sewer stub in an easement between 23 and 27 Penfold Court that drains east.

The Owner will be required to demonstrate in the engineering design and cost estimate schedules provisions how the sanitary sewer stub that exists between Lots 19 and 20 (municipal addresses 23 and 27) on Penfold Court to the north-most existing manhole on Penfold Court are to be abandoned, entirely at the owner’s expense.

(Condition No. 71 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

Sanitary flows from the proposed development to Thames Way or Rosebury Way will drain south to the Southampton pumping station located at Thames Way and Fulmar Way. Sanitary flows draining to Provident Way or the Penfold Court easement will drain by gravity to the pumping station at Homestead Drive.

Storm Drainage and Stormwater Management

There is a temporary stormwater management pond at the south-west corner of the adjacent Southampton subdivision. Flows currently directed to this pond are to be rerouted and accepted by the proposed stormwater management pond at the south end of the Mountaingate subdivision. There is an existing 1200 millimetre diameter storm sewer stub at the west limit of Thames Way that will convey flows from the existing development to the Mountaingate stormwater management pond.
There is a drainage ditch on the north side of White Church Road that is to act as the drainage outlet.

As such, the owner shall design and construct a suitable storm outlet to convey all external drainages as shown on Figure 5 of the Mountaingate Plan of Subdivision Functional Servicing Report (April 4, 2017) through the subject lands.

(Condition No. 48 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

The City of Hamilton will pay the owner for Block 374 required for the stormwater management facility in accordance with the City’s Development Charge Policy for quality and quantity ponds and for Block 375 based on an independent land appraisal to the satisfaction of Senior Director of Growth Management.

(Condition No. 68 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

The storm outlets from the proposed SWM Facility to White Church Road culvert will be designed and constructed at the owner's cost.

(Condition No. 66 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

Lots 350 & 351 on the draft plan are to remain undevelopable until the grading and storm designs demonstrate appropriate minor and major system outlets to accommodate the future developments on the adjacent lands known as 78 Marion Street.

(Condition No. 64 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

A 4.5 m drainage easement in favour of the City on Lots 115 to 124, shall be provided.

(Condition No. 65 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

Roadways

The existing width of Airport Road West adjacent to the subject lands is 23.16 metres. The ultimate right of way width is 26.21 metres requiring a 3.0 metre road widening to be dedicated along the south side adjacent to the subject lands. Therefore, the final plan of subdivision shall identify a separate block that shall be
dedicated to the City of Hamilton for road widening purposes. Currently Airport Road West has a rural cross section.

(Condition No. 23 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

There are existing cul-de-sacs on the subject lands at the west ends of Rosebury Way and Provident Way that will have to be removed in order to extend those roads through the subject lands. Each road has a 20 metre cross-section that shall be maintained along the extension of the road.

There is also an existing cul-de-sac at the west end of Thames Way situated on the existing lands to the east of the subject lands.

With respect to the proposed Zoning By-law amendment, Engineering staff have requested that 1.2 metre minimum setback be required at the garage side of the lot, for the street townhouse units backing onto 9555 Airport Road, in accordance with the City’s Grading Policy and to provide additional space for on street-parking. This requirement has been included in the amending Zoning By-law for these lands (Appendix “D” to Report PED18017).

Also, the Owner agrees to include in all notices of purchase and sale of residential units, the following warning clause:

“On-street, public parking in the surrounding neighbourhood will be limited and cannot be guaranteed in perpetuity. Garage space for this unit is provided and intended for the purposes of parking a vehicle. It is the owner’s responsibility to ensure that their parking needs can be accommodated.”

(Condition No. 33 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

In addition, the proposed zoning amendment contains a provision to require a minimum 2.0 metre clearance between the adjacent dwellings in case of back to front drainage or a major overland flow route is identified on the approved grading plan for the subject lands. These provisions have been addressed in the Amending By-law (Appendix “D” to Report PED18017).

The proposed 23 metre Right of Way for Mountaingate Road shall be reduced to 20 metres as per the City standard and the residual 2 metres is to be added to the lots along the west side of Street “F” and the additional 1 metre is to be distributed to the lots along Mountaingate Road as required to optimize lot layout. The garage
setback requirements for Lots 160 to 209, inclusive, shall be 8 metres in order to accommodate tandem parking for one vehicle in a garage, and one vehicle in a driveway (see Amending By-law attached as Appendix “D” to Report PED18017).

The Owner will also provide a plan to prospective landowners, which shows the location of the sidewalks throughout the subject lands.

(Condition No. 34 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

1.5 metre wide sidewalks are to be installed on both sides of Rosebury Way, Mountaingate Road, Provident Way, Street ‘A,’ and Street ‘B’ and on one side of Streets ‘C’, ‘D’, ‘E’ and ‘F’ (sidewalk on east side) including wheelchair ramps that incorporate integrated tactile accessibility features as per RD-124 to the City’s satisfaction.

(Condition No. 41 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

Mountaingate Road shall be established as a 20.0 metre Right of way from Street ‘B’ to Street ‘E’ to the City’s satisfaction.

(Condition No. 28 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

Block 365 shall be dedicated to the City of Hamilton as a public highway, by Owner’s certificate on the final plan of subdivision for road widening on Airport Road West to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

(Condition No. 29 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

The Owner agrees in writing that the removal of all existing septic beds, garages, playground equipment, wells, and any structures will be at the sole cost to the owner to the satisfaction of the City.

(Condition No. 35 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

Also, the Owner will be required to relocate, as required, all affected utility poles, hydrants, pedestals, hydro vaults, etc. on Airport Road, Rosebury Way, and Provident way, entirely at the owner’s expense to the City’s satisfaction.

(Condition No. 36 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)
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The minimum urban residential horizontal centreline road radius excluding 90 deg. Curves shall be: 90 m for local roads, 95 m for minor collectors and 160 m for major collectors, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

(Condition No. 40 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017).

A Hydrogeological report shall be submitted to the City, to assess impacts, identify any significant recharge and discharge zone, and provide recommendations to mitigate the groundwater impacts during any construction within the subdivision, including but not limited to house construction, and to undertake the works as recommended including monitoring.

(Condition No. 42 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

A pre-construction survey of surrounding roads that are outside the subject lands shall be provided to the City, as well as an adequate security for costs to repair and reconstruction to any of these roads that are damaged due to construction.

(Condition No. 46 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

A post-construction survey / photo inventory shall be provided that corresponds to the pre-construction survey required in Condition No. 46 to identify any damages and the owner further agrees to repair those damages.

(Condition No. 47 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

A reverse crowned concrete walkway within Block 371 shall be designed and constructed by the owner, to convey major system flows from Street ‘E’ to Provident Way entirely at the owner’s expense, to the City’s satisfaction.

(Condition No. 49 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

All driveway locations on the engineering drawings for all lots shall be indicated, and no driveway shall be located within a daylight triangle. Further, all driveway locations at bends and corners shall be situated to ensure that the driveways are within their own lot frontages.

(Condition No. 50 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)
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It shall be demonstrated that a 13.0 m pavement radius is provided along the inside curb line at the 90 degree bends on Streets “D”, “E”, and “F” complying with the City’s Engineering Guidelines.

(Condition No. 51 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

Functional Servicing Report

Currently, Airport Road West is a rural cross section. The Owner will be required to make a cash payment to the City of Hamilton for the future urbanization of Airport Road West based on the “New Roads Servicing Rate”.

(Condition No. 31 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)

The servicing corridor to the adjacent lands to the west, known as Block 372, shall be constructed and finished with low-maintenance landscaping.

Sanitary

The existing 300 millimetre diameter sanitary sewer on Provident Way from the upper limit to Fulmer Way is incorrectly labelled as being 450 millimetres in diameter under existing conditions.

The sanitary sewer design is based on the understanding that all sanitary sewers will be installed at adequate depth such that an infiltration factor of 0.4L / ha / s is appropriate.

The Owner acknowledges that the development shall not proceed until it has been demonstrated that adequate capacity is available in the downstream sanitary sewer system to service the subject lands, including:

i. along Rosebury Way;

ii. along Provident Way;

iii. the pumping station at the south end of Fulmar Way; and,

iv. the pumping station at Strathearn Place and Homestead Drive.

(Condition No. 67 of Appendix “G” to Report PED18017)
Water

As there are a number of narrow lots, the detailed design shall include adequate fire separation between units as necessary based on the requirements of the Water Supply for Public Fire Protection (1999) by the Fire Underwriters Survey. This will be provided through the approval of the Engineering submissions of the draft plan.

The Owner, through a soil consultant or other qualified consultant, shall: check existing wells which provide potable water supply to other properties located within a reasonable distance of the subject lands to establish the existing depth of water within wells, prior to commencement of construction; monitor these wells during construction and continue monitoring and checking the wells after completion of construction until full buildout of the subdivision. Where, in the opinion of the City, if any problems arise, they must be appropriately addressed by the Owner to the City’s satisfaction.

(Condition No. 43 of Appendix “G” to Report No. PED18017)

Parking Plan

Revisions to the submitted parking plan are necessary to show the final locations of hydrants, utility boxes, mailboxes, and other appurtenances. This plan shall be revised to include dimensions of parking spaces and driveway widths.

(Condition No. 44 of Appendix “G” to Report No. PED18017)

Stormwater


Also, the Owner agrees to monitor drainage across the lands from the SWM facility outlet to 500m south of the White Church Road culvert (located approximately 100m west of outlet) to ensure that the existing lands are not negatively impacted by the development. The monitoring plan will occur throughout the construction of the subdivision and for a period of not less than 2 years after all lot / blocks within the draft approved plan are fully developed. In the event that a problem arises, the
Owner further agrees to take the necessary remedial action as per the monitoring report at their cost. The engineering design and cost schedule for the outlet works shall include a minimum of $100,000 security for potential remedial works. The security shall not be released or reduced until it has been demonstrated that there are no impacts as a result of development for a period of not less than 2 years after full buildout of the draft approved plan to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

(Condition No. 57 of Appendix “G” to Report No. PED18017)

A Fluvial Geomorphological assessment and erosion flow exceedance analysis shall be submitted for the Welland Creek tributary from the proposed SWM facility outlet to 500 metres south of White Church Road.

(Condition No. 52 of Appendix “G” to Report No. PED18017)

It shall be demonstrated that the subject development has riparian rights to drain onto and across downstream private lands. The Owner shall notify the downstream land owner(s) whose properties are traversed by Welland Creek from the SWM outfall to 500 metres south of the White Church Road Culvert, of a proposed SWM outfall, and impending pond construction.

(Condition No. 53 of Appendix “G” to Report No. PED18017)

The increase or alteration of the existing floodplain on adjoining lands will not be permitted without a written authorization from the land owner.

(Condition No. 54 of Appendix “G” to Report No. PED18017)

An adequate outlet to convey flows from the proposed SWM facility to the White Church Road culvert shall be secured, which may require acquisition of lands or easements from adjacent land owners.

(Condition No. 55 of Appendix “G” to Report No. PED18017)

A minimum 2.0 metre separation between foundation walls and a maximum water surface depth of 0.30 metres on rear lot catch basins in any case where there is a requirement of an overland flow route to the municipal road allowance shall be included in the engineering design and cost schedules.
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(Condition No. 56 of Appendix “G” to Report No. PED18017)

Functional Servicing Report

Additional justification is necessary to elaborate on the post-development imperviousness, which is 34% for existing residential development as this is too low. A stage – storage - discharge chart will also be required which shows the following at 0.1 metre stages from the permanent pool elevation to the emergency spillway elevation:

i. Stages / elevations for all storm events;

ii. Incremental and cumulative surface area of the forebay and main cell;

iii. Incremental and cumulative volumes of the forebay and main cell;

iv. Discharges through individual control structures and total discharge through all control structures; and,

v. Pond drawdown time.

The Geomorphological Assessment and Erosion Analysis prepared by Geo-Morphix, dated January 2017, is based on the theoretical analysis for the existing channel between Highway 6 and White Church Road. However, this analysis did not consider a field survey and the proposed outlet conditions (a box culvert and channel) along the bottom of the road embankment. Staff have some concerns for the proposed outlet such as road embankment stability, erosion and meander belt width, emergency spillway location, etc. Staff recommends that the geomorphologic assessment should extend 500 metres south of White Church Road. The report should provide a clear professional statement for the erosion potential based on erosion exceedance analysis.

7. As per the Planning Act and the Council approved Public Participation Policy, Notice of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation was sent to 91 property owners within 120 m of the subject lands on January 25, 2008, and a Public Notice sign was posted on the property on February 15, 2008. In total, sixteen letters were received (see Appendix “I” to Report PED18017). The overall issues are generally summarized as follows:
Nature of the Proposed Development

Clarification was requested regarding the form and function of the proposed development. As indicated earlier in this report, the proposed development will be made up of 217 single detached dwelling units; 143 street townhouse units; 69 back to back and stacked townhouse units; one institutional block or 228 back to back or stacked townhouse units; one commercial block; one open space block; one future servicing block; one neighbourhood park; two natural open space blocks; two stormwater management (SWM) blocks; one future residential block; and four (4) future roads.

Name of Proposal – “Mountaingate”

Staff have received correspondence objecting to the name of the proposal: “Mountaingate”. The name that a proposal is assigned is not determined by staff, and is chosen by the owner. It is important to note that this name has no reflection on the type and form of development proposed and is often a personal choice or “marketing” name chosen by the landowner.

Number of Homes / Density

A concern was raised with respect to over intensification of the subject lands and increased densities. The proposed development conforms to both Provincial and Municipal density and intensification guidelines as well as the parent Multiple Residential “RM2” Zone and Residential “R4” Zone regulations, as such, staff feel that the proposal represents good planning. The only increase in density from a zoning perspective is in the “RM3” Zone where a maximum density of 100 units per hectare has been requested, and 30 units per hectare are permitted in the by-law. Furthermore, staff considers the density increase appropriate as adequate parking, transportation and infrastructure capacity, and amenity areas are being provided for the proposed development. The proposed development has been designed to be compatible with the surrounding uses and is maintaining and enhancing the character of the neighbourhood.

Traffic Volume

One of the concerns raised by residents in the area was related to potential increased traffic volumes resulting from the proposed new development. A Traffic Impact Study has been submitted and reviewed by staff in the Corridor
Management Division, Public Works Department. No concerns were raised by staff regarding this study.

Trail System

One of the letters that staff received requested that all of the park and open space throughout the subject lands be linked together by way of a trail system. It was also requested that this trail system be connected to systems in other neighbourhoods within Mount Hope.

The proposed draft plan, including the proposed Neighbourhood Park, is connected by way of sidewalks and servicing corridors (which will be grassed) enabling pedestrian connectivity throughout the “Mountaingate” community, which will function in the same way that a formal trail system would. The community will be connected to others within Mount Hope by way of the extension of Rosebury Way, Provident Way, and the eventual extension of Spitfire Drive.

Builder / Cost of Homes / Timing of Construction

Some correspondence asked who the builder of “Mountaingate” would be and the cost of homes. The owner of the subject lands, Hotz and Sons Limited, is not a builder. Once the proposed development has approvals in place, the owner will look to sell the lands to a builder. When the builder initiates the construction process the cost of homes will be determined, and will be done so based upon market demand. The construction of homes will commence once all Draft Plan conditions have been addressed.

School Block

An inquiry was submitted about the Institutional block. As noted previously in this report, there is an “Institutional” block located within the subject lands. When the Secondary Plan was written, this land was intended to be developed into a future separate elementary school. Discussions between the property owner and appropriate School Board officials regarding the proposed development have confirmed that the Hamilton-Wentworth Catholic District School Board is unsure as to whether or not these lands will be required for a future school. As such, the School Board would like to retain the ability for these lands to be dedicated for school purposes. This is acceptable to the applicant, provided there is an opportunity to develop these lands for residential development if the School Board deems these lands to be surplus. As such, an amendment to the UHOP has been
proposed which will allow for the development of multiple dwellings at a higher density. This land is proposed to be redesignated as “Site Specific Policy Area E”.

18 Aberdeen Avenue

A question was posed to staff as to what the proposed development would be behind 18 Aberdeen Avenue. There has been no development application submitted for these lands.

Housing Mix

Staff has received an inquiry related to the housing mix which is proposed. 33% of the proposed development will be single detached dwelling units; 22% will be traditional freehold townhouse units; 10% will be back to back or stacked townhouse units; and 35% will be a combination of back to back, and/or stacked townhouse units if the School Block is declared surplus.

Drainage

Concerns have been raised related to the proposed drainage system on the Draft Plan lands. A Stormwater Management Report was submitted, and subsequently revised through the application process. A revised report will be required to ensure that adequate drainage can be provided.

Institutional / Mixed – Use

A question was raised related to what types of uses could be expected in an Institutional / Mixed – Use block. There are no Mixed-Use blocks proposed for the “Mountaingate” project. If the Institutional block is declared surplus by the School Board, 228 townhouse units are proposed.

Southampton Phase 2 Plan of Subdivision

The developers of the Southampton Phase 1 and Phase 2 Plans of Subdivision (1536708 Ontario Inc.) indicated that terms of their draft plan approval required that a temporary Stormwater Management Pond was required to be maintained until the Mountaingate proposal was developed. As such, they have requested that any approvals applying to the Mountaingate proposal, related to the construction of permanent stormwater management facilities, both in terms of quantity, quality, size and location, would enable them, upon registration, to fully develop the entirety of
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Block 149 on Plan 62M-1051 for residential purposes. Block 374 and Block 375 as shown on the Draft Plan (Appendix "F" to Report PED18017 and Condition No. 58 of Appendix “G” to Report No. PED18017) facilitate the development of permanent Stormwater Management Ponds to meet the needs of the subject lands and the surrounding community. As such, upon review of the proposal by the City’s Growth Management staff, this future development could be permitted.

They also advise that they were required to post securities and enter into an Indemnity Agreement with the adjoining land owner in respect of the construction and maintenance of temporary turning circles at the westerly limits of Provident Way and Rosebury Way. They have requested that all such securities and Indemnity Agreement be fully and finally released immediately upon registration of the Mountaingate proposal, and that the applicable one foot reserves be lifted. Following registration the City’s Growth Management staff will review and determine the status of the outstanding securities and Indemnity Agreement which applies to these lands.

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION

Should the applications be denied, the lands could not be developed for the proposed residential draft plan of subdivision. The lands could be developed in accordance with the Deferred Development “DD” Zone, which permits limited agricultural and residential uses.

ALIGNMENT TO THE 2016 – 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN

Healthy and Safe Communities
Hamilton is a safe and supportive city where people are active, healthy, and have a high quality of life.

Built Environment and Infrastructure
Hamilton is supported by state of the art infrastructure, transportation options, buildings and public spaces that create a dynamic City.
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RC:jp
DRAFT Urban Hamilton Official Plan
Amendment No. XX

The following text, together with:

Appendix “A”  -  Volume 1, Schedule B - Natural Heritage System

Appendix “B”  -  Volume 1, Schedule B-4 - Detailed Natural Heritage Features – Key Natural Heritage Feature and Key Hydrologic Feature Wetlands

Appendix “C”  -  Volume 1, Schedule B-8 - Detailed Natural Heritage Features – Key Hydrologic Feature Streams

Appendix “D”  -  Volume 1, Schedule E-1 – Urban Land Use Designations

Appendix “E”  -  Volume 2, Map B.5.4-1 - Mount Hope Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan

attached hereto, constitutes Official Plan Amendment XX to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.

1.0  Purpose and Effect:

The purpose of this Amendment is to redesignate lands, add Site Specific Policies, and remove Natural Heritage Features from lands that fall within the Mount Hope Secondary Plan area. The effect is to allow for a Plan of Subdivision that includes residential, commercial, institutional, utility, and open space land uses.

2.0  Location:

A portion of the land known municipally as 9255 Airport Road West, Hamilton (former Township of Glanbrook) is affected by this Amendment.

3.0  Basis:

The basis for permitting this Amendment is as follows:

- The proposed amendment is in keeping with the policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Mount Hope Secondary Plan to provide a
diversity of housing opportunities that are suitable for different segments of the population and higher density development in order to make the best use of urban lands, especially along a local road.

- The proposed development is considered to be consistent with, and complementary to, the planned and existing development in the immediate area.

- The proposed amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017).

4.0 **Actual Changes:**

4.1 **Text Changes**

**Volume 2 – Section B.5.4 – Mount Hope Secondary Plan**

4.1.1 Volume 2 – Chapter 5.0 – Glanbrook Secondary Plans – Section B.5.4 – Mount Hope Secondary Plan is amended by:

(a) amending Policy B.5.4.2 by:

(i) replacing the word “and” with “,” between the phrases “Low Density Residential 2c” and “Low Density Residential 3f”; and,

(ii) adding the phrase “, and Medium Density Residential 3” after the phrase “Low Density Residential 3f”;

so the policy reads as follows:

“B.5.4.2 The residential areas are designated Low Density Residential 2, Low Density Residential 2c, Low Density Residential 3f, and Medium Density Residential 3 on Map B.5.4-1 Mount Hope - Land Use Plan. The following policies shall apply to each of these land use designations.”

(iii) adding a new policy, as follows:
"B.5.4.2.3 Medium Density Residential 3

a) In addition to Section E.3.5 – Medium Density Residential Policies of Volume 1, for lands designated Medium Density Residential 3 on Map B.5.4-1 – Mount Hope Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan, the following policies shall apply:

i) Notwithstanding Policy E.3.5.7 of Volume 1, for lands designated Medium Density Residential 3, the net residential density shall be greater than 75 units per hectare and shall not exceed 100 units per hectare.

(b) adding new Area Specific Policies, as follows:

“Area Specific Policy – Area X

B.5.4.11.X Notwithstanding Policies E.3.4.3 and E.3.4.4 of Volume 1 and Policies B.5.4.2.2 a) i) and ii) of Volume 2, for the lands located south of Airport Road West and north of Highway No. 6, designated Low Density Residential 2, and identified as Site Specific Policy – Area X on Map B.5.4-1 – Mount Hope Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan, the following policies shall apply:

a) the permitted uses shall be restricted to single detached dwellings; and,

b) the maximum density shall be 40 units per net hectare.

Area Specific Policy – Area X

B.5.4.11.X Notwithstanding Policy E.3.4.4 of Volume 1 and Policy B.5.4.2.2 b) ii) of Volume 2, for the lands located south of Airport Road West and north of Highway No. 6, designated Low Density Residential 2c, and identified as Site Specific Policy – Area X on Map B.5.4-1 – Mount Hope
Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan, the permitted density range shall be from 30 to 55 units per net hectare.

**Site Specific Policy – Area X**

B.5.4.11.X  Notwithstanding Policy E.3.5.8 of Volume 1 and Policy B.5.4.2.3 ii) of Volume 2, for the lands located south of Airport Road West and north of Highway No. 6, designated Medium Density Residential 3 and identified as Site Specific Policy Area X on Map B.5.4-1 – Mount Hope Secondary Plan – Land use Plan, maximum building heights shall be four storeys.

**Site Specific Policy – Area X**

B.5.4.11.X  In addition to Policy E.6.2.6 of Volume 1, and notwithstanding Policy E.3.5.8 of Volume 1 and Policy B.5.4.2.3 ii) of Volume 2, for the lands located south of Airport Road West and north of Highway No. 6, designated Institutional and identified as Site Specific Policy Area X on Map B.5.4-1 – Mount Hope Secondary Plan – Land use Plan, the following policies shall apply:

a) multiple dwellings may also be permitted; and,

b) maximum building heights shall be four storeys."

4.2  **Mapping Changes**

**Volume 1 – Schedule “B” – Natural Heritage System**

4.2.1  Schedule "B" – Natural Heritage System be amended by deleting Core Areas, Linkages, and Streams, as shown on Appendix “A” attached to this amendment.

**Volume 1 – Schedule “B-4” – Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Natural Heritage Feature and Key Hydrologic Feature Wetlands**
4.2.2 Schedule “B-4” – Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Natural Heritage Feature and Key Hydrologic Feature Wetlands be amended by deleting Wetlands, as shown on Appendix “B” attached to this amendment.

**Volume 1 – Schedule “B-8” – Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Hydrologic Feature Streams**

4.2.3 Schedule “B-8” – Detailed Natural Heritage Features Key Hydrologic Feature Streams be amended by deleting Streams, as shown on Appendix “C” attached to this amendment.

**Volume 1 – Schedule “E-1” – Urban Land Use Designations**

4.2.4 Schedule “E-1” – Urban Land Uses Designations be amended by redesignating lands from “District Commercial” to “Neighbourhoods” and from “Neighbourhoods” to “District Commercial”, as shown on Appendix “D” attached to this amendment.

**Volume 2 – Secondary Plans – Map B.5.4-1 – Mount Hope Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan**

4.2.5 Map B.5.4-1 – Mount Hope Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan be amended by:

a) Redesignating lands from “Institutional” and “Low Density Residential 3f” to “District Commercial”;

b) Redesignating lands from “District Commercial” and “Low Density Residential 3f” to “General Open Space”;

c) Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2”, “Utility”, and “Natural Open Space” to “Neighbourhood Park”;

d) Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2” and “Utility” to “Natural Open Space”;

e) Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2” and “Low Density Residential 2c” to “General Open Space”;
f) Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2” and “Low Density Residential 2c” to “Utility”;

g) Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2” to “Low Density Residential 2c”;

h) Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2c” and “Low Density Residential 3f” to “Medium Density Residential 3”;

i) Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2c”, “Low Density Residential 3f”, “Utility”, and “Neighbourhood Park” to “Low Density Residential 2”;

j) Redesignating lands from “Low Density Residential 2c”, Low Density Residential 3f”, and “Neighbourhood Park” to “Institutional”;

k) Adding “Area Specific Policy – Area “X” to lands designated Low Density Residential 2c”;

l) Adding Area Specific Policy - Area “X” to lands designated “Low Density Residential 2”;

m) Adding Site Specific Policy - Area “X” to lands designated “Institutional”; and,

n) Adding Site Specific Policy – Area “X” to lands designated “Medium Density Residential 3;

as shown on Appendix “E” attached to this amendment.

5.0 Implementation:

An implementing Zoning By-Law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision will give effect to the intended uses on the subject lands.

This is Schedule “1” to By-law No. ____ passed on the day of ____, 2018.

The
Appendix “A” Volume 1, Schedule B – Natural Heritage System

Appendix “B” Volume 1, Schedule B-4 - Detailed Natural Heritage Features – Key Hydrologic Feature Wetlands

Appendix “C” Volume 1, Schedule B-8 - Detailed Natural Heritage Features – Key Hydrologic Feature Streams

Appendix “D” Volume 3, Appendix A – Site Specific Map

attached hereto, constitutes Official Plan Amendment No. XX to the Rural Hamilton Official Plan.

1.0 **Purpose and Effect:**

The purpose and effect of this Amendment is to remove the Natural Heritage Systems Core Area identification, Key Hydrologic Feature Wetlands identification, Key Hydrologic Feature Streams identification and to apply a Site Specific Policy allowing the development of a stormwater management facility on the lands located at 9255 Airport Road West to serve the adjacent urban area.

2.0 **Location:**

The lands affected by this Amendment are known municipally as 9255 Airport Road West, in the City of Hamilton (former Township of Glanbrook).

3.0 **Basis:**

The basis for undertaking this Amendment is as follows:

- The application is subject to the Clergy Principal as it predated the inclusion of the policies contained in Volume 1, Section C.5 – Stormwater Management Facilities of the Rural Hamilton Official Plan and, although not necessary, a Site Specific Policy for the proposed stormwater management facility is appropriate; and,

- As the applications were submitted prior to the RHOP approval in March
2012 they are to be reviewed against the Region of Hamilton - Wentworth Official Plan as it pertains to the Natural Heritage System. As no Natural Heritage Features are identified within Map No. 4 of the Hamilton - Wentworth Official Plan, the removal of these features from the Rural Hamilton Official Plan is appropriate.

- These amendments to the RHOP will ensure consistency throughout the Plan and guarantee that the Plan is kept up to date on a go forward basis.

4.0 **Changes:**

4.1 **Text Changes:**

Rural Hamilton Official Plan, Volume 3 – Special Policy and Site Specific Areas

4.1.1 Rural Hamilton Official Plan Volume 3 – Special Policy and Site Specific Areas, Chapter B – Rural Site Specific Areas be amended by adding a new site specific policy as follows:

R-XX Lands known municipally as 9255 Airport Road West, former Township of Glanbrook

1.0 Notwithstanding Policy C.5.4.1 c), Storm Water Management Facilities, the lands known municipally as 9255 Airport Road West and identified as Site Specific Policy R-XX, may be developed as a stormwater management facility to serve the southern portion of Mount Hope.
4.2 **Mapping Changes:**

**Rural Hamilton Official Plan Volume 1 – Schedule B, Natural Heritage System**

4.2.1 Schedule "B" – Natural Heritage System be amended by deleting Core Areas, as shown on Appendix “A” attached to this amendment.

**Rural Hamilton Official Plan Volume 1 – Schedule B-4, Detailed Natural Heritage Features, Key Hydrologic Feature Wetlands**

4.2.2 Rural Hamilton Official Plan Volume 1 – Schedule “B-4” – Detailed Natural Features, Key Hydrologic Feature Wetlands be amended by removing “Key Hydrologic Feature Wetlands” identification as shown on Appendix “B”, attached to this amendment.

**Rural Hamilton Official Plan Volume 1 – Schedule B-8, Detailed Natural Heritage Features, Key Hydrologic Feature Streams**

4.2.3 Rural Hamilton Official Plan Volume 1 – Schedule “B-8” – Detailed Natural Features, Key Hydrologic Feature Streams be amended by removing “Key Hydrologic Feature Streams” identification as shown on Appendix “C”, attached to this amendment.

**Rural Hamilton Official Plan Volume 3 – Appendix A, Site Specific Key Map**

4.2.4 Rural Hamilton Official Plan Volume 3, Site Specific Key Map, be amended by identifying the subject lands as R-XX, to allow for the location of a stormwater management pond in the Rural Area, as shown on Appendix "D", attached to this amendment.

5.0 **Implementation:**

An implementing Zoning By-Law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision will give effect to the intended uses on the subject lands.

This Official Plan Amendment is Schedule “1” to By-law No. _____ passed on the ___ of _____. 2018.
CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW NO.

To Amend Zoning By-law No. 464 (Glanbrook)
Respecting Lands located at 9255 Airport Road West (Glanbrook)

WHEREAS the City of Hamilton Act, 1999, Statutes of Ontario, 1999 Chap. 14, Sch. C. did incorporate, as of January 1, 2001, the municipality “City of Hamilton”;

AND WHEREAS the City of Hamilton is the successor to certain area municipalities, including the former municipality known as the “The Corporation of the City of Hamilton” and is the successor to the former regional municipality, namely, “The Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth”;

AND WHEREAS the City of Hamilton Act, 1999 provides that the Zoning By-laws of the former area municipalities continue in force in the City of Hamilton until subsequently amended or repealed by the Council of the City of Hamilton;

AND WHEREAS Zoning By-law No. 464 (Glanbrook) was enacted on the 16th day of March, 1992, and approved by the Ontario Municipal Board on the 31st day of May, 1993;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton, in adopting Section ______ of Report ______ of the Planning Committee at its meeting held on the _______ day of ______ 2018, recommended that Zoning By-law No. 464 (Glanbrook), be amended as hereinafter provided; and

AND WHEREAS this By-law will be in conformity with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Rural Hamilton Official Plan, upon finalization of Official Plan Amendment No. ___;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:

1. That Schedule "F" – Mount Hope Urban Settlement Area Land Use Plan, appended to and forming part of By-law No. 464 (Glanbrook), be amended as follows:

   (a) by changing the zoning from the Deferred Development "DD" Zone and General Agricultural "A1" Zone to the Residential "R4-218(A)" Zone, Modified, the lands comprised in "Block 1";
(b) by changing the zoning from the Deferred Development "DD" Zone and General Agricultural "A1" Zone to the Residential Multiple "RM2-194(A)" Zone, Modified, the lands comprised in "Block 2";

(c) by changing the zoning from the Deferred Development "DD" Zone and General Agriculture "A1" Zone to the Residential Multiple "RM3-284(A)" Zone, Modified, the lands comprised in "Block 3";

(d) by changing the zoning from the Deferred Development "DD" Zone and General Agriculture "A1" Zone to the Residential Multiple "RM3-284(B)" Zone, Modified, the lands comprised in "Block 4"; and,

(e) by changing the zoning from the Deferred Development "DD" Zone and General Agriculture "A1" Zone to the Shopping Centre Commercial "C2-309" Zone, Modified, the lands comprised in "Block 5";

the extent and boundaries of which are shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule "A".

2. That Section 44, "Exceptions to the Provisions of the By-law", as amended, of Zoning By-law No. 464, is hereby further amended by modifying the “R4-218” Zone provisions (a) and (e) (i) as follows:

R4-218(A)

16.2 (a) Minimum Lot Frontage 9.0 metres, except on a corner lot the minimum frontage shall be 10.8 metres.

(e) Minimum Side Yard

(i) On a corner lot, the minimum side yard abutting the flanking street shall be 3.0 metres.

(ii) On a lot flanking an open space block, the minimum side yard abutting the open space shall be 2.4 metres;

(iii) The minimum setback for any building or structure to a daylight triangle or visibility triangle shall be 0.3 metres.

(j) Notwithstanding Section 7.25, all principle buildings shall be setback a minimum distance of 7.0 metres from the boundary of a transmission pipeline right-of-way. No landscaping, development, or the erection of any buildings or permanent structures including but not limited to fences, decks, swimming pools, over, under or upon the pipeline lands shall be permitted within this setback.

All other regulations of the Residential "R4-218" Zone shall apply.
3. That Section 44, “Exceptions to the Provisions of the By-law”, as amended, of Zoning By-law No. 464, is hereby further amended by modifying the “RM2-194” Zone provisions (c) (d), and (e) as follows:

**RM2-194(A)**

18.2 (c) Minimum Front Yard

| Street townhouse lots fronting Airport Road shall have a minimum setback of 8.0 metres. |

(d) Minimum Side Yard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0.0 metres, except:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) For an end unit not abutting a flanking street, the minimum side yard shall be 1.2 metres;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) For a corner unit abutting a flanking street, the minimum side yard shall be 3.0 metres;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) For an end unit abutting an open space area, the minimum side yard shall be 2.4 metres;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) The minimum setback for any building or structure to a daylight triangle or visibility triangle shall be 0.3 metres.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(m) Maximum Lot Coverage

| 55 % |

All other regulations of the Residential Multiple "RM2-194” Zone shall apply.

4. That Section 44, “Exceptions to the Provisions of the By-law”, as amended, of Zoning By-law No. 464, is hereby further amended by modifying the “RM3-284” Zone provisions (d), and (f) as follows:

**RM3-284(A)**

19.2 (d) Maximum Density

| 100 dwelling units per hectare |

(f) Minimum Side Yards

| 3.5 metres from the northerly block boundary to the front façade of a townhouse dwelling; |
| 4.5 metres from the westerly block boundary to the side façade of a townhouse dwelling; and, |
| 3.0 metres from the southerly block boundary to the side façade of a townhouse dwelling. |
(i) Maximum Height 14.0 metres

(o) For the purpose of this by-law, a Dwelling, Townhouse shall be defined as: a dwelling divided vertically and / or horizontally, with each unit separated by a common or party wall or walls and having two or more private entrances at grade.

All other regulations of the Residential Multiple "RM3-284" Zone shall apply.

5. That Section 44, “Exceptions to the Provisions of the By-law”, as amended, of Zoning By-law No. 464, is hereby further amended by modifying the “RM3-284” Zone and “RM3-284(A)” Zone provisions as follows:

RM3-284(B)

19.1 (a) In addition to the uses permitted in Section 19.1, a Public or Separate Elementary School shall also be permitted.

(p) For the purpose of this by-law, the regulations of Section 39.2 shall apply to a Public or Separate Elementary School.

All other regulations of the Residential Multiple “RM3-284” Zone and “RM3-284(A)” Zone shall apply.

6. That Section 44, “Exceptions to the Provisions of the By-law”, of Zoning By-law No. 464, be amended by adding new Exceptions “C2-309”, modified, as follows:

C2-309

Notwithstanding the provisions of Paragraphs (e) and (f) of Subsection 24.2, “REGULATIONS FOR USES PERMITTED IN SUBSECTION 24.1 (SHOPPING CENTRE COMMERCIAL)”, of Section 24, Shopping Centre Commercial “C2” Zone of Zoning By-law 464, the following shall apply:

(e) Minimum Front Yard 6.0 metres

(f) Minimum Side and Rear Yard 5.0 metres

All other regulations of the Shopping Centre Commercial “C2” Zone shall apply.

7. That no building or structure shall be erected, altered, extended or enlarged, nor shall any building or structure or part thereof be used, nor shall any land be used, except in accordance with the “R4”, Residential “RM2” Zone, Residential Multiple “RM3” Zone, or Community Institutional “C2” Zone provisions, subject to the special requirements as referred to in Section 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of this By-law.
8. That the Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to proceed with the giving of notice of the passing of this by-law, in accordance with the *Planning Act*.

**PASSED** this __________ ___ , 2018

___________________________________________  _______________________________________
F. Eisenberger                                  R. Caterini
Mayor                                         City Clerk
This is Schedule "A" to By-law No. 18-
Passed the ........... day of ...................., 2018

Schedule "A"
Map Forming Part of By-law No. 18-
to Amend By-law No. 464

Subject Property
9255 Airport Road West, Glenbrook

Block 1 - Lands to be rezoned from the Deferred Development "DD" & General Agriculture "A1" Zones to Residential "R4-218(A)" Zone

Block 2 - Lands to be rezoned from the Deferred Development "DD" & General Agriculture "A1" Zones to Multiple Residential "RMC-194(A)" Zone

Block 3 - Lands to be rezoned from the Deferred Development "DD" & General Agriculture "A1" Zones to Multiple Residential "RMC-284(A)" Zone

Block 4 - Lands to be rezoned from the Deferred Development "DD" & General Agriculture "A1" Zones to Multiple Residential "RMC-284(B)" Zone

Block 5 - Lands to be rezoned from the Deferred Development "DD" & General Agriculture "A1" Zones to Shopping Centre Commercial "C2-300" Zone

Block 6 - Lands to remain Agricultural "A1" Zone

Block 7 - Refer to By-law No. 05-200
CITY OF HAMILTON
BY-LAW NO. XX

To Amend Zoning By-law No. 05-200, Respecting Lands Located at
9255 Airport Road West, Glanbrook

WHEREAS the City of Hamilton has in force several Zoning By-laws which apply to the
different areas incorporated into the City by virtue of the City of Hamilton Act, 1999, S. O.
1999 Chap. 14;

WHEREAS the City of Hamilton is the lawful successor to the former Municipalities
identified in Section 1.7 of By-law No. 05-200;

WHEREAS Zoning By-law No. 05-200 was enacted on the 25th day of May, 2005;

WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton, in adopting Section of Report 18-
of the Planning Committee at its meeting held on the day of 2018,
recommended that Zoning By-law No. 05-200, be amended as hereinafter provided; and,

WHEREAS this By-law will be in conformity with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and the
Rural Hamilton Official Plan, upon finalization of Official Plan Amendment No. ;

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:

1. That Map Nos. 1747, 1748, 1784, and 1785 of Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps, to
Zoning By-law No. 05-200 are amended by incorporating additional
Neighbourhood Park (P1) Zone boundaries for the applicable lands, the extent
and boundaries of which are shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule “A”.

2. That Map Nos. 1747, 1784, and 1785 of Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps, to Zoning
By-law No. 05-200 are amended by incorporating additional Open Space (P4)
Zone boundaries for the applicable lands, the extent and boundaries of which are
shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule “A”.

3. That Map Nos. 1748 and 1785 of Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps, to Zoning By-law
No. 05-200 are amended by incorporating additional Conservation / Hazard
Lands (P5) Zone boundaries for the applicable lands, the extent and boundaries of which are
shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule “A”.

4. That Map No. 189 of Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps, to Zoning By-law No. 05-200
is amended by incorporating additional Conservation / Hazard Land - Rural (P6)
Zone boundaries for the applicable lands, the extent and boundaries of which are
shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule “A”.
5. That no building or structure shall be erected, altered, extended, or enlarged, nor shall any building or structure or part thereof be used, nor shall any land be used, except in accordance with the Neighbourhood Park (P1) Zone, Open Space (P4) Zone, Conservation / Hazard Lands (P5) Zone, and Conservation / Hazard Land - Rural (P6) Zone provisions, subject to the special requirements referred to in Sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 of this By-law.

6. That the Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to proceed with the giving of notice of the passing of this By-law in accordance with the Planning Act.

PASSED this ___ day of _____, 2018.

______________________________  ________________________________
Fred Eisenberger                     Rose Caterini
Mayor                                 City Clerk
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Special Conditions for Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval

For “Mountaingate” 25T-200723(R)

That this approval apply to the Draft Plan of Subdivision, 25T-200723(R), prepared by ODAN-DETECH Consulting Engineers and certified by Bruce MacLeod, O.L.S., dated September 12, 2017, consisting of 217 lots for single detached dwellings (Lots 1 – 36, 71 – 159, 245 – 259, 284 - 360), 143 lots for street townhouse units (Lots 37 – 70, 160 – 244, and 260 – 283), one block for 69 back-to-back and stacked townhouse units (Block 361), one block for institutional or 228 medium density residential units (conventional; back-to-back, stacked and / or stacked townhouse units) (Block 362), one commercial block (Block 363), one block for a future road widening (Block 364), one open space block (Block 365), one future servicing block (Block 366), one neighbourhood park (Block 369), three blocks for servicing corridor (Blocks 370, 371, and 372), two natural open space blocks (Blocks 373 and 376), two Stormwater Management Blocks (Blocks 374 and 375), and one future residential block (Block 377), one block for a 0.3 m reserve (Block 367), one block for a vegetation protection zone (Block 368), proposed Street “A”, Street “B”, Street “C”, Street “D”, Street “E”, Street “F”, proposed Mountaingate Road, the extension of Rosebury Way, and the extension of Provident Way, subject to the owner entering into a standard Form Subdivision Agreement, received, and approved by City Council with the following special conditions.

Development Planning, Heritage and Design

1. That, prior to registration, the owner / applicant agrees to include the following clauses, for the following lots, in all purchase and sale and / or lease agreements, and registered on title to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner:

All Lots:

“Purchasers / tenants are advised that their property is located within the Airport’s noise influence area.”

Lots 1-7:

Warning Clause “B”:

“Purchasers / tenants are advised that despite the inclusion of noise control features in the development and within the building units, sound levels due to increasing road traffic may on occasion interfere with some activities of the dwelling occupants as the sound levels exceed the sound level limits of the City of Hamilton’s and the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change.”

Warning Clause “C”:

“This dwelling unit has been designed with the provision for adding central air conditioning at the occupant’s discretion. Installation of central air conditioning by
Special Conditions for Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval

For “Mountaingate” 25T-200723(R)

the occupant in low and medium density developments will allow windows and exterior doors to remain closed, thereby ensuring that the indoor sound levels are within the sound level limits of the City of Hamilton’s and the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change.”

Lots 8, 15, 60 - 70, 93 and 94:

Warning Clause “B”:

“Purchasers / tenants are advised that despite the inclusion of noise control features in the development and within the building units, sound levels due to increasing road traffic may on occasion interfere with some activities of the dwelling occupants as the sound levels exceed the sound level limits of the City of Hamilton’s and the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change.”

Warning Clause “D”:

“This dwelling unit has been designed with the provision for adding central air conditioning at the occupant’s discretion. Installation of central air conditioning by the occupant in low and medium density developments will allow windows and exterior doors to remain closed, thereby ensuring that the indoor sound levels are within the sound level limits of the City of Hamilton’s and the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change.”

Lots 9-14, 16-59, 71-92 and 95-360:

Warning Clause “A”:

“Purchasers / tenants are advised that sound levels due to increasing road and air traffic may occasionally interfere with some activities of the dwelling unit occupants as the sound levels exceed the sound level limits of the City of Hamilton’s and the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change.”

Warning Clause “D”:

“This dwelling unit has been designed with the provision for adding central air conditioning at the occupant’s discretion. Installation of central air conditioning by the occupant in low and medium density developments will allow windows and exterior doors to remain closed, thereby ensuring that the indoor sound levels are within the sound level limits of the City of Hamilton’s and the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change.”
Special Conditions for Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval

For “Mountaingate” 25T-200723(R)

Blocks 361 and 362:

Warning Clause “A”:

“Purchasers / tenants are advised that sound levels due to increasing road and air traffic may occasionally interfere with some activities of the dwelling unit occupants as the sound levels exceed the sound level limits of the City of Hamilton’s and the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change.”

Warning Clause “D”:

“This dwelling unit has been designed with the provision for adding central air conditioning at the occupant’s discretion. Installation of central air conditioning by the occupant in low and medium density developments will allow windows and exterior doors to remain closed, thereby ensuring that the indoor sound levels are within the sound level limits of the City of Hamilton’s and the Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change.”

Warning Clause “E”:

“Purchasers are advised that sound level limits due to the proximity of the adjacent commercial facility, sound levels from the commercial facilities may at times be audible.”

2. That, prior to issuance of a building permit, when detailed grading information is available for Lots 1-8, 15, 60 - 70, 93 and 94, a detailed noise study should be performed to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner, to refine the acoustic barrier heights and specific acoustical requirements.

3. That, prior to issuance of a building permit, when architectural drawings are available for Lots 1-7 south of Rosebury Way, an acoustic consultant should provide revised glazing recommendations based on actual window to floor area ratios, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner.

4. That, prior to issuance of a building permit, when house locations and final grades are available, a Professional Engineer qualified to provide acoustical engineering services in Ontario will be required to review the lot plan and grading plans to certify that the noise control barriers as approved have been incorporated for lots adjacent to Highway 6, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner.
Special Conditions for Draft Plan of Subdivision Approval

For “Mountaingate” 25T-200723(R)

5. That, prior to the assumption of the subdivision, the City of Hamilton’s Building Department inspector or a Professional Engineer qualified to provide acoustical engineer services in the Province of Ontario shall certify that the noise control measures have been properly installed and constructed for the lots adjacent to Highway 6, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

6. That, prior to preliminary grading or servicing, the Owner / Applicant shall submit a Tree Protection Plan (TPP) prepared by a tree management professional, showing the location of drip lines, edges of existing plantings, the location of all existing trees and the methods to be employed in retaining trees to be protected, and to implement all approved tree saving measures, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner.

7. That, prior to preliminary grading, the Owner shall submit a Restoration Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner. This Restoration Plan is to aid in mitigating possible impacts from the development (i.e. encroachment, dumping, introduction of invasive species, and predation of wildlife by pets) on the natural heritage features and their functions. The Restoration Plan is to be prepared by a certified Landscape Architect in consultation with an ecologist and will identify the locations and species to be planted.

8. That, prior to preliminary grading and removal of the existing stormwater management pond, the Owner / Developer shall submit and implement a Fish / Wildlife Re-location Plan to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner.

9. That, prior to preliminary grading, a Grading Plan and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan is required for the subject lands and should be prepared to the satisfaction of the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority and the Director of Planning and Chief Planner.

Enbridge Pipelines Inc.:

10. That, prior to registration, the owner / applicant agrees to include the following clauses, in all purchase and sale and / or lease agreements, and registered on title to the satisfaction of the Director of Growth Management and Enbridge:

“That the Purchaser and / or lessee acknowledges that it has been advised and / or is otherwise aware that:
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(i) the northern 18.3 metres of the lands in Lots 71 to 77 inclusive (the “Easement Affected Properties”) are subject to an easement in favor of Enbridge Pipelines Inc. and / or its successor and / or assigns (the “Pipeline Easement”). The Pipeline Easement spans the entire east / west length of the northern 18.3 metres of the Easement Affected Properties (the “Pipeline Lands”).

(ii) the southern 18.3 metres of the lands in Lots 94 – 113 inclusive (the “Easement Affected Properties”) are subject to an easement in favour of Enbridge Pipelines Inc. and / or its successor and / or assigns (the “Pipeline Easement”). The Pipeline Easement spans the entire east / west length of the northern 18.3 metres of the Easement Affected Properties (the “Pipeline Lands”). The owner of these lands is prohibited from landscaping, developing, or erecting and building any permanent structures including, but not limited to: fences, decks, swimming pools which are located over, under or upon these Pipeline Lands.

(iii) The southern 18.3 metres of the lands in Lots 94 - 113 inclusive (the “North Safety Zone Lands”) are within a pipeline safety zone (the “Northern Safety Zone”).

(iv) the northern 30 metres, commencing at the northern boundary of the Pipeline Easement, of Lots 71 to 77 inclusive (the “Southern Safety Zone Lands”) are within a pipeline safety zone (the “Southern Safety Zone”).

(v) pursuant to terms of the Pipeline Easement and the applicable zoning by-law designations and other laws affecting the Pipeline Lands, an owner of an Easement Affected Property is prohibited from landscaping, developing, or erecting any buildings or permanent structures including but not limited to fences, decks, swimming pools or shed, over under or upon the Pipeline Lands unless written approval is provided by Enbridge Pipelines Inc.

(vi) pursuant to terms of the Pipeline Easement and applicable laws governing Pipeline Safety Zones, prior to any mechanical excavation being undertaken within the Pipeline Lands and / or the Southern Safety Zone Lands and / or Northern Safety Zone Lands, Enbridge Pipelines Inc. must be advised of such work. Such notification shall be deemed to have been made by providing notice through “Ontario One Call” at 1-800-400-2255 (or such replacement number as may be designated from time to time by public notice).
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(vii) subsection (i) to (vi) are not intended to disclose all matters relating to the Pipeline Easement and / or any restriction for lands which are within a Pipeline Safety Zone. For full details respecting the foregoing title to affected lands and all applicable laws, rules, regulations and / or other ordinances must be reviewed and/or consulted.”

Ministry of Transportation

11. That, prior to final approval, the owner shall submit to the Ministry of Transportation for their review and approval, a stormwater management plan and report indicating the intended treatment of the calculated runoff and impacts on the Highway 6 New Right-of-way.

12. That, prior to final approval, the owner shall submit to the Ministry of Transportation for their review and approval, a copy of a traffic impact assessment addressing the anticipated traffic volumes, resulting from the development, and their impact on the Highway 6 and Highway 6 New intersection.

Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA)

13. That, prior to grading, the owner / applicant apply for and receive any approvals and permits required by Fisheries and Oceans Canada (DFO), the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) and the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA), to the satisfaction of the NPCA.

14. That, prior to grading, detailed lot grading and drainage plans, delineating both existing and proposed grades and means whereby major system flows will be accommodated across the lands, be submitted to the satisfaction of the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority.

15. That, prior to grading, detailed sedimentation and erosion control plans explaining methods proposed for (a) the control of silt and erosion during the construction phase and (b) restoration proposed for the site after construction, be submitted to the satisfaction of the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority.
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17. That, prior to grading, the Owner / Applicant agrees to implement the mitigation measures as outlined in the approved Environmental Impact Study revised December 2014 and as updated in the April 2016 letter prepared by Savanta Inc. to the satisfaction of the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority.

18. That, prior to grading, the Owner / Applicant agrees in the executed subdivision agreement to implement all plans and required works arising from meeting the conditions as noted 13 to 17, inclusive, noted above, to the satisfaction of the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority.

Canada Post

19. That, prior to registration, the owner / applicant agrees to include the following clauses in all purchase and sale and / or lease agreements, and registered on title to the satisfaction of the Director Growth Management and Canada Post:

   i) the home / business mail delivery will be from a designated Centralized Mail Box (CMB); and,

   ii) that the developers / owners be responsible for officially notifying the purchasers of the exact Centralized Mail Box (CMB) locations prior to the closing of any home sales.

Hamilton-Wentworth Catholic District School Board

20. That, prior to the final approval, the applicant shall implement the following, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board:

   a) The acquisition, or reservation for future acquisition, of Block 362 designated in the plan for elementary school purposes;

   b) Prior to servicing, the clearing, grubbing, engineered filling, where required, and grading of Block 362 shall be completed. This includes the removal of any and all buildings and structures, tanks and utility structures; and,

   c) That the designation of Block 362 as an elementary separated school site is subject to the completion of a soils report, of which the findings will be addressed by the applicant to the satisfaction of the Hamilton-Wentworth Catholic District School Board.
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Engineering

21. That, prior to registration, the Owner shall show on the final plan a 0.3 metre reserve along the west side of the future servicing Block 366, between Residential Condominium Block 361 and Open Space Block 365, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

22. That, prior to grading, the Owner shall include in the Engineering design and cost estimate schedules, provisions to replace the existing sanitary sewer on Provident Way from the upper limit at the west end of Provident Way (approximately 42 m west of Penfold Court) as required to provide sufficient capacity for the proposed development while maintaining capacity for the existing Southampton Estates development entirely at the owner’s expense to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

23. That, prior to grading, the Owner shall include in the engineering design and cost estimate schedules, provisions to provide a 26 m cross section including provision to service the adjacent property to the west through Block 366 entirely at the Owner’s expense to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

24. That, prior to servicing, the Owner shall include in the Engineering design and cost estimates provisions for the construction a 1.5 m high black vinyl coated heavy duty chain link fence entirely at the owner’s expense in the following locations:

   a. along the east and west boundaries of Block 371 from Provident Way to Street E;

   b. continuously along the east property limit of Lot 125, across the rear property limits of Lots 125 to 134 (inclusive), and along the west property limit of Lot 134;

   c. continuously along the west property limit of Lot 292, across the rear property limits of Lots 292 to 301 (inclusive), and along the east property limit of Lot 301;

   d. along the south and north property limits of Block 372 from Street F to the west property limit of Block 372 except where noise barrier is required;

   e. along the south property limit of Lot 1 from Rosebury Way to the west property limit of Lot 1 except where noise barrier is required;
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f. along the east and west property limits of Block 370 from Street E to the North property limit of Block 370 and along the north property limit of Block 370;

g. along the south property limit of Lot 350 from Street D to the east property limit of Lot 350; and,

h. along the east property limit of Block 374 from Rosebury Way to the south property limit of Block 374 and continuing along the south property limit of Block 374 to the west property limit of Block 377;

to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

25. That, prior to registration, 4.5 m by 4.5 m daylight triangles shall be established on the final plan of subdivision at the following intersections:

   a. Rosebury Way and Street A;

   b. Street D and Street F;

   c. Street C and Street D;

   d. Street B and Street D; and,

   e. Rosebury Way and Provident Way;

to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

26. That, prior to registration, 9.0 m by 9.0 m daylight triangles shall be established on the final plan of subdivision at the following intersections:

   a. Street B, Street F, and Mountaingate Road;

   b. Street C and Mountaingate Road;

   c. Street D and Mountaingate Road;

   d. Street E, Street F, and Mountaingate Road;

   e. Street E and Mountaingate Road (North intersection); and,
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f. The Block 366 future services block and Mountaingate Road; to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

27. That, prior to registration, 12.0 m by 12.0 m daylight triangles be established on the final plan of subdivision at the intersection of Mountaingate Road and Airport Road West to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

28. That, prior to registration, Mountaingate Road shall be established as a 20 m Right of way from Street B to Street E to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

29. That, prior to registration, Block 364 be dedicated to the City of Hamilton as a public highway, by Owner’s certificate on the final plan of subdivision for road widening on Airport Road West to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

30. That, prior to registration, the Owner shall agree to include in all offers of Purchase and Sale a statement that advises the prospective purchaser that there is an approved grading plan and that the purchaser agrees not to alter any lands in a way that would conflict with the approved grading plan without approval from the City of Hamilton to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

31. That, prior to registration, the Owner will be required to make a cash payment to the City of Hamilton for the future urbanization of Airport Road West based on the “New Roads Servicing Rate” in effect at the time of payment to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

32. That, prior to registration, the Owner shall agree to include in all offers of Purchase and Sale or Lease Agreement a statement that advises the prospective purchaser or leasee that it is the sole responsibility of the home owner to maintain any and all noise barrier or other infrastructure required within the approved noise study and that the purchaser agrees not to alter any noise barrier or other infrastructure without approval from the City of Hamilton to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

33. That, prior to registration, the Owner shall agree to include in all notices of purchase and sale of residential units, the following warning clause:

“On-street, public parking in the surrounding neighbourhood will be limited and cannot be guaranteed in perpetuity. Garage space for this unit is provided and
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intended for the purposes of parking a vehicle. It is the owner’s responsibility to ensure that their parking needs can be accommodated.”

to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

34. That, prior to registration, the Owner shall include in any Agreements of Purchase and Sale for lots, blocks, units, and severed parcels, with respect to sidewalks:

   i. a plan showing the location of sidewalks; and,

   ii. a notice advising prospective purchasers and tenants that a sidewalk will, or will not, be constructed within the street right-of-way fronting the lot / block, unit or severed parcel;

to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

35. That, prior to grading, the Owner agrees in writing that the removal of all existing septic beds, garages, playground equipment, wells, and / or any structures will be at the sole cost to the owner to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

36. That, prior to servicing, the Owner be required to relocate, as required, all affected utility poles, hydrants, pedestals, hydro vaults, etc. on Airport Road, Rosebury Way, and Provident way, entirely at the owner’s expense to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

37. That, prior to servicing, the Owner shall agree that a maximum of 100 residential units of the final plan of subdivision shall be permitted to be constructed with only one (1) public road access to service each phase of the development. A second public road access to the subject lands is required, prior to development, beyond the initial one hundred (100) residential units to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

38. That, prior to servicing, the Owner agrees to provide in writing, a plan or procedure for dealing with issues concerning dust control and street cleaning (external roads included) throughout construction within the subdivision. This document will also include first point of contact, a schedule for regular cleaning of streets that is specific to the methods to be used, the source of water, and the contractor or agent to be used to undertake the works as well as contractor / agent contact information so that the City can direct the work to be completed as necessary all to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.
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39. That, **prior to servicing**, the Owner include in the engineering design for the draft plan lands removal of all dead or diseased trees within the City’s road allowance as required by reconstruction on existing streets and pay all costs for replacement of such street trees all to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

40. That, **prior to servicing**, the Owner shall include in the engineering design all road geometric to City of Hamilton standards. The minimum urban residential horizontal centreline road radius excluding 90 deg. Curves shall be: 90 m for local roads, 95 m for minor collectors and 160 m for major collectors, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

41. That, **prior to servicing**, the Owner include in the engineering design and cost estimate schedules for the draft plan lands installation of 1.5 m wide sidewalks on both sides of Rosebury Way, Mountaingate Road, Provident Way, Street ‘A,’ and Street ‘B’ and on one side of Streets ‘C,’ ‘D,’ ‘E’ and ‘F (sidewalk on east side)’ including wheel chair ramps that incorporate integrated tactile accessibility features as per RD-124 to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

42. That, **prior to servicing**, the owner shall submit a Hydrogeological report to the City, prepared by a qualified professional, to assess impacts, identify any significant recharge and discharge zone, and provide recommendations to mitigate the groundwater impacts during any construction within the subdivision, including but not limited to house construction, and to undertake the works as recommended including monitoring. The report shall also provide a groundwater contingency plan to ensure that an appropriate mitigation strategy is available to be implemented in the case whereof:

i. an aquifer is breached during excavation;

ii. groundwater is encountered during any construction within the subdivision, including but not limited to house construction;

iii. sump pumps are found to be continuously running; and,
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iv. water supply and sewage disposal systems and any surface and groundwater related infrastructure are negatively impacted;

all to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

43. That, prior to servicing, the Owner, through a soil consultant or other qualified consultant, shall: check existing wells which provide potable water supply to other properties located within a reasonable distance of the subject lands to establish the existing depth of water within wells, prior to commencement of construction; monitor these wells during construction and continue monitoring and checking the wells after completion of construction until full buildout of the subdivision. Where, in the opinion of the City, if any problems arise, they must be appropriately addressed by the Owner to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

44. That, prior to servicing, the Owner prepare a revised on-street parking plan for Streets “A”, “B”, “C”, “D”, “E”, “F”, Mountaingate Road, Provident Way, and Rosebury Way based on the premise of achieving on-street parking for 40% of the total number of units and it shall include:

i. driveway ramps and curb openings for all lots;

ii. the pairing of driveways;

iii. where lots in the subdivision abut a park entrance or a public walkway; and;

iv. the location of transit pads, community mailbox pads, and fire hydrants, where the location has been determined by the appropriate authorities;

to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

45. That, prior to grading, the owner shall prepare and provide a Construction Management Plan that provides details on any construction activity that will encroach into the municipal road allowance such as construction staging, scaffolding, cranes, etc. The plan must identify any required sidewalk and / or lane closures and the estimated length of time for such closures). Details on heavy truck routing must also be included, all to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.
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46. That, prior to grading, the owner shall prepare and provide the following:
   
i. a pre-construction survey of surrounding roads that are outside the subject lands; and,
   
ii. an adequate security for costs to repair and reconstruction to any of these roads that are damaged due to construction;

   to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

47. That, prior to registration of the plan of subdivision, the owner agrees to prepare a post-construction survey / photo inventory that corresponds to the pre-construction survey required in Condition 46 to identify any damages and the owner further agrees to repair those damages all to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

48. That, prior to servicing, the owner shall include in the engineering design and cost schedules a suitable storm outlet to convey all external drainages as shown on Figure 5 of the Mountaingate Plan of Subdivision Functional Servicing Report (April 4, 2017) through the subject lands including:
   
i. An adequate storm sewer system on Airport Road West and Mountain Gate Road to accommodate 100-year flows from external areas EX1, EX2 and EX3 to the limits of the frontage of the subject lands on Airport Road West;
   
ii. An adequate storm sewer system on Street B to accommodate 100-year pre-development from EX4 and EX5; and 100-year post-development flows from EX6 and 78 Marion Street;
   
iii. An adequate storm sewer system on Street E to accommodate the minor and major system flows from EX1 to EX6 lands at the owner’s expense;
   
iv. An adequate major overland flow route for external area EX7;
   
v. An adequate storm sewer system on Airport Road to accommodate the minor and major flows from drainage area 201 to the existing drainage ditch west of the subject lands at the owner’s expense; and,
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vi. An overland flow route and easement through the commercial Block 363 to accommodate an emergency spillway for the external drainage area C-201 and Airport Road.

all to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

49. That, prior to servicing, the owner agrees to include in the design and cost estimates provisions to construct a reverse crowned concrete walkway within Block 371 to convey major system flows from Street E to Provident Way entirely at the owner’s expense to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

50. That, prior to servicing, the Owner shall indicate all driveway locations on the engineering drawings for all lots, and that no driveway shall be located within a daylight triangle. Further, all driveway locations at bends and corners shall be situated to ensure that the driveways are within their own lot frontages to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

51. That, prior to registration of the plan of subdivision, the Owner demonstrates that a 13.0m pavement radius is provided along the inside curb line at the 90 degree bends on Streets “D”, “E” and “F” complying with the City’s Engineering Guidelines to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

52. That, prior to grading, the owner shall submit a Fluvial Geomorphological assessment and erosion flow exceedance analysis for the Welland Creek tributary from the proposed SWM facility outlet to 500m south of White Church Road West to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

53. That, prior to grading, the Owner shall demonstrate that the subject development has riparian rights to drain onto and across downstream private lands. The Owner shall notify the downstream land owner(s) whose properties are traversed by Welland Creek from the SWM outfall to 500m south of the White Church Road West Culvert, of a proposed SWM outfall, and impending pond construction to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

54. That, prior to grading, the Owner acknowledges that the increase or alteration of the existing floodplain on adjoining lands will not be permitted without a written authorization from the land owner to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.
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55. That, **prior to grading**, the Owner shall secure an adequate outlet to convey flows from the proposed SWM facility to the White Church Road West culvert, which may require acquisition of lands or easements from adjacent land owners, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

56. That, **prior to servicing**, the owner shall include in the engineering design and cost schedules entirely at the owner’s expense provision for a minimum of 2.0 m separation between foundation walls and a maximum water surface depth of 0.30 m on rear lot catch basins in any case where there is a requirement of an overland flow route to the municipal road allowance to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

57. That, **prior to grading**, the Owner agrees to monitor drainage across the lands from the SWM facility outlet to 500m south of the White Church Road West culvert (located approximately 100m west of outlet) to ensure that the existing lands are not negatively impacted by the development. The monitoring plan will occur throughout the construction of the subdivision and for a period of not less than 2 years after all lot / blocks within the draft approved plan are fully developed. In the event that a problem arises, the Owner further agrees to take the necessary remedial action as per the monitoring report at their cost. The engineering design and cost schedule for the outlet works shall include a minimum of $100,000 security for potential remedial works. The security shall not be released or reduced until it has been demonstrated that there are no impacts as a result of development for a period of not less than 2 years after full buildout of draft approved plan to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

58. That, **prior to grading**, the Owner shall submit a detailed Stormwater management report prepared by a qualified professional engineer, in accordance with the City of Hamilton Drainage Policies, City of Hamilton Comprehensive Guidelines (2017) and the MOE&CC Stormwater Management Planning and Design Manual (2003), and considering the following parameters:

   i. The design shall demonstrate a suitable pond outlet including an emergency spillway from the SWM facility block to the existing culvert on White Church Road West;

   ii. The pond shall be designed to meet erosion flow exceedance target identified in the Fluvial Geomorphologic Assessment report;
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iii. Verify and confirm that the lesser of predevelopment flow or pond outflows can be safely conveyed through the existing culvert on White Church Road West without an increase in floodplain on adjoining lands;

iv. The pond geometry shall be as per City of Hamilton Comprehensive Development Guidelines (2017);

v. The pond landscaping shall be as per City of Hamilton Landscape Design Guidelines for SWM facilities (2009); and,

vi. Demonstrate that 100-year HGL is located at or below the top of grate elevation at all inlet and rear-lot catch basin locations and that the 5-year HGL is within the sewer obvert based on 100-year and 5-year pond operating levels, respectively;

all to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management and the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority.

59. That, prior to assumption, the Owner agrees:

i. To submit an operation and maintenance manual, as per the City of Hamilton Comprehensive Development Guidelines (2017), to inspect and monitor the stormwater management facility upon commencement of construction or pre-grading of the subject lands through to assumption of the facility;

ii. To keep detailed logs concerning stormwater management facility performance and maintenance, including costs for cleaning and removal of sediment, and submit such logs to the City during pre-grading and construction activities in accordance with the operation manual;

iii. To construct, operate, and maintain at the Owner’s expense, the stormwater management facility, in a manner acceptable to the City, including any changes to conditions of the MOECC’s approval, throughout servicing of all stages of draft plan registration and development of all registered lots and blocks; or until such time as determined by the Senior Director of Growth Management;
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iv. To remove sediment from the stormwater management facility attributed to development, carry out a bathymetric survey and verify volumetric capacity of the stormwater management facility, prior to release of the Owner’s operation and maintenance responsibilities for the stormwater management facility; and,

v. a security for such costs.

all to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

60. That, prior to servicing, the Owner shall submit a detailed sump pump design to include a secondary relief / overflow on surface and back-up power unit to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

61. That, prior to registration, the Owner shall submit the necessary transfer deeds to the City’s Legal Services to convey, to the City, adequate lands including Blocks 374 and 375 for the stormwater management facility. The land costs for Block 374 will be in accordance with City’s financial policies and the land value for Block 375 will be based on an independent land appraisal all to the satisfaction of Senior Director of Growth Management.

62. That, prior to servicing, the owner agrees in writing that Block 377 and Lots 1 to 3 on the draft plan will remain undevelopable until the SWM pond design has been approved by the City, to the satisfaction of Senior Director of Growth Management.

63. That, prior to servicing, the owner agrees to include in the design and cost estimates removal of the existing temporary turning circles at the west ends of Rosebury Way and Provident Way entirely at the owner's expense to the satisfaction of Senior Director of Growth Management.

64. That, prior to servicing, the owner agrees in writing that the lots 350 & 351 on the draft plan shall remain undevelopable until the grading and storm designs demonstrate appropriate minor and major system outlets to accommodate the future developments on the adjacent lands known as 78 Marion Street to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

65. That, prior to registration, the Owner shall provide a 4.5 m drainage easement in favour of the City of Hamilton on lots 115 to 124, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.
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66. That, prior to grading, the Owner acknowledges that the storm outlets from the proposed SWM Facility to the White Church Road West culvert shall be designed and constructed at the owner’s cost, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.

67. That, prior to servicing, the Owner acknowledges in writing that the development shall not proceed until it has been demonstrated that adequate capacity is available in the downstream sanitary sewer system to service the subject lands, including:

i. along Rosebury Way;
ii. along Provident Way;
iii. the pumping station at the south end of Fulmar Way, and;
iv. the pumping station at Strathearn Place and Homestead Drive

all to the satisfaction of Senior Director of Growth Management.

68. That, prior to registration, the Owner agrees that the City of Hamilton shall pay the owner for Block 374 required for the stormwater management facility in accordance with the City’s Development Charge Policy for quality and quantity ponds and for Block 375 based on an independent land appraisal to the satisfaction of Senior Director of Growth Management.

69. That, prior to grading, a Traffic Impact Study must be submitted to the satisfaction of the Manager of Traffic Engineering, Public Works Department.

70. That, prior to registration, the owner / applicant agrees to construct the Neighbourhood Park (Block 369), to City standards and requirements, to accommodate the needs of the Mount Hope Neighbourhood, to the satisfaction of the Manager of Landscape Architectural Services, Public Works Department.

71. That, prior to grading, the Owner shall include in the engineering design and cost estimate schedules provisions to abandon the existing sanitary sewer stub between existing Lots 19 and 20 (municipal addresses #23 and #27) on Penfold Court to the north-most existing manhole on Penfold Court entirely at the owner’s expense to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management.
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Transport Canada

72. That, during any phase of construction, the disposal of waste that is edible by, or attractive to birds shall be properly covered and managed so that it does not attract birds, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Airport Manager and Transport Canada.

73. That, during any phase of construction, the installation of any construction crane should be coordinated with the Hamilton Airport Manager and with Transport Canada. Also, in advance of construction, an Aeronautical Obstruction Clearance Form must be submitted to Transport Canada for assessment, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Airport Manager and Transport Canada.

NOTES TO DRAFT PLAN APPROVAL

Pursuant to Section 51(32) of the Planning Act, draft approval shall lapse if the plan is not given final approval within three years. However, extensions will be considered if a written request is received before the draft approval lapses.
Hello Brenda

I am planning on attending the meeting at The Wing this evening. In case I don’t get to speak with you (at length) I would like to mention a few things that bother me about this project.

First—The name “Mountaingate”. Dreadful – anything with “gate” on the end of it is immediately negative. (Maybe that says something about the entire project.) There has to be another name that would suit the history of the property e.g. “Leeming Estates” “Glanford Estates”. (probably too posh sounding)

Second-The number of homes. I realize the Province wants to jam as many homes as possible in the least amount of space, but this is simply ridiculous. Right next to a prospective industrial park, next to a highway and what could be a much busier airport – Horrors!!

Third-Airport Road is already quite busy and adding many hundreds of additional cars to the mix is going to be dreadful. Especially with the school there. And to think that much of the cars from the southern portion driving along Provident Way and then onto Homestead Drive to Airport Road. Not good planning!

Airport Road has not seen any improvement to speak of since “Nordair” first came to fly and hoards of people came to see the jets.

Enough for now. See you this evening.
Hi Brenda.

The drawings and concepts look great. I am happy to see the area grow. I have one addition I feel that is needed for the Mount Hope community. Please include a trail system that incorporates the already existing neighbourhoods and the new proposed area. The area is in need of more nature area as well as what is being proposed. Build the trails along with the development so people of Mount Hope also have access to nature and trails.

Sincerely
Good Evening Brenda,

Do you have any more information in regards to the proposed development in Mount Hope? We currently do not live in the area but are looking to move there! Do you know who the developer is and who the builder would be? An approximate cost of what the houses will be selling for? And an estimated start date for construction?

Thank you
Sincerely

Sent from my iPhone
Further to our conversation over Facebook. I am emailing you to find out the particulars on looking to purchase a lot at the new mount Hope development site. (Gateway community?) could you please provide me information so that I can pursue my interest in living in mount Hope.

Thank you in advance.
Subject: questions

Hello Brenda, It was nice to see you the other night at the WING. I have two questions that you may be able to answer 1. when is the land behind us likely to be start development? The land behind Penfold Ct. And 2. are we included in the merger of Horizon? or are we left out again, and at the mercy of Hydro One? We did call city hall Re: the development, but did not get a callback or reply.
Sent: Friday, March 31, 2017 7:47 AM
To: Clackett, Robert; Johnson, Brenda
Subject: Regarding: UHOPA-15-003/ZAC-07-11 (R)/25T-200723 (R)

Hello Mr Clackett;
I sent you a email in regards to the above mentioned on July 5th 2016. I received a email back from you saying that there would probably not be any meetings till the new year...as of now I have not heard anything about up coming meetings. Is there anything pending for the near future.
Please let me know.
I received a letter in the mail with respect to the Hotz and Sons revised plan for Mountaingate subdivision on 9255 Airport Rd W. Attached to this mailing was a drawing that is nearly impossible to read.

Can send me the pdf copy of this so I can take a better look at it? It was the last pages of that letter and had an overview of the entire property and how it is proposed to be utilized for housing etc.

I specifically have a question around what appears to be Block 138 as it is near my property. The wording indicates Institution or Mixed use Condominium. I guess I am wondering if this area is still for the School Board to use for a new building (either Separate or Public Board)

Finally, this letter indicates that there is going to be a published report on the input received from the public. How can I get a copy of this when it is available? I would like to see it before the public meeting that is to be held in the future.

Thanks in advance
Good Afternoon Brenda

The letter I have attached to this email includes your name on page 3 at the bottom.

Therefore, I hope you have some knowledge of the events that will be taking place in the next while.

My house is highlighted in yellow – 18 Aberdeen Avenue, Mount Hope

My neighbor that owns the land behind us has just recently sold his property at 80 Marion Street. It is a large property that was purchased by a developer.

As there is such a long list of possibilities on page 1 of the letter; I was hoping you could give me some insight as to what type of homes will be built on the section behind my house and the developers name.

Thank you very much for all the help you can give me.
---Original Message---

Sent: June-19-16 1:23 PM
To: Clackett, Robert
Subject: UHOPA-15-003/zac-07-11(R)/25T-200723(R) - Mountain Gate Subdivision Mount Hope

Hi Robert,

I reside at 31 Penfold Crt. in Mount Hope and have received the revised plan for the Mountain Gate Subdivision by mail. The map plan included in the mailing is too small for me to read and decipher what is happening at the rear of my property.

Is it possible for you to email me a larger digital copy of better quality that I can actually read? Or perhaps you can advise me of where I could find an online posting of better quality?

I am interested in what is happening to the easement at the rear of my property and the elevation level of the proposed houses in lots 94-108 in this new subdivision and also the proposed timelines for this development.

Thank you
Hi Yvette and Melanie,

Thanks for taking the time to meet with me today. The discussion was very helpful. If you could please provide any information that is available for the Mountaingate subdivision, such as any studies, the latest concept plan, etc., that would be appreciated. It would be great to get Hotz’s contact info as well.

As a recap (correct me if anything was misinterpreted) we discussed the following:

- Explore the possibility of connecting to the Mountaingate subdivision via Spitfire Drive. Question: in order for this to occur, doesn’t the park have to be shifted?
- The City is not party to the Park Swap agreement between Hotz and Frisina. In order for this agreement to be carried out, cooperation between us (if we acquire this property) and Hotz is necessary.
- The fire department is interested in a land swap with Frisina, but there is not yet any formal agreement. The mechanism for the land swap would be either through land severance or the City will have to declare the Fire Department’s land a surplus. Question: if the land swap is for an equal amount of land (i.e. there is no money being exchanged, just an equal amount of land from both parties, does land surplus still have to be declared?
- The Significant Woodland will have to be explored with Melissa Kitty and an ecologist to determine the extent of the woodland and what kind of buffer may be required. Also, the value of the water feature draining through the land once the SWM pond is decommissioned will have to be explored to determine if the City and NPCA are interested in protecting this feature.

Thanks again,
Hi Brenda

Thank you for your dedication to our small but growing town of Mt Hope. I've had the honour of living here for almost 40 years now.

I had planned to attend the open house held last Monday but unfortunately had to attend a funeral out of town. I read with interest the article that appeared in our Glanbrook Gazette and have a question that I hope you can answer.

It stated that there is a section of land that is to be developed between White Church Road, the bypass and Airport road. Can you give me a more exact location? We live at 9043 White Church, just a few houses down from Hwy 6. Will that new development be behind us? I was under the impression that it was zoned greenspace.

Any information you can provide would be greatly appreciated.

Thanking you in advance
Good morning Alvin and Brenda

I'm a resident of Mount Hope for 10 years and I live at 154 Rosebury Way. I would like to express my objection against the zoning plan for UHOPA-15-003/ZAC-07-111(R)/ 25T-200723(R).

I'm specifically against the addition of stacked homes in our neighbourhood, according the to draft plans there is only going to be 161 single detached home out of 643 which is only 25%.

I would like to see at minimum 60-70% of the new sub-division to be single detached homes and the remaining 30-40% townhouse.

I'm totally 100% against the introduction of stacked homes I don't want to see not even 1 of them.

Please do not approve this expansion as is, I know there has been a lot of people in my neighbourhood that are voicing this as a concern, the City of Hamilton must listen to its people and not the builders and developer.

If you have any questions or you would like to speak with me contact me via e-mail at

Thanks
I am replying to a letter sent by you on January 28, 2015 concerning the subdivision proposed behind my property at 125 Strathearn Place in Mount Hope. I have no issues with the subdivision itself but my concerns are about the water drainage from the subdivision. I have an 18' easement on my property for a drainage ditch which at times the water is 5'-6' high. I am concerned that this will increase without a proper culvert or sewer system being put in place. I look forward to hearing how this problem will be rectified at the public meeting.
BY EMAIL (alvin.chan@hamilton.ca)

(Original by ordinary mail)

February 13, 2015

City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development Planning, Heritage and Design
Suburban Team
71 Main Street West
5th Floor
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P 4Y5

Attention: Mr. Alvin Chan

Dear Sirs:

Re: “Mountaingate” Draft Plan of Subdivision (the “Hotz Subdivision”)

- Notice of Revised Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment, Revised Zoning
  By-Law Amendment and Approval for Revised Draft Plan of Subdivision
- UHOPA-15-003 / ZAC-07-111(R) / 25T-200723(R)
- 9255 Airport Road West, Glanbrook, Ontario (the “Hotz Subdivision”)

We are the solicitors for 1536708 Ontario Inc. Our client developed the Southampton Phase 1 (62M-992) and Southampton Phase 2 (62M-1051) plans of subdivisions located immediately to the east of the above-captioned proposed development.

In connection with the registration of the Southampton Phase 2 plan of subdivision, our client created a temporary stormwater management pond (the “Temporary Pond”) within the limits of Block 149 on Plan 62M-1051. In accordance with the terms of the draft plan approval and the subdivision agreement for the Southampton Phase 2 lands, the Temporary Pond was required to be maintained by our client until the Hotz Subdivision was developed, at which time our client will be entitled to develop the Temporary Pond for residential purposes. Accordingly, our client requires that any approvals pertaining to the Hotz Subdivision provide for the requirement of the construction of sufficient permanent stormwater management facilities, both in terms of quantity, quality, size, location and otherwise, such that, immediately upon registration of the Hotz Subdivision, our client will be entitled to fully develop the entirety of Block 149 on Plan 62M-1051 for residential purposes.

Additionally, upon registration of the Southampton Phase 1 plan of subdivision, temporary turning circles were required to be created upon the lands comprising the Hotz Subdivision at the westerly limits of Provident Way and Rosebury Way. Our client was required to post securities and enter into an Indemnity Agreement with the adjoining owner in respect of the construction and maintenance of such temporary turnaround circles. Our client will thus further require that all such securities and Indemnity Agreement be fully and finally released immediately upon registration of the Hotz Subdivision, and that the applicable one foot reserves be lifted therefrom.
We trust that this makes clear our client's position in respect of the above-captioned development applications. By copy of this letter we are requesting that our office be provided with notice of any public or other meetings at which the subject applications will be considered. Please also provide our office with notice of the adoption of the proposed Official Plan Amendment, or of the refusal of a request to amend the Official Plan and/or the adoption of the proposed Zoning By-Law Amendment, or of the refusal of a request to amend the Zoning By-Law or of any decision of the City of Hamilton in respect of the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision. Would you kindly ensure this correspondence is accordingly provided to members of the Planning Committee and City Council prior to any such public or other meeting?

We further confirm that this letter is intended to be, and shall be considered, a written submission to the City of Hamilton such that our client shall be entitled to appeal any decision of the City of Hamilton pertaining to the subject Official Plan amendment, Zoning By-Law and/or Draft Plan of Subdivision.

Should you have any questions or comments, or require anything further, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours very truly,
-----Original Message-----

Sent: February-08-13 7:23 PM
To: Chan, Alvin
Cc: mirella buist; Alvisia Maga; Johnson, Brenda; Robichaud, Steve; Fabac, Anita; Kitay, Tami
Subject: File: uhopa-15-003

Hi Alvin,

We live on [REDACTED] the proposed developed land. Water flow has always been an issue in this area as we get a lot of water run off from the wooded area and farmer's field. Can you please provide a detailed analysis of the water catchment plan and sewers for the area. We just want to make sure that the new development is prepared for the amount of water that the area passes. And, that our houses are not the recipient of higher water flow.

We have documented photos and videos of the water situation when it's running high (if you need to see it, please let me know).

Can you please respond in writing so that we have a detailed paper trail in the event of a flooding situation?
Alvin,

I received a letter in the mail with respect to the Hotz and Sons revised plan for Mountaingate subdivision on 9255 Airport Rd W.
Attached to this mailing was a drawing that is nearly impossible to read.

Can send me the pdf copy of this so I can take a better look at it? It was the last page of that letter and had an overview of the entire property and how it is proposed to be utilized for housing etc.

I guess I am also wondering what this property is currently zoned as and what the different blocks are going to be rezoned as. I assume it is currently as Agricultural as it is farmed... Most I have a query around what appears to be Block 140 as it is near my property. The wording indicates Institution or Mixed use Condominium. Would that be the same zoning – or is there a decision point that needs to be made to find out what zone it will be?

For clarification, what is institutional or mixed use and what does it cover in terms of buildings that would be erected?

Finally, this letter indicates that there is going to be a published report on the input received from the public. How can I get a copy of this when it is available? I would like to see it before the public meeting that is to be held in the future.

Thanks in advance
CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW NO. _____

A by-law to amend Zoning By-law 05-200 to permit the development of commercial uses on lands located at 9255 Airport Road West (Glanbrook)

WHEREAS the City of Hamilton has in force several Zoning By-laws which apply to the different areas incorporated into the City by virtue of the City of Hamilton Act, 1999, S. O. 1999 Chap. 14;

WHEREAS the City of Hamilton is the lawful successor to the former Municipalities identified in Section 1.7 of By-law No. 05-200;

WHEREAS Zoning By-law No. 05-200 was enacted on the 25th day of May, 2005;

WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton, in adopting Section ____ of Report 18-__ of the Planning Committee at its meeting held on the 16th day of January 2018, recommended that Zoning By-law No. 05-200, be amended as hereinafter provided; and,

WHEREAS this By-law will be in conformity with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and the Rural Hamilton Official Plan, upon finalization of Official Plan Amendment No. ____;

1. That Map No. 1747 and 1748 of Schedule “A” - Zoning Maps, of Zoning By-law No. 05-200, be amended as follows:

   a. by adding to the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200, the lands the extent and boundaries of which are shown as Schedule “A” to this By-law; and,

   b. by establishing a District Commercial (C6) Zone, to the lands the extent and boundaries of which are shown as Schedule “A” to this By-law.

2. That the Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to proceed with the giving of notice of the passing of this By-law, in accordance with the Planning Act.
PASSED and ENACTED this ______ day of January, 2018.

__________________________________  ________________________________
F. Eisenberger                        R. Caterini
MAYOR                                CLERK
ZAR-07-011
This is Schedule "A" to By-law No. 18-
Passed the ........... day of .................., 2018

Schedule "A"

Map Forming Part of By-law No. 18-______
to Amend By-law No.

Subject Property
9255 Airport Road West, Glenbrook
- Lands to be added to By-law 05-200 and Zoned District Commercial (C6) Zone
- Refer to By-law No. 484
- Refer to By-law No. 05-200
TO: Chair and Members
Planning Committee

COMMITTEE DATE: January 16, 2018

SUBJECT / REPORT NO: Preliminary Screening for the Request to Designate 650 and 672 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton, Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (Ward 8) (PED18001)

WARD(S) AFFECTED: Ward 8

PREPARED BY: Jeremy Parsons
905-546-2424 Ext. 1214

SUBMITTED BY: Steve Robichaud
Director, Planning and Chief Planner
Planning and Economic Development Department

SIGNATURE:

RECOMMENDATION

(a) That Council direct and authorize staff to undertake a Cultural Heritage Assessment of 650 and 672 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton, shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18001, to determine whether the property is of cultural heritage value worthy of designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act;

(b) That the Cultural Heritage Assessment work be assigned a high priority and be added to staff’s work plan for completion and presentation to the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee (HMHC) no later than December 31, 2018, as per the attached Appendix “G” to Report PED18001;

(c) That should the Cultural Heritage Assessment determine that 650 and 672 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton, is of cultural heritage value or interest, a Statement of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and Description of Heritage Attributes be prepared by staff for Council’s consideration for designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act;

(d) Pursuant to Section 27(1.2) of the Ontario Heritage Act, that Council direct staff to add the respective buildings located at 650 and 672 Sanatorium Road, shown in Appendix “A” of Report PED18001, to the Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest (the “Register”), following consultation with the HMHC as per the Council-approved Designation Process (see Appendix “D” to Report PED18001);
(e) Pursuant to Section 27(5) of the Ontario Heritage Act, that Council require that any notice of intention to demolish or remove any structure or building on 650 and 672 Sanatorium Road, shown in Appendix “A” to Report PED18001, include a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment report, to the satisfaction and approval of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner;

(f) That a copy of Report PED18001 be forwarded to the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee for information and consultation; and,

(g) That a copy of Report PED18001 be forwarded to the property owner and the designation requestors for information.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The subject lands known municipally as 650 and 672 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton, (see location map and photographs attached as Appendices “A” and “C” to Report PED18001) is a total of 6.51 acres and contains the following features:

- The Medical Superintendent’s Residence (also known as Residence 37 and the San House): Colonial Revival campus residence built in 1922;
- The Patterson Building: Collegiate Gothic institutional building built in 1932;
- Early-mid 20th century accessory garage building;
- Modern accessory building;
- Two large surface parking lots; and,
- A substantial lawn area with a number of large trees.

On August 22, 2017 staff received a letter requesting designation under the Ontario Heritage Act for the property located at 650 Sanatorium Road (the “San House”). On October 16, 2017, staff received a second formal designation request, from the same party to include the property located at 672 Sanatorium Road (the “Patterson Building”). Both buildings are located on the same parcel of land despite having separate municipal addresses.

The property is currently listed on the City’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and / or Historical Interest as a Cultural Heritage Landscape. The property is not designated under Part IV or V of the Ontario Heritage Act, listed on the Register, or subject to a Heritage Conservation Easement Agreement.
Through this Report, staff have determined that 650 and 672 Sanatorium Road meets all three categories of the criteria contained in Ontario Regulation 9/06 and is considered to have design/physical value, historical/associative value, and contextual value. Staff recommend that Council direct and authorize staff to carry out a Cultural Heritage Assessment of 650 and 672 Sanatorium Road to determine whether the property is of sufficient cultural heritage value to merit designation under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. Staff recommend that the Cultural Heritage Assessment work be assigned a high priority within the staff work plan.

**Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 8**

**FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

**Financial:** None

**Staffing:** None

**Legal:**

The City’s Legal Counsel was consulted in the preparation of the original 2008 staff report regarding the formal Designation Process (Report PED08211), the recommendations of which are summarized below:

Owner consent is not required for designation of a property under the Ontario Heritage Act. Accordingly, a Council may decide that it is in the public and/or community interest to conserve a property, despite objections by the owner.

As per the Council-approved Designation Process (see Appendix “C” to Report PED18001), this Report provides staff with direction to complete further research and evaluation of the properties for a later decision by Council. If staff are directed to proceed, Council will make a decision on designation at a subsequent stage in the designation process once a staff report has been prepared, and Cultural Heritage Assessment, a draft designation By-law, advice from the HMHC, and the positions of the property owners and any other interested parties are presented.

**HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

The subject property, known municipally as 650 and 672 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton, was previously included in the lands of the former Mountain Sanatorium (and later Chedoke Hospital) on the western brow of the Niagara Escarpment. The Sanatorium lands once contained approximately 30 buildings. The Mountain Sanatorium was officially opened in 1906 by the Governor General Earl Grey. The institution was Canada’s fourth sanatorium but the largest of its kind in Canada. During the early 20th
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century, tuberculosis was a severe disease that affected thousands of people. The original Mountain Sanatorium contained upwards of 15 buildings, many of them simple wood-frame structures. Following efforts to contain outbreaks during the First World War, the Federal government invested in more substantial structures, including the following structures still standing in the vicinity: the Long & Bisby Building (1920), the Bruce Memorial Building (1922), the Southam Pavilion (1928), the Evel Pavilion (1932), the Wilcox Pavilion (1938), and the Holbrook Pavilion (1951).

The San House was built in 1922 for Dr. John Howard Holbrook, the hospital’s medical superintendent from 1908-1945 and served subsequent hospital uses in the latter half of the 20th century. The San House replaced the former farmhouse, purposed as the residence of Dr. John Howard Holbrook and family, that was destroyed by fire that same year. The property currently sits vacant but does not appear to have been added to the City’s Vacant Building Registry. The Patterson Building was built in 1932 as a residence for 45 nurses. The building was renovated as early as 1975 for office use, and currently houses Columbia International College. Both properties are listed on the City’s Inventory of Buildings or Architectural and / or Historical Interest as part of a Cultural Heritage Landscape.

On August 22, 2017 staff received a letter with seven (7) signatures from nearby residents of the subject lands requesting designation under the Ontario Heritage Act for the property located at 650 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton. Staff served the owners with Notice of this request on September 14, 2017. On October 16, 2017, staff received a second formal designation request from the same residents to include the property located at 672 Sanatorium Road. The residents had originally requested designation for 565 Sanatorium Road (which is located across the street). After staff followed up to confirm the request, the requestors clarified that the designation request was intended for the Patterson Building (672 Sanatorium Road). Staff served the owners with Notice of this request on October 17, 2017.

Under the Council approved process for requests to designate, preliminary screening reports are presented to Planning Committee and Council, after which a copy is provided to the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee. After consultation with HMHC, the property may be placed on the Register.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS

Provincial Policy Statement (2014):

Section 2.6 of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) pertains to Cultural Heritage and Archaeology and Subsection 2.6.1 states that “significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved”. The recommendations of
this Report will enable the City to better facilitate the conservation of the subject property and, therefore, are consistent with this policy.

Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP):

Volume 1, Section B.3.4 - Cultural Heritage Resources Policies of the UHOP states that the City shall “protect and conserve the tangible cultural heritage resources of the City, including archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes” (B.3.4.2.1(a)), and “identify cultural heritage resources through a continuing process of inventory, survey, and evaluation, as a basis for the wise management of these resources” (B.3.4.2.1(b)). These policies demonstrate Council’s commitment to the identification, protection, and conservation of cultural heritage resources; the recommendations of this Report comply with these policies.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION

Staff have been in contact with the requesting parties as well as the property owner. Following each of the letters requesting designation, staff have served notice of the request upon the property owner (see Appendix “H” to Report PED18001). Staff were first contacted by phone on June 23, 2017 by Ms. Deborah Clinton, a neighbouring property owner, inquiring about requesting designation for the San House. On June 26, 2017 staff were contacted by phone by Mr. Victor Lee of ATA Architects, inquiring about the status of the property and indicating that the current direction of the property owner is to eventually tear down the San House as part of future development of the lands. Staff have noted to Mr. Lee that discussions have begun on a heritage designation request for the subject property. Subsequently, staff have maintained communication with the requesting parties; with Mr. Lee; and with Ms. Nadine Nock, executive assistant at Columbia International College. Staff have also informed the Ward Councillor of the designation requests through the carbon copy of a letter sent to the property owners (see Appendix “H” to Report PED18001). A copy of this Report will be sent to the property owners as well to the requesting parties.

ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

Preliminary Evaluation – Ontario Regulation 9 / 06:

In 2006, the Province issued criteria for determining cultural heritage value or interest under the Ontario Heritage Act. The regulation identifies three (3) broad categories of criteria: Design / Physical Value, Historical / Associative Value, and Contextual Value, under which three (3) subsets of criteria are further identified (see Appendix “E” to Report PED18001).

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.
OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.
OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.
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1) Design / Physical Value:

The property known municipally as 650 and 672 Sanatorium Road includes two prominent buildings estimated to be of significant cultural heritage value. The San House (or Residence 37) was built in 1922 as the residence of medical superintendent Dr. John H. Holbrook. The red brick building is an excellent example of Colonial Revival architecture with a high, symmetrical profile, a steeply-pitched side gable roof, and pedimented dormers along the front and rear roof. The building includes a decorative doorway with sidelights, transom, and an early or original door. The entrance is covered by a columned portico. The building's windows have all been replaced but are punctuated by stone sills and brick lintels with stone keystones. The building's slate roof material may also be original to the home (see Appendix “C” to Report PED18001 for photographs of the building). One historical account indicates that the San House was “finished in quarter-cut oak, a gift of Guy Long of the Long Lumber Company” (Ralph Wilson, Chedoke: More Than a Sanatorium, 2006).

The Patterson Building was built in 1932 and is a reserved example of Collegiate Gothic architecture (1890-1940). The brick building has long, rectangular, and balanced massing. The front façade has two large projecting pedimented sections capped with decorative stone niches at the apexes. The central entrance is projected and features attached flanking pilasters and an attractive stone hood moulding surrounding the doorway. The Patterson Building includes a modern glass addition on the south end and a less contemporary addition at the rear. The rear of the building features a simple brick face with stone sills, soldier course brick lintels, and stone stringcourses running the length of the wall. The building includes modern windows throughout (see Appendix “C” to Report PED18001 for photographs of the building).

2) Historical / Associative Value:

The property is included in the former Mountain Sanatorium Cultural Heritage Landscape. The property has a lengthy institutional history as hospital lands. The former sanatorium was a treatment centre for patients with tuberculosis during the 20th century. The San House is associated with Dr. John Howard Holbrook, medical superintendent from 1908-1945. As both a resident and superintendent, Dr. Holbrook was pivotal in the sanatorium’s eminence as an expansive treatment centre for tuberculosis and, later, the institution’s transition to an emergency hospital in the 1960s. The Patterson Building is named after Thomas Patterson, Hamilton Health Association board member from 1918 to 1928. The building’s Collegiate Gothic architecture parallels other buildings that form a part of the heritage landscape, including the Southam Pavilion, Wilcox Pavilion, and Evel Pavilion each located on adjacent property. The Patterson Building housed resident nurses until 1975 when it was renovated for office space. Both buildings are directly connected to the history of the lands and form significant elements of the former Mountain Sanatorium Cultural Heritage Landscape.
3) Contextual Value:

The property is a part of the former Mountain Sanatorium (and later Chedoke Hospital Sanatorium) lands. The Patterson Building and the San House each contribute to the context of this campus landscape and stand as tangible features of the landscape’s historical narrative. The property is located adjacent to other former sanatorium properties located within the area. The property includes an expansive lawn with numerous mature trees, pointing to the site’s former pastoral character.

Conclusion:

Staff concludes that the property known municipally as 650 and 672 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton, is of sufficient cultural heritage value to warrant further research and assessment of the property for potential designation under the Ontario Heritage Act.

Work Plan Priority:

The Council approved Designation Process provides for the prioritization of detailed research and assessment work. Within the annual work plan, Planning staff can typically process three (3) to four (4) properties through the designation process. These priorities generally fall within the following time frames: high-priority (0-1 years), medium priority (2-3 years), and low priority (4+ years). The current work plan extends to the year 2034 and contains seventy-three (73) properties pending review for designation.

Work plan priorities are assigned based on a number of factors, including:

- Heritage value associated with the property;
- Risk to the property with respect to demolition or removal;
- Current level of property maintenance;
- Funding eligibility;
- City ownership of the property; and,
- Work plan / staff resources.

Staff are recommending that the subject property be assigned as a high priority designation for completion in 2018 (see Appendix “G” to Report PED18001), based on the lack of protections in place and the possible demolition of the San House. The further research and assessment work will provide Council with adequate information upon which to base a decision regarding designation under the Ontario Heritage Act. The currently approved work plan priorities are contained in Appendix “F” to Report PED18001. At the time of preparing this Report, the City has not received any applications for the demolition of the subject property. However, the building has been vacant. Given the property’s vulnerable state due to it being vacant, staff recommend
that Council require that, following its addition to the Register, any Notice of Intention to Demolish the building on the subject property include a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment to protect the City’s interest in the building, in the interim period before a Cultural Heritage Assessment can be prepared (see recommendation (d) to Report PED18001).

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION

1. Direct Staff Not to Carry Out a Cultural Heritage Assessment

   Council could direct staff not to carry out a Cultural Heritage Assessment. This alternative would be contrary to the Council-approved Designation Process (see Appendix “D” to Report PED18001) for considering requests for designation. The Designation Process anticipates that, when legitimate requests for designation are received, a Cultural Heritage Assessment will be completed so that Council can then consider designation with all of the pertinent information before it. As such, staff do not support this recommendation.

2. Assign Different Work Plan Priority

   Council may assign a different work plan priority for the Cultural Heritage Assessment than recommended by staff. Given the consideration of all the factors noted in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation section of this Report, staff are of the opinion that the recommended work plan priority is warranted. As such, staff do not support this recommendation.

ALIGNMENT TO THE 2016 – 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN

Built Environment and Infrastructure

*Hamilton is* supported by state of the art infrastructure, transportation options, buildings and public spaces that create a dynamic City.

Culture and Diversity

*Hamilton is* a thriving, vibrant place for arts, culture, and heritage where diversity and inclusivity are embraced and celebrated.

APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED

- Appendix “A”: Location Map
- Appendix “B”: Designation Requests for 650 and 672 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton
- Appendix “C”: Historical and Contemporary Photographs
- Appendix “D”: Council-Approved Designation Process

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.
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- Appendix “E”: Ontario Regulation 9 / 06: Criteria for Determining Cultural Heritage Value or Interest
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N.T.S.
Designation Request for 650 Sanatorium Road: Received by staff August 22, 2017

July 4, 2017

Dear Jeremy Parsons,

We the undersigned, are residents living in the vicinity of 650 Sanatorium Road and are seeking to have this property designated under the Ontario Heritage Act.

We believe that there is significant history associated with this house and would like to see it protected.

For the purposes of continued communication, please contact Deb Clinton, debclinton@rogers.com.

Thank you,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>E-Mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>267 West 33rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>204 West 33rd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>216 W 33rd St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>208 W 33rd St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>192 W 33rd St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>187 W 33rd St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>199 W 33rd St</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Designation Request for 672 Sanatorium Road: Received by staff October 16, 2017

October 16, 2017

Dear Jeremy,

Please accept this letter on behalf of a group of residents on West 33 Street regarding a request for 650 Sanatorium and 672 Sanatorium be considered for historical designation.

Thank You,

Deb Clinton
Figure 1: Front (south) façade of the former Medical Superintendent’s Residence, the “San House”, at 650 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton (Historical Hamilton, 2015).

Figure 2: A closer view of the symmetrical southern façade showing the columned portico, window keystones, slate roof, and Classical pedimented dormers (2017).
Figure 3: View from the southwest corner of the roofline profile. The image displays slate siding on the dormers, projected brick corbel corners, and modillion brackets on the underside of an extended cornice soffit (2017).
Figure 4: View of the rear of the building (north and west elevations) showing a matching profile with equivalent pedimented dormers. An early one-and-a-half storey aluminum and wooden-clad addition is shown on the eastern portion of the rear façade (2017).

Figure 5: A closer look at the rear of the building (2017).
Figure 6: An accessory garage building on the property with a yet unknown history (2017).

Figure 7: An early photograph of the San House, looking west. A bank barn which was believed to be torn down in the late 1930s can be seen in the background (Ralph Wilson, Chedoke: More Than a Sanatorium, 2006).
Figure 8: A circa 1930s photograph showing the rear of the building, the early wood-clad addition, and two automobiles (Wilson, Chedoke, 2006).

Figure 9: The original farmhouse on the property that was purposed as the home of the Holbrook family until it was destroyed by fire in 1922 (Wilson, Chedoke, 2006).
Figure 10: In 1919, the Prince of Wales (Prince Edward) visited Hamilton, including the Mountain Sanatorium. He is seen here walking with Dr. Holbrook on the grounds of 650 Sanatorium Road, the original farmhouse seen in the background (Wilson, Chedoke, 2006).

Figure 11: Dr. John Howard Holbrook and his family on the front porch of the San House, circa 1926 (Wilson, Chedoke, 2006).
Figure 12: The southern end of the front (west) façade of the Patterson Building now owned and adaptively-reused by Columbia International College. The projected entrance features a subtle ogee arch peak and an attractive hood moulding made of stone (2017).

Figure 13: The northern end of the front façade. The building displays a restrained application of the Gothic Collegiate style with roofline enhanced with open stone niches (2017).
Figure 14: The southern end of the rectangular Patterson Building with a projecting modern glass addition housing a connecting stairwell (2017).

Figure 15: The rear (east) portion of the building. Note the modern addition, off-colour brick elevator addition, and modern windows. The brick building features a simple rear façade with stone sills, soldier course brick lintels, and stone stringcourses running the length of the façade (2017).
Figure 16: An early photograph (ca. 1930s) of the Patterson Building (Wilson, *Chedoke*, 2006).

Figure 17: The Patterson Building was built as a nurse residence in 1932. Pictured are a group of “Patterson Nurses” (Wilson, *Chedoke*, 2006).
DESIGNATION PROCESS

1. Designation initiated
   - Council
   - MHC
   - Owner
   - Third Party

2. Preliminary Staff screening property meets one or more of three Ontario Heritage Act (OHA) criteria
   - (Yes)
   - Property does not move forward and person/body that initiated request informed
   - (No)

3. Staff Report and Preliminary Screening To EDPC and Council for direction and prioritization
   - (No)
   - Denial. Request does not move forward
   - (Yes)

4. High Place on Current Year Work Plan
   - Medium Place on Work Plan in 2-3 Years
   - Low Place on Work Plan in 4-5 Years

5. Property placed in register after consultation with MHC

6. Full cultural heritage assessment prepared (full screening with City criteria and OHA criteria)

7. Assessment reviewed by
   - Inventory and Research Subcommittee of the Municipal Heritage Committee

8. MHC considers staff assessment

9. MHC provides advice to EDPC via Staff report and recommendation

10. Staff Report, Cultural Heritage Assessment, Draft By-law and Statement of Cultural Heritage Value forwarded to EDPC for consideration

11. Council makes a decision on the proposed designation
   - (Yes)
   - Proposed designation approved
   - Notice of Intent to Designate served and advertised
   - (No)
   - Proposed designation referred to Conservation Review Board (CRB)

12. Objection received within 30 days

13. Proposed designation referred to Conservation Review Board (CRB)

14. CRB hearing and report

15. Council considers CRB report and recommendations
   - (Yes)
   - Notice of Withdrawal
   - (No)

16. Designation by-law passed and registered on title

Council Approved on October 29, 2008
Ontario Heritage Act

ONTARIO REGULATION 9 / 06:
CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING CULTURAL HERITAGE VALUE OR INTEREST

Criteria

1. (1) The criteria set out in subsection (2) are prescribed for the purposes of clause 29 (1) (a) of the Act. O. Reg. 9 / 06, s. 1 (1).

(2) A property may be designated under section 29 of the Act if it meets one or more of the following criteria for determining whether it is of cultural heritage value or interest:

1. The property has design value or physical value because it,
   i. is a rare, unique, representative or early example of a style, type, expression, material or construction method,
   ii. displays a high degree of craftsmanship or artistic merit, or
   iii. demonstrates a high degree of technical or scientific achievement.

2. The property has historical value or associative value because it,
   i. has direct associations with a theme, event, belief, person, activity, organization or institution that is significant to a community,
   ii. yields, or has the potential to yield, information that contributes to an understanding of a community or culture, or
   iii. demonstrates or reflects the work or ideas of an architect, artist, builder, designer or theorist who is significant to a community.

3. The property has contextual value because it,
   i. is important in defining, maintaining or supporting the character of an area,
   ii. is physically, functionally, visually or historically linked to its surroundings, or
   iii. is a landmark. O. Reg. 9 / 06, s. 1 (2).
Staff Work Plan for Designation under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (as amended by a Council Motion on June 14, 2017)

*Denotes a completed designation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Kelly House*</td>
<td>2042 Jerseyville Rd</td>
<td>Ancaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Tisdale House*</td>
<td>314 Wilson St E</td>
<td>Ancaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Book House</td>
<td>167 Book Rd E</td>
<td>Ancaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Dundas Post Office</td>
<td>104 King St W</td>
<td>Dundas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Desjardins Canal</td>
<td>- Dundas</td>
<td>Dundas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Vimy Oak Tree*</td>
<td>79 Hamilton St N</td>
<td>Flamborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Woodburn Hall*</td>
<td>1062 Golf Club Rd</td>
<td>Glanbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Gore Park</td>
<td>1 Hughson St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>King George School</td>
<td>77 Gage Ave N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Auchmar Gatehouse</td>
<td>71 Claremont Dr</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Centenary United Church</td>
<td>24 Main St W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Inglewood*</td>
<td>13-15 Inglewood Dr</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Treble Hall*</td>
<td>4-12 John St N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Barton Reservoir</td>
<td>111 Kenilworth Access</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>1395-1401 King St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Westdale Theatre*</td>
<td>1014 King St W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Royal Connaught</td>
<td>82-112 King St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Hambly House</td>
<td>170 Longwood Rd N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>MacNab Terrace*</td>
<td>262 MacNab St N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Gage Park</td>
<td>1000 Main St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Former Cathedral School</td>
<td>378 Main St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Carpenter Coach House*</td>
<td>1065 Hwy 8</td>
<td>Stoney Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Ferguson Pumping Station</td>
<td>231 Ferguson Ave S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Former Blacksmith Shop</td>
<td>2 Hatt St</td>
<td>Dundas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Jimmy Thompson Pool</td>
<td>1099 King St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>7 Ravenscliffe Ave</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Regency Cottage</td>
<td>39 Lakeview Dr</td>
<td>Stoney Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>W.H. Ballard School</td>
<td>801 Dunsmure Rd</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Memorial School</td>
<td>1175 Main St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>105 Erie Ave</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Kenilworth Library</td>
<td>103 Kenilworth Ave N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Former Union School</td>
<td>634 Rymal Rd W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Cannon Knitting Mill</td>
<td>134 Cannon St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Bell Building</td>
<td>17 Jackson St W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Oak Hall</td>
<td>10 James St N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Former Bank of Nova Scotia</td>
<td>54 King St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Former Elfrida United Church</td>
<td>2251 Rymal Rd E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Former Hamilton Distillery Company Building</td>
<td>16 Jarvis St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Former County Courthouse</td>
<td>50 Main St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Charlton-Hughson-Forest-John Block</td>
<td>39-49 Charlton Ave E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40, 50 Forest Ave</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>183-189 Hughson St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Copp Block</td>
<td>165-205 King St E (Except No. 193)</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Hughson House</td>
<td>103 Catharine St N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Hamilton Hydro</td>
<td>55 John St N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>First Pilgrim United Church</td>
<td>200 Main St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>St. John’s Evangelical Lutheran Church</td>
<td>37 Wilson St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Stelco Tower</td>
<td>100 King St W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Landmark Place / Century 21 Building</td>
<td>100 Main St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Hamilton Club</td>
<td>6 Main St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Commercial Building</td>
<td>189 Rebecca St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>George Armstrong School</td>
<td>460 Concession St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Gartshore Building</td>
<td>64 Hatt St</td>
<td>Dundas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Undercliffe</td>
<td>64 Aberdeen Ave</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Gateside</td>
<td>131-135 Aberdeen Ave</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Hereford House / Royal Alexandra</td>
<td>13-15 Bold St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19-21 Bold St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>192 Bold St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>Henson Court</td>
<td>170 Caroline St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>Central Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>252 Caroline St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>Eggshell Terrace</td>
<td>14-24 Charlton Ave W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>99 Duke St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>191 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>173 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Maple Lawn</td>
<td>254 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Widderly</td>
<td>274 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Bright Side / Sunny Side</td>
<td>280 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Balfour House</td>
<td>282 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>41 Charlton Ave W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>72 Charlton Ave W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>Stone Houses</td>
<td>14 Duke St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>98 Duke St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Herkimer Terrace</td>
<td>11-17 Herkimer St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Semi-detached Residence</td>
<td>44-46 Herkimer St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Residences</td>
<td>370 Hess St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Residences</td>
<td>378 Hess St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Residences</td>
<td>384 Hess St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>HREA Residence</td>
<td>203 MacNab St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>Moodie Residence</td>
<td>37 Aberdeen Ave</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>125 Aberdeen Ave</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>Gibson Residence</td>
<td>311 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>312 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>Cartwright Residence</td>
<td>321 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>Whitton Residence</td>
<td>351-353 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>Pigott Residence</td>
<td>358 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>Semi-detached Residence</td>
<td>64 Charlton Ave W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>First Hamilton Christian Reformed Church</td>
<td>181 Charlton Ave W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>Herkimer Apartments</td>
<td>86 Herkimer St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>347 Queen St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>403 Queen St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>The Castle / Amisfield</td>
<td>1 Duke St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Staff Work Plan for Designation under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* (as amended by a Council Motion on June 14, 2017)

*Denotes a completed designation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Kelly House*</td>
<td>2042 Jerseyville Road</td>
<td>Ancaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Tisdale House*</td>
<td>314 Wilson St E</td>
<td>Ancaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Book House</td>
<td>167 Book Rd E</td>
<td>Ancaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Dundas Post Office</td>
<td>104 King St W</td>
<td>Dundas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Desjardins Canal</td>
<td>- Dundas</td>
<td>Dundas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Vimy Oak Tree*</td>
<td>79 Hamilton St N</td>
<td>Flamborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Woodburn Hall*</td>
<td>1062 Golf Club Rd</td>
<td>Glanbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Gore Park</td>
<td>1 Hughson St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>King George School</td>
<td>77 Gage Ave N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Auchmar Gatehouse</td>
<td>71 Claremont Dr</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Centenary United Church</td>
<td>24 Main St W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Inglewood*</td>
<td>13-15 Inglewood Dr</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Treble Hall*</td>
<td>4-12 John St N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Barton Reservoir</td>
<td>111 Kenilworth Access</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Church</td>
<td>1395-1401 King St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Westdale Theatre*</td>
<td>1014 King St W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Royal Connaught</td>
<td>82-112 King St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Hambly House</td>
<td>170 Longwood Rd N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>MacNab Terrace*</td>
<td>262 MacNab St N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Gage Park</td>
<td>1000 Main St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Former Cathedral School</td>
<td>378 Main St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Carpenter Coach House*</td>
<td>1065 Hwy 8</td>
<td>Stoney Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Former Blacksmith Shop</td>
<td>2 Hatt St</td>
<td>Dundas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>San House &amp; Patterson Building</td>
<td>650 &amp; 672 Sanatorium Road</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Ferguson Pumping Station</td>
<td>231 Ferguson Ave S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Jimmy Thompson Pool</td>
<td>1099 King St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>7 Ravenscliffe Ave</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Regency Cottage</td>
<td>39 Lakeview Dr</td>
<td>Stoney Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>W.H. Ballard School</td>
<td>801 Dunsmure Rd</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Memorial School</td>
<td>1175 Main St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>105 Erie Ave</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Kenilworth Library</td>
<td>103 Kenilworth Ave N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Former Union School</td>
<td>634 Rymal Rd W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Cannon Knitting Mill</td>
<td>134 Cannon St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Bell Building</td>
<td>17 Jackson St W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Oak Hall</td>
<td>10 James St N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Former Bank of Nova Scotia</td>
<td>54 King St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Former Elfrida United Church</td>
<td>2251 Rymal Rd E</td>
<td>Stoney Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Former Hamilton Distillery Company Building</td>
<td>16 Jarvis St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>Former County Courthouse</td>
<td>50 Main St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Charlton-Hughson-Forest-John Block</td>
<td>39-49 Charlton Ave E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40,50 Forest Ave</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>183-189 Hughson St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>Copp Block</td>
<td>165-205 King St E (Except No. 193)</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Hughson House</td>
<td>103 Catharine St N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>Hamilton Hydro</td>
<td>55 John St N</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>First Pilgrim United Church</td>
<td>200 Main St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2023</td>
<td>St. John's Evangelical Lutheran Church</td>
<td>37 Wilson St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Stelco Tower</td>
<td>100 King St W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Landmark Place / Century 21 Building</td>
<td>100 Main St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Hamilton Club</td>
<td>6 Main St E</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>Commercial Building</td>
<td>189 Rebecca St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>George Armstrong School</td>
<td>460 Concession St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Gartshore Building</td>
<td>64 Hatt St</td>
<td>Dundas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Undercliffe</td>
<td>64 Aberdeen Ave</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Gateside</td>
<td>131-135 Aberdeen Ave</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>Hereford House /</td>
<td>13-15 Bold St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>192 Bold St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>Henson Court</td>
<td>170 Caroline St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>Central Presbyterian Church</td>
<td>252 Caroline St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>Eggshell Terrace</td>
<td>14-24 Charlton Ave W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>99 Duke St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027</td>
<td></td>
<td>191 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>173 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Maple Lawn</td>
<td>254 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Widderly</td>
<td>274 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Bright Side / Sunny Side</td>
<td>280 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Balfour House</td>
<td>282 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2028</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>41 Charlton Ave W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>72 Charlton Ave W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>Stone Houses</td>
<td>14 Duke St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2029</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>98 Duke St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Herkimer Terrace</td>
<td>11-17 Herkimer St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Semi-detached Residence</td>
<td>44-46 Herkimer St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>Residences</td>
<td>370 Hess St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>378 Hess St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>384 Hess St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030</td>
<td>HREA Residence</td>
<td>203 MacNab St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>Moodie Residence</td>
<td>37 Aberdeen Ave</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>125 Aberdeen Ave</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>Gibson Residence</td>
<td>311 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2031</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>312 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>Cartwright Residence</td>
<td>321 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>Whitton Residence</td>
<td>351-353 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>Pigott Residence</td>
<td>358 Bay St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032</td>
<td>Semi-detached Residence</td>
<td>64 Charlton Ave W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>First Hamilton Christian Reformed Church</td>
<td>181 Charlton Ave W</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2033</td>
<td>Herkimer Apartments</td>
<td>86 Herkimer St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>347 Queen St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>403 Queen St S</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2034</td>
<td>The Castle / Amisfield</td>
<td>1 Duke St</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
September 14, 2017

Columbia Chedoke Residence
1003 Main Street West
Hamilton, ON  L8S 4P3

RE: Request for heritage designation for property known municipally as 650 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton

Dear property owner,

On August 22, 2017 Cultural Heritage staff at the City of Hamilton received a formal request for designation for the property located at 650 Sanatorium Road under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*.

In accordance with the Council-approved process for designation requests, Cultural Heritage staff will be preparing a preliminary screening of the property in view of the criteria set out in the *Ontario Heritage Act* through a staff report.

This report is expected to be discussed at the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee on November 16, 2017; Planning Committee on December 5, 2017; and Council on December 13, 2017.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 905-546-2424 ext. 1214 or by email at jeremy.parsons@hamilton.ca

Sincerely,

Jeremy E. Parsons, B.A., M.A., CAHP intern
Planner II, Cultural Heritage
Development Planning, Heritage & Design

cc:  Victor Lee, ATA Architects Inc.
October 17, 2017

FILE: 650-672 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton

Columbia Chedoke Residence
c/o Vincent Chan
1003 Main Street West
Hamilton, ON L8S 4P3

Re: Request to Designate 650-672 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act

Dear Mr. Chan,

Please be advised that City of Hamilton staff have received requests to designate 650-672 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

On August 22, 2017 Cultural Heritage staff received a formal request for designation of the property located at 650 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton (Medical Superintendent’s Residence 37) and have served notification on September 14, 2017. On October 16, 2017 Cultural Heritage staff received a second formal designation request from the same requestors for the property located at 672 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton (Patterson Building). This letter serves as notification for this request.

In accordance with the Council-approved process for designation requests, Cultural Heritage staff will be finalizing preliminary screening reports for each of the aforementioned buildings in view of the criteria set out under the Ontario Heritage Act. You will be forwarded a copy of the staff report and the decision of City Council.

This report is expected to be presented at the City of Hamilton Planning Committee on January 16, 2018 and Council on January 24, 2018. Please note that these dates have been updated from the dates listed in the previous letter sent out on September 14, 2017. Given that both buildings are located on the same parcel of land, both requests will be discussed in the same report.

For more information on heritage designation, please find a copy of the City’s Heritage Designation Process brochure and infosheet attached. If you have any questions, please contact me at 905-546-2424 ext. 1214 or jeremy.parsons@hamilton.ca

Sincerely,

Jeremy E. Parsons, B.A., M.A., CAHP Intern
Planner II – Cultural Heritage
Development Planning, Heritage & Design
cc: Victor Lee, ATA Architects Inc. (victor@ataarchitectsinc.com)
    Nadine Nock, Columbia College (nnock@cic-totalcare.com)
    Ward 8 Councillor Terry Whitehead (terry.whitehead@hamilton.ca)
INFORMATION REPORT

TO: Chair and Members Planning Committee

COMMITTEE DATE: January 16, 2018

SUBJECT/REPORT NO: Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) on the City of Hamilton’s Refusal or Neglect to Adopt an Amendment to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, Town of Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464, and Draft Plan of Subdivision, for Lands Located at 9684, 9694, and 9714 Twenty Road West (Glanbrook) (Ward 11) (PED18009)

WARD(S) AFFECTED: Ward 11

PREPARED BY: Melanie Schneider (905) 546-2424 Ext. 1224

SUBMITTED BY: Steve Robichaud Director, Planning and Chief Planner Planning and Economic Development Department

SIGNATURE:

Council Direction:

In accordance with subsections 17(40), 17(40.1), 34(11), and 51(34) of the Planning Act, an Official Plan Amendment Application, Zoning By-law Amendment Application, and Draft Plan of Subdivision Application may be appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) after 120 days (Zoning By-law Amendment Application), 180 days (Draft Plan of Subdivision Application), and 270 days (Official Plan Amendment Application) if Council has not made a decision on the application.

A motion to direct staff to advise the Planning Committee on matters relating to appeals regarding lack of decision by Council, pursuant to the Planning Act was passed by City Council on May 18, 2010. This Information Report was prepared in accordance with Council’s policy for staff to advise the Planning Committee and City Council of appeals for non-decision to the OMB.

The following information is provided for Planning Committee’s information with regards to Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment Application UHOPA-15-12, Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-15-023, and Draft Plan of Subdivision Application 25T-201505, which have been appealed to the OMB for lack of decision.
SUBJECT: Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) on the City of Hamilton’s Refusal or Neglect to Adopt an Amendment to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, Town of Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464, and Draft Plan of Subdivision, for Lands Located at 9684, 9694, and 9714 Twenty Road West (Glanbrook) (Ward 11) (PED18009) - Page 2 of 3

Information:

The subject lands, municipally known as 9684, 9694, and 9714 Twenty Road West, Glanbrook, are located east of Glancaster Road and west of Garth Street (see location map attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED18009).

The lands are bound to the west by the Draft Approved Kopper Meadow Phase 2b Plan of Subdivision (2S-200522); to the north by the Villages of Glancaster Phases 3, 5, and 10 (Condominiums), to the east by existing single detached dwellings; and to the south by the Urban Hamilton and Rural Hamilton border.

The subject lands are irregular in shape, with broken frontage of 101.28 metres along Twenty Road West, a depth of 177.79 metres, and an area of 3.28 hectares. The lands are currently vacant.

Applications:

The applications were originally submitted on December 17, 2014, deemed incomplete on January 17, 2015, and deemed completed on April 29, 2015.

A revised submission was submitted on February 6, 2017. This revised concept proposes 27 lots for single detached dwellings, one block for 33 townhouse dwellings and one semi detached dwelling, five lots for single detached dwellings which will also function as a temporary stormwater management facility, one block for a permanent stormwater management facility, and one block for the extension of Kellogg Avenue. Additional lands at 9694 Twenty Road West were incorporated into the design to accommodate this revision (see Appendix “C” to Report PED18009).

Official Plan Amendment Application:

The proposed Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment Application (UHOPA-15-12) is to designate a portion of the lands from “Low Density Residential 2” to “Low Density Residential 2b” in the North-West Glanbrook Secondary Plan in Volume 2 of the UHOP, in order to permit the development of townhouse dwelling units.

Zoning By-law Amendment Application:

The purpose of the revised Zoning By-law Amendment Application (ZAC-15-023) is for a change in zoning from the Residential “H-R4-206” Holding Zone and the Existing Residential “ER” Zone to a modified Residential “H-R4” Holding Zone, a change from...
the Existing Residential “ER” Zone to a modified Residential “R4” Zone, a change from the Existing Residential “ER” Zone and the Residential “H-R4-206” Holding Zone to the Multiple Residential “RM3” Zone, a change from the Existing Residential “ER” Zone to the Residential “R4-244” Zone, Modified, and a change from the Residential “H-R4-206” Holding Zone, Modified and the Existing Residential “ER” Zone to the Conservation Hazard (P5) Zone. The effect of this revised application is for the development of 27 single detached dwellings, 33 townhouse dwellings, one semi detached dwelling, five lots for future single detached dwellings to encompass a temporary stormwater management facility, and a block for a permanent stormwater facility.

Draft Plan of Subdivision

The purpose of the Draft Plan of Subdivision Application (25T-201505) is to create 28 lots for single detached dwellings, one block for 36 townhouse dwelling units, one block for future development, 3 blocks for stormwater management purposes and one block for road widening purposes and the extension of Kellogg Avenue (see Appendix “B” to Report PED18009).

Neighbourhood meetings to discuss this proposal were held on June 3, 2015 and March 27, 2017, both organized by the applicant.

Issues remain with respect to the Stormwater Management design and design of the Silverbirch Boulevard termination. In addition, the required Tree Protection Plan is outstanding and the submitted Environmental Impact Study requires further information regarding the evaluation of vegetation protection zones. Finally, insufficient parking facilities have been proposed on site and justification for this deficiency from the applicant remains outstanding.

The appeals to the OMB were received by the City Clerk’s Office on November 16, 2017, 283 days after the receipt of the revised proposal, and 931 days after the original application was deemed complete.

Appendices and Schedules Attached

- Appendix “A”: Location Map
- Appendix “B”: Original Draft Plan of Subdivision
- Appendix “C”: Revised Draft Plan of Subdivision
- Appendix “D”: Appeal Letters
Appendix "A" to Report PED18009
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Location Map

Date: March 6, 2017

Appendix "A"

Subject Property

9684, 9694 & 9714 Twenty Road West

Key Map - Ward 11

N.T.S.
November 16, 2017

DEVELORED

Clerk
City of Hamilton
Office of the City Clerk
71 Main Street West, 1st Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Dear Clerk:

RE: 9684, 9694 and 9714 Twenty Road West, Hamilton, Ontario –
    Appeal by Harmony on Twenty Properties Inc. to the
    Ontario Municipal Board for Failure of the Approval Authority
    To make a Decision

Please find enclosed three appeals to the Ontario Municipal Board in respect to the above noted matter.

Yours very truly,

DUXBURY LAW
PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
Per:

[Signature]

Brian Duxbury
BD:me
Encls.
### Appendix D to Report PED18009
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**Appellant Form (A1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Appeal</th>
<th>Type of Appeal</th>
<th>Act Reference (Section)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Act Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Plan or Official Plan Amendment</td>
<td>Appeal a decision by local council that adopted an OP or OPA (exempt from approval by Minister or Approval Authority)</td>
<td>17(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that approved or did not approve all or part of a plan or amendment</td>
<td>17(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the plan within 180 days</td>
<td>17(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council failed to adopt the requested amendment within 180 days</td>
<td>22(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council refused the requested amendment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning By-law or Zoning By-law Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal the passing of a Zoning By-law</td>
<td>34(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law – failed to make a decision on the application within 120 days</td>
<td>34(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law – refused by the municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Control Zoning By-law</td>
<td>Appeal the passing of an Interim Control By-law</td>
<td>38(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Variance</td>
<td>Appeal a decision of the Committee of Adjustment that approved or refused the application</td>
<td>46(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent/Severance</td>
<td>Appeal a decision that approved or refused the application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal conditions imposed</td>
<td>53(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal changed conditions</td>
<td>53(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Application for consent – Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the application within 90 days</td>
<td>53(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan of Subdivision</td>
<td>Application for a plan of subdivision – Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the plan within 180 days</td>
<td>51(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that approved a plan of subdivision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that did not approve a plan of subdivision</td>
<td>51(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal a lapsing provision imposed by an Approval Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal conditions imposed by an Approval Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal conditions - after expiry of 20 day appeal period but before final approval (only applicant or public body may appeal)</td>
<td>51(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Appeal changed conditions</td>
<td>51(46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject of Appeal</td>
<td>Type of Appeal</td>
<td>Act Reference (Section)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>☐ Appeal a Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appeal an amendment to a Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>19(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge Complaint</td>
<td>☐ Appeal municipality’s decision regarding a complaint</td>
<td>22(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td>22(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-ending Agreement</td>
<td>☐ Objection to a front-ending agreement</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Objection to an amendment to a front-ending agreement</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Act Matters</td>
<td>☐ Appeal an Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>257.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>☐ Appeal an amendment to an Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>257.74(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Development Charge Complaint</td>
<td>☐ Appeal approval authority’s decision regarding a complaint</td>
<td>257.87(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td>257.87(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Resources Act Matters</td>
<td>☐ One or more objections against an application for a ‘Class A’ aggregate removal licence</td>
<td>11(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal Licence</td>
<td>☐ One or more objections against an application for a ‘Class B’ aggregate removal licence</td>
<td>11(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Application for a ‘Class A’ licence — refused by Minister</td>
<td>13(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Application for a ‘Class B’ licence — refused by Minister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Changes to conditions to a licence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Amendment of site plans</td>
<td>15(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Minister proposes to transfer the licence – applicant does not have licensee’s consent</td>
<td>18(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Minister proposes to refuse transfer of licence – applicant is licensee or has licensee’s consent to transfer</td>
<td>19(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Minister proposes to refuse transfer of licence – applicant does not have licensee’s consent to transfer</td>
<td>20(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Act Matters</td>
<td>☐ Appeal the passing of a by-law to divide the municipality into wards</td>
<td>222(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Boundary By-law</td>
<td>☐ Appeal the passing of a by-law to redivide the municipality into wards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appeal the passing of a by-law to dissolve the existing wards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act Matters</td>
<td>☐ Appeal the passing of a by-law designating a heritage conservation study area</td>
<td>40.1(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Conservation District</td>
<td>☐ Appeal the passing of a by-law designating a heritage conservation district</td>
<td>41(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Appeal</th>
<th>Act/Legislation Name</th>
<th>Section Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2. Location Information

Address and/or Legal Description of property subject to the appeal *
9684, 9694, 9714 Twenty Road West, Hamilton, Ontario

Municipality *
City of Hamilton

Upper Tier (Example: county, district, region)

### 3. Appellant/Objector Information

**Note:** You must notify the OMB of any change of address or telephone number in writing. Please quote your OMB Case/File Number(s) after they have been assigned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Company Name or Association Name (Association must be incorporated – include copy of letter of incorporation) *
Harmony on Twenty Properties Inc.

Professional Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:acameracci@urbex.biz">acameracci@urbex.biz</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daytime Telephone Number *</th>
<th>Alternate Telephone Number</th>
<th>Fax Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>905-522-3328 ext. 113</td>
<td></td>
<td>905-522-0452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mailing Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Number</th>
<th>Street Number *</th>
<th>Street Name *</th>
<th>PO Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>161</td>
<td>Rebecca Street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town *</th>
<th>Province *</th>
<th>Country *</th>
<th>Postal Code *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>L8R 1B9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Representative Information

☑ I hereby authorize the named company and/or individual(s) to represent me

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duxbury</td>
<td>Brian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Company Name
Duxbury Law Professional Corporation

Professional Title
Lawyer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:brian@duxburylaw.ca">brian@duxburylaw.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daytime Telephone Number *</th>
<th>Alternate Telephone Number</th>
<th>Fax Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>905-570-1242 ext.</td>
<td></td>
<td>905-570-1955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mailing Address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Number</th>
<th>Street Number</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>PO Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>King Street West</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>L8P 1A4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: If you are representing the appellant and are not a solicitor, please confirm that you have written authorization, as required by the OMB’s Rules of Practice and Procedure, to act on behalf of the appellant. Please confirm this by checking the box below.

☐ I certify that I have written authorization from the appellant to act as a representative with respect to this appeal on his or her behalf and I understand that I may be asked to produce this authorization at any time.

5. Appeal Specific Information

Municipal Reference Number(s)
City of Hamilton File No. UHOPA-15-12R

Outline the nature of your appeal and the reasons for your appeal *
This is an appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board for failure of the approval authority (City of Hamilton) to make a decision on the Official Plan Amendment Application within 180 days.

The City of Hamilton extended the approval period for this Official Plan Amendment from 180 days to 270 days. That time period has now elapsed.

The Appellant submits that this proposed amendment to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan to designate a portion of the lands from "Low Density Residential 2" to "Low Density Residential 2c" in the northwest Glanbrook Secondary Plan for the lands, is consistent with the provisions of the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 and conform with the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe.

The Appellant submits that it has provided all required studies and justification for the amendment and that it has satisfied the requirements of the City of Hamilton in respect to Planning Act matters and that the proposed amendment and designation represents good land use planning.

Such further and other grounds for this appeal as may be advisable.

Oral/written submissions to council

Did you make your opinions regarding this matter known to council?
☐ Oral submissions at a public meeting  ☐ Written submissions to council

Planning Act matters only

Applicable only to official plans/amendments, zoning by-laws/amendments and minor variances that came into effect/were passed on or after July 1, 2016 (Bill 73)

Is the 2-year no application restriction under section 22(2.2) or 34(10.0.0.2) or 45(1.4) applicable?
☐ Yes  ☑ No

6. Related Matters

Are there other appeals not yet filed with the Municipality?
☐ Yes  ☑ No

Are there other matters related to this appeal? (For example: A consent application connected to a variance application)
☐ Yes  ☑ No

7. Scheduling Information

How many days do you estimate are needed for hearing this appeal?
☐ 1 day  ☐ 2 days  ☑ 3 days  ☐ 4 days  ☐ 1 week

☐ More than 1 week

How many expert witnesses and other witnesses do you expect to have at the hearing providing evidence/testimony? Two

Describe expert witness(es)' area of expertise (For example: land use planner, architect, engineer, etc.)
Land use planning and engineering
How many expert witnesses and other witnesses do you expect to have at the hearing providing evidence/testimony?
Two
Describe expert witness(es)' area of expertise (For example: land use planner, architect, engineer, etc.)
Land use planning and engineering

Do you believe this matter would benefit from mediation?
(Prior to scheduling a matter for mediation, the OMB will conduct an assessment to determine its suitability for mediation)
☐ Yes    ☐ No

8. Required Fee

Total Fee Submitted * $ 300

Payment Method *  ► ☐ Certified cheque ☐ Money Order  ☑ Solicitor's general or trust account cheque

9. Declaration

I solemnly declare that all of the statements and the information provided, as well as any supporting documents are true, correct and complete.

Name of Appellant/Representative  Signature of Appellant/Representative  Date (yyyy/mm/dd)
Brian Duxbury  2017/11/16

Personal information requested on this form is collected under the provisions of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended, and the Ontario Municipal Board Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O. 28 as amended. After an appeal is filed, all information relating to this appeal may become available to the public.
### 1. Appeal Type (Please check all applicable boxes) *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Appeal</th>
<th>Type of Appeal</th>
<th>Act Reference (Section)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Act Matters</td>
<td>□ Appeal a decision by local council that adopted an OP or OPA (exempt from approval by Minister or Approval Authority)</td>
<td>17(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that approved or did not approve all or part of a plan or amendment</td>
<td>17(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the plan within 180 days</td>
<td>17(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Council failed to adopt the requested amendment within 180 days</td>
<td>22(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Council refused the requested amendment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning By-law or Zoning By-law Amendment</td>
<td>□ Appeal the passing of a Zoning By-law</td>
<td>34(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law — failed to make a decision on the application within 120 days</td>
<td>34(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law — refused by the municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Control Zoning By-law</td>
<td>□ Appeal the passing of an Interim Control By-law</td>
<td>38(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Variance</td>
<td>□ Appeal a decision of the Committee of Adjustment that approved or refused the application</td>
<td>45(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent/Severance</td>
<td>□ Appeal a decision that approved or refused the application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal conditions imposed</td>
<td>53(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal changed conditions</td>
<td>53(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Application for consent – Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the application within 95 days</td>
<td>53(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Application for a plan of subdivision – Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the plan within 150 days</td>
<td>51(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that approved a plan of subdivision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that did not approve a plan of subdivision</td>
<td>51(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal a lapsing provision imposed by an Approval Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal conditions imposed by an Approval Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal conditions - after expiry of 20 day appeal period but before final approval (only applicant or public body may appeal)</td>
<td>51(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal changed conditions</td>
<td>51(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject of Appeal</td>
<td>Type of Appeal</td>
<td>Act Reference (Section)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>□ Appeal a Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal an amendment to a Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>19(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge Complaint</td>
<td>□ Appeal municipality’s decision regarding a complaint</td>
<td>22(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td>22(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-ending Agreement</td>
<td>□ Objection to a front-ending agreement</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Objection to an amendment to a front-ending agreement</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Development By-law</td>
<td>□ Appeal an Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>257.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal an amendment to an Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>257.74(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Development Complaint</td>
<td>□ Appeal approval authority’s decision regarding a complaint</td>
<td>257.87(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td>257.87(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Resources Act Matters</td>
<td>□ One or more objections against an application for a ‘Class A’ aggregate removal licence</td>
<td>11(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal Licence</td>
<td>□ One or more objections against an application for a ‘Class B’ aggregate removal licence</td>
<td>11(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Application for a ‘Class A’ licence — refused by Minister</td>
<td>13(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Application for a ‘Class B’ licence — refused by Minister</td>
<td>16(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Changes to conditions to a licence</td>
<td>11(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Amendment of site plans</td>
<td>18(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Minister proposes to transfer the licence – applicant does not have licensee’s consent</td>
<td>18(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Minister proposes to refuse transfer of licence – applicant is licensee or has licensee’s consent to transfer</td>
<td>20(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Revocation of licence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Act Matters</td>
<td>□ Appeal the passing of a by-law to divide the municipality into wards</td>
<td>222(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Boundary By-law</td>
<td>□ Appeal the passing of a by-law to redivide the municipality into wards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal the passing of a by-law to dissolve the existing wards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Heritage Act Matters</td>
<td>□ Appeal the passing of a by-law designating a heritage conservation study area</td>
<td>40.1(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Conservation District</td>
<td>□ Appeal the passing of a by-law designating a heritage conservation district</td>
<td>41(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Appeal</th>
<th>Act/Legislation Name</th>
<th>Section Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 2. Location Information

Address and/or Legal Description of property subject to the appeal *
9684, 9694, 9714 Twenty Road West, Hamilton, Ontario

Municipality *
City of Hamilton

Upper Tier (Example: county, district, region)

### 3. Appellant/Objector Information

Note: You must notify the OMB of any change of address or telephone number in writing. Please quote your OMB Case/File Number(s) after they have been assigned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Company Name or Association Name (Association must be incorporated – include copy of letter of incorporation) *
Harmony on Twenty Properties Inc.

Professional Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th><a href="mailto:acameracci@urbex.biz">acameracci@urbex.biz</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daytime Telephone Number</th>
<th>Alternate Telephone Number</th>
<th>Fax Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>905-522-3328 ext. 113</td>
<td></td>
<td>905-622-0452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Number</th>
<th>Street Number</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>PO Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Rebecca Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>L8R 1B9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Representative Information

☑ I hereby authorize the named company and/or individual(s) to represent me

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duxbury</td>
<td>Brian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Company Name
Duxbury Law Professional Corporation

Professional Title
Lawyer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th><a href="mailto:brian@duxburylaw.ca">brian@duxburylaw.ca</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daytime Telephone Number</th>
<th>Alternate Telephone Number</th>
<th>Fax Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>905-570-1242 ext.</td>
<td></td>
<td>905-570-1955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Number</th>
<th>Street Number</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>PO Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>King Street 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>L8P 1A4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Note:** If you are representing the appellant and are not a solicitor, please confirm that you have written authorization, as required by the OMB's Rules of Practice and Procedure, to act on behalf of the appellant. Please confirm this by checking the box below.

☐ I certify that I have written authorization from the appellant to act as a representative with respect to this appeal on his or her behalf and I understand that I may be asked to produce this authorization at any time.

### 5. Appeal Specific Information

Municipal Reference Number(s)  
City of Hamilton File No. ZAC-15-23R

Outline the nature of your appeal and the reasons for your appeal:

The Appellant submits that the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment to provide for modifications to a mix of residential zones and to open space conservation represents a mix of uses that will implement the Official Plan designation and amendment and constitute good land use planning.

The Appellant submits that it has provided such information, studies and responses as are required to satisfy the planning requirements of the City of Hamilton.

The Appellant submits that the City of Hamilton has failed to make a decision on the Application within 120 days of submission of the Application.

The Appellant will submit such further and other grounds as may be deemed advisable.

### Oral/written submissions to council

Did you make your opinions regarding this matter known to council?

☐ Oral submissions at a public meeting  ☐ Written submissions to council

### Planning Act matters only

Applicable only to official plans/amendments, zoning by-laws/amendments and minor variances that came into effect/were passed on or after July 1, 2016 (Bill 73)

Is the 2-year no application restriction under section 22(2.2) or 34(10.0.0.2) or 45(1.4) applicable?

☐ Yes  ☑ No

### 6. Related Matters

Are there other appeals not yet filed with the Municipality?

☐ Yes  ☑ No

Are there other matters related to this appeal? (For example: A consent application connected to a variance application)

☑ Yes  ☐ No

If yes, please provide OMB Reference Number(s) and/or Municipal File Number(s):


### 7. Scheduling Information

How many days do you estimate are needed for hearing this appeal?

☐ 1 day  ☐ 2 days  ☑ 3 days  ☐ 4 days  ☐ 1 week

☐ More than 1 week

How many expert witnesses and other witnesses do you expect to have at the hearing providing evidence/testimony?

Two
Describe expert witness(es)' area of expertise (For example: land use planner, architect, engineer, etc.)
Land use planning and engineering

Do you believe this matter would benefit from mediation?
(Prior to scheduling a matter for mediation, the OMB will conduct an assessment to determine its suitability for mediation)

✓ Yes  ☐ No

8. Required Fee

Total Fee Submitted *  $ 300

Payment Method *  ▶  ☐ Certified cheque  ☐ Money Order  ✓ Solicitor's general or trust account cheque

9. Declaration

I solemnly declare that all of the statements and the information provided, as well as any supporting documents are true, correct and complete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Appellant/Representative</th>
<th>Signature of Appellant/Representative</th>
<th>Date (yyyy/mm/dd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Duxbury</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017/11/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal information requested on this form is collected under the provisions of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended, and the Ontario Municipal Board Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O. 28 as amended. After an appeal is filed, all information relating to this appeal may become available to the public.
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## Appellant Form (A1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipt Number (OMM Office Use Only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date Stamp - Appeal Received by Municipality</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Appeal Type (Please check all applicable boxes)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Appeal</th>
<th>Type of Appeal</th>
<th>Act Reference (Section)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Act Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Official Plan or Official Plan Amendment</td>
<td>☐ Appeal a decision by local council that adopted an OP or OPA (exempt from approval by Minister or Approval Authority)</td>
<td>17(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that approved or did not approve all or part of a plan or amendment</td>
<td>17(36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the plan within 180 days</td>
<td>17(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Council failed to adopt the requested amendment within 180 days</td>
<td>22(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Council refused the requested amendment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning By-law or Zoning By-law Amendment</td>
<td>☐ Appeal the passing of a Zoning By-law</td>
<td>34(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law – failed to make a decision on the application within 120 days</td>
<td>34(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law – refused by the municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Control Zoning By-law</td>
<td>☐ Appeal the passing of an Interim Control By-law</td>
<td>38(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Variance</td>
<td>☐ Appeal a decision of the Committee of Adjustment that approved or refused the application</td>
<td>45(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent/Severance</td>
<td>☐ Appeal a decision that approved or refused the application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appeal conditions imposed</td>
<td>53(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appeal changed conditions</td>
<td>53(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Application for consent – Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the application within 90 days</td>
<td>53(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan of Subdivision</td>
<td>☐ Application for a plan of subdivision – Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the plan within 180 days</td>
<td>51(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that <strong>approved</strong> a plan of subdivision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that <strong>not approved</strong> a plan of subdivision</td>
<td>51(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appeal a lapsing provision imposed by an Approval Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appeal conditions imposed by an Approval Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appeal conditions – after expiry of 20 day appeal period but before final approval (only applicant or public body may appeal)</td>
<td>51(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appeal changed conditions</td>
<td>51(48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject of Appeal</td>
<td>Type of Appeal</td>
<td>Act Reference (Section)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Charges Act Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>☐ Appeal a Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appeal an amendment to a Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>19(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge Complaint</td>
<td>☐ Appeal municipality's decision regarding a complaint</td>
<td>22(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td>22(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-ending Agreement</td>
<td>☐ Objection to a front-ending agreement</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Objection to an amendment to a front-ending agreement</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Act Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>☐ Appeal an Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>257.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appeal an amendment to an Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>257.74(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Development Charge Complaint</td>
<td>☐ Appeal approval authority's decision regarding a complaint</td>
<td>257.87(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td>257.87(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggregate Resources Act Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal Licence</td>
<td>☐ One or more objections against an application for a 'Class A' aggregate removal licence</td>
<td>11(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ One or more objections against an application for a 'Class B' aggregate removal licence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Application for a 'Class A' licence – refused by Minister</td>
<td>11(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Application for a 'Class B' licence – refused by Minister</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Changes to conditions to a licence</td>
<td>13(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Amendment of site plans</td>
<td>16(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Minister proposes to transfer the licence – applicant does not have licensee's consent</td>
<td>18(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Minister proposes to refuse transfer of licence – applicant is licensee or has licensee's consent to transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Minister proposes to refuse transfer of licence – applicant does not have licensee's consent to transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Revocation of licence</td>
<td>20(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Act Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Boundary By-law</td>
<td>☐ Appeal the passing of a by-law to divide the municipality into wards</td>
<td>222(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appeal the passing of a by-law to redivide the municipality into wards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appeal the passing of a by-law to dissolve the existing wards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontario Heritage Act Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Conservation District</td>
<td>☐ Appeal the passing of a by-law designating a heritage conservation study area</td>
<td>40.1(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Appeal the passing of a by-law designating a heritage conservation district</td>
<td>41(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2. Location Information

Address and/or Legal Description of property subject to the appeal:
9664, 9694, 9714 Twenty Road West, Hamilton, Ontario

Municipality:
City of Hamilton

Upper Tier (Example: county, district, region)

### 3. Appellant/Objector Information

**Note:** You must notify the OMB of any change of address or telephone number in writing. Please quote your OMB Case/File Number(s) after they have been assigned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Company Name or Association Name (Association must be incorporated – include copy of letter of incorporation):
Harmony on Twenty Properties Inc.

Professional Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:acoameraco@urbex.biz">acoameraco@urbex.biz</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daytime Telephone Number *</th>
<th>Alternate Telephone Number</th>
<th>Fax Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>605-522-3328 ext.113</td>
<td></td>
<td>905-622-0452</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mailing Address**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Number</th>
<th>Street Number *</th>
<th>Street Name *</th>
<th>City/Town *</th>
<th>Province *</th>
<th>Country *</th>
<th>PO Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Rebecca Street</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>L8R 1B9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Representative Information

- I hereby authorize the named company and/or individual(s) to represent me

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duxbury</td>
<td>Brian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Company Name
Duxbury Law Professional Corporation

Professional Title
Lawyer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:brian@duxburylaw.ca">brian@duxburylaw.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daytime Telephone Number</th>
<th>Alternate Telephone Number</th>
<th>Fax Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>905-570-1242 ext.</td>
<td></td>
<td>905-570-1955</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mailing Address**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Number</th>
<th>Street Number</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>PO Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>West</td>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>L8P 1A4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: If you are representing the appellant and are not a solicitor, please confirm that you have written authorization, as required by the OMB's Rules of Practice and Procedure, to act on behalf of the appellant. Please confirm this by checking the box below.

☐ I certify that I have written authorization from the appellant to act as a representative with respect to this appeal on his or her behalf and I understand that I may be asked to produce this authorization at any time.

5. Appeal Specific Information

Municipal Reference Number(s)
City of Hamilton File No. 2ST-2015-05R

Outline the nature of your appeal and the reasons for your appeal *

The Appellant submits that the proposed draft Plan of Subdivision implements the Zoning By-law Amendments and Official Plan Amendment sought by the Appellant for the subject property.

The Appellant submits that it has satisfied the requirements of the City of Hamilton in respect to the City’s requirements for the draft Plan of Subdivision and says that the Plan of Subdivision satisfies the requirements of subsection 51(24) of the Planning Act and represents good land use planning. The Appellant submits that the City has failed to make any determination in respect to the Appellant's draft Plan of Subdivision within 180 days of submission of its Application.

The Appellant submits such further and other grounds as may be deemed advisable.

Oral/written submissions to council

Did you make your opinions regarding this matter known to council?
☐ Oral submissions at a public meeting  ☐ Written submissions to council

6. Related Matters

Are there other appeals not yet filed with the Municipality?
☐ Yes  ☑ No

Are there other matters related to this appeal? (For example: A consent application connected to a variance application)
☑ Yes  ☐ No

If yes, please provide OMB Reference Number(s) and/or Municipal File Number(s)

7. Scheduling Information

How many days do you estimate are needed for hearing this appeal?
☐ 1 day  ☐ 2 days  ☑ 3 days  ☐ 4 days  ☐ 1 week

☐ More than 1 week

How many expert witnesses and other witnesses do you expect to have at the hearing providing evidence/testimony? Two

Describe expert witnesses’ area of expertise (For example: land use planner, architect, engineer, etc.)
Land use planning and engineering
Do you believe this matter would benefit from mediation?
(Prior to scheduling a matter for mediation, the OMB will conduct an assessment to determine its suitability for mediation)

☐ Yes  ☐ No

8. Required Fee

Total Fee Submitted * $ 300

Payment Method * ▶  ☐ Certified cheque  ☐ Money Order  ☑ Solicitor’s general or trust account cheque

9. Declaration

I solemnly declare that all of the statements and the information provided, as well as any supporting documents are true, correct and complete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Appellant/Representative</th>
<th>Signature of Appellant/Representative</th>
<th>Date (yyyy/mm/dd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brian Duxbury</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>2017/11/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal information requested on this form is collected under the provisions of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended, and the Ontario Municipal Board Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O. 28 as amended. After an appeal is filed, all information relating to this appeal may become available to the public.
**INFORMATION REPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TO:</th>
<th>Chair and Members Planning Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMMITTEE DATE:</td>
<td>January 16, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT/REPORT NO:</td>
<td>Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) on the City of Hamilton’s Refusal or Neglect to Adopt an Amendment to the Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57, for Lands Located at 941 Old Mohawk Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED18010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD(S) AFFECTED:</td>
<td>Ward 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARED BY:</td>
<td>Michael Fiorino (905) 546-2424 Ext. 4424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMITTED BY:</td>
<td>Steve Robichaud Director, Planning and Chief Planner Planning and Economic Development Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIGNATURE:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Council Direction:**

In accordance with subsection 34(11) of the *Planning Act*, a Zoning By-law Amendment Application may be appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) after 120 days (Zoning By-law Amendment Application) if Council has not made a decision on the application.

A motion to direct staff to advise the Planning Committee on matters relating to appeals regarding lack of decision by Council, pursuant to the *Planning Act* was passed by City Council on May 18, 2010. This Information Report was prepared in accordance with Council’s policy for staff to advise the Planning Committee and City Council of appeals for non-decision to the OMB.

The following information is provided for Planning Committee’s information with regards to Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-17-014, which has been appealed to the OMB for lack of decision.
SUBJECT: Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) on the City of Hamilton’s Refusal or Neglect to Adopt an Amendment to the Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57, for Lands Located at 941 Old Mohawk Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED18010) - Page 2 of 3

Information:

The subject lands, municipally known as 941 Old Mohawk Road, Ancaster, are located at the west end of Old Mohawk Road, north of the Lincoln M. Alexander Parkway and east of Highway 403 (see location map attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED18010).

The subject lands are rectangular in shape, with a frontage of 56.4 metres and a depth of 71.5 m. metres, and an area of 0.39 hectares. The lands are currently developed with a one and a half storey single detached dwelling with a detached barn, above-ground swimming pool, and deck.

Zoning By-law Amendment Application:

The purpose of the Zoning By-law Amendment Application (ZAC-17-014) is for a change in zoning from the Agricultural “A” Zone to a modified Multiple Residential “R3” Zone, in the Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57, in order to permit the development of four lots for single detached dwellings. Two future Consent applications will be required to establish three (3) new lots, and one (1) retained lot shown as Lot 1 on Appendix “B” to Report PED18010. The natural heritage features and environmental constraints on site will be contained within the retained lot, and a vegetation protection zone (VPZ) is proposed to protect these features.

The application for a Zoning By-law Amendment was submitted on December 23, 2016 and deemed complete on January 19, 2017. Staff and the applicant have met several times throughout the Zoning By-law Amendment Application review process to discuss outstanding issues and options on how to best address these issues.

The outstanding issues that require additional studies and/or revisions to reports and Plans include the following:

- Further justification of how the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment will ensure compatibility with the surrounding development by respecting and maintaining or enhancing the street patterns, including setbacks and building separations as per policy B.2.4 Residential Intensification;

- A Record of Site Condition has not been submitted to date as the property was identified to formerly be used for the manufacturing of lead shot shells;

- A revised Environment Impact Statement (EIS) is required but has not been submitted to date. A revised EIS is required prior to the application being reviewed by the Environmentally Significant Areas Impact Evaluation Group (ESAIEG);

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.
OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.
OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.
SUBJECT: Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) on the City of Hamilton’s Refusal or Neglect to Adopt an Amendment to the Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57, for Lands Located at 941 Old Mohawk Road (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED18010) - Page 3 of 3

- A Hamilton Conservation Authority permit is required. The Hamilton Conservation Authority requested the deferral of the application until the lot boundary encroachment within the Vegetative Protection Zone (VPZ) is rectified to provide a continuous 15 metre VPZ from the watercourse and significant woodland and adequate erosion access is provided to address the quantity and quality of water runoff. To date, these two issues have not been resolved; and,

- Revised mapping indicating the Zoning boundary line to delineate the Conservation / Hazard Land – Rural (P5) Zone has not been submitted to date.

The appeals to the OMB were received by the City Clerk’s Office on November 14, 2017, 335 days after the receipt of the initial applications.

Appendices and Schedules Attached

- Appendix “A”: Location Map
- Appendix “B”: Site Plan Concept
- Appendix “C”: Appeal Letter
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Location Map

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

File Name/Number: ZAC-17-014
Date: January 17, 2017
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Subject Property

941 Old Mohawk Road

Key Map - Ward 12  N.T.S.
November 14, 2017

Via Delivered

Ms. Rose Caterini
City Clerk

City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 1st Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Dear Ms. Caterini,

RE: Notice of Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board
Zoning By-law Amendment Application No. ZAC-17-014
941 Old Mohawk Road, Ancaster, City of Hamilton

Fortino’s Umbrella Inc. is the owner of property municipally known as 941 Old Mohawk Road in Ancaster.

On December 23, 2015, the subject Zoning By-law Amendment Application was submitted to the City of Hamilton and later deemed complete on January 19, 2017. The purpose of the application is to change the zoning of the lands from Agricultural “A” Zone to the Residential “R3” Zone, Modified in Zoning By-law No. 87-57 and to the Conservation/Hazard Lands “P5” Zone in Zoning By-law No. 05-200. The Effect of the application is to accommodate four lots for single detached dwellings in the appropriate residential zone while the rear portion of the lands be zoned Conservation/Hazard Land “P5” Zone to protect the natural heritage features on the subject property. Fortino’s Umbrella Inc. now appeals this application to the Ontario Municipal Board as the municipality has failed to make a decision on the application with 120 days as required by Section 34(11) of the Planning Act.

In support of this appeal, please find enclosed the following:

- One (1) certified cheque made payable to the Minister of Finance in the amount of $300.00; and,
- The completed OMB Appellant Form (A1) for Application No. ZAC-17-014.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Regards,

Mr. Jordan Fortino

Encl. (2)

Fortino’s Umbrella Inc.
51 Herkimer Street
Hamilton, ON L8P 2G3
905-515-6176
**Appellant Form (A1)**

**Ontario Municipal Board**  
655 Bay Street, Suite 1600  
Toronto ON M5G 1E5  
Telephone: 416-212-8349  
Toll Free: 1-866-448-2248  
Fax: 416-326-5370  
Website: www.olt.gov.on.ca

### 1. Appeal Type (Please check all applicable boxes)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Appeal</th>
<th>Type of Appeal</th>
<th>Act Reference (Section)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning Act Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Official Plan or Official Plan Amendment</em></td>
<td>□ Appeal a decision by local council that adopted an CP or OPA (exempt from approval by Minister or Approval Authority)</td>
<td>17(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that approved or did not approve all or part of a plan or amendment</td>
<td>17(38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the plan within 180 days</td>
<td>17(40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Council failed to adopt the requested amendment within 180 days</td>
<td>22(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Council refused the requested amendment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Zoning By-law or Zoning By-law Amendment</em></td>
<td>□ Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law - failed to make a decision on the application within 120 days</td>
<td>34(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law - refused by the municipality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Interim Control Zoning By-law</em></td>
<td>□ Appeal the passing of an Interim Control By-law</td>
<td>38(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Minor Variance</em></td>
<td>□ Appeal a decision of the Committee of Adjustment that approved or refused the application</td>
<td>45(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Consent/Severance</em></td>
<td>□ Appeal a decision that approved or refused the application</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal conditions imposed</td>
<td>53(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal changed conditions</td>
<td>53(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Application for consent – Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the application within 90 days</td>
<td>53(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Plan of Subdivision</em></td>
<td>□ Application for a plan of subdivision – Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the plan within 180 days</td>
<td>51(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that approved a plan of subdivision</td>
<td>51(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that did not approve a plan of subdivision</td>
<td>51(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal a late filing provision imposed by an Approval Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal conditions imposed by an Approval Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal conditions - after expiry of 20 day appeal period but before final approval (only applicant or public body may appeal)</td>
<td>51(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal changed conditions</td>
<td>51(43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject of Appeal</td>
<td>Type of Appeal</td>
<td>Act Reference (Section)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>□ Appeal a Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal an amendment to a Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>15(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge Complaint</td>
<td>□ Appeal municipality’s decision regarding a complaint</td>
<td>22(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td>22(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-ending Agreement</td>
<td>□ Objection to a front-ending agreement</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Objection to an amendment to a front-ending agreement</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Act Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>□ Appeal an Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>257,65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal an amendment to an Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>257,74(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Development Charge Complaint</td>
<td>□ Appeal approval authority’s decision regarding a complaint</td>
<td>257,87(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td>257,87(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggregate Resources Act Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal Licence</td>
<td>□ One or more objections against an application for a ‘Class A’ aggregate removal licence</td>
<td>11(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ One or more objections against an application for a ‘Class B’ aggregate removal licence</td>
<td>11(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Application for a ‘Class B’ licence — refused by Minister</td>
<td>11(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Application for a ‘Class B’ licence — refused by Minister</td>
<td>11(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Changes to conditions to a licence</td>
<td>13(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Amendment of site plans</td>
<td>16(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Minister proposes to transfer the licence — applicant does not have licensee’s consent</td>
<td>18(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Minister proposes to refuse transfer of licence — applicant is licensee or has licensee’s consent to transfer</td>
<td>18(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Minister proposes to refuse transfer of licence — applicant does not have licensee’s consent to transfer</td>
<td>18(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Revocation of licence</td>
<td>20(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Act Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Boundary By-law</td>
<td>□ Appeal the passing of a by-law to divide the municipality into wards</td>
<td>222(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal the passing of a by-law to redivide the municipality into wards</td>
<td>222(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal the passing of a by-law to dissolve the existing wards</td>
<td>222(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontario Heritage Act Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Conservation District</td>
<td>□ Appeal the passing of a by-law designating a heritage conservation study area</td>
<td>41(1)(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal the passing of a by-law designating a heritage conservation district</td>
<td>41(4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other Matters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject of Appeal</th>
<th>Act/Legislation Name</th>
<th>Section Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**2. Location Information**

Address and/or Legal Description of property subject to the appeal *
941 Old Mohawk Road, Ancaster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality *</th>
<th>City of Hamilton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Tier (Example: county, district, region)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. Appellant/Objector Information**

*Note:* You must notify the OMB of any change of address or telephone number in writing. Please quote your OMB Case File Number(s) after they have been assigned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fortino</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Company Name or Association Name (Association must be incorporated – include copy of letter of incorporation)
Fortino's Umbrella Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Title</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email Address</th>
<th><a href="mailto:jordie@fortino.bros.com">jordie@fortino.bros.com</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daytime Telephone Number *</th>
<th>Alternate Telephone Number</th>
<th>Fax Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>905-515-6176</td>
<td>ex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mailing Address**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Number</th>
<th>Street Number *</th>
<th>Street Name *</th>
<th>PO Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Harriker Street</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town *</th>
<th>Province *</th>
<th>Country *</th>
<th>Postal Code *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>L6P 2G3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Representative Information

I hereby authorize the named company and/or individual(s) to represent me

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Email Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daytime Telephone Number</th>
<th>Alternate Telephone Number</th>
<th>Fax Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ex.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mailing Address**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit Number</th>
<th>Street Number</th>
<th>Street Name</th>
<th>PO Box</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City/Town</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Postal Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: If you are representing the appellant and are not a solicitor, please confirm that you have written authorization, as required by the OMB's Rules of Practice and Procedure, to act on behalf of the appellant. Please confirm this by checking the box below.

☐ I certify that I have written authorization from the appellant to act as a representative with respect to this appeal on his or her behalf and I understand that I may be asked to produce this authorization at any time.

5. Appeal Specific Information

Municipal Reference Number(s)
ZAC-17-014

Outline the nature of your appeal and the reasons for your appeal:
The application was submitted on December 23, 2016 and deemed complete by the City on January 10, 2017 and the municipality has failed to make a decision within 120 days as required by Section 34(11) of the Planning Act.

6. Related Matters

☐ Oral submissions at a public meeting ☐ Written submissions to council

Planning Act matters only
Applicable only to official plan/aamendments, zoning by-law amendments and minor variances that came into effect after passed on or after July 1, 2016 (Bill 73)

☐ Yes ☑ No

Is the 2-year no application restriction under section 22(2.2) or 34(10.0.0.2) or 45(1.4) applicable?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Are there other appeals not yet filed with the Municipality?

☐ Yes ☑ No

Are there other matters related to this appeal? (For example: A consent application connected to a variance application)

☐ Yes ☑ No

7. Scheduling Information

How many days do you estimate are needed for hearing this appeal?

☐ 1 day ☐ 2 days ☑ 3 days ☐ 4 days ☐ 1 week

☐ More than 1 week

How many expert witnesses and other witnesses do you expect to have at the hearing providing evidence/testimony?

3

Describe expert witness(es)' area of expertise (For example: land use planner, architect, engineer, etc.)

Land use planning, development engineering and natural heritage.
Do you believe this matter would benefit from mediation? 
(Prior to scheduling a matter for mediation, the OMB will conduct an assessment to determine its suitability for mediation)

☐ Yes  ☑ No

8. Required Fee

Total Fee Submitted *  $ 300

Payment Method *  ☑ Certified cheque  ☐ Money Order  ☐ Solicitor’s general or trust account cheque

9. Declaration

I solemnly declare that all of the statements and the information provided, as well as any supporting documents are true, correct and complete.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Appellant/Representative</th>
<th>Signature of Appellant/Representative</th>
<th>Date (yyyy/mm/dd)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Fortino for Fortino's Umbrella Inc.</td>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>2017/11/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Personal information requested on this form is collected under the provisions of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P. 13, as amended, and the Ontario Municipal Board Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. O. 26 as amended. After an appeal is filed, all information relating to this appeal may become available to the public.
MOTION

Committee Date: January 16, 2018

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR GREEN............................................................

SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR...............................................................

Community Improvement Plan Incentives

That staff be directed to report back on the feasibility of limiting Development Charge reductions, Parkland Dedication Fee reductions or any Community Improvement Plan incentives to the regulated height and density restrictions of the Council adopted Official Plan and/or Zoning By-law with full fees to be applied to all height and density that surpass the restrictions.
MOTION

Committee Date: January 16, 2018

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR A. JOHNSON..................................................

SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR.................................................................

Re: Exemption of Affordable Housing Projects from Application Fees

WHEREAS, the City has exempted affordable housing projects from the payment of parkland dedication fees;

WHEREAS, the City has exempted affordable housing projects from the payment of development charges;

WHEREAS, in 2016 Council approved the waiving of several planning fees for affordable housing projects including application fees for re-zonings, Official Plan Amendments, Site Plans, and a portion of fees for Plans of Subdivision and Plans of Condominium; and

WHEREAS, for the purposes of this motion, affordable housing includes any project that either has been approved to receive funding from the Government of Canada or the Province of Ontario under an affordable housing program or has been approved by the City of Hamilton or the CityHousing Hamilton Corporation through an affordable housing program;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That staff report back on significant fees and securities related to development approvals that are typically incurred by affordable housing projects, the estimated cost to the City of waiving or reimbursing these fees, and the potential funding sources for offsetting any lost City revenues.