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 January 16, 2018

4. **DELEGATION REQUESTS**
   
   4.1 Tom Cooper and Jodi Dean from the Hamilton Roundtable for Poverty Reduction to support staff's report regarding the restriction of the number and locations of payday loan outlets in Hamilton. (For future meeting.)

   4.2 Paula Kilburn and the Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities Transportation Working Group to speak to the staff report regarding the number of accessible taxis. (For future meeting.)

   *4.3 Doug Hoyes, Michalos & Associates Inc. to provide their most recent statistics and recommendations respecting the proposed payday loan by-law. (For future meeting.)

   *4.4 Catherine Spears, Spears + Associates Inc., respecting Eastgate Square Centennial Secondary Plan and the Transit Oriented Corridor Zoning (For today's meeting regarding Items 8.1 and 8.2)
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6. **PUBLIC HEARINGS / DELEGATIONS**

6.1 Application to Amend the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 6593 for Lands Located at 347 Charlton Avenue West, Hamilton (PED18035) (Ward 1)

Registered Speakers

1. Wendy Johncox, 320 Herkimer Street, Hamilton
2. Andrew Kelly, 316 Herkimer Street, Hamilton
3. **Kate Connolly, 12 – 285 Bold Street, Hamilton**
4. **Joe Gallagher, 332 Herkimer Street, Hamilton**

*6.1.a* Written comments from Kate Connolly, 12 - 285 Bold Street, Hamilton

*6.1.b* Written comments from Amanda McInnis and Alex Christie, 355 Charlton Avenue West

*6.1.c* Written comments from Wendy Johncox, 320 Herkimer Street, Hamilton

*6.1.d* Written comments from Mark Stewart, President, Kirkendal Neighbourhood Association

6.2 Applications for an Amendment to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and to the Town of Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464 for Lands Located at 235 Tanglewood Drive, Glanbrook (PED18034) (Ward 11)

6.3 Applications for an Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for Lands Located at 2782 Barton Street East, Hamilton (PED18022) (Ward 5)

6.4 Applications for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for Lands Located at 503 and 515 Garner Road West (Ancaster) (Ped18032) (Ward 12)

6.5 Application for an Amendment to the Rural Hamilton Official Plan and the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200 for Lands Located at 1051 Green Mountain Road East, Stoney Creek (PED18029) (Ward 11)

*6.5.a* Written Comments from Jen Baker, Hamilton Naturalists' Club
6.6 Brad Clark, Maple leaf Strategies, to present a summary of the Hamilton Rental Housing Roundtable discussion paper entitled "Promoting Code Compliant Rental Housing with Safe, Clean and Healthy Dwelling Units" (Approved January 16, 2018)

*6.6.a Discussion Paper

7. STAFF PRESENTATIONS

8. DISCUSSION ITEMS

8.1 Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan and Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (PED18007) (Wards 5 and 9) (TABLED January 16, 2018)
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)

8.2 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) (TABLED January 16, 2018)

8.3 Bill 139, Building Better Communities and Conserving Watersheds Act, 2017 - Ontario Proposed Changes to the Land Use Planning and Appeals System (LS16027(b)) (City Wide)

9. MOTIONS

10. NOTICES OF MOTION

*10.1 Applicant's Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board respecting Minor Variance Application FL/A-17:442 for lands located at 374 5th Concession Road East
11. GENERAL INFORMATION / OTHER BUSINESS

11.1 Outstanding Business List
11.1.a Items requiring new due dates:
Item “C” – C.I. to Amend Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 6593 for 118 to 338 Mountain Brow Boulevard (Hamilton) (PED13101)
Due date: February 20, 2018
New due date: June 5, 2018

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: February 20, 2018
New due date: March 20, 2018

Item “H” – Deferral of Item 5 of HMHC Report 15-005 proposing inclusion of 1021 Garner Rd E on register of properties of cultural heritage value or interest to allow consultation with property owner and to correct wording.
Due date: February 20, 2018
New due date: March 20, 2018

Item “N” – That staff be directed to present to the Planning Committee an updated digital sign by-law.
Due date: February 20, 2018
New due date: April 17, 2018

Item “P” - That staff be directed to report back on how to revise Council’s current policy respecting OMB appeals for non-decision to ensure the public has the opportunity to provide input
Due date: February 20, 2018
New due date: April 17, 2018

Item “BB” - Staff to report back on Class 4 Noise receptor status for Downtown Secondary Plan and/or broader city-wide policy.
Due date: February 6, 2018
New due date: April 3, 2018

Item “DD” - That the appropriate City of Hamilton staff be requested to address the issue of declining establishments paying into the Paid Duty program in Hess Village and report back to the Planning Committee 45 days before the start of the 2018 Paid Duty season with solutions.
Due date: February 20, 2018
New due date: March 20, 2018
11.1.b Items identified as complete to be removed:
Item “L” – Staff to report back with periodic updates re: progress on capturing illegal businesses and increase in licensed businesses.
(Item 5.2)

Item “Q” – 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.
(Item 8.4)

Item “AA” – That staff be directed to report to the Planning Committee as to whether or not the Licensing Division is able to continue to licence rental properties without the resources requested (Item 5.1)

12. PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

12.1 Bill 139, Building Better Communities and Conserving Watersheds Act, 2017 - Ontario Proposed Changes to the Land Use Planning and Appeals System (LS16027(c)/PED16237(b) (City Wide) (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.

*12.2 Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendments for Lands Located at 860 Queenston Road (OMB Cast No. PL17082) (LS18010) (Ward 9) (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.

13. ADJOURNMENT
PLANNING COMMITTEE
MINUTES 18-001
9:30 a.m.
Tuesday, January 16, 2018
Council Chambers
Hamilton City Hall
71 Main Street West

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

Absent with Regrets: R. Pasuta, Personal

Also Present: Councillor T. Whitehead

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE REFERRED TO COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION:

1. Active Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision Applications (PED18002) (City Wide) (Item 5.1)

(Pearson/Conley)
That Report PED18002 respecting Active Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision Applications, be received.

CARRIED

2. Responsible Animal Ownership By-law 12-031 be Amended to Include the Offence of Barking Dog (PED18003) (City Wide) (Item 5.2)

(Pearson/Conley)
(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.

CARRIED
3. Review of Problems Associated with Increased Visitors to Waterfalls (PED18011) (Wards 6, 9, 13, 14 and 15) (Item 5.3)  

(Pearson/Conley)  
That Report PED18011 respecting Review of Problems Associated with Increased Visitors to Waterfalls, be received.  
CARRIED

4. Quality Index for Rental Units (PED18026) (City Wide) (Outstanding Business List Item) (Item 5.4)  

(Pearson/Conley)  
That Report PED18026 respecting Quality Index for Rental Units, be received.  
CARRIED

5. Application to Deem 1428 and 1444 Sandhill Drive, (Ancaster) Being Lots 8 to 11, Inclusive, of Registered Plan No. 62M-630, “Stanlow Industrial Park, Phase 1,” Not to be Part of a Registered Plan of Subdivision, for the Purposes of Subsection 50(3) of the Planning Act (PED18041) (Ward 12) (Added 5.5)  

(Pearson/Conley)  
That approval be given to deem 1428 and 1444 Sandhill Drive (Ancaster), being Lots 8 to 11, inclusive, of Registered Plan No. 62M-630, “Stanlow Industrial Park, Phase 1,” not to be part of a Registered Plan of Subdivision, for the purposes of Subsection 50(3) of the Planning Act, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18041, on the following basis:  

(a) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18041, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council;  

(b) That the proposal to deem Lots 8 to 11, inclusive, of “Stanlow Industrial Park, Phase 1,” Registered Plan 62M-630, not to be part of a registered plan of subdivision, for lands known as 1428 and 1444 Sandhill Drive, is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014), and complies with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.  
CARRIED

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

(B. Johnson/Pearson)  
(a) 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:

(i) 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,

(ii) 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.

(b) That there were no public submissions received regarding this matter.

Main Motion, as Amended, CARRIED

7. 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) (Item 6.4)

(Farr/Pearson)

(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 amended by adding the following subsection, and be approved, as amended:

3(b) That the Owner purchase the alleyway required to implement the proposed development and provide confirmation that the abutting landowners have been granted easements over the alleyway to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner;
(ii) That the amending By-law, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18013, as amended, be added to Schedules 910, 911, 952 and 953 of Zoning By-law No. 05-200; and,

(iii) That the proposed change in zoning 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;

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

Main Motion, as Amended, CARRIED

8. 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) (Item 6.5)

(Collins/Farr)

(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 dwelling 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;

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

Main Motion, as Amended, CARRIED

9. 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) (Item 6.6)

(B. Johnson/Conley)

(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 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.

(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 previously known as “Mountaingate” be amended to be known as Lancaster Heights, 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 previously known as “Mountaingate”, as amended to be known as “Lancaster Heights”, 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), as per the agreement between Branthaven Homes and Hotz and Sons Limited, 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, as amended, to include the requirement that traffic calming measures be installed between the existing subdivision and “Lancaster Heights”;

(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 Park land 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.
(g) That the public submissions received regarding this matter did not affect the decision.

Main Motion, as Amended, CARRIED

10. Preliminary Screening for the Request to Designate 650 and 672 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton, Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (PED18001) (Ward 8) (Item 8.1)

(Pearson/Partridge)
(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.

CARRIED
11. **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 Glenbrook 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) (Item 8.2)**

(Green/B. Johnson)
That Report PED18009 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, Town of Glenbrook Zoning By-law No. 464, and Draft Plan of Subdivision, for Lands Located at 9684, 9694, and 9714 Twenty Road West (Glanbrook), be received.

CARRIED

12. **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) (Item 8.3)**

(Skelly/Conley)
That Report PED18010 respecting 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), be received.

CARRIED

13. **Purchase Leaseback of 18 Sinclair Avenue, Hamilton (Added Item)**

(Collins/Farr)
WHEREAS the City is acquiring the property at 18 Sinclair Court (being a three bedroom, 2 storey home), the closing of which will take place on January 31, 2018;

WHEREAS, the property owner is acquiring a small bungalow in Hamilton - this closing is scheduled to coincide with the sale of her property to the City on January 31, 2018;

WHEREAS, one of the property owners has limited mobility and has, for several years, resided in a long term care facility, and is unable to assist their spouse; and

WHEREAS, the property owner is requesting a lease-back of her property for a short term commencing February 1, 2018, ending on May 31, 2018, at nominal consideration ($2.00) to permit a staged move through the Winter/Spring seasons;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:
(a) That the Real Estate Section of the Planning and Economic Development Department be authorized and directed to enter into a short term lease of 18 Sinclair Court at $500 per month with the existing property owners commencing February 1, 2018 and terminating on May 31, 2018;

(b) That the Mayor and Clerk be authorized and directed to execute all necessary documents in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor.

CARRIED

14. To Recognize Storage as a Permitted Use for the Property Located at 3868 Hwy No. 6, Mount Hope (Added Item)

(B. Johnson/Pearson)
WHEREAS, in approving the Rural Zoning By-law, it was the intent of Council to provide flexible zoning in the rural area to support existing businesses;

WHEREAS, the property at 3868 Hwy No. 6, Mount Hope has been used for storage uses prior to amalgamation and adoption of the Rural Zoning By-law; and

WHEREAS, the Rural Zoning By-law has a site specific exception for the property at 3868 Hwy No. 6, Mount Hope to recognize the use of the property for storage related uses;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That Planning and Economic Development staff be advised that the intent of Council in approving the Rural Zoning By-law applicable to the subject lands was to recognize the use of the property for a storage facility.

CARRIED

15. 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) (Added Item 12.1)

(Conley/Pearson)
That the direction to staff respecting the 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 approved and remain private and confidential until approved by Council.

CARRIED
FOR INFORMATION:

(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (Item 1)

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

1. **ADDED DELEGATION REQUESTS**

   4.1 Brad Clark, Maple Leaf Strategies, to present a summary of the Hamilton Rental Housing Roundtable discussion paper entitled “Promoting Code Compliant Rental Housing with Safe, Clean and Healthy Dwelling Units,” at the February 6, 2018 meeting.

   4.2 Alexander Temporale, A.T.A. Architects Inc., regarding the heritage designation of the property located at 650 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton (Item 8.1) (For today’s agenda.)

2. **ADDED CONSENT ITEM**

   5.5 Application to Deem 1428 and 1444 Sandhill Drive, Being Lots 8 to 11, Inclusive, of Registered Plan No. 62M-630, “Stanlow Industrial Park, Phase 1,” Not to be Part of a Registered Plan of Subdivision, for the Purposes of Subsection 50(3) of the Planning Act (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (Ward 12) (PED18041)

3. **ADDED WRITTEN COMMENTS**

   6.2(b) Ed Fothergill, Fothergill Planning & Development Inc., on behalf of Marfad Holdings, 928 Queenston Road, Stoney Creek respecting the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, PED18007

   6.2(c) Sarah Knoll, GSP Group, on Behalf of SmartREIT 502-560 Centennial Pkwy North respecting the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, PED18007

   6.2(d) Ed Fothergill, Fothergill Planning & Development Inc., on behalf of Parkway Nissan, 191 Centennial Parkway North respecting the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, PED18007

   6.2(e) Catherine Spears, Professional Planner, Spears + Associates, on behalf of Bentall Kennedy LP (Canada) Eastgate Square respecting the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, PED18007

   6.2(f) James Webb of WEBB Planning Consultants, on behalf of The Effort Trust Company, respecting the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, PED18007
6.2(g) Patricia Foran, Aird & Berlis LLP, on behalf of Queenston Road Holdings Inc. respecting the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, PED18007

6.2(h) Stephen Fraser, A. J. Clarke and Associates Limited, on behalf of A. DeSantis Holding Limited.

6.3(a) Valerie Righton, owner of 2358058 Ontario Limited, 165 Queenston Road respecting Item 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)

6.6(a) Matt Johnson and Carmela Agro, of UrbanSolutions, Planning and Land Development Consultants Inc., on behalf of Branthaven Mount Hope Inc. (Branthaven) respecting Item 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)

4. REPLACEMENT OF APPENDICES TO ITEMS 6.2, 6.3 AND 6.5

- The maps on pages 68 of 75 and 72 of 75 of Appendix “B” to Item 6.2 respecting Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan, PED18007 are replaced with the distributed copies.

- Appendix “B” to Item 6.3 respecting 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) is replaced with the distributed copy.

- Appendix “G” to Item 6.5 respecting 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) is replaced with the distributed copy.

5. ADDED PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL ITEM

12.1 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) (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.

(Farr/Green)
That the agenda for the January 16, 2018 meeting be approved, as amended.  
CARRIED

(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 2)

Councillors Pearson and Green declared an interest with respect to Item 4.1 as they are both owners of rental properties.

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

(i) December 5, 2017 (Item 3.1)

(Skelly/Farr)
That the Minutes of the December 5 2017 meeting be approved.  
CARRIED

(d) DELEGATION REQUESTS (Item 4)

(Skelly/B. Johnson)
That the following delegation request be approved to attend at a future meeting:

(i) Brad Clark, Maple Leaf Strategies, to present a summary of the Hamilton Rental Housing Roundtable discussion paper entitled "Promoting Code Compliant Rental Housing with Safe, Clean and Healthy Dwelling Units."  
(Added 4.1)
CARRIED

(Pearson Partridge)
That the following delegation request be approved to address Committee at today's meeting:

(i) Alexander Temporale, A.T.A. Architects Inc., regarding the heritage designation of the property located at 650 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton  
(Item 8.1) (Added 4.2.)
CARRIED

(Farr/Pearson)
That Item 6.4 respecting 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) be considered first.  
CARRIED
DELEGATIONS/PUBLIC HEARING (Item 6)

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

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act, Chair A. Johnson 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 Draft Plan of Condominium, 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.

No member of the public came forward,

James Doracin from Branthaven, the applicant, was in attendance.

(B. Johnson/Partridge)
That the staff presentation be waived.

CARRIED

(Partridge/Pearson)
That the public meeting be closed.

CARRIED

(B. Johnson/Pearson)
That the recommendations be amended by adding the following subsection (b) and re-lettering the balance:

(b) That there were no public submissions received regarding this matter.

Amendment CARRIED

For disposition of this matter refer to Item 6.

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

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act, Chair A. Johnson 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 Amendment, 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**

6.2(a) Meaghan Palynchuk, Manager, Municipal Relations, Bell Canada

6.2(b) Ed Fothergill, Fothergill Planning & Development Inc., on behalf of Marfad Holdings, 928 Queenston Road, Stoney Creek

6.2(c) Sarah Knoll, GSP Group, on Behalf of SmartREIT 502-560 Centennial Pkwy North

6.2(d) Ed Fothergill, Fothergill Planning & Development Inc., on behalf of Parkway Nissan, 191 Centennial Parkway North

6.2(e) Catherine Spears, Professional Planner, Spears + Associates, on behalf of Bentall Kennedy LP (Canada) Eastgate Square

6.2(f) James Webb of WEBB Planning Consultants, on behalf of The Effort Trust Company

6.2(g) Patricia Foran, Aird & Berlis LLP, on behalf of Queenston Road Holdings Inc.

6.2(h) Stephen Fraser, A. J. Clarke and Associates Limited, on behalf of A. DeSantis Holding Limited.

**Pearson/Collins**

That the written comments, Item 6.2(a) to 6.2(h) be received.  

CARRIED

The following individuals addressed Committee with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and provided an overview of the report. Copies of the presentations are available for viewing on the City’s website:

Melanie Pham, Planner, provided an introduction to the report. Patrick Kennedy of Dillon Consulting provided an overview of the Secondary Plan. Norma Moores of IBI Group provided an overview of the Transportation Master Plan. Melanie Pham, Planner, provided an overview of the Secondary Plan. Madeleine Giroux, Planner, provided an overview of Item 6.3, the Transit Oriented Corridor Zoning Extension, as the two Items are related.
(Conley/Pearson)
That the presentations be received.

CARRIED

Speakers

1. Catherine Spears, Professional Planner, Spears + Associates, on behalf of Bentall Kennedy LP (Canada) Eastgate Square

Catherine Spears addressed Committee on behalf of her client, the owner of Eastgate Square and spoke in support of the proposal but expressed some concerns and referred to recommendations which she outlined in her letter which is Item 6.2(e).

2. James Webb, WEBB Planning Consultants on behalf of The Effort Trust Company

James Webb addressed Committee and indicated that his client, The Effort Trust Company, owner of Queenston Mall, is in agreement with the long term vision but is concerned with the transitional period and asked for the opportunity to continue to work with staff.

3. Stephen Fraser, J.J. Clarke and Associates Limited, on behalf of A. DeSantis Holdings Limited, regarding 517 – 523 Queenston Road

Stephen Fraser addressed Committee and asked for more time to work out the concerns of his client, A. DeSantis Holdings Limited, with staff.

4. Steven Silverberg, representing Laurier Queenston Road Inc., 826 and 840 Queenston Road

Steven Silverberg addressed Committee and indicated that Laurier Queenston Road Inc., the owners of 826 and 840 Queenston Road, want to participate in the public meeting and be informed of Council’s decisions.

5. Michael Crough, IBI Group

Michael Crough addressed Committee and indicated that he is representing two properties; Image Honda, 155 Centennial Parkway North and Satay Motors, 282 Centennial Parkway North. Their issue is with Policy Item 677(k)(iv) regarding the Urban Design requirements.
6. Matt Johnston, UrbanSolutions, Planning and Land Development Consultations

Matt Johnston addressed Committee and indicated that he is representing his client who is the owner of 140 Centennial Parkway North. They believe that this location could accommodate an increase in the height restrictions.

7. Fred Pizzoferrato, 103 Centennial Parkway South, Stoney Creek

Fred Pizzoferrato addressed Committee and indicated that he is a long time resident of Centennial Parkway and he believes the road should be widened to three lanes each way.

8. Valerie Righton, owner of 2358058 Ontario Limited, 165 Queenston Road

Valerie Righton addressed Committee and indicated that she is seeking confirmation that the zoning on her property at 165 Queenston Road, does include the allowable parking spaces and setbacks. Staff confirmed that it did.

(Collins/Pearson)
That the delegations be received.

CARRIED

(Partridge/Pearson)
That the public meeting be closed.

CARRIED

(Collins/Pearson)
That Report PED18007 respecting Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan and Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan Amendment be TABLED to the next meeting in order for staff to address the concerns expressed in the public submissions.

CARRIED

(iii) 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) (Item 6.3)

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act, Chair A. Johnson 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

6.3(a) Valerie Righton, owner of 2358058 Ontario Limited, 165 Queenston Road

(Skelly/Collins)
That the added written comments, Item 6.3(a) be received. CARRIED

No member of the public came forward.

(Skelly/Collins)
That the public meeting be closed. CARRIED

(Collins/Pearson)
That Report PED18012 respecting Proposed Transit Oriented Corridor Zones in Zoning By-law No. 05-200 - LRT Extension and Housekeeping Amendments be TABLED to the next meeting in order for staff to address the concerns expressed in the public submissions. CARRIED

(iv) 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) (Item 6.4)

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act, Chair A. Johnson 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 Zoning By-law Amendment, 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.

Tiffany Singh and Daniel Barnett, Planners, addressed Committee with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and provided an overview of the report. A copy of the presentation is available for viewing on the City’s website.

(Pearson/Farr)
That the staff presentation be received. CARRIED
Sergio Manchia of UrbanSolutions and Bernardo Graziani (Graziani + Corazza Architects Inc.) were in attendance representing the applicant and addressed Committee with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation. A copy of the presentation is available for viewing on the City’s website.

(Farr/Collins)
That the agents’ presentation be received.
CARRIED

Speakers

1. Jonathan Deveau, 80 King William Street

Jonathan Deveau addressed Committee and expressed his concerns with the proposal which included the height and the affect on traffic. He provided a hand-out titled “Section view showing impact of Podium and Tower on King William” which was distributed. A copy has been retained for the Clerk’s record.

2. Rob Fiedler, Planning Coordinator, of the Beasley Neighbourhood Association (BNA).

Rob Fiedler addressed Committee and indicated that although the Association does not oppose the proposal they do have concerns with the proposed height.

(Collins/Farr)
That the delegations be received.
CARRIED

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

(Partridge/Farr)
That Appendix “B” be amended by adding the following subsection:

3(b) That the Owner purchase the alleyway required to implement the proposed development and provide confirmation that the abutting landowners have been granted easements over the alleyway to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning and Chief Planner;

CARRIED

(Farr/Pearson)
That the recommendations be further amended by adding the following subsection (b):
(b) That the public submissions received regarding this matter did not affect the decision.

Amendment CARRIED

For disposition of this matter refer to Item 7.

(v) 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) (Item 6.5)

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act, Chair A. Johnson 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 Draft Plan of Subdivision and Draft Plan of Condominium, 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.

No member of the public came forward.

(B, Johnson/Partridge)
That the public meeting be closed.

CARRIED

(Conley/Pearson)
That the staff presentation be waived.

CARRIED

Brenda Khes of GSP Group was in attendance representing the applicant.

(Collins Farr)
That the recommendations be amended by adding the following subsection (h):

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

Amendment CARRIED

For disposition of this matter refer to Item 8.
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) (Item 6.6)

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act, Chair A. Johnson 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 Urban and Rural Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments and the Draft Plan of Subdivision, 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

6.6(a) Matt Johnson and Carmela Agro, of UrbanSolutions, Planning and Land Development Consultants Inc., on behalf of Branthaven Mount Hope Inc. (Branthaven)

(B. Johnson/Conley)
That the added written comments, Item 6.6(a) be received.

CARRIED

(B. Johnson/Partridge)
That the staff presentation be waived.

CARRIED

Michael Hannay was in attendance representing the owner. He addressed Committee and indicated that they support the staff report.

Speakers

1. Sergio Manchia, representing Avatar Homes Inc.

Sergio Manchia addressed Committee and indicated that he is representing Avatar Homes Inc., the owner of the property adjacent to the proposed development. He indicated support for the proposal and noted that the developer agreed to install a permanent storm water management pond so that Avatar can release its temporary storm water management facility.
2. Matt Johnston, UrbanSolutions, Planning and Land Development Consultants representing Branthaven Homes

Matt Johnston addressed Committee and indicated that he is representing Branthaven Homes, the owner of the lands abutting the proposed development. He is requesting amendments to the recommendations and indicated that he has copies of the amendments.

(B. Johnson/Partridge)
That the delegations be received. CARRIED

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

(B. Johnson/Conley)
(a) That the conditions be amended to reflect the agreement between Branthaven Homes and the applicant regarding drainage;

(b) That traffic calming measures be installed between the existing subdivision and the new subdivision;

(c) That the development/subdivision previously known as “Mountaingate”, now be known as “Lancaster Heights”.

Amendment CARRIED

(B. Johnson/Conley)
That the recommendations be amended by adding the following subsection (g):

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

Amendment CARRIED

For disposition of this matter refer to Item 9.

(f) DISCUSSION ITEMS (Item 8)

(i) Preliminary Screening for the Request to Designate 650 and 672 Sanatorium Road, Hamilton, Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (PED18001) (Ward 8) (Item 8.1)
Delegation

(i) Alexander Temporale, A.T.A. Architects Inc (Added 4.2)

Alexander Temporale addressed Committee with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation and indicated that he was retained by Columbia International College, the owner of the building located at 650 Sanatorium Road. He outlined reasons why 650 Sanatorium Road does not merit heritage designation. A copy of his presentation is available for viewing on the City’s website.

(Partridge/Green)
That the delegation be received.  
CARRIED

Ward Councillor Terry Whitehead was in attendance to speak to this issue.

For disposition of this matter refer to Item 10.

(g) MOTIONS (Item 9)

(i) Community Improvement Plan Incentives (Item 9.1)

(Green/Conley)
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.

CARRIED

Chair A. Johnson relinquished the Chair to Vice Chair Farr to move the following motion:

(ii) Exemption of Affordable Housing Projects from Application Fees (Item 9.2)

(A. Johnson/Collins)
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-
zonnings, 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.

CARRIED

Chair A. Johnson assumed the Chair.

(h) NOTICES OF MOTION (Item 10)

(i) Purchase Leaseback of 18 Sinclair Avenue, Hamilton (Added 10.1)

Councillor Collins introduced a notice of motion respecting Purchase Leaseback of 18 Sinclair Avenue, Hamilton.

(Collins/Farr)
That the rules of order be waived in order to allow the introduction of a motion respecting Purchase Leaseback of 18 Sinclair Avenue, Hamilton.

CARRIED

For disposition of this matter refer to Item 13.

(ii) To Recognize Storage as a Permitted Use for the Property Located at 3868 Hwy No. 6, Mount Hope (Added 10.2)

Councillor B. Johnson introduced a notice of motion To Recognize Storage as a Permitted Use for the Property Located at 3868 Hwy No. 6, Mount Hope.

(B. Johnson/Pearson)
That the rules of order be waived in order to allow the introduction of a motion To Recognize Storage as a Permitted Use for the Property Located at 3868 Hwy No. 6, Mount Hope.

CARRIED

For disposition of this matter refer to Item 14.
(i) GENERAL INFORMATION/OTHER BUSINESS (Item 11)

(i) Outstanding Business List (Item 11.1)

(Conley/Pearson)
That the following new due dates be approved:

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 TBD

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

That the following Items be removed:

Item “G” - Quality Index for Rental Units (Item 5.4 on this agenda)

Item “FF” - 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 of King St E. between Barnesdale Avenue & Fairholt Street. (Item 6.3 on this agenda.)

CARRIED

(j) PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL (Item 12)

Committee approved the following without moving into Closed Session:

(i) 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) (Added Item 12.1)

(Conley/Pearson)
That the rules of order to waived to permit the introduction of a motion respecting Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) on the City of Hamilton’s Refusal or Neglect to Adopt an Amendment to the Urban
For disposition of this matter, refer to Item 15.

(k) ADJOURNMENT (Item 13)

(Collins/B Johnson)
That, there being no further business, the Planning Committee be adjourned at 3:07 p.m.

CARRIED

Respectfully submitted,

Councillor A. Johnson
Chair, Planning Committee

Ida Bedioui
Legislative Co-ordinator
Office of the City Clerk
Form: Request to Speak to Committee of Council
Submitted on Wednesday, January 24, 2018 - 9:54 am

==Committee Requested==
Committee: Planning Committee

==Requestor Information==
Name of Individual: Tom Cooper and Jodi Dean

Name of Organization: Hamilton Roundtable for Poverty Reduction

Contact Number: 905-667-3595

Email Address: tom@hamiltonpoverty.ca

Mailing Address:
100 Main Street East
suite 203
Hamilton, On
L8N 3W4

Reason(s) for delegation request: We would like to request the opportunity to present to Planning Committee at it's February 20th meeting to discuss and support City of Hamilton staff recommendations on restricting the number and locations of payday loan outlets in Hamilton. The Hamilton Roundtable for Poverty Reduction has been very active in the community highlighting the challenges posed by the payday loan industry and would value the opportunity to present information on this critical issue.

Will you be requesting funds from the City? No

Will you be submitting a formal presentation? Yes
Form: Request to Speak to Committee of Council
Submitted on Wednesday, January 24, 2018 - 10:47 am

Committee Requested:
Committee: Planning Committee

Requestor Information:
Name of Individual: Paula Kilburn and the Advisory Committee for Person's with Disabilities, Transportation Working Group
Name of Organization: ACPD - Advisory Committee for Persons with Disabilities, Transportation Working Group
Contact Number:
Email Address:
Mailing Address: 71 Main Street West, Hamilton
Reason(s) for delegation request: To discuss the number of accessible taxis required to meet equitable service.
Will you be requesting funds from the City? No
Will you be submitting a formal presentation? No
Form: Request to Speak to Committee of Council
Submitted on Tuesday, January 30, 2018 – 12:34 pm

==Committee Requested==
Committee: Planning Committee

==Requestor Information==

Name of Individual: Doug Hoyes, CPA, LIT
Name of Organization: Hoyes, Michalos & Associates Inc.
Contact Number: 905-777-0770
Email Address: doug@hoyes.com
Mailing Address:
1030 Upper James St., Suite 301
Hamilton, Ontario L9C 6X6

Reason(s) for delegation request: Re: February 20 Planning Committee Meeting. I am a Licensed Insolvency Trustee (formerly called a bankruptcy trustee); we are finding that an increasing number of our clients have payday loans, and the high interest rates are a contributing factor in their need to file bankruptcy. I would like to briefly present our most recent statistics, and provide recommendations on the proposed payday loan bylaw.

Will you be requesting funds from the City? No

Will you be submitting a formal presentation? No
Form: Request to Speak to Committee of Council
Submitted on Monday, February 5, 2018 - 12:23 pm

==Committee Requested==
Committee: Planning Committee

==Requestor Information==
Name of Individual: Catherine Spears

Name of Organization: Spears + Associates Inc.

Contact Number: 416 698-3700 or 416 571-8321 Cell

Email Address: caspears@interlog.com

Mailing Address:
36 Queensbury Avenue Toronto ON M1N 2X7

Reason(s) for delegation request:
Eastgate Square Centennial Secondary Plan and TOV 4 Zoning

Will you be requesting funds from the City? No

Will you be submitting a formal presentation? Yes
INFORMATION REPORT

TO: Chair and Members
Planning Committee

COMMITTEE DATE: February 6, 2018

SUBJECT/REPORT NO: Licensing and By-law Services Division Resources as it Relates to the Licensing of Rental Properties (PED10049(w)) (City Wide)(Outstanding Business List Item)

WARD(S) AFFECTED: City Wide

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 August 18, 2017, City Council directed staff to report back to the Planning Committee as to whether or not the Licensing Division is able to do the necessary work in support of a report on licensing rental properties without any additional resources.

Information:

Currently rental properties are not licensed by the City and to do so would require research into the feasibility and implementation of licensing rental properties.

At the August 15, 2017 meeting, the Planning Committee considered the Rental Housing Sub-Committee Report 17-003(PED10049(v)) which sought approval for the Licensing and By-Law Services Division to hire a full time Project Manager from the redistribution of resources within the Licensing and By-law Services Division to lead this work.

The Project Manager would be tasked with updating the staff Report PED10049(h) Regulation of Rental Housing, prepare the feasibility framework for a pilot project for Licensing Rental Housing for Wards 1 and 8 and complete a high-level comparison of rental housing programs in other municipalities.

The funding for a Project Manager, for six months, is estimated to cost $60,000.

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.
Council referred Report PED10049(v) to the 2018 Budget Process, but later requested it be referred back to the Planning Committee to consider whether the work could be done with existing resources.

The Division does not have the capacity within its existing staff resources to complete this work, but absent any further direction, will contract with a Project Manager to lead the work and this may result in a pressure on the Division’s 2018 Budget.

Upon the decision to move forward, this item respecting whether or not the Licensing and By-law Services Division is able to continue to license rental properties without the resources requested be identified as complete and removed from the Planning Committee Outstanding Business List.

**Appendices and Schedules Attached**

N/A

KL:st
INFORMATION REPORT

TO: Chair and Members
Planning Committee

COMMITTEE DATE: February 6, 2018

SUBJECT/REPORT NO: Periodic Update Respecting Illegal Businesses in Rural Areas of Ward 11 (PED16207(b))(Ward 11) (Outstanding Business List Item)

WARD(S) AFFECTED: Ward 11

PREPARED BY: Robert Ustrzycki
(905) 546-2424 Ext. 4721

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

SIGNATURE:

Council Direction:

City Council, at its meeting held on June 22, 2016, approved Item 9 of Planning Committee Report 16-012, as amended, which directed staff to undertake an 18month pilot program, including hiring a temporary Zoning Enforcement Officer, to address complaints regarding alleged illegal businesses in the agricultural areas of Ward 11.

At the November 1, 2016 Planning Committee staff presented the terms of reference, including key performance measures and expectations before initiating the pilot program, with the undertaking to provide to the Planning Committee Interim Information Reports at six month intervals from the commencement of the project.

Information:

On September 19, 2017 staff Information Report PED16207(a) provided members of the Planning Committee interim results of the inspections from commencement of this project on March 6, 2017 through June 2017.

As a follow-up to Report PED16207(a), results for 73 properties investigated from March 6, 2017 to December 2017 are noted in Appendix “A” attached to this Report. Staff will continue to analyze and evaluate the data for a final report to the Planning Committee to determine if the actions and initiatives met the goals and objectives of the project.
As this report addresses the interim Information Reports on the Planning Committee Outstanding Business List respecting Illegal Businesses in Rural Areas of Ward 11, it is appropriate to be identified as complete and removed from the list.

APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED

Appendix “A”: Glanbrook Special Project Work Term Report December 15th, 2017

KL/RU/st
Glanbrook Special Project Work Term Report

December 15th, 2017

Submitted to:
Robert Ustrzycki

Submitted By:
Sanja Flynn
GOAL

The emphasis for this project is to educate businesses of the applicable Zoning By-law, and the requirements to establish a legally operating business keeping our mandate of “Open for Business”.

Both education and enforcement are important components to ensure that everyone ultimately complies with the Zoning By-laws and that all businesses operate on a level playing field. It is the desire of this enforcement plan that most illegal businesses will avail itself of the opportunity for voluntarily compliance.

Property and business owners have been very appreciative and receptive to the educational component of this project with the assistance and guidance towards compliance by the MLE staff by navigating the Zoning By-laws and various City Departments for a better understanding of their obligations.

INTERIM RESULTS

The lengthy investigation process begins by verifying the approved zoning of the property, and inspecting the premises to determine if the property is in compliance with the City Zoning By-laws and any other applicable by-laws. Every effort is made to personally attend the property and speak with the business owner to the contravention and the remedial steps that can be taken to legalize the business.

Following the first eight months, 73 suspect properties / businesses were reported and identified. Results of the inspections from March to December 2017 in Ward 11 for the 73 target locations are noted on the following pages.
Officer Sanja Flynn
December 2017

COMPLIANCE TO DATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfounded – No Contravention</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under jurisdiction of the NEC</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Compliance</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Action</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-zoning</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensing</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Investigation</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Bar chart showing compliance status]
PROGRAM ANALYSIS / MOVING FORWARD

Summary to Date

Investigation of the 73 reported complaints determined that 49% of the suspect properties were conducting businesses in contravention of the City of Hamilton Zoning and/or Licensing By-laws.

While 23 of the suspect properties still remain under investigation, only two of the 13 identified contraventions investigated in the first eight months of this pilot project resulted in legal action. Voluntary compliance was gained in 85% of the remaining identified contraventions through relocating, licensing, re-zoning applications, or ceasing operations.

Failure of the two establishments to diligently pursue their re-zoning applications will result in legal action.

Aside from this pilot project, one property was identified as a possible marijuana grow-op that was referred to Hamilton Police Services.

Officer Sanja Flynn December 2017
RECOMMENDATION

That the Sign By-law 10-197 be amended to include regulations for Construction Hoarding Signs, and that the amending by-law, attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED17217(a), which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by Council.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Section 5.11 – Other Signs outlines additional types of signs that fall outside the Regulations for Particular Type of Signs under the Sign By-law 10-197.

Construction Hoarding Signs were not considered when the original By-law was passed. However, their use is common within the construction industry. The inclusion of Construction Hoarding Signs will create the criteria for the use of these signs which is inclusive of the intent of the By-law, while ensuring this type of advertisement is not considered prohibited. The hoarding will continue to follow all construction requirements of the Site Plan as well as the Ontario Building Code. Only the regulatory approval of allowing advertising on hoarding will change.

This addition will update the Hamilton Sign By-law and supports the “Open for Business” approach as directed by Council.

Alternatives for Consideration – Not Applicable
FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial / Staffing / Legal: N/A

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The City of Hamilton Sign By-law 10-197 was passed in 2010 with further technical and housekeeping amendments approved in 2011.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS

N/A

RELEVANT CONSULTATION

Open for Business Sub-Committee, Building Division and Legal Services were consulted in the preparation of this Report.

ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

The Licensing Section of Planning and Economic Development have responded to several complaints of signage on construction hoarding over the past few years. Although it is a common practice for builders to use hoarding signs to advertise their project, the Sign By-law does not recognize this type of signage and therefore makes it prohibited under section 4.1(c) of the General Prohibition and Regulations, which reads as:

4.1 No person shall display or permit to be displayed a sign:
   (c) which is not specifically permitted under this By-law.

Following a review of the Sign By-law 10-197, the attached draft amendment provides definition, clarity and regulations as to what is acceptable on Construction Hoarding Signs and permits this type of signage.

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION

N/A

ALIGNMENT TO THE 2016 – 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN

Economic Prosperity and Growth
Hamilton has a prosperous and diverse local economy where people have opportunities to grow and develop.
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 Sign By-law 10-197

KL:st
CITY OF HAMILTON
BY-LAW NO.

To Amend By-law No. 10-197, a By-law Respecting Signs within the City of Hamilton

WHEREAS Council enacted a By-law respecting Signs within the City of Hamilton, being By-law No. 10-197;

AND WHEREAS this By-law amends By-law No. 10-197;

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

1. Subsection 5.11.2(c) of By-law No.10-197 is deleted in its entirety and replaced with the new subsection:

branding signs

(c) a sign that appears on any surface on a property (including a sign on construction hoarding authorized by the City on or abutting a property) except a wall of a building, and has no independent structure of its own, except:

(i) consisting only of the following:

1. the name of the business on the property;
2. the registered trademark of the business on the property;
3. the ownership of the business on the property; or
4. the name of an activity, product or service available or to be available on the property; and

(ii) for all branding signs other than sign on construction hoarding, in a commercial, industrial or institutional zone or on that part of a property where the use is commercial, industrial or institutional;

2. This By-law comes into force on the day it is passed.

PASSED this day , 2018.
To Amend By-law No. 10-197, a By-law respecting Signs within the City of Hamilton

Fred Eisenberger
Mayor

Rose Caterini
City Clerk

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.: PED17217(a)
Date: 02/06/2018

Ward(s) or City Wide: City Wide

Prepared by: Ken Leendertse
Phone No: 3059

For Office Use Only, this doesn't appear in the by-law
INFORMATION REPORT

TO: Chair and Members Planning Committee

COMMITTEE DATE: February 6, 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 City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 6593 and City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200, for Lands Located at 952 – 954 Concession Street, (Hamilton) (Ward 6) (PED18028)

WARD(S) AFFECTED: Ward 6

PREPARED BY: Alana Fulford (905) 546-2424 Ext. 4771

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

SIGNATURE: 

Council Direction:

In accordance with the provisions of subsection 34(11) of the Planning Act, that was in effect at the time of the appeal being filed, 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 has been 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 ZAR-17-010, 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 City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 6593 and City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200, for Lands Located at 952 – 954 Concession Street, (Hamilton) (Ward 6) (PED18028) - Page 2 of 3

Information:

The subject lands, municipally known as 952 – 954 Concession Street, Hamilton, are located at the corner of Concession Street and Upper Gage Avenue (see the Location map attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED18028).

The subject property has a lot frontage of 28 metres (along Concession Street), a lot depth of 30.480 metres, and an area of 0.09 ha. The subject property presently consists of an existing one storey commercial building approximately 395 sq m in size, containing four separate commercial units. The plaza contains 15 parking spaces (10 spaces at a 90 degree angle, and 5 parallel parking spaces), and has primary access from Concession Street. There is a secondary access to the plaza from Upper Gage Avenue via a public alley located immediately to the south of the subject property (refer to Appendix “B” to Report PED18028). The subject property is surrounded by residential development, mainly in the form of single detached dwellings, with a Neighbourhood Park (Mountain Drive Park) immediately to the north.

The application was considered by Planning Committee at its meeting on November 14, 2017, where Committee recommended denial. The application was further considered by Council on November 22, 2017, where the application was denied.

The appeal to the OMB was received by the City Clerk’s Office on November 20, 2017, 333 days after the receipt of the initial application (refer to Appendix “C” to Report PED18028). The appeal was submitted after the Planning Committee Meeting but before the Council Meeting.

Application:

Zoning By-law Amendment Application:

The purpose of the Zoning By-law Amendment Application is to rezone the subject lands from the existing “G-3/S-1214” (Public Parking Lots) District, Modified, and the existing “G-4/S-1214a” (Designed Neighbourhood Shopping Area) District, Modified, to “G-4/S-1214b” (Designed Neighbourhood Shopping Area) District, Modified, for the entirety of the subject property, to permit an Animal Hospital (veterinary clinic) on the ground floor of the existing commercial building, and to permit three (3) residential units within a proposed second storey addition. Ten (10) parking spaces are proposed. Of the ten (10) spaces proposed, four (4) spaces are for the residential use, five (5) spaces are for the commercial use, and one (1) space is for barrier free parking, to be used...
jointly for both the commercial or residential use. A number of site specific modifications are proposed to implement the proposed development.

There were two modifications to the initial proposal. Firstly, to limit the veterinary clinic to the ground floor of the existing building instead of also including the basement as part of the veterinary clinic, as originally proposed. Secondly, the four (4) residential units initially proposed for the new second storey addition were reduced to three (3).

The application was submitted on December 22, 2016 and deemed complete on January 9, 2017. Staff’s analysis of the application can be found in Report PED17193.

Public Consultation:

In accordance with Council’s Public Participation Policy, the proposal was circulated as part of the Notice of Complete Application to 83 property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands on January 20, 2017. One letter has been received from the public through this circulation. A Neighbourhood Information Meeting, organized by the applicant, was held on May 3, 2017 in consultation with the Ward Councillor. Approximately 8 residents attended the meeting. The public meeting was held on November 14, 2017, with notice of the public meeting given on October 27, 2017 to 83 property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands. Three residents attended the public meeting and made delegations in opposition to the proposed changes to the Zoning By-law.

On November 11, 2017, a petition containing 150 names was submitted in opposition to the application.

Appendices and Schedules Attached

- Appendix “A”: Location Map
- Appendix “B”: Site Plan
- Appendix “C”: Letter of Appeal

AF:jp
Location Map

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

File Name/Number: ZAR-17-010
Date: January 16, 2017

Appendix "A"

Subject Property

952 - 954 Concession Street

Key Map - Ward 6

N.T.S.
November 20, 2017

Ms. Rose Caterini
City Clerk
City of Hamilton
71 Main St. W., 1st Floor
Hamilton, ON
L8P 4Y5

Dear Ms. Caterini:

Re: Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board
Subsection 34(11) of the Planning Act, R.S.O., P. 13, as amended
Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAR-17-10
952-954 Concession Street, Hamilton

We are counsel to Sammani 786 Inc. ("Sammani"), who is the owner of the property municipally known as 952 - 954 Concession Street (the "Site") in the City of Hamilton ("City"), with respect to their Zoning By-law Amendment application.

Through its planning consultant, IBI Group, Sammani filed an application to amend the City’s Zoning By-law, together with all of the required studies and supporting documentation. The application was declared complete as of January 9, 2017. At the Planning Committee meeting held on November 14, 2017, staff recommended approval of the application, as set out in Report No. PED17193, however despite staff’s recommendation, the Planning Committee decided to recommend refusal of the application to City Council. To date, City Council has failed to make a decision on the proposed Zoning By-law amendment.

Accordingly, on behalf of our clients we hereby appeal the proposed Zoning By-law amendment to the Ontario Municipal Board (the "Board") pursuant to the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended on the basis that they have failed to make a decision within 120 days of the application being deemed complete.

THE SITE

The Site is located on the south side of Concession Street and west of Upper Gage Avenue. The Site is rectangular in shape and represents a corner lot condition with 28 metres of frontage on Concession Street and 30 metres of frontage on Upper Gage Avenue. The Site consists of an existing one storey commercial building of approximately 385 square metres in size.
containing four separate commercial units. The Site contains 15 parking spaces, primary road access to Concession Street and secondary access from Upper Gage Avenue via a public alley located immediately to the south of the Site.

THE APPLICATION

The purpose of the application is to amend the City’s Zoning By-law No. 8593 to permit an Animal Hospital on the ground floor of the existing commercial building, and to permit three residential units within a proposed second storey addition. The amendment proposes to rezone the Site from the existing “G-3” (Public Parking Lots) District, and the existing “G-4/S-1214a” (Designed Neighbourhood Shopping Area) District, Modified to “G-4/S-1214b” (Designed Neighbourhood Shopping Area) District, Modified, for the entirety of the Site. A number of site specific modifications to the rezoning are proposed to implement the development.

ZONING AMENDMENT APPEAL

While reasons for an appeal from a non-decision are not required, we note the following in support of our client’s appeal of their Zoning By-law Amendment application:

1. As noted above, the City declared the application complete under the Planning Act as of January 9, 2016. However, City Council has failed to adopt the requested amendment within the requisite timeframe.

2. The proposal is consistent and conforms to the applicable planning policy framework as noted below:

   (a) The Provincial Policy Statement (2014), by providing an appropriate range and mix of residential and employment uses;

   (b) The Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017), by supporting the achievement of complete communities that are designed to support healthy and active living and meeting people’s need for daily living throughout an entire lifetime. The residential component also supports a range and mix of housing options to serve all sizes, incomes and ages of households. Finally, the application provides intensification within a built-up area and utilizing existing infrastructure, including transit.

   (c) Urban Hamilton Official Plan, by proposing a veterinary clinic and residential uses, which are permitted uses within the Local Commercial designation. It also satisfies
the built form policy for multiple storey buildings to be designed with local commercial uses on the ground floor and residential units above. It proposes that the location of the primary public entrance to the veterinary clinic be from Concession Street, which satisfies the policy that primary entrances to commercial space be through the principal façade of the building. Further streetscape improvements are proposed through façade treatment and fenestration along the street frontage. It is also a permitted form of residential intensification within the built-up area, which supports the achievement of the 40% residential and employment intensification target within Neighbourhoods. The proposal contributes to achieving a range of dwelling types, while the built form is of an appropriate scale which maintains a relationship with the existing neighbourhood character.

(d) From both a land use and urban design standpoint, the proposal is compatible with and sensitive to the surrounding neighbourhood, in terms of the proposed height, built form, and other urban design features. The proposed residential units are a complementary addition to the existing commercial use of the Site.

(e) The proposed redevelopment facilitates an appropriate form of land development and represents good land use planning.

(f) From a land use planning perspective, the proposed redevelopment of the Site promotes the achievement of numerous policy directives supporting intensification within built-up urban area, particularly in locations that are well served by municipal infrastructure, including public transit. The proposed redevelopment would result in a desirable mixed use development that supports the achievement of complete communities.

(g) Such further and other reasons as counsel may advise and the Board may permit.

In satisfaction of the Board’s filing requirements, attached please find attached the following:

1. Board appeal form entitled “Appellant Form (A1)” duly completed and signed; and

2. One cheque, in the amount of $300.00, payable to the Minister of Finance representing the Board’s filing fee for the appeal herein.

In the interim, kindly acknowledge the receipt of this letter and advise that the appeal has been forwarded to the Board in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act.
Thank you for your attention to this matter. We trust that the enclosed material and the above information are sufficient for the acceptance of the appeal at this time. If you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours truly,

WeirFoulds LLP

Denise Baker

DB/rev

Ends.

cc: Client

11099802.1
## 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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Appeal a decision by local council that adopted an OP or OPA (exempt from approval by Minister or Approval Authority)</td>
<td>17(34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the plan within 180 days</td>
<td>17(40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Council failed to adopt the requested amendment within 180 days</td>
<td>22(7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Council refused the requested amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning By-law or Zoning By-law Amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law – refused by the municipality</td>
<td></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>☐ Appeal a decision that approved or refused the application</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent/Severance</td>
<td>☐ Appeal conditions imposed</td>
<td>50(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Appeal changed conditions</td>
<td>50(27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Application for consent – Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the application within 90 days</td>
<td>50(14)</td>
<td></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(24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that approved a plan of subdivision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that did not approve a plan of subdivision</td>
<td>51(39)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Appeal a lapsing provision imposed by an Approval Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Appeal conditions imposed by an Approval Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Appeal changed conditions</td>
<td>51(48)</td>
<td></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</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></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</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>257.85</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></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></td>
<td>☐ One or more objections against an application for a ‘Class B’ aggregate removal licence</td>
<td>11(5)</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>Aggregate Removal</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></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>Municipal Act Matters</td>
<td>☐ Appeal the passing of a by-law to divide the municipality into wards</td>
<td></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>222(4)</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></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>
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2. Location Information

Address and/or Legal Description of property subject to the appeal *
952 - 954 Concession Street

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.

Last Name | First Name

Company Name or Association Name (Association must be incorporated – include copy of letter of incorporation) *
Samman 736 Inc.

Professional Title

Email Address

Daytime Telephone Number *
519-771-1730 ext.

Alternate Telephone Number
Fax Number

Mailing Address

Unit Number | Street Number * | Street Name * | PO Box
70 | Paris Road |

City/Town * | Province * | Country * | Postal Code *
Bramford | ON | Canada | N3R 1H7

4. Representative Information

☑ I hereby authorize the named company and/or individual(s) to represent me

Last Name | First Name
Baker | Denise

Company Name
WeirFoulds LLP

Professional Title
Barrister and Solicitor

Email Address
dbaken@weirfoulds.com

Daytime Telephone Number
416 477-3520 ext.

Alternate Telephone Number
905-629-8630

Fax Number
905-829-2035

Mailing Address

Unit Number | Street Number | Street Name | PO Box
10 | 1525 | Cornwall Road |

City/Town | Province | Country | Postal Code
Oakville | ON | Canada | L8J 0B2

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

☐ 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)
ZAR-17-010

Outline the nature of your appeal and the reasons for your appeal.
See attached correspondence.

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 77)

Is the 2-year no application restriction under section 22(2.2) or 34(10.0.2) 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.)

Planner and Traffic/Parking

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>Denise Baker</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017/11/17</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>February 6, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT/REPORT NO:</td>
<td>Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) for Lack of Decision on Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment Application (UHOPA-17-03), Town of Flamborough Zoning By-law No. 90-145-Z Amendment Application (ZAC-17-013) and Draft Plan of Subdivision Application (25T-201702) for Lands Located at 609 and 615 Hamilton Street North, 3 Nisbet Boulevard and 129, 131, 135 and 137 Trudell Circle (Flamborough) (Ward 15) (PED18031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD(S) AFFECTED:</td>
<td>Ward 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARED BY:</td>
<td>Brynn Nheiley 905-546-2424 Ext 4283</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 the provisions of the *Planning Act* in effect at the time of the application, specifically subsections 17 (40), 17 (40.1), 22 (7), 34 (11) and 51 (34), an Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision Application may be appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) after 270 days (Official Plan Amendment Application), 120 days (Zoning By-law Amendment Application) and 180 days (Plan of Subdivision 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 has been 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-17-03, Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-17-013 and Draft Plan of Subdivision Application 25T-201702, which have been appealed to the OMB for lack of decision.
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Information:

The subject lands municipally known as 609 & 615 Hamilton Street North, 3 Nisbet Boulevard and 129, 131, 135 and 137 Trudell Circle are located north-west of the intersection of Hamilton Street North and Parkside Drive in Waterdown (see location map attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED18031).

The subject lands are surrounded to the north by existing single detached dwellings and a youth centre; to the east by existing townhouses, Waterdown Memorial Park and by a commercial plaza; to the south by existing single detached dwellings, semi detached dwellings and townhouses; and, to the west by existing townhouses.

The subject lands make up an irregular shaped site with a frontage of 69.8 m on Hamilton Street North, having a depth of approximately 106 m (irregular), and an area of 1.15 hectares. The subject lands are currently vacant and contain remnant parcels from the Parkside Hills Subdivision, including temporary turning circles.

Applications:

The original Applications proposed to construct 63 residential units in a mix of housing types that included two (2) semi detached units fronting on a public road (Trudell Circle), 15 block townhouses on a private condominium road (Trudell Circle), two (2) back-to-back townhouses which front on a public road (Trudell Circle), seven (7) back-to-back townhouses which front on a public road (Nisbet Boulevard), and 37 back-to-back townhouses which front onto a private condominium road (Trudell Circle). 126 parking spaces and 12 visitor parking spaces were also proposed on a private road (Trudell Circle).

Official Plan Amendment Application:

The purpose of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment Application (UHOPA-17-013) is to establish a Site Specific Amendment within the Neighbourhoods Designation of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, to remove all portions of the subject lands from the Waterdown North Secondary Plan and to permit a mix of dwelling types considered to be low and medium density housing types. The effect of this amendment will be to permit the development of the subject lands to allow for 63 residential units, composed of 3% semi detached residential units with the remaining proposed units to consist of a mix of block townhouses or multiple dwellings.
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Zoning By-law Amendment Application:

The subject lands are located within three zones of the Town of Flamborough Zoning By-law No. 90-145-Z:

- 609 and 615 Hamilton Street North are located within the Automotive Commercial “AC-2” Zone, Modified;
- 129-137 Trudell Circle are located within the Urban Residential (Single Detached) “R1-34” Zone; and,
- 3 Nisbet Boulevard is located within the Medium Density Residential “R6-16” Zone, Modified.

The purpose of the Zoning By-law Amendment Application (ZAC-17-013) is to change the zoning to a Site Specific Medium Density “R6” Zone and Urban Residential (Single Detached) “R1” Zone to implement the proposed semi detached block townhouses or multiple dwellings. The proposed Zoning modifications were adapted from the “R6-27” and “R1-34” Zones in the Town of Flamborough Zoning By-law No. 90-145-Z.

Plan of Subdivision Application:

The purpose of the Plan of Subdivision Application (25T-201702) is to create two (2) semi detached dwelling lots and two (2) blocks containing 61 units with a proposed extension of the public roadway, known as Trudell Circle, to the east, and connecting to the south end of Trudell Circle by a private condominium road.

The Applications were submitted on December 23, 2016 and deemed complete on January 19, 2017, once the required Archaeological Assessment and electronic copy of all information / reports / documents were received.

On September 29, 2017, the Applicant submitted four new concept plans for consideration, and met with City Staff on November 2, 2017. The four concepts are described as follows:

- Proposal #1: 91 residential units, consisting of 84 stacked townhouses fronting on a private condominium road which includes one dead-end road and 115
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parking spaces, and seven (7) street townhouses fronting on a public road. Existing temporary cul-de-sacs were proposed to remain.

- Proposal #2: 56 residential units, consisting of 35 back-to-back townhouses and 14 townhouses fronting on a private condominium road which includes one dead-end road and 17 visitor parking spaces, and seven (7) back-to-back townhouses fronting on a public road. Existing temporary cul-de-sacs were proposed to remain.

- Proposal #3: 56 residential units, consisting of 35 back-to-back townhouses and 14 townhouses fronting on a private condominium road which includes one dead-end road, a second road loop, and 21 visitor parking spaces, and seven (7) back-to-back townhouses fronting on a public road. Existing temporary cul-de-sacs were proposed to be removed.

- Proposal #3-R: 58 residential units, consisting of 37 back-to-back townhouses and 14 townhouses fronting on a private condominium road which includes three dead-end roads and 10 visitor parking spaces, and seven (7) back-to-back townhouses fronting on a public road. Existing temporary cul-de-sacs were proposed to be removed.

Proposal #3-R, was indicated to the Applicant as being the preferred option by Staff, but that it will require revisions. Many of the comments pertaining to the original Applications, and which were circulated by Staff to the Applicant, persist as issues in the four concepts most recently provided. These issues included, but were not limited to the following:

- Access to the proposed condominium road is from two points on the existing public road, Trudell Circle. A cul-de-sac is required at each location where there is a division between the public right of way and the private road to provide for movement of maintenance vehicles within the public right of way;

- Continuous sidewalks, which connect pedestrians through the site to public sidewalks and transit stops, and avoid the need for multiple pedestrian crossings;

- In accordance with the Functional Service Report produced by Urbantech West, Staff cannot confirm there is sufficient capacity available for the existing municipal services to accommodate the proposed development; and,
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- The applicant shall ensure that the total number of residential units, including proposed units and the existing 43 units, will not exceed the maximum of 100 serviced units on a single access road.

There was a general discussion between Staff and the Applicant of the necessity to revise any reports or studies that will be impacted by changing the development proposal. To date, the Applicant has not submitted any revisions, as discussed at the November 2, 2017 meeting, of the concepts, nor to the reports and studies of the original completed Application.

The appeal to the OMB was received by the City Clerks' office on October 27, 2017, 308 days after the receipt of the initial Application.

APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED

- Appendix “A”: Location Map
- Appendix “B”: Concept Plan
- Appendix “C”: Appeal Letter

BN:jp
October 25, 2017

VIA COURIER

City of Hamilton
Office of the City Clerk
71 Main St. W., 1st Floor
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P 4Y5

Dear Sir/Madam:

Re: Notice of Appeal of Proposed Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision, Pursuant to Sections 22(7), 34(11) and 51(34) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended, respectively

609 & 615 Hamilton Street North, 3 Nisbet Boulevard and 129-137 Truedell Circle, Waterdown, City of Hamilton

We are counsel for Parkside Hills Inc. (Country Green Homes Inc.) ("Parkside") owner of lands municipally known as 609 and 615 Hamilton Street North, 3 Nisbet Boulevard and 129-137 Truedell Circle (the "Site"). The Site is located in the Village of Waterdown, within the City of Hamilton (the "City") and geographically located on the west side of Hamilton Street North between Nisbet Boulevard and Parkside Drive. The Site is also legally described as Part of Lot 8, Concession 4, Geographic Township of East Flamborough, in the City.

The Site is irregular in shape and is approximately 1.15 hectares in size, having a 132.2 metre frontage and a depth of 104.5 metres. The Site is currently vacant. 609 and 615 Hamilton Street North were the sites of two former gasoline service stations. 3 Nisbet Boulevard and 129-137 Truedell Circle are remnant parcels from an abutting subdivision being used as a temporary turning circle.

On March 22, 2016, a Formal Consultation meeting was held with the City. Following that meeting, on December 23, 2016, concurrent Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Draft Plan of Subdivision applications (the "Applications") were filed with the City of Hamilton (the "City"). By letter dated January 19, 2017, these Applications were declared complete by the City (File No's: UHOPA-17-03, ZAC-17-013 and 25T-201702). To date, City Council has failed to adopt the requested Official Plan amendment within 270 days (the processing period extended by the City from the 180 pursuant to Section 17(40.1) of the Planning Act, R.S.O. 1990, c. P.13, as amended (the "Act"), or to make a decision on the
proposed Zoning By-law amendment within 120 days. Similarly, more than 180 days have passed and the City, as the approval authority, has failed to make a decision on the Draft Plan of Subdivision.

Accordingly, on behalf of Parkside, we hereby appeal the proposed Official Plan amendment and Zoning By-law amendment to the Ontario Municipal Board (the "Board") pursuant to section 22(7) of the Act, in the case of the proposed Official Plan amendment, and pursuant to section 34(11) of the Act in the case of the proposed Zoning By-law amendment. We hereby also appeal the Draft Plan of Subdivision to the Board pursuant to Section 51(34) of the Act.

THE APPLICATIONS

The Site is currently vacant and is designated by the City's Official Plan as Neighbourhoods and Mixed Use – Medium Density in the Waterdown North Secondary Plan, save and except the lands municipally known as 609 and 615 Hamilton Street North, which are outside the Secondary Plan. The City's Zoning By-law zones the Site as Automotive Commercial "AC-2" Zone, Modified (609 and 615 Centre Road) and Medium Density Residential "R6-16" Zone, Modified (3 Nisbet Boulevard) Development "D". Both the City's Official Plan and Zoning By-law contemplate the intensification and urbanization of the Site.

The subject lands are proposed to be redeveloped for a multi-lot residential development for 63 units consisting of street back-to-back townhouse units, block townhouse units, block back-to-back townhouse units, and semi-detached units. A future Common Element Condominium will establish a shared private road that 39 units will front onto and 12 visitor parking spaces. The remaining 24 units will front onto municipal right-of-ways.

The lands will be subdivided to create two (2) lots, three (3) blocks, and one (1) street, as follows:

- Lots 1 and 2: Two (2) semi-detached dwelling units;
- Block 1: 14 street back-to-back townhouse units;
- Block 2: Road widening of Hamilton Street North, to be dedicated to the City;
- Block 3: 47 dwelling units, consisting of eight (8) street back-to-back townhouse units, 24 block back-to-back townhouse units, and 15 block townhouse units; and,
• Street 'A' – Municipal right-of-way (i.e., extension of Truedell Circle).

The concurrent applications for an Official Plan Amendment and Rezoning were to advance a site-specific policy and implementing zoning to permit the intended subdivision layout, including some minor designation changes and the introduction of zoning regulatory performance standards. Specifically, an Official Plan Amendment is required to permit the block townhouse units in a "Low Density Residential" area of the "Neighbourhoods" designation and will remove the subject lands from the boundaries of the Waterdown North Secondary Plan Area. The Rezoning will provide for appropriate and contemporary zoning regulations to govern the future development of the residential enclave.

The Applications are intended to facilitate a compact form of development and to assist the City in meeting the density requirement as contained in the City's Official Plan.

While Parkside remains eager and willing to work with the City and interested stakeholders, no decision or direction has been received to conclude on the most reasonable option. Moreover, with the upcoming changes contemplated to the Act, Parkside has decided to file a "friendly" appeal of the Applications to the Board in order to advance the development.

Despite these three appeals, Parkside remains prepared to consider appropriate revisions to the proposed redevelopment, once further direction is provided by City Staff and Council. It remains our hope that this matter can be resolved on a consensual basis rather than through a contested Board hearing. However, we are filing the appeals at this stage in the expectation that the Applications for the proposed redevelopment will inevitably end up before the Board in any event, and in order to preserve our clients' place in the hearing queue.

Through this hopefully continued consultation process with the City, we expect that refinements to the Draft Plan of Subdivision may be necessary. This may include the conversion of the Draft Plan of Subdivision into a draft plan of condominium, predominantly due to the common element road discussed above.

Finally, while reasons for an appeal from a non-decision are not required under sections 22(7), 34(11) and 51(34) of the Act, we note the following in support of our clients' appeals of the Applications:

1. The proposed redevelopment of the Site is consistent with and conforms to the applicable planning policy framework as noted below:
(a) The Provincial Policy Statement (2014) ("PPS"), by providing a sustainable land use pattern for the financial well-being of the Province and the Municipality;

(b) The Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2006) ("Growth Plan"), by providing a transit-supportive form of intensification within a built-up area utilizing existing services and infrastructure. Moreover, it is a pedestrian-friendly site within a transit-oriented corridor, with major roadways and bus routes abutting the subject properties; and

(c) The City's Official Plan, insofar as the proposed higher density mixed-use development will facilitate intensification within the built-up area;

2. From both a land use and urban design standpoint, the proposed redevelopment is compatible with and sensitive to the pattern of existing development within the surrounding area, in terms of the proposed heights, densities, built form, transitional elements and other urban design features. At the same time, it affords an opportunity to significantly improve the built-form and implement the approved policy framework with a high-quality and contemporary urban design.

3. The proposed redevelopment facilitates an appropriate form of land development and represents good land use planning.

4. The proposed Zoning By-law amendments for the Site include appropriate zoning regulations, which collectively eliminate or mitigate any undue impacts on adjoining properties or the surrounding community. Those zoning regulations will form the basis for a detailed site plan review.

5. The proposed redevelopment represents an appropriate level of redevelopment and intensification of the Site. The proposed redevelopment is in keeping with the planning and urban design framework established in the PPS, the Growth Plan, the City's Official Plan and the applicable urban design guidelines.

6. From a land use planning perspective, the proposed redevelopment of the Site promotes the achievement of numerous policy directives supporting intensification within built-up urban area.

7. Such further and other reasons as counsel may advise and the Board may permit.
In satisfaction of the Board's filing requirements, attached please find the following:

1. Three (3) Board appeal forms entitled "Appellant Form (A1)" duly completed and signed in respect of the Official Plan, zoning, and Draft Plan of Subdivision appeals herein; and

2. One (1) cheque, in the amount of $900.00, payable to the Minister of Finance representing the Board's filing fees for the three appeals herein.

In the interim, kindly acknowledge the receipt and sufficiency of this letter and advise that the appeals have been forwarded to the Board in accordance with the provisions of sections 22(9) and 34(23) of the Planning Act.

By copy of this letter to the Board, we are requesting that the files on these three related appeals be processed concurrently pending a formal consolidation with one another.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. Should you have any questions or require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me or Paul Chronis, Senior Planner in our office, at (416) 947-5069 or pchronis@weirfoulds.com.

Yours truly,

Michael J. McQuaid, Q.C.
WeirFoulds LLP

Encl.

C: Paul Chronis, WeirFoulds LLP
Clients
Instructions for preparing and submitting the Appellant Form (A1)

- **Important:** Do not send your appeal directly to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB).
  Submit your completed appeal form(s) and filing fee(s) by the filing deadline to either the Municipality or the Approval Authority/School Board, as applicable. The notice of decision provided by the municipality/approval authority will tell you where to send the form and appeal fee.

- The Municipality/Approval Authority/School Board will forward your appeal(s) and fee(s) to the OMB.

- We are committed to providing services as set out in the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005.*
  If you have any accessibility needs, please contact our Accessibility Coordinator as soon as possible at:
  - Toll free: 1-866-448-2248;
  - TTY: 1-800-855-1155 via Bell relay

- E-mail is the primary form of communication used by the OMB. Providing an e-mail address ensures prompt delivery/receipt of documents and information. Please ensure to include your e-mail address in the space provided on the appeal form.

- A filing fee of $300 is required for each type of appeal you are filing.
  Example: An appeal of an official plan and a zoning by-law would be $300 + $300 for a total fee of $600.

- To view the Fee Schedule, visit the OMB’s website [http://elto.gov.on.ca/omb/fee-chart/].

- The filing fee **must** be paid by certified cheque or money order, in Canadian funds, payable to the **Minister of Finance.** Do not send cash.

- If you are represented by a solicitor the filing fee may be paid by a solicitor’s general or trust account cheque.

- Professional representation is not required but please advise the OMB if you retain a representative after the submission of this form.

- The *Planning Act, Development Charges Act, Education Act* and *Ontario Municipal Board Act* are available on the OMB’s website [http://elto.gov.on.ca/omb/legislation-and-regulations/].

- Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory.
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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Appeal the passing of an Interim Control By-law</td>
<td>38(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Variance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>Appeal a decision of the Committee of Adjustment that approved or refused the application</td>
<td>45(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</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(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent/Severance</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>☐</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>Plan of Subdivision</td>
<td></td>
<td></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</td>
<td>Appeal a Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge</td>
<td>Appeal an amendment to a Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>19(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge</td>
<td>Appeal municipality's decision regarding a complaint</td>
<td>22(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge</td>
<td>Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td>22(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-ending</td>
<td>Objection to a front-ending agreement</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-ending</td>
<td>Objection to an amendment to a front-ending agreement</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Development</td>
<td>Appeal an Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>257.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Development</td>
<td>Appeal an amendment to an Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>257.74(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Development</td>
<td>Appeal approval authority's decision regarding a complaint</td>
<td>257.87(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Development</td>
<td>Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td>257.87(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</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</td>
<td>One or more objections against an application for a 'Class B' aggregate removal licence</td>
<td>11(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>Application for a 'Class A' licence – refused by Minister</td>
<td>11(11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>Application for a 'Class B' licence – refused by Minister</td>
<td>11(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>Changes to conditions to a licence</td>
<td>13(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>Amendment of site plans</td>
<td>16(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>Minister proposes to transfer the licence – applicant does not have licensee’s consent</td>
<td>18(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>Minister proposes to refuse transfer of licence – applicant is licensee or has licensee’s consent to transfer</td>
<td>18(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>Minister proposes to refuse transfer of licence – applicant does not have licensee’s consent to transfer</td>
<td>18(7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>Revocation of licence</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>Municipal Act Matters</td>
<td>Appeal the passing of a by-law to redivide the municipality into wards</td>
<td>222(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal Act Matters</td>
<td>Appeal the passing of a by-law to dissolve the existing wards</td>
<td>222(6)</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>Ontario Heritage Act Matters</td>
<td>Appeal the passing of a by-law designating a heritage conservation district</td>
<td>41(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Matters</td>
<td>Subject of Appeal</td>
<td>Act/Legislation Name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2. Location Information

Address and/or Legal Description of property subject to the appeal *
609 & 615 Hamilton Street North, 3 Nisbet Boulevard and 129-137 Truedell Circle, Watertown, Hamilton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality *</th>
<th>City of Hamilton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Tier (Example: county, district, region)</td>
<td></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>Nesbitt</td>
<td>John G.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Company Name or Association Name (Association must be incorporated – include copy of letter of incorporation)
Parkside Hills Inc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Email Address
jeff.colyer@countrygreenhomes.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daytime Telephone Number *</th>
<th>Alternate Telephone Number</th>
<th>Fax Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>905-693-8525 ext.</td>
<td></td>
<td>905-693-1103</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>C</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>Industrial Drive</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>Milton</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>L9T 5A6</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>McQuaid</td>
<td>Mike</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Company Name
WeirFoulds LLP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Email Address
mcquaid@weirfoulds.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daytime Telephone Number</th>
<th>Alternate Telephone Number</th>
<th>Fax Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>416-365-1110 ext.5020</td>
<td></td>
<td>416-365-1876</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>4100</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Wellington 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>Toronto</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>M5K 1B7</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)
UHOPA-17-03, ZAC-17-013 & 25T-201702

Outline the nature of your appeal and the reasons for your appeal *
Refer to the attached Notice of Appeal

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)
Subdivision and Zoning concurrently appealed

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?

Three

Describe expert witness(es)' area of expertise (For example: land use planner, architect, engineer, etc.)
Planning, Traffic & Urban Design
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)
Michael McQuaid  [Signature]  2017/10/25

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.
Instructions for preparing and submitting the Appellant Form (A1)

- **Important:** Do not send your appeal directly to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB).
  Submit your completed appeal form(s) and filing fee(s) by the filing deadline to either the Municipality or the Approval Authority/School Board, as applicable. The notice of decision provided by the municipality/approval authority will tell you where to send the form and appeal fee.

- The Municipality/Approval Authority/School Board will forward your appeal(s) and fee(s) to the OMB.

- We are committed to providing services as set out in the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005*. If you have any accessibility needs, please contact our Accessibility Coordinator as soon as possible at:
  - Toll free: 1-866-448-2248; or
  - TTY: 1-800-855-1155 via Bell relay

- E-mail is the primary form of communication used by the OMB. Providing an e-mail address ensures prompt delivery/receipt of documents and information. Please ensure to include your e-mail address in the space provided on the appeal form.

- A filing fee of $300 is required for each type of appeal you are filing.
  Example: An appeal of an official plan and a zoning by-law would be $300 + $300 for a total fee of $600.

- To view the Fee Schedule, visit the OMB’s website [http://elto.gov.on.ca/omb/fee-chart/].

- The filing fee **must** be paid by certified cheque or money order, in Canadian funds, payable to the Minister of Finance. Do not send cash.

- If you are represented by a solicitor the filing fee may be paid by a solicitor’s general or trust account cheque.

- Professional representation is not required but please advise the OMB if you retain a representative after the submission of this form.

- The *Planning Act, Development Charges Act, Education Act and Ontario Municipal Board Act* are available on the OMB’s website [http://elto.gov.on.ca/omb/legislation-and-regulations/].

- Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory.
## 1. Appeal Type (Please check all applicable boxes)

### Subject of Appeal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Act Matters</th>
<th>Zoning By-law or Zoning By-law Amendment</th>
<th>Interim Control Zoning By-law</th>
<th>Minor Variance</th>
<th>Consent/Severance</th>
<th>Plan of Subdivision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ Appeal a decision by local council that adopted an OP or OPA (exempt from approval by Minister or Approval Authority)</td>
<td>□ Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law – failed to make a decision on the application within 120 days</td>
<td>□ Appeal the passing of an Interim Control By-law</td>
<td>□ Appeal a decision of the Committee of Adjustment that approved or refused the application</td>
<td>□ Appeal a decision that approved or refused the application</td>
<td>□ Application for a plan of subdivision – Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the plan within 180 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that approved or did not approve all or part of a plan or amendment</td>
<td>□ Application for an amendment to the Zoning By-law – refused by the municipality</td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal conditions imposed</td>
<td>□ Appeal conditions imposed</td>
<td>□ Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that approved a plan of subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the plan within 180 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal changed conditions</td>
<td>□ Appeal changed conditions</td>
<td>□ Appeal a decision of an Approval Authority that did <strong>not approve</strong> a plan of subdivision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Council failed to adopt the requested amendment within 180 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Application for consent – Approval Authority failed to make a decision on the application within 90 days</td>
<td>□ Application for consent imposed by an Approval Authority</td>
<td>□ Appeal a lapsing provision imposed by an Approval Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>□ Council refused the requested amendment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal conditions imposed by an Approval Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Act Reference (Section)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Act Matters</th>
<th>Zoning By-law or Zoning By-law Amendment</th>
<th>Interim Control Zoning By-law</th>
<th>Minor Variance</th>
<th>Consent/Severance</th>
<th>Plan of Subdivision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17(24)</td>
<td>34(19)</td>
<td>38(4)</td>
<td>45(12)</td>
<td>53(19)</td>
<td>51(34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17(36)</td>
<td>34(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53(19)</td>
<td>51(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17(40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53(27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22(7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51(43)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject of Appeal</td>
<td>Type of Appeal</td>
<td>Act Reference (Section)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Development Charges Act Matters</strong></td>
<td>Appeal a Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge</td>
<td>Appeal an amendment to a Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>19(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge</td>
<td>Appeal municipality’s decision regarding a complaint</td>
<td>22(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge</td>
<td>Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td>22(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-ending</td>
<td>Objection to a front-ending agreement</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front-ending</td>
<td>Objection to an amendment to a front-ending agreement</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education Act Matters</strong></td>
<td>Appeal an Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>257.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Development</td>
<td>Appeal an amendment to an Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>257.74(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Development</td>
<td>Appeal approval authority’s decision regarding a complaint</td>
<td>257.87(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Development</td>
<td>Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td>257.87(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggregate Resources Act Matters</strong></td>
<td>One or more objections against an application for a ‘Class A’ aggregate removal licence</td>
<td>11(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>One or more objections against an application for a ‘Class B’ aggregate removal licence</td>
<td>11(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>Application for a ‘Class A’ licence – refused by Minister</td>
<td>11(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>Application for a ‘Class B’ licence – refused by Minister</td>
<td>11(11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>Changes to conditions to a licence</td>
<td>13(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>Amendment of site plans</td>
<td>16(8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>Minister proposes to transfer the licence – applicant does not have licensee’s consent</td>
<td>18(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>Minister proposes to refuse transfer of licence – applicant is licensee or has licensee’s consent to transfer</td>
<td>18(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>Minister proposes to refuse transfer of licence – applicant does not have licensee’s consent to transfer</td>
<td>18(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>Revocation of licence</td>
<td>20(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Municipal Act Matters</strong></td>
<td>Appeal the passing of a by-law to divide the municipality into wards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>222(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ward Boundary By-law</td>
<td>Appeal the passing of a by-law to dissolve the existing wards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontario Heritage Act Matters</strong></td>
<td>Appeal the passing of a by-law designating a heritage conservation study area</td>
<td>40.1(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td>Appeal the passing of a by-law designating a heritage conservation district</td>
<td>41(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 *
609 & 615 Hamilton Street North, 3 Nisbet Boulevard and 129-137 Truedell Circle, Watertown, Hamilton

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.

Last Name
Nesbitt
First Name
John G.

Company Name or Association Name (Association must be incorporated – include copy of letter of incorporation)
Parkside Hills Inc.

Professional Title
President

Email Address
jeff.colyer@countrygreenhomes.com

Daytime Telephone Number *
905-693-8525  ext.
Alternate Telephone Number
Fax Number
905-693-1103

Mailing Address
Unit Number
C
Street Number *
410
Street Name *
Industrial Drive
PO Box

City/Town *
Milton
Province *
Ontario
Country *
Canada
Postal Code *
L9T 5A6

4. Representative Information

☑ I hereby authorize the named company and/or individual(s) to represent me

Last Name
McQuaid
First Name
Mike

Company Name
WeirFoulds LLP

Professional Title
Lawyer

Email Address
mcquaid@weirfoulds.com

Daytime Telephone Number *
416-365-1110  ext.5020
Alternate Telephone Number
Fax Number
416-365-1876

Mailing Address
Unit Number
4100
Street Number
66
Street Name
Wellington Street West
PO Box

City/Town
Toronto
Province
Ontario
Country
Canada
Postal Code
M5K 1B7

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)
UHOPA-17-03, ZAC-17-013 & 25T-201702

Outline the nature of your appeal and the reasons for your appeal *
Refer to the attached Notice of Appeal

---

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?

Three

Describe expert witness(es)' area of expertise (For example: land use planner, architect, engineer, etc.)

Planning, Traffic & Urban Design
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

Michael McQuaid

Signature of Appellant/Representative

Date (yyyy/mm/dd)

2017/10/25

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.
Instructions for preparing and submitting the Appellant Form (A1)

- **Important**: Do not send your appeal directly to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB).

Submit your completed appeal form(s) and filing fee(s) by the filing deadline to either the Municipality or the Approval Authority/School Board, as applicable. The notice of decision provided by the municipality/approval authority will tell you where to send the form and appeal fee.

- The Municipality/Approval Authority/School Board will forward your appeal(s) and fee(s) to the OMB.

- We are committed to providing services as set out in the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act, 2005*. If you have any accessibility needs, please contact our Accessibility Coordinator as soon as possible at:
  - Toll free: 1-866-448-2248; or
  - TTY: 1-800-855-1155 via Bell relay

- E-mail is the primary form of communication used by the OMB. Providing an e-mail address ensures prompt delivery/receipt of documents and information. Please ensure to include your e-mail address in the space provided on the appeal form.

- A filing fee of $300 is required for each type of appeal you are filing. Example: An appeal of an official plan and a zoning by-law would be $300 + $300 for a total fee of $600.

- To view the Fee Schedule, visit the OMB’s website [http://elto.gov.on.ca/omb/fee-chart/].

- The filing fee **must** be paid by certified cheque or money order, in Canadian funds, payable to the *Minister of Finance*. Do not send cash.

- If you are represented by a solicitor the filing fee may be paid by a solicitor’s general or trust account cheque.

- Professional representation is not required but please advise the OMB if you retain a representative after the submission of this form.

- The *Planning Act, Development Charges Act, Education Act and Ontario Municipal Board Act* are available on the OMB’s website [http://elto.gov.on.ca/omb/legislation-and-regulations/].

- Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory.
### Appellant Form (A1)

**Ontario Municipal Board**
655 Bay Street, Suite 1500
Toronto ON M5G 1E5

**Telephone:** 416-212-6349  
**Toll Free:** 1-866-448-2248  
**Fax:** 416-326-5370  
**Website:** www.elto.gov.on.ca

---

<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>📀</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>📀</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>📀</td>
<td>Appeal the passing of an Interim Control By-law</td>
<td>38(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>📀</td>
<td>Appeal a decision of the Committee of Adjustment that approved or refused the application</td>
<td>45(12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>📀</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>📀</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 did <strong>not approve</strong> a plan of subdivision</td>
<td>51(39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>📀</td>
<td>Appeal a lapping 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</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</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</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</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</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</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>Aggregate Removal</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></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></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></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ontario Heritage Act Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Matters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3040E (2017/A4)
Address and Legal Description of property subject to the appeal *
609 & 615 Hamilton Street North, 3 Nisbet Boulevard and 129-137 Truedell Circle, Watertown, Hamilton

Municipality*
City of Hamilton

Upper Tier (Example: county, district, region)

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.

Last Name
Nesbitt

First Name
John G.

Company Name or Association Name (Association must be incorporated – include copy of letter of incorporation)
Parkside Hills Inc.

Professional Title
President

Email Address
ejeff.colyer@countrygreenhomes.com

Daytime Telephone Number*
905-693-8525 ext.

Alternate Telephone Number
Fax Number
905-693-1103

Mailing Address
Unit Number
C
Street Number *
410
Street Name *
Industrial Drive

City/Town *
Milton

Province *
Ontario

Country *
Canada

PO Box

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.

☑ I hereby authorize the named company and/or individual(s) to represent me

Last Name
McQuaid

First Name
Mike

Company Name
WeirFoulds LLP

Professional Title
Lawyer

Email Address
mcquaid@weirfoulds.com

Daytime Telephone Number
416-365-1110 ext. 5020

Alternate Telephone Number
Fax Number
416-365-1876

Mailing Address
Unit Number
4100
Street Number
66
Street Name
Wellington Street West

City/Town
Toronto

Province
Ontario

Country
Canada

Postal Code
M5K 1B7
5. Appeal Specific Information

Municipal Reference Number(s)
UHOPA-17-03, ZAC-17-013 & 25T-201702

Outline the nature of your appeal and the reasons for your appeal *
Refer to the attached Notice of Appeal

---

6. Related Matters

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

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)
Official Plan and Zoning concurrently appealed

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?
Three

Describe expert witness(es)' area of expertise (For example: land use planner, architect, engineer, etc.)
Planning, Traffic & Urban Design

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)
Michael McQuaid  □/\□/\□  2017/10/25

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>February 6, 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 Urban Hamilton Official Plan and the City of Stoney Creek Zoning By-law No. 3692-92 for Lands Located at 261 King Street (Stoney Creek) (Ward 10) (PED18033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARD(S) AFFECTED:</td>
<td>Ward 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARED BY:</td>
<td>Jacob Larsen (905) 546-2424 Ext. 5277</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 the provisions of the *Planning Act* in effect at the time of the application, specifically subsections 17 (40), 17 (40.1), and 34 (11), an Official Plan Amendment, Zoning By-law Amendment and Plan of Subdivision Application may be appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB) after 270 days (Official Plan Amendment Application), 120 days (Zoning By-law Amendment Application) and 180 days (Plan of Subdivision 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 has been 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 the Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment Application UHOPA-16-028 and Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-16-068, 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 and the City of Stoney Creek Zoning By-law No. 3692-92 for Lands Located at 261 King Street (Stoney Creek) (Ward 10) (PED18033) - Page 2 of 3

Information:

The subject lands, municipally known as 261 King Street East, Hamilton, are located between Corman Avenue and Green Road (refer to Appendix “A” to Report PED18033).

The subject property is irregular in shape and has a lot frontage of 45 metres, an average lot depth of 203 metres, and an area of 0.39 ha. The subject lands are currently developed with a two storey single detached dwelling. The subject property is surrounded by residential development, mainly in the form of single detached dwellings, with institutional, commercial, and multiple dwelling uses located nearby at the intersection of King Street East and Highway 8. Additional commercial uses are located to the west on King Street East. The applications were submitted on October 24, 2016 and deemed complete on November 4, 2016.

Applications:

Official Plan Amendment Application:

The applicant applied for an Official Plan Amendment Application to the Western Development Area Secondary Plan in Volume 2 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan to redesignate the site to “Medium Density Residential 3”, to permit a multiple dwelling. Additionally, a site specific exception is required to increase the density to 116 units per net hectare. This application is proposed to permit a 45 unit multiple dwelling development in the form of a four storey building, with a stepped backed fourth floor.

Zoning By-law Amendment Application:

The applicant has applied for a Zoning By-law Amendment to rezone the subject lands from the Multiple Residential “RM3-16” Zone, Modified, to the Multiple Residential “RM4” Zone, Modified, within the Stoney Creek Zoning By-law No. 3692-92. 58 parking spaces are proposed, 54 spaces and 2 barrier-free spaces underground, and two spaces are provided at grade, at a rate of one space per dwelling unit plus 0.28 visitor spaces per unit. A number of site specific modifications are proposed to implement the proposed development, including a parking reduction of 24 spaces (29%) (refer to Appendix B to Report PED 18033).

The application was modified to address concerns raised by residents and staff and a revised development concept was submitted on June 16, 2017. These proposed design changes included a stepped-back fourth floor plate and modulation of the façade.
Public Consultation:

As per the statutory requirements of the Planning Act, and the Applicant's Public Consultation Strategy, an Open House was held on November 10, 2016. Notice of the Open House was mailed to all property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands, and the Ward Councillor. Twenty-five (25) people attended the Open House and seven (7) written submissions were received from residents opposed to the development. In addition, a petition was received signed by 144 individuals opposed to the development.

A number of outstanding issues remain, including the massing of the proposed structure, the proposed height, potential for shadows and overlook concerns, and compatibility with adjacent single detached dwellings.

The appeal to the OMB was received by the City Clerk's Office on November 27, 2017; 396 days after the receipt of the initial application (refer to Appendix “C” to Report PED18033).

Appendices and Schedules Attached

- Appendix “A”: Location Map
- Appendix “B”: Site Plan
- Appendix “C”: Letter of Appeal

AF/JL:jp
Site Location

Location Map

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

File Name/Number: ZAC-16-068/UHOPA-16-028
Date: November 2, 2016

Appendix "A"

Scale: N.T.S.
Planner/Technician: VMVS

Subject Property

261 King Street East, Stoney Creek

Key Map - Ward 10
November 27th, 2017

Rose Caterini, City Clerk
Office of the City Clerk
City of Hamilton
71 Main St. West, 1st Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Dear Ms. Caterini:

RE: Notice of Appeal – Failure to make a decision within 180 days
261 King Street East, Stoney Creek, L8G 1M1 – UHOPA-16-028

We act on behalf of J.A.N. Group Inc. with respect to the above-noted matters. J.A.N. Group Inc. is the owner of the property located at 261 King Street East, Stoney Creek, located in the City Hamilton (the "City"). The aforementioned project is being appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board due to the timeframe mandated by subsection 17(40) of the Planning Act R.S.O 1990, c. P.13, being exceeded.

The Site is located on the north side of King Street East, west of Green Road in the former City of Stoney Creek. There is an existing single detached dwelling on the property.

Please note this appeal is submitted in tandem with an appeal of the related Zoning By-law Amendment (ZAC-16-068). Our client requests that the Board consolidate these appeals to be heard together.

GSP Group Inc. submitted applications for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment on October 21st, 2016. This application was deemed complete by the City on November 18th, 2016, and was circulated on the same date. Section 17(40) of the Planning Act requires the approval authority to make a decision within a 180-day time frame. The timeframe therefore lapsed on approximately May 17th, 2017.

Accordingly, our client is appealing City Council’s non-decision on the Official Plan Amendment application to the Ontario Municipal Board pursuant to subsection 17(40) of the Planning Act, R.S.O 1990, c. P.13.

Enclosed within this appeal are: one (1) cheque in the amount of $300.00, payable to the Minister of Finance, representing the Board’s filing fees for the appeal; and one (1) completed Ontario Municipal Board appellant form.
We trust this is satisfactory. Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at bkhes@gspgroup.ca or 905-572-7477.

Yours truly,
GSP Group Inc.

[Signature]

Brenda Khes, MCIP RPP
Associate - Senior Planner

Cc: John Frketich, J.A.N. Group Inc.
Instructions for preparing and submitting the Appellant Form (A1)

- **Important:** Do not send your appeal directly to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB).
  Submit your completed appeal form(s) and filing fee(s) by the filing deadline to either the Municipality or the Approval Authority/School Board, as applicable. The notice of decision provided by the municipality/approval authority will tell you where to send the form and appeal fee.

- The Municipality/Approval Authority/School Board will forward your appeal(s) and fee(s) to the OMB.

- We are committed to providing services as set out in the *Accessibility for Ontarians with Disabilities Act*, 2005. If you have any accessibility needs, please contact our Accessibility Coordinator as soon as possible at:
  - Toll free: 1-866-448-2248; or
  - TTY: 1-800-855-1155 via Bell relay

- E-mail is the primary form of communication used by the OMB. Providing an e-mail address ensures prompt delivery/receipt of documents and information. Please ensure to include your e-mail address in the space provided on the appeal form.

- A filing fee of $300 is required for each type of appeal you are filing.
  Example: An appeal of an official plan and a zoning by-law would be $300 + $300 for a total fee of $600.

- To view the Fee Schedule, visit the OMB’s website [http://elto.gov.on.ca/omb/fee-chart/].

- The filing fee must be paid by certified cheque or money order, in Canadian funds, payable to the Minister of Finance. Do not send cash.

- If you are represented by a solicitor the filing fee may be paid by a solicitor’s general or trust account cheque.

- Professional representation is not required but please advise the OMB if you retain a representative after the submission of this form.

- The *Planning Act, Development Charges Act, Education Act* and *Ontario Municipal Board Act* are available on the OMB’s website [http://elto.gov.on.ca/omb/legislation-and-regulations/].

- Fields marked with an asterisk (*) are mandatory.
### 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></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></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>Consent/Severance</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 laping 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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge</td>
<td>□ Appeal a Development Charge By-law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By-law</td>
<td>□ Appeal an amendment to a Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal municipality's decision regarding a complaint</td>
<td>19(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge</td>
<td>□ Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td>22(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint</td>
<td>□ Appeal municipality's decision regarding a complaint</td>
<td>22(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></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</td>
<td>□ Appeal an Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>257.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge</td>
<td>□ Appeal an amendment to an Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td>257.74(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By-law</td>
<td>□ Appeal an amendment to an Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal an amendment to an Education Development Charge By-law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Appeal approval authority’s decision regarding a complaint</td>
<td>257.87(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>□ Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td>257.87(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Charge</td>
<td>□ Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaint</td>
<td>□ Failed to make a decision on the complaint within 60 days</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Revocation of licence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Resources</td>
<td>□ One or more objections against an application for a ‘Class A’ aggregate</td>
<td>11(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act Matters</td>
<td>removal licence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ One or more objections against an application for a ‘Class B’ aggregate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Amendment of site plans</td>
<td>16(8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Removal</td>
<td>□ Minister proposes to transfer the licence – applicant does not have</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licence</td>
<td>licensee’s consent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Minister proposes to refuse transfer of licence – applicant is licensee or</td>
<td>18(5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>licensee’s consent to transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ Revocation of licence</td>
<td>20(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>□ Appeal the passing of a by-law to divide the municipality into wards</td>
<td>222(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act Matters</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>Heritage</td>
<td>□ Appeal the passing of a by-law designating a heritage conservation study</td>
<td>40.1(4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation District</td>
<td>area</td>
<td></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

#### 2. Location Information

Address and/or Legal Description of property subject to the appeal *

- 261 King Street East
- Stoney Creek, ON
- L8G 1M1

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.

- **Last Name:** Frketich
- **First Name:** John

Company Name or Association Name (Association must be incorporated – include copy of letter of incorporation)
- J.A.N Group Inc.

Professional Title

- Email Address: jfrketic@can-amindustrial.com

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daytime Telephone Number *</th>
<th>Alternate Telephone Number</th>
<th>Fax Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>905-920-6010 ext.</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>8</td>
<td>Admiral Circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **City/Town:** Grimsby
- **Province:** Ontario
- **Country:** Canada
- **Postal Code:** L3M 5C7

#### 4. Representative Information

I hereby authorize the named company and/or individual(s) to represent me

- **Last Name:** Khes
- **First Name:** Brenda

Company Name
- GSP Group Inc.

Professional Title
- Senior Planner

Email Address
- bkhes@gspgroup.ca

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Daytime Telephone Number</th>
<th>Alternate Telephone Number</th>
<th>Fax Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>905-572-7477 ext.</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>200</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>Locke Street South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **City/Town:** Hamilton
- **Province:** Ontario
- **Country:** Canada
- **Postal Code:** L8P 4A9
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)
UHOPA-16-028

Outline the nature of your appeal and the reasons for your appeal *
Please see attached cover letter

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?

3+

Describe expert witness(es)' area of expertise (For example: land use planner, architect, engineer, etc.)
Land Use Planner, Urban Design Expert, Transportation Engineer, others
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
Brenda Khes

Signature of Appellant/Representative

Date (yyyy/mm/dd)
2017/11/27

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.
HAMILTON MUNICIPAL HERITAGE COMMITTEE
REPORT 18-001
9:30 a.m.
Thursday, January 18, 2018
Room 264, 2nd Floor
Hamilton City Hall
71 Main Street West

Present: Councillors A. Johnson and M. Pearson
A. Denham-Robinson (Chair), W. Arndt, D. Beland, G. Carroll, C. Dmitry, K. Garay, M. McGaw, T. Ritchie, K. Stacey

Absent with Regrets: Councillor J. Partridge – Personal, R. Sinclair, T. Wallis

THE HAMILTON MUNICIPAL HERITAGE COMMITTEE PRESENTS REPORT 18-001
AND RESPECTFULLY RECOMMENDS:

1. Inventory & Research Working Group Meeting Notes – October 30, 2017 (Item 5.2)

(a) Addition of St. Luke’s Anglican Church, 454 John Street North to the City of Hamilton Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.

The Inventory/Research Working Group recommends that St. Luke’s Anglican Church, 454 John Street North, be added to the City of Hamilton Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.

(b) Addition of Hughson Street Baptist Church, 383 Hughson Street, North to the City of Hamilton Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.

The Inventory/Research Working Group recommends that Hughson Street Baptist Church, 383 Hughson Street, North be added to the City of Hamilton Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.
2. Correspondence from Wayne Morgan, President, Community Heritage Ontario, respecting Report 10 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development entitled Preserving Canada’s Heritage: The Foundation for Tomorrow. (Item 11.1)

(a) That the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee supports the recommendations in the Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development Report entitled “Preserving Canada’s Heritage: The Foundation of Tomorrow”; attached as Appendix “A” to Report 18-001;

(b) That approval be given to the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee to write to the federal Minister of Environment and Sustainable Development, with copies to the Minister of Finance and local Members of Parliament, in support of the recommendations in Preserving Canada’s Heritage: The Foundation of Tomorrow”, as outlined in the draft letter attached as Appendix “B” to Report 18-001;

(c) That the Mayor be requested to co-sign the letter in support the recommendations in Preserving Canada’s Heritage: The Foundation of Tomorrow.

FOR INFORMATION:

(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (Item 1)

The Chair introduced Greg MacPherson, the new Assistant Cultural Planner to the Committee.

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

1. DELEGATION REQUEST (Item 4)

4.2 Sergio Manchia, Urban Solutions Planning & Land Development Consultants Inc., respecting PED18019, Recommendation to Designate 104 King Street West, Dundas (Former Dundas Post Office) Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (for today’s meeting)

2. CONSENT ITEM (Item 5)

5.2 Inventory and Research Working Group Meeting Notes – October 30, 3017 (deferred at the December 14, 2017 Hamilton Municipal Heritage Meeting)

Item 8.1, Recommendation to Designate 104 King Street West, Dundas (Former Dundas Post Office) Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act
(PED18019) (Ward 13) was moved up the agenda to immediately follow Consent Items; and

Item 7.1, Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee Member Roles and Responsibilities, be moved down the agenda to immediately following Item 11.2.

The Agenda for the January 18, 2018 Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee was approved, as amended.

(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 2)

D. Beland declared interest in Added Item 5.2, Inventory & Research Working Group Meeting Notes – October 30, 2017, as a family member is the Pastor of Hughson St. Baptist Church.

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

(i) December 14, 2017 (Item 3.1)

The Minutes of the December 14, 2017 meeting of the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee were approved, as presented.

(d) DELEGATION REQUESTS (Item 4)

(i) Pastor Dwayne Cline, Hughson St. Baptist Church, respecting 383 Hughson St. North, Hamilton (for today’s meeting) (Item 4.1)

The delegation request from Pastor Dwayne Cline, Hughson St. Baptist Church, respecting 383 Hughson St. North, Hamilton, was approved for today’s meeting.

(ii) Sergio Manchia, Urban Solutions Planning & Land Development Consultants Inc., respecting PED18019, Recommendation to Designate 104 King Street West, Dundas (Former Dundas Post Office) Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (for today’s meeting) (Added Item 4.2)

The delegation request from Sergio Manchia, Urban Solutions Planning & Land Development Consultants Inc., respecting PED18019, Recommendation to Designate 104 King Street West, Dundas (Former Dundas Post Office), was withdrawn, as the report has been deferred to a future meeting of the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee.
(e) CONSENT ITEMS (Item 5)

(i) Heritage Permit Application – Delegated Approval (Item 5.1)

Heritage Permit Application HP2017-071, Proposed replacement of front steps and stoop, 37 Mill Street North, Flamborough (Waterdown), By-law No. 93-34-H, was received.

(ii) Inventory & Research Working Group Meeting Notes – October 30, 2017 (Added Item 5.2) (TABLED at the December 14, 2017 meeting)

Pastor Dwayne Cline was present at the meeting but did not wish to speak to the Committee.

The Inventory & Research Working Group Meeting Notes of October 30, 2017 were LIFTED from the Table.

For further disposition of this matter, refer to Item 1.

(f) PRESENTATION (Item 7)

(i) Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee Member Roles and Responsibilities (Item 7.1)

Jeremy Parsons and Chelsey Tyers, Cultural Heritage Planners, addressed Committee with an overview of Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee Member Roles and Responsibilities from a Heritage perspective, with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation. Paper copies of the presentation were distributed at the meeting. A copy of the presentation has been included in the official record.

Loren Kolar, Legislative Coordinator, addressed Committee with an overview of Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee Member Roles and Responsibilities from a Heritage perspective, with the aid of speaking notes. A copy of the notes has been included in the official record.

The presentation respecting Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee Member Roles and Responsibilities, was received.

The presentation is available through the Office of the City Clerk.

(g) DISCUSSION ITEM (Item 8)

(i) Recommendation to Designate 104 King Street West, Dundas (Former Dundas Post Office) Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act (PED18019) (Ward 13) (Item 8.1)
Report PED18019 respecting a Recommendation to Designate 104 King Street West, Dundas (Former Dundas Post Office) Under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act, was deferred to a future meeting of the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee to allow for staff to work with the developer.

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

(ii) Buildings and Landscapes (Item 11.5)

The following items were removed from the List of Buildings and Landscapes, as they no longer required monitoring by the Committee:

(a) Endangered Buildings and Landscapes:

(ix) 43-51 King Street East, Hamilton (Kresge Property) (R) – K. Stacey

(x) St. Thomas Anglican Church Parsonage, 18 West Avenue South, Hamilton – T. Ritchie

(b) Buildings and Landscapes of Interest (yellow):

(iii) Centenary Church, 24 Main Street West (R) – D. Beland

(vi) 33 Bowen Street, Hamilton (R) - T. Ritchie

The following updates were received:

(a) Endangered Buildings and Landscapes (Red):

Red = Properties where there is a perceived immediate threat to heritage resources through: demolition; neglect; vacancy; alterations, and/or, redevelopment

(i) Tivoli, 108 James Street North, Hamilton (D) – A. Johnson

No report.

(ii) Book House, 167 Book Road East, Ancaster (R) – M. McGaw

No report.

(iii) Andrew Sloss House, 372 Butter Road West, Ancaster (D) – M. McGaw

No report.
(iv) Century Manor, 100 West 5th Street, Hamilton (D) – K. Garay

No report.

(v) Beach Canal Lighthouse (D) – J. Partridge

No report.

(vi) 18-22 King Street East, Hamilton (R)(NOI) – K. Stacey

No report.

(vii) 24-28 King Street East, Hamilton (R)(NOI) – K. Stacey

No report.

(viii) 1 St. James Place, Hamilton (D) – K. Stacey

No report.

(ix) 2 Hatt Street, Dundas – K. Stacey

No report.

(b) Buildings and Landscapes of Interest (yellow):
(Yellow = Properties that are undergoing some type of change, such as a change in ownership or use, but are not perceived as being immediately threatened)

(i) Delta High School, 1284 Main Street East, Hamilton (D) – D. Beland

No report.

(ii) James Street Baptist Church, 96 James Street South, Hamilton (D) – A. Denham-Robinson

No report.

(iii) Pearson Home, 493 Dundas Street East, Waterdown (D) – J. Partridge / W. Arndt

No report.

(iv) St. Giles United Church, 85 Holton Avenue South (L) – D. Beland

No report.
No report.

(vi) 33 Bowen Street, Hamilton (R) - T. Ritchie

A new restaurant has been opened at the property.

(vii) 2251 Rymal Road East, Stoney Creek (R) – C. Dimitry

No report.

(c) Heritage Properties Update (green): (Green = Properties whose status is stable)

(i) The Royal Connaught Hotel, 112 King Street East, Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie

No report.

(ii) (Thomas Building) 46 - 52 James Street North, Hamilton (D) – R. Sinclair

No report.

(iii) St. Marks, 120 Bay Street South, Hamilton (D) – A. Denham-Robinson

No report.

(iv) Auchmar, 88 Fennell Avenue West, Hamilton (D) – K. Garay

The fundraiser planned for the property has been postponed.

(vi) Jimmy Thompson Pool, 1099 King Street E., Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie

No report.

(vii) Abrey-Zimmerman House, Courtcliffe Park, Flamborough (D) – J. Partridge

(viii) Treble Hall, 4-12 John Street North, Hamilton (R) – T. Ritchie

New signage has appeared giving a website for information on rental possibilities in the building.
(d) Heritage Properties Update (black):
(Black = Properties that HMHC have no control over and may be demolished)

(i) Auchmar Gate House, Claremont Lodge 71 Claremont Drive (R) – K. Garay
   No report.

(h) ADJOURNMENT (Item 12)

There being no further business, the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee, adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Alissa Denham-Robinson, Chair
Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee

Loren Kolar
Legislative Coordinator
Office of the City Clerk
December 29, 2017

Hamilton
Ms. Alissa Denham-Robinson
Chairperson
Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee
c/o Loren Kolar, Legislative Coordinator
71 Main St West
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Dear Ms. Alissa Denham-Robinson,

Community Heritage Ontario (CHO) is writing to all Ontario municipal heritage committees seeking support for federal action on the conservation of heritage properties.

CHO seeks the support of both your Heritage Committee and your Municipal Council in each writing to the federal Minister of Environment with copies to the Minister of Finance and your member(s) of federal Parliament supporting the recommendations of the federal House of Commons Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development contained in report 10 regarding the preservation of Canada’s heritage. A copy of the seventeen Committee recommendations is attached. The full report is available for viewing at: http://www.ourcommons.ca/DocumentViewer/en/42-1/ENVI/report-10.

While all of the Committee’s recommendations are worthy of support, it would be helpful if, in your letters, you emphasized recommendation number eleven, a proposed tax credit for restoration and preservation work on buildings listed in the Canadian Register of Historic Places. The tax credit program could be similar to one that has been utilized for years by the United States federal government. That tax credit program has achieved success in conserving America’s heritage properties while at the same time generating substantial economic development.

Implementation of the Committee’s recommendations will not only help conserve federally owned heritage properties but will also assist in the conservation of privately owned heritage properties.

It is essential that we demonstrate widespread support for a federal government role in conserving Canada’s heritage and that this role should be pursued through the implementation of the Standing Committee’s recommendations.

Input is being sought by the federal government on these recommendations over the next two months. It is important that letters of support be received by the federal Ministers no later than February 28, 2018.

Sincerely,

Wayne Morgan
President, Community Heritage Ontario

Recommendations Attached
RECOMMENDATIONS

of Report 10 of the House of Commons Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development - Preserving Canada’s Heritage: The Foundation for Tomorrow

The Committee Recommends that the federal government:

1. *Policy on Management of Real Property* be integrated in new legislation so that custodian departments of designated federal heritage buildings are required to protect the commemorative integrity of these buildings and prevent demolition-by-neglect.

2. introduce legislation to provide statutory protection for federal heritage buildings.

3. introduce legislation imposing on Crown corporations the same requirements imposed on federal departments and agencies by the *Policy on Management of Real Property* regarding the management of federal heritage buildings, in order to protect the commemorative integrity of buildings owned by these Crown corporations and prevent their demolition-by-neglect.

4. introduce legislation to establish a process to protect, conserve, document and exhibit archaeological resources on federal land and under waters of federal responsibility.

5. introduce legislation to provide a statutory obligation on federal departments, agencies and Crown corporations to protect the commemorative integrity of all national historic sites of Canada.

6. introduce legislation to provide a statutory obligation on federal departments, agencies and Crown corporations to protect the integrity of federal heritage buildings owned by the federal government or under its jurisdiction.

7. Treasury Board Secretariat work with federal departments and agencies to ensure that they invest 2% of the asset replacement value annually towards the maintenance and repair of federal heritage buildings, as recommended in the Treasury Board Secretariat’s *Guide to the Management of Real Property*.

8. adopt a policy requiring federal departments and agencies to, when deemed appropriate, give preference to existing heritage buildings when considering leasing or purchasing space.

9. introduce legislation to:

   a. ensure that federal actions do not adversely impact the commemorative integrity of national historic sites of Canada or the integrity of heritage sites and buildings designated by provinces and municipalities in Canada;

   b. provide statutory protection for Canadian World Heritage sites;

   c. ensure that federal actions take into consideration the heritage values of Canada’s historic places; and

   d. give statutory recognition of the Canadian Register of Historic Places and the *Standards and Guidelines for the Conservation of Historic Places in Canada*. 
10. restore the funding level for the National Cost-Sharing Program for Heritage Places to a minimum of $10 million per year.

11. establish a tax credit for the restoration and preservation of buildings listed on the Canadian Register of Historic Places.

12. in co-operation with provincial and territorial governments, work to adapt future versions of Canada’s National Model Building Codes in a manner that will facilitate the restoration and the rehabilitation of existing buildings and the preservation of their heritage characteristics.

13. Parks Canada review its National Cost-Sharing Program and, if it is determined that rural sites are under-represented in applications for funding or in the awarding of funding, steps should be taken to improve the program.

14. consider supporting an initiative modelled after the “Main Street America” model, to encourage public and private investment in commercial historic buildings in rural areas and small cities as a catalyst for community sustainability and economic development.

15. support an Indigenous-led initiative that will be responsible for:

   a. determining how places that are important to Canada’s Indigenous peoples should be protected and preserved;

   b. enhancing the capacity of Indigenous communities to preserve places that are important to them; and

   c. presenting the perspective of Indigenous communities regarding the protection of places that are important to them to the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada and its Secretariat, Parks Canada and other federal government departments and agencies.

16. Parks Canada, in cooperation with Indigenous groups, include Indigenous registrars in the Canadian Register of Historic Places to improve the process by which Indigenous places that are important to Indigenous peoples are identified and designated.

17. in support of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s calls to action 79 and 81, and in consultation with Indigenous groups:

   a. introduce legislation amending the Historic Sites and Monuments Act to add First Nations, Inuit, and Métis representation on the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada and its Secretariat.

   b. The Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada revise the policies, criteria, and practices of the National Program of Historical Commemoration to integrate Indigenous history, heritage values, and memory practices into Canada’s national heritage and history.

   c. Parks Canada develop and implement a national heritage plan and strategy for commemorating and, where appropriate, conserving residential school sites, the history and legacy of residential schools, and the contributions of Indigenous peoples to Canada’s history.

   d. in collaboration with Residential School Survivors, commission and install a publicly accessible, highly visible, Residential Schools National Monument in the city of Ottawa to honour Survivors and all the children who were lost to their families and communities.
January 26, 2018

Attn:  The Honourable Catherine McKenna, MP  
Minister of Environment and Climate Change  
E.  Catherine.McKenna@parl.gc.ca

Cc:  The Honourable Bill Morneau, MP  
Minister of Finance  
E.  Bill.Morneau@parl.gc.ca

Re:  Support of Federal Action on the Conservation of Heritage Properties

Dear Minister McKenna,

On behalf of the Municipal Heritage Committee of Hamilton, Ontario, we write to you in support of the recommendations put forward by the Federal House of Commons Standing Committee on Environment and Sustainable Development, contained in report 10, regarding “Preserving Canada’s Heritage: The Foundation for Tomorrow”.

This report contains seventeen (17) Committee recommendations focused on positive ways to promote the preservation of our most vulnerable properties. These recommendations address methods to reduce demolition by neglect, support Truth and Reconciliation for Indigenous groups, encourage investment and request the creation of new heritage related policy and legislation. The implementation of these Committee recommendations will not only help conserve federally owned heritage properties, but will assist in the conservation of privately owned heritage properties across the country.

Of great significance, is recommendation number eleven (11); which proposes a tax credit for restoration and preservation work on buildings listed in the Canadian Register of Historic Places. This recommendation offers a means to achieving success in conserving Canada’s heritage properties while at the same time generating substantial economic development stimulus.

We strongly support the federal government’s role in conserving Canada’s heritage and encourage the government to pursue this role through the implementation of the Standing Committee’s recommendations.

Sincerest regards,  
Alissa Denham-Robinson, Chair  
Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee  
Hamilton, Ontario, Canada
RECOMMENDATION

That the Director of Licensing and By-law Services or designate be delegated the authority to designate events under Special Occasion Permits as “municipally significant”, if all required plans and documents are received, and to address any other related matters that apply to Special Occasion Permits, which have been previously designated by Council.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As a business improvement process, Staff is seeking delegated authority from Council to the Director of Licensing and By-law Services to designate if a Special Occasion Permit (SOP) is of municipal significance. The recommendation will streamline the process and provide better customer service.

The new process will ensure Ward Councillor support but will negate the need to have a Council resolution for every Special Occasion Permit request.

Alternatives for Consideration – Not Applicable

FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial – Staffing - Legal: N/A
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Alcohol and Gaming Commission of Ontario (AGCO), Special Occasion Permit Application Guide confirms applications are to be received at least 10 days prior to any indoor event, and at least 30 days prior to any outdoor event (with less than 5,000 attendees). The requirement of the municipal resolution is that it be in the form of a delegated municipal official to designate the event as municipally significant.

The current practice is to seek a Council resolution through a motion to designate an event as municipally significant.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS

AGCO, Special Occasion Permit Regulations
Liquor License Act

RELEVANT CONSULTATION

The Open for Business Sub-Committee was consulted in the preparation of this Report.

ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

As a business improvement process, staff is seeking delegated authority from Council to the Director of Licensing and By-law Services to designate if a SOP is of municipal significance.

A SOP is required anytime alcohol is served anywhere other than in a licensed establishment or a private place. SOPs are for occasional, special events only, and not for personal profit or running an ongoing business.

The AGCO may only issue a SOP for public events liquor sales to a registered charity, a registered non-profit organization, an event of provincial, national or international significance, or an event designated by Municipal Council as an event of municipal significance. The AGCO requests a municipal resolution or letter from a delegated municipal authority designating the event as municipally significant.

The current process is that Licensing and By-law Services seeks approval from all the stakeholders including Fire, Health, Building, Planning and the Ward Councillor prior to submitting a motion to Council designating an event as municipally significant. Council then considers this motion during their monthly meeting and a report back to the AGCO follows the approval.
In 2016, the City of Hamilton authorized a total of 186 SOPs. Of these, 23 required Council resolutions. In 2017, the City of Hamilton authorized 147 SOPs and 38 required Council resolution. The requirement of a Council resolution is often inconvenient for the customer, as Council resolution occurs bi-monthly, however requests for SOPs do not follow those same timelines.

By allowing for a delegated authority, the current process would continue to be followed including comments and consideration by the Ward Councillor. However, no longer would Council be required to approve a motion for municipal significance for SOPs.

Although the City will provide a letter designating an event municipally significant, the AGCO will make the final decision based on criteria being met in order for a SOP to be issued for liquor sales at a public event.

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.

APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES

N/A

KL/AP/st
CITY OF HAMILTON
PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
Planning Division

TO: Chair and Members
Planning Committee

COMMITTEE DATE: February 6, 2018

SUBJECT/REPORT NO: Review of Committee of Adjustment Refund Program for Residential Properties Within the Airport Employment Growth District Area and Feasibility of Including Provisions within the Zoning By-laws to Provide for Relief (City Wide)(PED18005) (Outstanding Business List Item)

WARD(S) AFFECTED: City Wide

PREPARED BY: Scott Baldry
(905) 546-2424 Ext. 4144

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

SIGNATURE: 

RECOMMENDATION

a) That the refund program for Committee of Adjustment applications regarding legally established non-conforming single family dwellings located within the Airport Employment Growth District (AEGD) Lands and in the Beach Road, McNeilly Road and Margaret Avenue neighbourhoods be discontinued upon Ontario Municipal Board approval of By-law 17-240;

b) The item respecting minor variance applications in the Airport Employment Growth District (AEGD) be identified as complete and removed from the Planning Committee Outstanding Business List.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On November 1, 2016, Planning Committee passed a motion that stated as follows:

“That staff be directed to refund, upon written request of the owner, the City of Hamilton’s required Minor Variance application fee for the expansion or alteration to a legal non-conforming residential property to permit an accessory use in the Airport Employment Growth District (AEGD) where the application is supported by City of Hamilton Planning Staff and approved by the Committee of
Adjustment, effective June 1st, 2016 for a 24 month period, to be funded from the Tax Stabilization Reserve Account #110046."

A subsequent motion was passed on April 18, 2017 by Planning Committee that stated as follows:

“(a) That staff be directed to report back on the feasibility of including an 'as of right' amendment to the bylaw, or the cost associated with a refund, upon written request of the owner, of the City of Hamilton's required Minor Variance application fee for the expansion or alteration to a legal non-conforming residential property to permit an accessory use in the Beach Road, McNeilly Road and Margaret Avenue neighbourhoods where the application is supported by the City of Hamilton Planning Staff effective April 1st, 2017 for a 24 month period, and to report back on possible funding sources including but not limited to the Tax Stabilization Reserve;

(b) That staff report back to the Planning Committee in December, 2019, on the number of applications and assessment as to whether or not the refund program should be continued within industrial areas.

The motions were intended to alleviate the financial burden of residents living in these areas that were required to apply for Minor Variances due to their status as a legally established non-conforming single detached dwelling for the addition of accessory buildings and structures.

Amendments to the Zoning By-laws for the former municipalities as well as the current Zoning By-law 05-200 were approved by Council on November 8, 2017 (By-law 17-240) regarding the inclusion of a clause that would alleviate the requirement for Committee of Adjustment approval for accessory buildings and structures to legally established non-conforming residential properties. By-law 17-240 has been appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB).

The inclusion of the amendments to the Zoning By-laws of the former municipalities, and the current interpretation by the Building Division, as well as the current Zoning By-law 05-200, will allow for expansions to existing dwellings and the construction of accessory buildings and structures (e.g. pools) and therefore will negate the requirement for Committee of Adjustment approval, therefore the program of refunding Minor Variance Applications will no longer be required. As such staff are recommending the elimination of the program.

**Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 4**
FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial: Currently the program provides for refunds from the Tax Stabilization Reserve Account #110046. The amount of refunds to date has been in the amount of $3480.00.

Staffing: N/A

Legal: N/A

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Lands are usually referred to as being legally established non-conforming or grandfathered when the municipality changes the zoning of large areas of land and now creates a situation where the use is no longer permitted in the new zone. Through updates in municipal by-laws, lands that once contained legal permitted uses can become legally established non-conforming as the municipality updates its vision of growth and land uses.

The land rights of individuals have been protected under provisions in the Planning Act. Legislation based on the Planning Act usually contain provisions that help individuals with land that fall within this category by protecting and entrenching their rights. Where expansions of these types of uses are proposed, the usual course of action is that of the Minor Variance process to permit the expansion. The Minor Variance process does permit the City to review applications to ensure that the long term goals set out in the Official Plan are met.

The City of Hamilton updated its Official Plan and is in the progress of updating its Zoning By-law. During this process, area designations will be changed as well as the zoning which may result in creating numerous legally established non-conforming uses. The Airport Employment Growth District (AEGD) lands are an example of this type of occurrence.

There were area residents located within the Airport Employment Growth District (AEGD) lands that voiced concerns regarding the extra costs associated with expanding their single detached dwellings and accessory buildings and structures as a result of being in this designated area. As identified previously in this report, Planning Committee passed two motions to provide relief from the fees if the application was supported by Municipal Staff and approved by the Committee of Adjustment. This was expanded to include the Beach Road, McNeilly Road and Margaret Avenue neighbourhoods.
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The refund of fees would come from the Tax Stabilization Reserve Account #110046.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS

N/A

ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

The City has processed three applications for refund with a total cost impact of $3480.00 on the Tax Stabilization Reserve Account.

On November 8, 2017 Council adopted updates to the Zoning By-laws of the former municipalities as well as the current Zoning By-law 05-200, to include provisions that would permit legally established single detached dwellings to add accessory structures as well as decks and porches. By-law 17-240 has been appealed and will not come into force and effect until the Ontario Municipal Board makes a decision on the appeal.

Currently there is an interpretation of the Zoning By-laws for the former municipalities as well as the current Zoning By-law 05-200 that will see relief occur in the event of an appeal in the provisions of the Council approved By-law amendments that deal with legal non-conforming single detached dwelling uses. This interpretation will uphold the proposed provisions until such time as the Ontario Municipal Board makes a determination on any appeals. Therefore staff recommends discontinuing the refund.

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION

Council could direct staff to maintain the existing refund program and report back to Planning Committee in April 2019 with a recommendation on its continuance, however this is not recommended as the refund program is no longer required for alterations to existing buildings. New accessory structures will continue to require Committee of Adjustment approval until such time as By-law No. 17-240 is approved by the OMB.

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.
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Built Environment and Infrastructure

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

sb:jp
CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW NO.

To Amend Zoning By-law No. 6593
Respecting Lands Located at 347 Charlton Avenue West, Hamilton

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”;

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”;

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;

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; and

WHEREAS this By-law will be in conformity with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan approved August 16, 2013.

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

1. That Sheet No. W14 of the District Maps, appended to and forming part of Zoning By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton), as amended, is further amended by changing from the “D” (Urban Protected Residential – One and Two Family Dwellings, etc.) District to the “DE/S-1753” (Low Density Multiple Dwelling) District, Modified on the lands the extent and boundaries of which are shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule “A”.

Authority:
Ward: 1
Bill No.
2. That the “DE” (Low Density Multiple Dwelling) District provisions, as contained in Section 10A of Zoning By-law No. 6593, be modified with the following special requirements:

(a) That in addition to Section 10A(1), of Zoning By-law No. 6593 a multiple dwelling shall be restricted to a maximum of six (6) dwelling units.

(b) That Section 10A(1) (viii) shall not apply.

(c) That notwithstanding Section 10A(3)(i), a front yard depth of at least 0 metres.

(d) That notwithstanding Section 10A(3)(c), for a multiple dwelling, a side yard along each side lot line of a width of at least 2.0 metres.

(e) That notwithstanding Section 10A(4)(iii)(b), for a multiple dwelling consisting of more than four dwelling units and not more than six dwelling units, a width of at least 14.8 metres.

(f) That notwithstanding Section 18(3)(vi)(d), a roofed-over or screened but otherwise unenclosed one-storey porch at the first storey level, including eaves and gutters, may project the full width of the front yard.

(g) That notwithstanding Section 18A(1)(a), a residential parking rate of 1.0 space per dwelling unit shall be provided.

(h) Section 18A(1)(b) shall not apply.

(i) Section 18A(1)(c) shall not apply.

(j) That notwithstanding Section 18A(7), every required parking space, other than a parallel parking space, shall have dimensions not less than 2.6 metres wide and 5.5 metres long.

(k) That notwithstanding Subsection 18A(11)(a), not less than 1.3 metres from an adjoining residential district boundary, except for a maximum 3.5 metre long portion along the easterly lot line which may be located less than 0.0 metres from a residential district boundary.

(l) That notwithstanding Section 18A(12)(a), for the parking area referred to in Section 2 (j) of this By-law, between the boundary of the parking area and the adjoining residential district an area landscaped with a planting strip shall not be required for a maximum 3.5 metre long portion along the easterly lot line.

(m) That notwithstanding Subsection 18A(25), where a multiple dwelling is adjacent to a residential district that does not permit such uses, every access driveway to the multiple dwelling shall be located not less than 1.5 metres from the common boundary between the district in which multiple dwelling is located and the district that does not permit such uses.
3. 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 “DE” (Low Density Multiple Dwelling) District provisions, subject to the special requirements referred to in Section 2.

4. That Sheet No. W14 of the District Maps is amended by marking the lands referred to in Section 1 of this By-law as “DE/S-1753”.

5. That By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton) is amended by adding this By-law to Section 19B as Schedule S-1753.

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
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
347 Charlton Avenue West
Change in zoning from the "D" (Urban Protected Residential - One and Two Family Dwelling, etc.) District to the "DE/S-1753" (Low Density Multiple Dwelling) District, Modified
Is this by-law derived from the approval of a Committee Report? Yes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee: Steve Robichaud</th>
<th>Report No.: PED18035</th>
<th>Date: 02/06/2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ward(s) or City Wide: Ward: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(MM/DD/YYYY)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared by: Daniel Barnett             Phone No: 905-546-2424 ext. 4445

*For Office Use Only, this doesn't appear in the by-law*
March 30, 2017

City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development Planning, Heritage and Design
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor, Hamilton, Ont.
L8P 4Y5

Attention: Planning and Economic Development Department

Re: Application for 347 Charlton Avenue West
File #

I am the owner of the property at 351 Charlton Avenue West and I wish to be kept informed of any future meetings relating to the above noted application.

I have concerns with the proposed building. The proposed building is too large, too tall and it does not keep with the general design of the street.

I believe that it is an over-intensification and over-development of the site and is not compatible with the surrounding area.

I also have concern both with parking difficulties that will ensue on Charlton Avenue, as well as difficulties relating to the alley in the rear of the properties.

Yours very truly,

Rebecca Katz
351 Charlton Avenue West
Hamilton, Ont.
L8P 2E6
Barnett, Daniel

From: Adam Guy
Sent: March 31, 17 3:30 PM
To: Tchisler, Gerry
Cc: Stranak, Cindy; Johnson, Aidan
Subject: Re: 347 Charlton Ave West - ZAC-17-018 - UHOPA-17-007

Gerry,

Thank you for the opportunity for me to share my concerns with the proposed structure at 347 Charlton Ave. West in Hamilton. Generally speaking, I support intensification and investments in the neighbourhood. However, the proposal to build a high-intensity residence building in the heart of a residential neighbourhood, poses significant congestion, noise and privacy concerns, and will set a precedent for future builds of this nature.

Concerns:

- Four of the six proposed private balconies (as part of the fire escape) will have direct sight lines into neighbour's properties – significantly reducing their privacy and absolutely reducing their home value.

- The multi-use rooftop patio (or party terrace) will further infringe on the privacy of the entire surrounding area – for immediate neighbours and in all directions. Furthering concerns on noise broadcast in the heart of the residential neighbourhood – with reduced accountability as the owner does not live the building. This specific proposal seems “out of touch” with the residential community.

- Six private balconies, one multiple-use rooftop patio (or party terrace), 6 rear-entries (likely the primary point of access) and six rear parking spots which will need to have 24-hour lighting will add significant traffic and noise and disruption to neighbours.

- The increase in height will replace the view of the escarpment (for many neighbours) with a party terrace. Reducing their home values.

- The street is simply not safe enough to accommodate this level of intensification. Cars regularly traverse the road much over the speed limit.

- Construction of the building will be in the heart of the neighbourhood (as opposed to on a corner or at a cross section of two connector streets). The development will have far reaching impacts on the front sidewalk and the back alley for a significant duration.

- Homes in the area were built over a century ago and construction may impact their foundations and/or the house itself. In addition, I also would assume that increased use of city services, such as sewer and water, may be affected. Although I would expect the developer and/or City to compensate or accommodate, this will take additional time and energy for neighbours to diligently observe and monitor impacts and possibly litigate as required.

Additional observations:

- Since the new ownership of the building, the removal of snow has been contracted to a third party organization. This company has been routinely removing the snow by vehicle assisted plow and dumping it on the opposing sidewalk as well as tending to the property between the hours of 10pm and 4am. This “approach” to maintenance emphasizes the lack of consideration (or even awareness) of the neighbours. I see this anecdote as an example of new tensions that will emerge if there is to be the development of a commercial residential building in the heart of a residential community.

In summary, this simply seems to be an overly ambitious concept that pushes the boundaries (within the existing zoning) in every way. I think we can be willing to accommodate certain requests but the sheer number of variance requests and degrees of departure from the by-law (e.g. 3 times the existing rule of multiple dwellings) should tell us something, as a neighbourhood, that this is simply crossing the line in terms of what we think the future vision of the neighbourhood should be.
Adam Guy

Owner of 350 Charlton Ave. West

On Thu, Mar 9, 2017 at 1:02 PM, Tchisler, Gerry <Gerry.Tchisler@hamilton.ca> wrote:

Hi Adam,

You can still submit comments after the deadline. The deadline simply ensures that they’ll be incorporated into the staff report. There was a small error on the initial public notice so you’ll receive a revised notice within the next week or so with an extended deadline.

At this point, staff from different departments are still reviewing the proposal to identify issues so there are no timelines set for when a recommendation will go the Planning Committee for consideration. Once the review has been completed, the issues resolved and staff’s recommendation prepared, the Committee meeting will be scheduled and you’ll receive another notice in the mail informing you of the time and date (you should receive it about 2 weeks from the meeting date).

If you have any questions about the proposal you can also give me a call at the number below.

Regards,

Gerry Tchisler M.P.L.
Planner II (Urban Team)
Development Planning, Heritage & Design Section
Planning and Economic Development Department
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y6

t: (905) 546-2424 x. 4148
f: (905) 546-4202
e: gerry.tchisler@hamilton.ca

---

From: Adam Guy [mailto:]
Sent: March-09-17 12:47 PM
To: Tchisler, Gerry
Cc: Stranak, Cindy
Subject: 347 Charlton Ave West - ZAC-17-018 - UHOPA-17-007
Gerry,

I am the owner of 350 Charlton Ave. West - across from 347.

It's my understanding that a public meeting with the GSP group was held yesterday. Unfortunately, I was unable to attend. I am still hoping to meet with GSP to better understand the proposed amendments and overall vision proposed by the developer - as well as construction approach and timelines. I am somewhat familiar with the proposal as it was brought up at the Kirkendall Neighbourhood Association over a year ago.

Can you please help me understand timelines? My understanding is that the opportunity for written comments has now expired (as of March 9th)? I would still like to ensure that I can provide input and check to see if my neighbours have been adequately engaged and their input received (e.g. I am curious to know if any of them participated in consultations with GSP).

What are the next steps? When will these amendments be reviewed and possibly approved?

Regardless, please keep me informed (e.g. notified of the adoption/refusal of the amendments)

Thank you,

Adam

--

Adam Guy
Dear Mr. Tchisler,

I write on behalf of myself and my husband with respect to the above-noted application.

We are opposed to the application to allow a three story, six dwelling multiplex on our street.

Firstly, parking is already at a premium. Visitors to Locke Street park on our street all the time, such that for residents it is already quite difficult to find parking on the street. A six unit building will make things worse. Even if there is parking for the tenants, your letter indicates that it will only be one car per family. If they have multiple cars per family or visitors, these cars will be parked on the street – which could result in many more spaces being used.

I am also concerned about the height of the building and how this will affect the esthetic of the street – this residences in this area, at least at face value, are predominantly single family dwellings and an apartment building will look out of place.

Thank you for allowing us to submit our comments and concerns for consideration.

Please note that I expressly request that this communication or our contact information NOT be posted on the City of Hamilton’s website.

Yours very truly,

Amanda McInnis
Appendix "G" to Report PED18035
Page 7 of 29

Ms. Gavy Tchider,
City of Hamilton Planning and
Economic Development Department,
Development Planning,
Heritage and Design - Urban Team
71 Main St. West, 5th Floor
Hamilton, Ont. L8P 4Y8

Please note - Kindly refrain from general public,
rental vehicles (i.e., guest vehicles) using the
caretaker's (i.e., Hamilton, Ont. L8P 4Y8)
area at night.

Charlton once said that the
people have a
too many for the people. I a
earning for the people. The people need a
enough. The people need a
60-
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Dear Mr. Tchisler:

We are residents at 320 Herkimer Street which backs onto 347 Charlton West. We have concerns regarding the applicants to allow a 3 storey, 6 unit building in the middle of an Urban Protected Residential Zone and Neighbourhoods Official Plan area.

This area is supposed to be stable and protected from intensification. This lot is the same size as many other lots in the area; the location map shows 20 lots that are similar. If 347 Charlton West were to be developed with 6 units it will set a precedent for the redevelopment of all these lots and others in the larger neighbourhood. We object to this precedent.

We are also concerned about the height, density, vehicle access, parking and provision of open space on the site.

There are other houses in the area with more than one unit, however 6 units are extreme overdevelopment of this single house lot.

Most of the houses in the area are 1 or 2 storeys with a third tucked into the roof line. Three full storeys is not in keeping with the character of the neighbourhood.

If parking is provided from the rear lane it will not be accessible during snowy winters, as the City of Hamilton does not clear its lanes, therefore the residents’ cars will be parked on the street. Charlton West is a bus route and bike route and finding a parking spot is already an issue. The shops and restaurants on Locke Street South and the churches at Charlton West and Herkimer Street also contribute to excess parking on the side streets.

Six parking spaces will be a tight fit on this lot, leaving little room for private open space for 6 units.

This is a case of intensification and overdevelopment that is not welcome in this low density neighbourhood.

We wish to be kept informed of any meeting, report or appeal regarding this development.

Sincerely,

Wendy Johncox and Richard Kuchynski
320 Herkimer Street
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P 2J1
Hi Mr. Tchisler,

I'm writing to provide input on the proposed development at 347 Charlton Ave W.

I live at 316 Herkimer St which is the property directly south of the proposed development.

With the 5 or 6 units they are planning on including in this 3 storey apartment building, there will be an increase of upwards of 20 people living in the one property. This will increase the amount of noise and drastically reduce the amount of privacy, all while contributing to negative effects on property values of all abutting properties. With no mature trees and 3 full stories with a balcony and a party terrace, once residents move in, they will have a direct line of sight completely unobstructed into my backyard and swimming pool. While other houses have windows at the back of their house on the third floor, it is normally one window and is barely noticeable. It is not acceptable that the City will allow balconies and a party terrace to be built which will prevent myself, my wife, my daughter and our guests from having what is a reasonable amount of privacy in our backyard. This applies to other neighbours as well. The inclusion of 24 hour lit parking is also an issue that will decrease the quality of use of our properties.

While infill is an important strategy, it cannot be unquestioned high-density infill all the time everywhere. This is a mature neighbourhood that will drastically change if developments like this are allowed to take place. Adding balconies, awnings, party terraces, parking pads and 3 full stories is a practice completely out of step with surrounding properties. The lot in question is not even significantly large for the area, so if a low-value property on a moderately sized lot is all it takes to be destined for high-density infill, the City is allowing for irrevocable changes to one of its most unique neighbourhoods.

The concerns around privacy, noise, property values, overcrowding, increased demand on infrastructure and a lack of winter parking on Charlton all indicate the plans are in need of significant revision. While high-density infill can be completely appropriate, it is just not the case with this specific project.

Please confirm receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

Andrew Kelly
316 Herkimer St
Hi Gerry,
I am emailing you as your name was given as someone to contact with public input regarding the Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment for the property at 347 Charlton Avenue West.

I am a resident of 304 Herkimer street, and my property backs onto the same alleyway as 347 Charlton Ave. I have no concerns with the proposal to build a six-unit building on this site except as it relates to the alleyway.

The alley between Locke Street and Dundurn, sandwiched by Charlton and Herkimer, is in terrible disrepair. Many residents use this laneway to access their rear parking spaces, including my family. The proposed new multi-unit building has plans for a parking lot with 6 spaces off of the alley. This will introduce quite a bit more traffic to the alley way and I'm really concerned about the impact additional traffic will have on the alley considering the state in which it already sits.

I want to know what the city is planning to do in terms of improving or even just maintaining the alley. There are currently more pot holes than flat pavement, and in the six years I have owned my house I have never seen the city complete any maintenance on the alley at all.

The participatory budgeting plans for Ward 1 consistently have alleyway improvements as one of the items of concern but it never ends up being the highest priority. I have always trusted that this is because work on alley ways is something the city is already tracking as part of a master plan, but I'm asking the question now that this apartment building is being proposed right down the road - what is the city going to do to improve the condition of the alley so that it is at least safe to drive down without worrying about my car's suspension?

Thank you very much for your time. I do request that you please remove my personal information from any publication of my written comments.

Candice Vander Klippe
Barnett, Daniel

From: Catherine Hudson
Sent: February-22-17 11:40 AM
To: Tchisler, Gerry
Subject: application by GSP Group

Re: GSP Group application regarding 347 Charlton Avenue West - official plan and zoning by-law amendment

Hello - our house is at 39 Chatham St in Ward 1. Our main concern with the above-mentioned application is about the alley that runs behind Chatham Street - which has various functions and where many Chatham Street residents access their private parking.

I am seeking assurance that access and usage of this alley will not be impaired, changed or diminished in any way should the GSP application be approved.

Can you offer us this assurance?

thanks

Catherine & Geoffrey Hudson
Good afternoon Councillor Johnson,

It was unfortunate that you could not stay at the meeting last night. I hope everything went well with your spouse.

There were some good comments made at the meeting. Comments from an architect in the audience were particularly informative. Apparently, he is working a redevelopment in the downtown (on Robert Street?) and came to give support for the 347 Charlton proposal. After seeing the proposal and hearing the comments from the residents he agreed that the scale and location of the 347 Charlton development are inappropriate for the neighbourhood. It was his opinion that intensification should start closer to the ends of the Charlton at Locke and Dundurn and then gradually move inward along the street over time. I hope someone will be able to provide you with notes on his comments.

Since I do not live directly adjacent to this development my primary concern is parking. Nothing the developer presented last night eased my concerns. Here are my comments with respect to the parking issue:

- The proponent stated that data from one of his other apartments was used to justify the reduced parking requirements, however, this other building is old and will have relatively low rents compared to 347 Charlton. 347 Charlton will be a high rent property being that it is new and close to Locke Street. Please ask the proponent to find comparably priced rentals and see what the parking requirements are at those buildings. Older rental buildings such as the complex used by the developer for comparison have low income tenants that would use transit. Someone that earns $20,000/yr is not going to rent in this new apartment building because rents there will be in the $20,000/yr range there.

- There is no access to the parking in the winter. The alley is not maintained and with the frequent cycles of below freezing then above freezing temperatures the condition of the alley often becomes impassable even to all-wheel drive vehicles. Because of this the 6-8 cars from this complex will park on the street January to April when the alley is impassable. Note that the developer will not plow the alley. He is not even going to plow the parking lot. He is going to have a heated parking area to melt the snow not to mention liability issues.

- There is already no room for the cars of existing residents during the winter because of the snow banks. This problem is compounded by the visitors to Locke Street that do not want to pay for parking or cannot find parking on Locke Street. Parking is tight in the summer but it is like musical chairs in the winter. Someone will not end up with parking.

I understand that the province has mandated intensification but it is important that this be done in an orderly manner that adds value to the neighbourhood and not creates a ghetto where single family homes are left to decay until they are in a suitable condition to tear down. Is it wise to allow development that will destroy the character of a neighbourhood which is the reason why people want to come here in the first place? Intensification does not mean that you have to replace 1 unit with six. How about 2 or three or four. Also intensification should be directed to areas such as Robert Street and the eastern portion of downtown which are in decay. Redevelopment there adds value to the neighbourhood. The proposed development on Charlton has the potential to start the slow decline of our neighbourhood.
I also want to reiterate the parking issues not just for this proposal but for all proposals in the Locke street area. Any redevelopment that takes place here will be a higher end development. People with means own cars. Parking is an issue. It is tight already and visitors to Locke street park on Charlton and Herkimer to avoid paying for parking. Parking studies need to be specific to the neighbourhood and take into account Locke street visitors and loss of on street + alley parking in winter. Parking studies should be done in February at 9pm on a Thursday after a couple a huge snow storms.

If the City is intent on Intensification in this neighbourhood then Parking must be addressed. Is the City going to remove snow from the alley? and remove (not just plow) snow on Herkimer and Charlton? and something must also be done about parking for the businesses on Locke street that park on these streets.

Thanks
Joe Gallagher
332 Herkimer Street.
Barnett, Daniel

From: Joe G.
Sent: February-21-17 6:12 PM
To: Tchisler, Gerry
Cc: Johnson, Aidan
Subject: File ZAC-17-018  UHOPA-17-007  347 Charlton Avenue West

Dear Mr. Tchisler,

I received a letter yesterday regarding the proposal for a 3 storey 6 unit apartment at 347 Charlton West. I wanted to make some comments:

- This proposal is out of character with the single family residences in the neighbourhood along Charlton, Chatham and Herkimer Street.
- In addition the density is far to high for what is now a single family lot.
- Further the six parking spaces assumes that any couples living there will have only one vehicle. I doubt this will be the case.
- Further, I suspect the parking spaces will be accessed from the alley. There is no winter maintenance of the alley so the tenants will be parking on the street during normal winters where we have snow. Parking on Herkimer where I live is already a problem in winter because visitors to Locke street do not want to pay for parking. Putting 6-8 cars on Charlton will add pressure to the Locke Street parking which will spill over to Herkimer Street.

Please remove any personal information from comments that are made public.

Dear Mr. Johnson,

I have concerns about the type of development being allowed in this neighbourhood. This application is over the top, however, in general I am also concerned about the size of detached houses being built on what are essentially half lots. All the builder does is apply for a minor variance and lot sizes and setbacks are thrown out the window. There should be limits on building sizes where the home will not meet the zoning standards. The size should not exceed the size of the house that was previously there or the size of the adjacent properties (which ever is larger). Building projections into the Rear yard should be limited to the depth of the adjacent properties as well. Unfortunately this was not considered when the house two doors down from me was constructed. Now when I look to the west all I see is a huge brick wall.

I am asking that you look into having the City planning department set standards for Ward 1 similar to what I have suggested above. If staff are looking for an example I believe the City of Mississauga has a by-law that limits rear yard projections for infill construction.

Joe Gallagher
332 Herkimer Street
Dear Gerry Tchisler,

I am writing to you with significant concerns regarding the planned Zoning By-law Amendment Plan: ZAC-17-018 and UHOPA-17-007.

I request that my personal information, name, and any contact information NOT be posted on the City's website, but am happy to be contacted by yourself or involved parties for follow up as needed with further information or to further discuss the concerns of my husband and myself.

We live within a few houses of the planned development and our concerns are as follows.

The planned building is large and out of character with the rest of the residential housing in the area.

A building of this size and height (along with the planned parking) will stand out on a street of well-maintained, single family homes and converted multi-apartment homes that add density but maintain the community feel of the street.

The planned building would be imposing, impersonal, and sandwiched onto a lot that is too small and not adequately supported by safe access or street parking.

The addition of a bike lane on Charlton Ave W has been an effective and welcome addition to the traffic flow in the area, but it has already restricted parking on a very well-used street. Residents who do not have driveways are already competing with Locke Street visitors who do not want to pay for parking, and on the weekends, church attendees who require parking. The residents of the planned building will need more than the 6 spaces planned, as it is likely that some couples will likely live there and they will also need parking for visitors. When the alley access is poor, such as in the winter when snow is not removed, street parking will become even more of a problem.

Regarding the planned parking access, the alley/laneway that would provide access to the parking is not maintained (especially in winter where snow and ice cause accessibility problems), insufficiently lit, and visibility is poor at both entrances. Pedestrians that walk along Locke Street rarely pay attention to the alleys that exit on to it. This foot traffic (including increasing numbers of young children) is growing as the area continues to develop as a place for people from outside the neighbourhood and city to visit. Many young families and children use the alley to travel to and from school. Adding additional vehicular traffic and relying on this alley for parking access is dangerous and short-sighted.

We also have concerns about the precedent that this development would set.

Like most homeowners in the area, we have concerns about how this will affect the value of our investment. The size and facade of the building, as well as the resulting change of tone and direction it will generate on the street, could have significant negative consequences for the value of our property and that of our neighbours.
As property values in the area increase and as older homes come on the market in what is now a very in-demand area, young professionals and families are already facing significant challenges finding starter homes that are affordable and in decent condition. Allowing a developer to take a viable starter home and lot and turn it into an impersonal apartment block sets a precedent that other older homes will be similarly razed and developed for profit over community building.

There is already zoning for greater density at either ends of the street, on Locke and Dundurn, where it will enhance and support the neighbourhood, rather than breaking up and depersonalizing a safe, connected, well-maintained and supportive community block.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

---

"I may not have gone where I intended to go, but I think I have ended up where I needed to be."
Douglas Adams
Kirkendall Alliance for Responsible Development  
314 Herkimer Street  
Hamilton ON  
L8P 2J1

March 30, 2017

Attention:
Gerry Tchisler, City of Hamilton  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
Development Planning, Heritage and Design – Urban Team

Re Files: ZAC-17-018 and UHOPA-17-007

Please be advised that the undersigned strongly object to the Zoning By-law Amendment outlined in File no. ZAC-17-018 and the Amendment to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan as described in File no. UHOPA-17-007.

The objections include, but are not limited to the following:

1. **Charlton Avenue Street Parking**

   Although parking is to be provided by the developer of the apartment block, the number of spots does not meet the need of the number of potential drivers/automobile owners in the building. This will lead to an increased demand on the already stressed level of street parking on Charlton Ave. With the addition of five households concentrated on this part of the street, it is reasonable to expect an increase in visitors, and their vehicles. The proposed parking for the tenants is behind the apartment block with access only available through an alley that is not maintained or safe. This will undoubtedly lead to tenants choosing to park on Charlton Street as close to the building as possible. Again, homeowner residents of Charlton Avenue will experience an imminent increase in stress on an already problematic parking situation.

2. **Increased Traffic in alley between Charlton Avenue and Herkimer Street.**

   This alley is not maintained by the City of Hamilton in a manner that permits safe driving conditions or a safe walking environment. The poorly patched, uneven and broken up surface is a menace for all those that attempt to use it in summer and often impossible to use in the snowy/icy conditions of winter. There is not sufficient lighting in the alleyway. The accesses in and out of the alleyway on Dundurn and particularly on Locke Street are not marked and not suitable for regular usage. The Locke Street exit is absolutely blind to drivers exiting the alley and hidden to pedestrians using the west side sidewalk on Locke Street. To add more traffic, especially for tenant parking access, would require significant improvements to ensure the safety of the residents of this community.
3. Privacy
The residents directly behind and next to the proposed apartment block will have tenants overlooking their backyards. This is a particularly uncomfortable scenario when considering that the privacy is not lost to neighbouring homeowners, it is lost to tenants. As an example, all three families living directly across the alley from the proposed apartment block have young girls. The balconies and bedrooms of the proposed apartment block overlook the backyards in which they play, two of which have in-ground pools. It is necessary to understand how this development will significantly affect the peaceful enjoyment of the families residing here.

4. Property Values
As a result of the efforts of the single-family homeowners in the subject community, this area has become one of the most desirable residential neighbourhoods in the city to live and to raise a family. This has brought a new consistency, safety, cleanliness and obvious homeowner pride of ownership to the streets of Herkimer and Charlton. With the major investments that homeowners have made in their houses and land comes an expectation that the City of Hamilton appreciates the resident's drive to improve a neighbourhood. There is absolutely no question that approving the proposed amendments is in essence an act whereby the City of Hamilton is allowing a non-resident developer to erode the value of the tax-paying homeowner residents' most valuable asset. This is unacceptable in any circumstance.

5. Architectural Consistency
The proposed structure is in no way consistent with the current homes on this residential street. Charlton Avenue and Herkimer Street are lined with beautiful homes, many of which date back over 100 years. The appeal of the neighbourhood is in no small part due to the preservation of the look and feel of the architecture, which is precisely why the City of Hamilton created Zoning By-laws and the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. The approval of the proposed amendments is in direct conflict of the very purpose of both the Zoning By-law and the Official Plan.

6. Setting a Precedent
As mentioned in #5, approval of the proposed amendments is in direct contradiction of the spirit and purpose of the Zoning By-law and the Official Plan. This is not a matter of a minor change to accommodate a resident homeowner who is looking to build a garage, garden shed or to build an addition on to their home. The application for amendments allowing this apartment block to be built serves no purpose to the improve community that the City Planning and Development Department is charged with protecting. Allowing this apartment block to be built in its proposed form would be a shameful choice to accommodate an out-of-town developer at a great financial and emotional
expense to the tax-paying resident homeowners that have worked so hard to bring
the community to where it is today.
If these amendments are approved, the Planning and Economic Development
Department and Development Planning, Heritage and Design is opening the flood
gates to anyone who wishes to garner a profit at the expense of local residents and
their cherished historic and architectural and family-oriented community.

7 Interference with the direction of neighbourhood progress, as decided by the
residents.
Over the past two decades, the community bordered by Aberdeen Avenue to the
South, Locke Street to the East, Main Street to the North and Dundurn Street to
the West, has gradually returned to a vibrant, family-friendly and generally well-
balanced community.
It is clear that the transition from a high density of “Absentee Landlord”
properties to a neighbourhood of home-owner occupied homes has been a major
contributor to the recent positive changes on our streets. The limited number of
absentee property owners and tenants has created a concentration of residents
with a clear vested interest in living in a clean, respectful and safe community.

Please note that a number of affected residents have attempted to connect with GSP
Group and the developer directly, with unsatisfactory results. As a result, the time that
we have had to gather information and communicate with one another has not been
sufficient.

In closing, it is our request that significantly more dialogue with the community occur
before the subject amendments be granted.

Thank you for your consideration.

The Kirkendall Alliance for Responsible Development.

Name       Address (optional)       Signature

Pamela Haddad 310 Hertemer St
Mike Haddad   216 Hertemer St
Kamila Cannon 312 Hertemer St
Martina Shank 114 Hertemer
Andrew Ryley 316 Hertemer
Barnett, Daniel

From: Lynn Gates
Sent: April-02-17 11:26 PM
To: Tchisler, Gerry
Subject: FW: Concerns Regarding 347 Charlton Ave W Zoning By-law Amendment (ZAC-17-018) and Admendment to the Urban Official Plan (UHOPA-17-007)

Resent to correct address

From: Lynn Gates [mailto:
Sent: Sunday, April 2, 2017 9:55 PM
To: ‘Gerry.Tchisler@hamilton.ca’
Cc: 

Subject: RE: Concerns Regarding 347 Charlton Ave W Zoning By-law Amendment (ZAC-17-018) and Admendment to the Urban Official Plan (UHOPA-17-007)

Thank you for providing us with information regarding the proposed development on 347 Charlton West and the opportunity to provide input. We live at 339 Charlton Avenue West, which is one lot over from this site.

While we commend and support the City of Hamilton’s efforts to increase population density per hectare of land, we have several serious concerns about the proposed request for a zoning amendment to allow the building of a 6-unit multi-residential building, three stories high with a flat roof, with back-facing balconies, a roof top terrace, and an asphalt backyard of 6 parking spaces.

Density - My understand is that because Charlton West is categorized as a Collector Street, multi-residential buildings are permitted, even though the Secondary Plan for Kirkendall has the area zoned as Urban Protected Residential. Based on the existing Residential Zoning requirements, a minimum of 5 units can be developed on this 0.56 hectare lot and 9 parking spaces. However, the developer is requesting a zoning amendment to build 6 2-bedroom apartments, which could potentially house 12 adults and 6 children. Kirkendall already has a dense, walkable community. There is no need to add a building of this size to an essentially single-family home street. We do not need another building dwarfing a lot similar to the lots at 220 Dundurn St. The smaller 2-story brick apartment building down the street is not pretty, but it does not overwhelm the lot it sits on. I believe it is also a 6-plex, with 2 apartments in the basement, built of an orange-coloured brick similar to the Victorian-style homes on the street.

Both apartment unit scenarios would significantly stress the street and back alley lane through an increase in vehicular traffic, backyard noise, loss of greenspace, loss of privacy, increased rainwater run-off and added light pollution. If there is a need to increase the size of the population of Kirkendall, density could be increased through the addition of apartments above commercial buildings on Locke and Dundurn streets without damaging the walkability and livability of Kirkendall.

Residential Zoning By-law and Official Plan Amendment – In our opinion, the request for rezoning is more than a minor variance to be determined by the Committee of Adjustment. Rather, it is a precedent setting decision that should not be done ‘piece-meal’ without the context of a growth plan for Kirkendall. These streets were zoned residential for a reason and changing the zoning without a vision in mind is just poor
planning. There are many smaller homes on lots that could be bought and razed in future years and replaced with infill buildings. A thoughtful approach for whether this should occur is needed as rezoning decisions affect the character, culture, walkability, pedestrian safety and density of the neighbourhood. Each CoA approval sets a precedent and encourages other developers to destroy an existing family home and rebuild something larger. All of these individual requests for rezoning to multiresidential are being decided without the context of a bigger plan of how intensification should happen in Kirkendall.

The Urban Residential Zoning Review has not been completed by City staff. In addition, the Kirkendall Neighbourhood Association is just beginning the Kirkendall Neighbourhood Strategy Project, which will provide the opportunity for residents to identify where they think intensification should happen. Until the City zoning update has been completed, or the City revises the Kirkendall Secondary Plan (1974), a moratorium should be put on further rezoning in the residential areas. Otherwise, Collector Streets such as Charlton, Herkimer and Jackson could be ruined by several multiresidential lots that do not fit with the character of the neighbourhood.

Parking Requirements – The proposed building of 6 apartments requires 9 parking spaces according to the existing parking by law: 1.25 spaces per unit and .25 per visitor. In no way is that possible on this size of lot, indicating that the building size is inappropriate for the space. Requesting an amendment for reduced parking to 6 spaces does not solve the problem as the entire backyard is still needed to become a paved mini-parking lot - which is not suitable for a residential neighbourhood. Apparently, the lighting for the parking lot would be pointed down, but it would be on all night – something not typical for a residential neighbourhood, unpleasant for neighbours, and would add to the light pollution the city creates.

This proposal does not meet the requirement for a loading space as there is insufficient land. The existing family home has a driveway and garage that accommodates 2 to 3 cars. A significantly larger family home could be built on this lot with sufficient room for parking for 2-3 cars off the back alley, thus not affecting other home owners.

Impact on Street Parking – The proposed multi-residential building could potentially add 12 cars for this one building. That means 6 residents trying to find street parking in the summer, and maybe all 12 looking for street parking in the winter, as the back alleyway is not plowed. Residents of Charlton are already experiencing difficulty getting street parking in front of their homes. A 2014 parking study of Kirkendall around Locke Street requested by then Councillor McHattie indicated that street parking was at 90% capacity. Given that additional restaurants without adequate parking for seats have been added since then, even less curb-side parking is likely available. Street parking for residents is already at a crisis resulting in several residents considering requesting permission to remove their front garden to install a parking space. This trend would alter the existing character of the street by breaking up the sidewalk, making it less walkable and less safe for pedestrians and cyclists, as well as less visually appealing.

Accessibility to Parking - Residents of the apartment building would access their parking via the back alleyway. This lane is not maintained by the City and is uneven with broken concrete and potholes. In the winter time, the lane is not plowed and at times is not accessible to cars without 4-wheel drive and a high carriage due to the ruts of snow and ice in the middle of the lane.

Roof Top Terrace - The back of the building will include balconies and the third story flat roof an ‘amenity’ terrace, which will significantly increase the noise factor for nearby residents and significantly decrease their privacy.
Front Facade - The proposed build would also stick out like a sore thumb on the street given its bulk, the flat roof, and the iron bars across the sliding front windows. The recently built multi-family dwellings on 203 Homewood and 91 Chatham are 2.5 storied brick buildings with a peaked roof and blend in to the character of the other homes on their streets better than this example.

Lack of Climate Mitigation - Given the supposed commitment of the City to mitigating climate events, should new builds with a flat roof not include a green roof and solar panels? The parking lot for 6 cars doesn’t leave much room for greenspace and will increase the rain run-off in to the alley as it is black asphalt rather than permeable pavers — also not very climate-change friendly. There is no room for the planting of trees to provide shade for the building to decrease the need for air conditioning and the black pavement will reflect heat and contribute to our downtown urban heat island.

Impact on Existing Housing Prices — The proposed build would likely lower the value of the surrounding homes which is an unfair impact on the existing home owners.

In summary, as residents of Charlton Street West, we respectfully request that this Rezoning request be denied. This development benefits only the greed of the developer and not the Kirkendall neighbourhood nor the residents of the street.

Sincerely,

Lynn Gates and Leo Gervais
339 Charlton Avenue West

("
Barnett, Daniel

From: Stranak, Cindy
Sent: April-04-17 10:04 AM
To: Tchisler, Gerry
Cc: Johnson, Aidan; 'Mark Stewart'
Subject: RE: 347 Charlton Ave W Zoning By-law Amendment (ZAC-17-018) and Amendment to the Urban Official Plan (UHOPA-17-007)

Hi Gerry,

Hope your day is starting well. Please see email below – the email bounced back to Mark (looks like may be a typo in your name).

Thank you and please let us know if you have any questions,

Warm regards,
Cindy

****************************************
Cindy Stranak
Constituency Assistant to Councillor Aidan Johnson
Ward 1, Chedoke – Cootes, City of Hamilton
phone: 905-546-2226

From: Mark Stewart []
Sent: April-03-17 4:41 PM
To: Gerry.Tchisler@hamilton.ca
Cc: Stranak, Cindy; Johnson, Aidan
Subject: 347 Charlton Ave W Zoning By-law Amendment (ZAC-17-018) and Amendment to the Urban Official Plan (UHOPA-17-007)

Dear Mr. Tchisler,

My name is Mark Stewart and I am writing to you in my capacity as Chair of the Kirkendall Neighbourhood Association Development Committee.

We are writing to urge the City to keep our members’ concerns in mind when providing comments to the developer regarding the re-zoning of 347 Charlton.

We are happy to be a central point of contact on this project and to help coordinate neighbourhood comments and feedback. We have been in contact with the developer / consultants on this project and have arranged to meet with them in the future after they have received your comments.

Please keep in touch with us on the subject and do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.

Yours truly,
Mark Stewart
Kirkendall Neighbourhood Association, Development Committee
Hello, Gerry.

My name is Nikki Loney. My husband, Shawn Trotter and our young son, live at 343 Charlton Ave. West. We are directly beside the property listed in the Zoning/By Law file ZAC-17-018/UHOPA-17-007.

On Tuesday, March 7th, we met with the planner, owner, and architect of this proposed apartment building. We had the opportunity to see the plans and ask questions. We appreciate the courtesy that was extended to us by the GSP group and their clients.

We have a few concerns about the plans.

1. The building is too high. There are plans for a rooftop amenities room which would be higher than all the other properties on the street. There is another apartment building on the street that is 21/2 stories high. The dimensions apartment appears to be more appropriate/consistent for the dwellings on this street.

2. Noise concerns. We are also concerned with the noise that having an outdoor rooftop area would cause, especially during warmer months.

3. There are plans for a 6 car parking lot off of the back alley. We are concerned about the noise of 6 cars coming in and out of this property and any light/noise pollution that may be a result of the increased traffic from the back alley.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Nikki Loney.
Shawn Trotter

--

Nikki Loney
Barnett, Daniel

From: Paul Stanley
Sent: March-04-17 2:22 PM
To: Tchisler, Gerry
Subject: File No. ZAC-17-018 and File No.UHOPA-17-007

Regarding File No. ZAC-17-018 and File No. UHOPA-17-007

Sir

Allowing a six unit building on our street is not in the spirit of what we want to see happening here. I realize you note six parking spots but that does not help much with the parking problems we have already. Most families have more then one car and when these units have visitors more problems. Adding a 85 seat restaurant on Locke St. with not enough parking is making this issue even worse for us. This is a loud NO.

Paul Stanley 353 Charlton Ave W. Hamilton
March 6, 2017

Re.: Zoning By-law Amendment (File No. ZAC-17-018)

Dear Mr. Tchisler,

I am strongly opposed to any change to the existing by-law, to add site specific modifications to the existing “D” District zoning, to permit a three storey, six-unit multiple dwelling with six parking spaces at 347 Charlton Ave. W.

That address is zoned for a single dwelling unit, and I insist that it be kept that way. This would set a precedent for our area, since there are other several lots of the same size, which could then also be changed to multiple dwelling units. This area is protected as a single-dwelling neighbourhood.

Yours truly,

Peter Robinson

324 Herkimer St.

Hamilton, L8P 2J1
Barnett, Daniel

From: Terry <
Sent: March-09-17 10:09 PM
To: Tchisler, Gerry
Cc: Sarah Rogers
Subject: ZAC-17-018 and UHOPA-17-007

Hello,

As a homeowner at 333 Charlton Avenue West, I am writing to voice my concern regarding the proposed development at 347 Charlton Avenue West.

While I can appreciate the attempt at urban intensification, I feel that it is out of place at that part of the street, where single family homes prevail. Parking is already at a premium in front of our home thanks to one side of the street hosting the bike lane and our proximity to Locke Street.

Additionally, at the public meeting yesterday, it was mentioned that there was to be a party room for the building on the roof. I have severe concerns about this and the additional noise that will be generated on a residential street.

I do not want a three story apartment hosting six units at this location. Please let me know when your public report will be issued.

Thank you.

Terry and Sarah Rogers
333 Charlton Avenue West
From:
Sent: January-31-18 8:34 AM
To: Bedioui, Ida
Cc: Johnson, Aidan
Subject: Letter for Planning Committee

Dear Members of the Planning Committee:

I am writing in regards to: Application to Amend the City of Hamilton Zoning By-Law No. 6593 for Lands Located at 347 Charlton Avenue West, Hamilton (Ward 1), (PED18035). I live in the Kirkendall neighbourhood and have a keen interest in development issues. I am highly supportive of this project for the following reasons:

a) rental units are needed in the Kirkendall neighbourhood as increased housing prices prohibit ownership for many;

b) the developer and architect have previously liaised with the adjacent residents and made significant adjustments to address privacy concerns by eliminating amenities that occupants would have enjoyed (e.g. balconies, rooftop amenity).

c) the project's design visually honours the general architectural style on the street. This is an attractive infill and is similar in scale to other infill units in Kirkendall.

d) parking - a constant challenge in our neighbourhood - is being provided on-site for each unit.

e) staff are recommending approval of this application.

I am aware that some of the adjacent neighbours have been both active and vocal in their resistance to this project. There have been concerns expressed that these are rental units. I believe that neighborhoods that are diverse in their housing and resident composition are vibrant and I base this on both my educational background as well as my lived experience. It is my hope that this project will be approved as it is needed in our neighbourhood.

Sincerely,

Kate Connolly
12-285 Bold Street
Hamilton, Ontario
Dear Mr. Johnson,

My husband and I live at 355 Charlton Avenue West. As you are no doubt aware, developers (GSP Group) have submitted an application for a zoning by-law amendment to allow them to construct a 6 unit apartment building at 347 Charlton Avenue West. There is a public meeting of the Planning Committee on February 6, 2018 at 9:30 am.

We submitted our written objection to the development and our opposition only grew once we met with the GSP Group representatives over the summer. The following are just some of our concerns:

We take issue with the fact that they will only be providing one parking space per unit. Parking is a major problem on our street as most houses do not have driveways and visitors to Locke Street routinely park on our street.

Further, they intend to build a parking lot in the alleyway, which will not only substantially increase the use of the alley which is not maintained by the City, but they will be lighting it with flood lights which will cause light pollution for the neighbouring properties.

We are also concerned because the height of the apartment building which will have overhanging balconies, will result in a loss of privacy for the properties below.

We are also concerned that the construction will result in damage to the foundations of neighbouring properties and query whether there is sufficient infrastructure (i.e. plumbing, etc) to support such a large project.

We take issue with the zoning of our street as a through street. The addition of the bike lanes has substantially slowed the traffic on our street, such that it is no different than many of the neighbouring streets, yet those home owners do not face this kind of development.

As I am sure you are no doubt aware, many people in the neighbourhood are dismayed by this construction project and the precedent that it sets. The documentation we received in advance of the public meeting contained pages and pages of emails from concerned homeowners and residents in your ward expressing their concern. I hope you will be attending at the meeting, (as I am sure many of us will be) to support and speak on behalf of your concerned constituents.

Kindest Regards,

Amanda McInnis and Alex Christie
To: Chair and Members of the Planning Committee  
Committee Date: February 6, 2018  
Subject: Application to Amend the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 6593 for lands  
Located at 347 Charlton Ave. W. Hamilton (Ward 1) (PED18035)  
Submitted by: Wendy Johncox  

RECOMMENDATION  
1. That the recommendations of the report on this matter prepared by Daniel Barnett and submitted by Steve Robichaud of the City of Hamilton Planning and Development Department, Planning Division not be approved and that the report be sent back to the Department to change the recommendations to the following:  
a. The zoning be changed to permit a Low Density Multiple Dwelling with four (4) units and 4 parking spaces.  
b. The draft By-law be amended to reflect these changes and add the provision that:  
   - no habitable space shall be allowed below the ground floor;  
   - an outdoor private open space shall be provided between the parking spaces and the rear wall of the building; and  
   - the height shall not exceed 2 storeys.  

DESCRIPTION  
The applicant submitted a proposal to build a three storey, six unit building with six parking spaces mid-block on Charlton Avenue West between Locke Street South and Dundurn Street South in Ward One. The site is currently occupied by a single storey house on a full lot.  
The house to the east is also single storey and the house to the west is two and a half storeys. The rest of the block is a mix of one to two and a half storey houses, a few of which have been converted into several units. There is also an apartment building beside the church located at Locke Street South and Charlton Avenue West.  
Some houses have parking on site either from a front driveway or accessed from the rear lane, but many residents and visitors to the area park on the street. Parking is only allowed on the north side of the street. The south side is a bike lane and there are two bus stops: one mid-block and one at Dundurn Street South.
SETTING A PRECEDENT

The application for six units and six parking spaces is setting a dangerous precedent for the area which could destabilize it in years to come. There are many full lots in the area. Appendix A to the Planning Report shows another six full lots on Charlton, two on Chatham Street, seven on Herkimer and five on Stanley. That is potentially 19 lots which could also apply to build a six unit apartment building. This could increase the number of units in this small area by 120, including the proposed development.

Such development would greatly change the scale and character of the exiting low density residential neighbourhood and is in contravention of Section E.3.2.4 of the Hamilton Official Plan which states:

"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."

The Kirkendall North Neighbourhood Plan permits a range of residential densities and housing types that provide a stable viable neighbourhood. The potential to develop so many units in such a small area is not conducive to a stable neighbourhood and therefore is not compatible with the area and does not meet the policies of this Plan.

CONCERNS WITH THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

Height and Density:
The existing residential neighbourhood does not have any buildings with six two bedroom apartments or three full stories. There are several with two or three units but not six.

The 29 unit apartment building described in the planning report is next to a church of similar height and is on the periphery of the block near Locke Street South. Section E.3.3.1 of the Hamilton Official Plan states that:

"Lower density residential uses and building forms shall generally be located in the interiors of neighbourhood areas with higher density dwelling forms and supporting uses located on the periphery of neighbourhoods on or in close proximity to major or minor arterial roads."

The proposed three storey, six unit building is in the middle of a block, not on the periphery of the neighbourhood and therefore does not meet this policy of the Hamilton Official Plan. The development is too high and dense for this location.
Floor plans on Appendix F of the Planning report show two units per floor on the Ground, Second and Third Floors. The Basement Floor Plan shows six storage lockers, bicycle parking and electrical and mechanical rooms. It also shows one large area, the same size as the units on the top floors, with two side windows on the west side of the property.

There is the potential for the developer to convert this space to residential at a later date through an application to the Committee of Adjustment to vary the site specific by-law. In order to prevent this from happening, the by-law should specify that no habitable rooms should be allowed below the ground floor of the development.

**Outdoor Amenity Space:**
The proposal does not provide any outdoor amenity space for most of the units. Only two outdoor porches are provided on the ground floor, the other four units have no outdoor space. The amended application which removes the rear balconies and roof top amenity space decreases the overlook onto adjacent properties but leaves no amenity space for the future tenants of the subject building. The entire rear lot is filled with parking and driveway access to the six spaces.

E.3.6.7 of the Hamilton Official Plan sets out criteria on how development is to be evaluated. One of the criteria is that the development provide adequate landscaping and amenity features. These have not been provided, instead the planning report indicates that the amenity needs will be met through the private ground floor porches and parks in the area.

Local parks do not provide barbeques or picnic benches and other furniture that would be used and welcomed in a private amenity space.

**Parking:**
The six parking spaces are proposed along the eastern boundary of the property and will be accessed by a driveway from the rear lane. This is a ratio of one per unit with no visitor parking provided. The rationale is that there is street parking, a bus route and bike lanes so visitors and tenants will have access to alternative modes of transportation.

Charlton Avenue West has parking on only one side of the street. Due to its proximity to Locke Street South, the street is also used by visitors to the churches, restaurants and businesses on that commercial street. Existing residents have trouble finding parking on Charlton Street West during busy periods on Locke Street South. The reduction of three parking spaces for the development will further exacerbate this problem.

**ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL**

There is the potential for increased height, density and number of units on the site, but not to the degree outlined in the rezoning application or recommended for approval by the Planning and Development Department.
A two storey, four unit building with four parking spaces would reduce the density, while still achieving an increase in rental units in the neighbourhood. With the reduction of parking there would be an opportunity to provide private landscaped open space as an amenity area to the rear of the building. There is enough room to install the four spaces perpendicular to the laneway on the lot, similar to other parking spaces located in the lane.

The required number of visitor parking spaces would also be reduced, thus reducing the tight parking situation on Charlton Avenue West.

CONCLUSION

The proposed alternative plan would meet the policies of the Hamilton Official Plan and the Kirkendall North Neighbourhood Plan. The current rezoning application does not meet the intent of those plans and therefore should not be supported.

CONTACT

Wendy Johncox
320 Herkimer Street
Hamilton, Ontario
City of Hamilton  
Attention: Chair and Members of the Planning Committee  
Re: Application by 347 Charlton Ave (PED18035)

I act as Chair of the Kirkendall Development Review Committee and am writing in regards to Application to Amend the City of Hamilton Zoning By-Law No. 6593 for Lands Located at 347 Charlton Avenue West, Hamilton (Ward 1), (PED18035).

The Kirkendall Development Review Committee (DRC) is comprised of resident volunteers who keep apprised of development proposals within the neighborhood itself. The committee liaises with residents, developers, and other stakeholders who are proposing both residential as well as commercial projects in the Kirkendall neighbourhood.

The Development Review Committee has been highly aware of the project at 347 Charlton Avenue West and, in fact, hosted a meeting between the residents and the developers so that residents could express their concerns and gain a greater understanding of the project being proposed.

In general, the Development Review Committee supports housing of various types in our neighborhood. We have a very vibrant neighborhood and many people want to live here but home ownership has become an impossible goal for many people. As such, having rental units, condo development and diverse housing stock meets the needs of people who seek to live in the area.

The Development Review Committee does not take a specific stand on issues. We hope to provide opportunities for dialogue between developers and residents and let the immediate neighbours speak for themselves.

It appears that the developer has attempted to meet some of the resident concerns with architectural adjustments to the project. Balconies and a roof top amenity have been eliminated to address neighbour concerns regarding privacy. Parking - always a concern in Kirkendall - is being provided on site for every unit. Further, the height of the building is in keeping with other homes on the street and similar to other multi residential in-fill units currently in the neighbourhood.

It is appreciated the efforts the developer has made thus far to consider the residents' concerns. We hope there will be continued dialogue between the developer and residents as this proposal works through the next stages.

Thank you for taking the time to review our comments, please contact the undersigned if you have any questions.

Yours truly,

Doreen Stermann
327 Herkimer St.  
Chair, Development Committee,  
Kirkendal Neighbourhood Association

[Signature]
TO: Chairs and Members
Planning Committee

COMMITTEE DATE: February 6, 2018

SUBJECT/REPORT NO: Applications for an Amendment to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and to the Town of Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464 for Lands Located at 235 Tanglewood Drive, Glanbrook (Ward 11) (PED18034)

WARD(S) AFFECTED: Ward 11

PREPARED BY: Alaina Baldassarra
905-546-2424 Ext. 7421

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

SIGNATURE:

RECOMMENDATION

(a) That Amended Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment Application UHOPA-17-019 by Rob-Geof Properties Limited, Owner, for a site specific amendment to permit fourteen (14) Street Townhouse Dwellings with a maximum density of 45 units per net residential hectare within the Binbrook Village Secondary Plan, for lands located at 235 Tanglewood Drive, Glanbrook, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18034, be APPROVED, on the following basis:

(i) That the draft Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18034, 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 (2014) and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017).

(b) That Amended Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-17-025, by Rob-Geof Properties Limited, Owner, for a change in zoning from the Deferred Development “DD” Zone to the Residential Multiple “RM2-310” Zone, Modified,
for the lands located at 235 Tanglewood Drive, Glanbrook, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18034, be APPROVED, on the following basis:

(i) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED18034, 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 this By-law will comply with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan upon approval of Official Plan Amendment No. __;
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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 applications for amendment to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Proposal

The subject property is located on the west side of Tanglewood Drive, north of Maggie Johnson Drive and south of Degrow Court. The property is currently vacant, is rectangular in shape, approximately 0.31 ha (3100 square metres) in size, and is municipally known as 235 Tanglewood Drive, Glanbrook (see Appendix “A” to Report PED18034). The property was severed from O’Neills Farm Equipment on January 22, 2016 and the subject site was not included as part of the subdivision application across the road. At the time of the severance, the applicant advised the subject lands would be developed as street townhouses.

The submitted applications, as amended, consist of a UHOP Amendment and a Zoning By-law Amendment. The combined applications are to permit the development of fourteen (14) street townhouse dwellings with access onto Tanglewood Drive. An amendment to the UHOP is required to create a site specific policy to permit a maximum net residential density of 45 units per net hectare, whereas the Binbrook Village Secondary Plan identifies a density range of 26 to 40 units per net hectare.

In addition, the applicant applied for a change in zoning from the Deferred Development “DD” Zone to a site specific Residential Multiple “RM2-310” Zone, Modified along with modifications to the minimum lot area, minimum lot frontage, maximum lot coverage, minimum side yard setback and minimum encroachment into a required yard. In the original application submission, the applicant submitted a request to remove the dwelling unit placement provision within the Residential Multiple “RM2” zone. This provision relates to a maximum of eight (8) dwelling units attached in a continuous row and requires the offsetting or staggering of the front façade of the units or to require that the front façade materials and design be varied to award a continuous façade and therefore creating more interesting streetscape. Staff are of the opinion the amendment...
to modify the provision instead of removal complies with the UHOP and can be met by the applicant's proposal.

**Chronology:**

**February 15, 2017:** Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-17-025 received.

**February 24, 2017:** Application ZAC-17-025 deemed complete.

**March 14, 2017:** Notice of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation was sent to 62 property owners within 120 m of the subject lands.

**April 25, 2017:** Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment Application UHOPA-17-019 received.

**April 26, 2017:** Application UHOPA-17-019 deemed complete.

**May 8, 2017:** Updated Notice of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation was sent to 62 property owners within 120 m of the subject lands.

**May 9, 2017:** Public Notice sign installed on subject property.

**January 10, 2018:** Public Notice Sign updated with Public Meeting date.

**January 19, 2018:** Circulation of the Notice of Public Meeting to 62 property owners within 120 m of the subject property.

**Details of Submitted Application:**

**Applicant / Agent:** A.J. Clarke and Associates Ltd. (c/o Steve Fraser)

**Owner:** Rob-Geof Properties Limited

**Location:** 235 Tanglewood Drive

**Property Size:**
- Lot Frontage: +/- 93.71 m (307.44 ft)
- Lot Depth: +/- 33.59 m (108.26 ft)
- Lot Area: +/- 3,121.3 sq. m. (0.312 ha)
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Services: Existing Full Municipal Services

Existing Land Use and Zoning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Lands:</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Development “DD” Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surrounding Lands:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Vacant (currently subject to applications 25T-201706, ZAC-17-027 and UHOPA-17-012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Street Townhouse Dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Vacant (zone permits Single Detached Dwellings)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>O’Neil's Farm Equipment &amp; Lawn and Garden Equipment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS

Provincial Policy Statement (2014)

The applications have been reviewed with respect to the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). The PPS provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest related to land use planning and development.

The following policies, amongst other policies, apply:

“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;

   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; and,

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 applications are consistent with the policies that focus on growth and development in Settlement Areas as the proposed land use pattern will provide a density that efficiently uses the land and resources, and is appropriate for the infrastructure and public service facilities planned for the area while being sensitive to the existing housing stock in the area.

“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 was deemed to have archeological potential. As such, a Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment dated October 31, 2017 was submitted to the City of Hamilton. While an interest has yet to be signed off by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, Staff concur with the recommendations made in the report, and the archaeology condition for the subject application has been satisfactorily met. Staff have requested that the copy of the approval letter from the Ministry be provided when received by the applicant.
Based on the foregoing, the proposed UHOP Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications are consistent with the PPS because the proposed intensification efficiently uses existing infrastructure and provides a range of housing types while properly maintaining similar built forms and densities in the area.

Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017)

The proposal conforms to the Guiding Principles, Section 1.2.1, as it is designed to support healthy and active living and meet people’s needs for daily living. It also provides for a range and mix of housing options to serve varying sizes, incomes, and ages of households.

The following policies, amongst other policies, apply:

“2.2.1.4 Applying the policies of this Plan will support the achievement of complete communities:

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,

e) ensure the development of high quality compact built form, an attractive and vibrant public realm, including public open spaces, through site design and urban design standards.”

The subject lands are located within the Urban Boundary, in a settlement area where municipal services are available, and the proposed development will provide for a complete community through a compact design that will introduce a variety of housing types in the area. The proposal supports convenient access to local stores and services in the area.

Based on the foregoing, the proposal conforms to the policies of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017).

Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP)

The subject lands are identified as “Neighbourhoods” on Schedule ‘E’ – Urban Structure of the UHOP, and are designated “Neighbourhoods” on Schedule E-1 – Urban Land
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Use Designations. The lands are also designated “Low Density Residential 2h” on Map B.5.1-1 – Binbrook Village Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan.

The following policies, amongst others, are applicable to the proposal:

Scale and Design

“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;

Residential Uses

“E.3.3.1 Lower density residential uses and building forms shall generally be located in the interior of neighbourhood areas with higher density dwelling forms and supporting uses located on the periphery of neighbourhoods on or in close proximity to major or minor arterial roads;

E.3.4.1 The preferred location for low density residential uses is within the interior of neighbourhoods; and,

E.3.4.2 Low density residential areas are characterized by lower profile, grade-oriented built forms that generally have direct access to each unit at grade.”

The proposal for fourteen (14) street townhouse dwellings satisfies the above noted policies as the proposed dwellings are considered ‘street townhouse dwellings’ with direct access to each unit at grade and the subject property is located within the interior of the neighbourhood. Additionally, the proposed built form is compatible with the existing single detached dwellings and street townhouse dwellings in the surrounding area but an Official Plan Amendment is required because of the proposed density. The intensification policies in the UHOP are discussed below.

Design

“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 adjacent to major or minor arterial roads shall be discouraged.

b) 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 proposed street townhouse dwellings will front directly onto and have direct access to Tanglewood Drive which is identified as a local road on Map B.5.1-2 – Binbrook Village - Open Space Linkages. As well, the proposal is compatible with the immediate surroundings, such as the existing street townhouse dwellings to the south, which have similar lot areas, lot widths, and building setbacks.

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.”
Regarding the above, the character of Tanglewood Drive consists of low-rise residential buildings including single detached and street townhouse dwellings with similar lot frontages, ranging from 6 metres to 12 metres, and area requirements, ranging from 200 square metres to 400 square metres. The proposed fourteen (14) street townhouse dwellings will be compatible with the established built form and lot sizes in the area. Additionally, the proposal would provide a range of dwelling types in the area. The proposed development will contribute to the planned urban structure through the provision of compatible low-rise infill residential development on a greenfield site. The applicant has provided a Traffic Impact Brief and Staff concur that there are no concerns regarding the proposed trip generation. Furthermore, all parking for the proposed units would be provided on-site. Therefore, the proposed development complies with the policies of the UHOP for Neighbourhoods designation.

“B.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 conservation of cultural heritage resources; and,
- infrastructure and transportation capacity and impacts.”

The proposal complies with policies b) to j) above by providing similar height and massing to adjacent lands, most closely to the existing street townhouses directly abutting the south side of the property. The units will be maintaining the setbacks and height in the parent zoning, similar to the built street townhouse dwelling units abutting the south portion of the property ensuring minimal shadow impact onto neighbouring as well as overlook.

As well, the proposal is similar in regard to building envelopes of the existing street townhouse dwellings to the south of the subject lands on the west side of Tanglewood Drive. The existing townhouse dwellings have a minimum front yard setback of 7.5 metres, rear yard setback of 7.5 metres, minimum side yard setback of 1.9 metres, lot area sizes ranging from 200 square metres to 210 square metres, and lot frontages ranging from 6 metres to 7.9 metres. The maximum height of 10.7 metres is similar to the existing dwellings in the area and existing townhouse dwellings to the south and is not being modified from the parent zoning permissions.

Further, the proposed development will maintain the existing surrounding lot pattern with units facing directly onto Tanglewood Drive by having a similar rhythm and setback requirement as the existing townhouse dwellings on the same street. The proposal includes a minimum 45 square metre rear yard private amenity space for each unit. Finally the subject property is located approximately 120 metres from Jackson Heights Public Park.

Therefore, the proposed UHOP complies with the intent of the intensification policies in the Official Plan.

Noise

The UHOP contains relevant policies with respect to noise. Section 3.6.3 indicates:

“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.3.6.3.7 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:

a) 100 metres of a minor arterial road, as identified on Schedule C – Functional Road Classification; and,

c) 400 metres of a truck route.”

The property is located within 400 metres of a full time truck route (Regional Road 56). Therefore, the Official Plan requires that a Noise Study be submitted. It is noted that the applicant did not submit a Noise Study with the application and because the development will not be subject to a Site Plan Control, the applicant will be required to submit a Noise Study as a condition of the future severance application.

Therefore, the proposal complies with intent of Volume 1 of the UHOP.

Binbrook Village Secondary Plan

The subject lands are designated “Low Density Residential 2h” in the Binbrook Village Secondary Plan. The following policies, amongst others, apply to the proposal:

“B.5.1.4.1 The following goals shall apply to the Residential designations:

(a) Establish residential neighbourhoods which are diverse in population, scaled for the pedestrian can accommodate cars and transit, and have a well-defined public realm;

(c) Create safe, efficient and attractive residential neighbourhoods consisting of a range and mix of housing types and densities;

(d) Integrate residential neighbourhoods with parks and schools in order to provide a functional, efficient, practical, safe and visually pleasing living environment; and,

(g) Ensure new residential development considers and is sensitive to existing residential uses and other existing and permitted uses in the Binbrook Village.
B.5.1.4.3 In addition to Section E.3.0 – Neighbourhoods Designation of Volume 1, the following general policies apply to all residential land use designations identified in Map B.5.1-1 – Binbrook Village – Land Use Plan:

(a) Residential development in Binbrook Village shall have a compact urban form to enhance the livability of the community, provide for cost efficiencies, and support environmental sustainability;

(c) A range and mix of housing types shall be permitted, including single detached, semi-detached, duplexes, townhouses, quadruplexes, and apartment (multiple) dwellings, as well as with housing supports; and,

(e) The location and design of new residential areas shall be sensitive to the density and form of the existing residential uses. To encourage compatibility, new residential areas shall also be sensitive to the location and nature of existing and future non-residential uses.

B.5.1.4.5 Low Density Residential

(b) Notwithstanding policies E.3.4.3 and E.3.4.4 of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply to the lands designated Low Density Residential 2h on Map B.5.1-1 - Binbrook Village – Land Use Plan:

i) The permitted uses shall consist primarily of multiple dwelling unit types including street, block and stacked townhouse dwellings. Duplexes and Triplexes may also be permitted; and,

ii) The density range shall be from 26 to 40 units per hectare.

B.5.1.10.1 In addition to Section B.3.3 – Urban Design Policies of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply to all Residential designations identified on Map B.5.1-1 – Binbrook Village – Land Use Plan:

(g) Long and short townhouse blocks shall be mixed to provide rhythm in the streetscape.

(h) The massing of long townhouse blocks should be broken down so not to create a single monotonous elevation. Rooflines, colours,
chimneys, window bays, changes in material and other elements should be used to achieve this objective."

The application is to permit the development of fourteen (14) street townhouse dwellings on the subject lands which is a permitted use within the designation. The proposed street townhouse dwellings provide a range of housing options and the density is sensitive to the development in the surrounding area. The proposed density is required to permit a similar type of multiple dwelling and built form as the existing housing stock in the neighbourhood. As well, the property is located within close proximity to the main intersection of Regional Road 56 and Binbrook Road in Binbrook which has a range of commercial uses. Additionally, the proposed elevations provided by the applicant include varying exterior design within the townhouse block units. The varying exterior design provides a variation within the townhouse block, will create an attractive streetscape and maintain the character of the existing neighbourhood.

The Binbrook Village Secondary Plan identifies a density range of 26 to 40 units per hectare. As discussed previously, the proposed street townhouse dwellings will have a density of 45 units per hectare. As this represents a minor increase in density, the Amendment can be supported as the development is compatible with the surrounding area and makes efficient use of existing municipal infrastructure.

Township of Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464

The subject lands are currently zoned Deferred Development “DD” Zone. This zone permits limited agricultural uses, dwellings existing at the date of the passing of the By-law including accessory structures, Urban Farm and Community Garden. The applicant is proposing residential uses on the subject property.

The purpose of the application is to amend the zoning on the property to a site specific Residential Multiple “RM2” Zone. The site specific provisions required to permit the proposed dwelling include modifications to the minimum lot frontage, lot area, minimum side yard setbacks, maximum lot coverage and encroachments into yards. The site specific modifications are further discussed in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation Section of this report.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION

The following Internal Departments and Agencies had no comments or objections to the applications:

- Recreation Planning, Community and Emergency Services Department;
The following Departments and Agencies submitted the following comments:

**Public Health Services, Public Health Services Department** has requested that a Dust Management Plan and Pest Control Plan be completed for the subject lands. Staff note that the requirement for a Pest Control Plan and Dust Management Plan will be dealt with as a condition of consent.

**Forestry and Horticulture Section, Public Works Department** has requested that a Tree Management Plan and Landscape Plan showing the street trees be submitted through the Committee of Adjustment Process.

**Corridor Management, Public Works Department** does not have any concerns regarding the Rezoning but the applicant should be aware that the need for traffic calming has been identified on this roadway. Traffic Engineering will monitor the area after full build out and from there will decide what traffic calming measures will be required.

**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 circulated to 62 property owners within 120 m of the subject property on May 8, 2017. A Public Notice sign was posted on the property on May 9, 2017, and updated on January 10, 2018, with the Public Meeting date. Finally, Notice of the Public Meeting was circulated to 62 property owners on January 18, 2018, in accordance with the requirements of the *Planning Act*.

Public Consultation Strategy

The applicant submitted a Public Consultation Strategy which noted that the subject lands went through a public process during the severance of the subject property from the adjacent property identified as 2461 Highway 56. At that time, the applicant indicated that the subject lands would be used for residential purposes. The applicant stated that depending on whether any issues arose from surrounding owners during the application process, a public meeting would be held. To date there have been no comments or concerns received regarding the proposal.
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; which directs and encourages infill and intensification within the built-up area;

   (ii) It complies with the general intent and purpose of the UHOP and Secondary Plan; and,

   (iii) The proposed development is an appropriately scaled infill development that is compatible with existing and planned residential land uses in the surrounding area and represents good planning by, among other things, supporting intensification.

2. Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment

   Street townhouse dwellings are a permitted use on the subject lands as identified in the Binbrook Village Secondary Plan. However, as discussed previously in this Report, an Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment is required to permit a maximum net residential density of 45 units per hectare. The general area is characterized by a diverse form and scale of housing. The proposed fourteen (14) street townhouse dwellings, with the proposed Amendment for a 5 unit per hectare increase in density, will therefore remain compatible with the scale and character of the existing and planned development in the area. Additionally, the design of the proposed street townhouse dwellings are compatible with the surrounding neighbourhood with respect to lot pattern, lot widths and setback provisions. The subject lands abut a property to the south which has the same site specific provisions related to the lot width and setbacks. Therefore, Staff support the requested UHOP Amendment.

3. Zoning By-law Amendment

   The applicant has requested to rezone the property to the Residential Multiple “RM2-310” Zone, Modified. The site is currently zoned Deferred Development “DD” Zone which does not permit street townhouse dwellings. The rezoning is required to facilitate the development of fourteen (14) street townhouse dwellings with site specific modifications.
Staff are supportive of this change, as the proposed street townhouse dwellings are compatible with the existing residential development surrounding the property. The proposal will also provide the appropriate intensification within the urban built-up area of the City, utilizing existing municipal infrastructure.

The following site specific modifications to the Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464 are required to implement the proposal (See Appendix “C” to Report PED18034):

Minimum Lot Area and Lot Frontage

The proposed site specific will provide a Minimum Lot Area of 200 square metres per unit whereas the Residential Multiple “RM2” Zone requires a minimum of 210 square metres. As well, the proposed site specific will provide a minimum Lot Area of 260 square metres for an end dwelling unit / lot that does not abut a flanking street whereas the Residential Multiple “RM2” Zone requires a minimum of 270 square metres.

Additional to the reduced Lot Area, the proposed site specific will provide a Lot Frontage of 6 metres whereas the Residential Multiple “RM2” Zone requires a minimum of 7 metres. As well, the proposed site specific will permit a Lot Frontage of 7.9 metres for an end dwelling unit / lot that does not abut a flanking street whereas the Residential Multiple “RM2” Zone requires a minimum of 9 metres.

All of the proposed dwelling units will provide a minimum 7.5 metre rear yard setback and a minimum area of 45 square metres. Required parking and building setbacks in accordance with the existing Zoning By-law provisions will be provided. Additionally, the applicant will maintain the minimum amount of parking spaces required for each unit. Therefore, the proposed lot size will be sufficient to provide adequate parking, adequate amenity space, and establish a suitable sized dwelling unit within the building setbacks identified in the parent zone. In addition, the lot area and lot width proposed is consistent with the established character of the street, which has existing street townhouse lots ranging in lot width of 6 – 8 metres. In summary, the applicants are able to meet the intent of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and the requested amendments are minor in nature. On this basis, the modification to the minimum lot area and minimum lot width can be supported.
Minimum Side Yard Setback

The proposed site specific is to permit a minimum side yard setback of 1.9 metres for end dwelling units which do not abut a flanking street whereas the standard Residential Multiple “RM2” Zone requires a minimum side yard setback of 2 metres for end dwelling units which do not abut a flanking street.

The proposed change in Side Yard Setbacks is in keeping with the character of the surrounding dwellings since the proposed change is a minor change from the parent Zoning By-law. Engineering Staff did not have any concerns regarding the reduced Side Yard. Overall, the requested modification is a minor change and the proposed modification can be supported.

Maximum Lot Coverage

The proposed site specific provision is to permit a maximum lot coverage of 55% whereas the Residential Multiple “RM2” Zone permits a maximum lot coverage of 35%.

The intent of creating a maximum lot coverage for a property is so that the site is not overbuilt and can properly accommodate drainage, amenity space, and accessory structures. The proposed increase in lot coverage will not impact the applicants ability to maintain the required amenity space, front and rear yard setback for the subject site, as there have been no requests to decrease these setbacks. The increased lot coverage is in keeping with the character of the existing neighbourhood as the existing Street Townhouse dwellings to the south have similar coverage on reduced lot areas. As such, Staff are supportive of the increase for Lot Coverage.

Dwelling Unit Placement

The proposed site specific will modify the existing provision to remove the requirement for varying materials of the front face or wall for every four (4) dwelling units whereas the current provision requires that the dwelling units vary in exterior design and materials of the front face or wall for every four (4) dwelling units.

The intent of the current provision is to provide an opportunity to have varying complementary built form in a neighbourhood to decrease the uniformity and provide a sense of place. Staff are of the opinion that the modification still complies with the UHOP as the applicant is required to provide some variation in
design of the building. Additionally, the removal of the varying materials allows for the applicant to design a building in line with the existing character of the area while still providing some variation in the built form. On this basis, the modification to the dwelling unit placement can be supported.

**Encroachment into Yards**

The proposed site specific is to permit a maximum 0.5 metre encroachment into any required yard for an alcove with a maximum width of 3.0 metres. In the current Zoning By-law, encroachments into the required yard range from 0.5 to 1.5 metres, depending on the proposed encroachment. The applicant is requesting to encroach into any required yard by the amount of 0.5 metres. The intent of the required yards is to make sure that the privacy, access, landscaping and drainage is maintained on the property. Staff are of the opinion that the encroachment will not impact the access or the required landscaping on the properties. Therefore, Staff are of the opinion that the proposed modification to the application can be supported.

4. The proposal will be subject to a Consent to Sever Land application in order to divide the parcel of land into fourteen (14) new lots. Additionally, the proposed street townhouse dwellings are not subject to Site Plan Control.

5. With regards to the servicing of the subject site, there is an existing 300 mm watermain and 375 mm combined sanitary and sewer fronting the property. No road widening is required. Engineering has advised that they have no concerns regarding the proposed applications and all other engineering requirements will be dealt with through the severance application.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION**

Should the applications be denied, the subject lands would remain as the current Deferred Development “DD” Zone in the Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464, which does not permit the proposed residential use.

**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.

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.
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” – Draft Official Plan Amendment
Appendix “C” – Draft Zoning By-law Amendment
Appendix “D” – Proposed Lot Configuration
Appendix “E” – Proposed Building Elevations
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Amendment No. XX

The following text, together with:


1.0 Purpose and Effect:

The purpose and effect of this Amendment is to amend the Binbrook Village Secondary Plan Land Use Plan by establishing a Site Specific Policy Area to permit the proposed development of 14 Street Townhouse Dwellings with a maximum density of 45 units per hectare.

2.0 Location:

The lands affected by this Amendment are known municipally as 235 Tanglewood Drive within the City of Hamilton (former Township of Glanbrook).

3.0 Basis:

The basis for permitting this Amendment is as follows:

- The proposal satisfies all characteristics and requirements of the low 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 Actual Changes:

4.1 Text Changes

Urban Hamilton Official Plan Volume 2 – Secondary Plans

4.1.1 Volume 2: Chapter B, Glanbrook Secondary Plans, Section
B.5.1.13 Binbrook Village Secondary Plan is amended by adding a new Site Specific Policy – Area “X” as follows:

“Site Specific Policy – Area “X”

B.5.1.13.X Notwithstanding Volume 2, Policy B.5.1.4.5 c) ii), for the lands located at 235 Tanglewood Drive, designated Low Density Residential 2h and identified as Site Specific Policy – Area “X” on Map B.5.1-1 – Binbrook Village Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan, the maximum net residential density shall be 45 units per hectare."

4.2 Mapping Changes:

Urban Hamilton Official Plan Volume 2 – Secondary Plans

4.2.1 Urban Hamilton Official Plan Volume 2, Map B.5.1-1 – Binbrook Village Secondary Plan Land Use Plan, be amended by identifying the subject lands as Site Specific Policy Area - XX, 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. 464, Respecting Lands located at 235 Tanglewood Drive in the Former Township of Glanbrook, now in the City of Hamilton


AND WHEREAS the City of Hamilton is the successor to certain area municipalities, including the former area municipality known as “The Corporation of the Township of Glanbrook,” and is the successor to the former Regional municipality, namely “The Regional Municipality of the Hamilton-Wentworth”;

AND WHEREAS the City of Hamilton Act, 1999 provides that the Zoning By-laws of the former 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 Item XX of Report PED18034 of the Planning Committee, at its meeting held on XXDay ofXXXX, recommended that the Zoning By-law No. 464 (Glanbrook), be amended as hereinafter provided;

AND WHEREAS this By-law is in conformity with the Urban 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 “H” appended to and forming part of By-law No. 464 (Glanbrook), is amended by changing the zoning from the Deferred Development “DD” Zone to the Residential Multiple “RM2-310” Zone, Modified.

   The extent and boundaries of which are shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule “A”.

2. That Section 44 “Exceptions to the Provisions on this By-law”, of Zoning By-law No. 464 (Glanbrook) be amended by adding Special Exception “RM2-310” as follows:
“RM2-310” 235 Tanglewood Drive

1) Notwithstanding the regulations of SECTION 18: RESIDENTIAL MULTIPLE “RM2” Zone, Subsection 18.2 – REGULATIONS FOR USES PERMITTED IN PARAGRAPH (A) OF SUBSECTION 18.1 (STREET TOWNHOUSE DWELLING), Clauses (a), (a)(i), (b), (b)(i), (c), (e)(i), and k(ii) the following regulations shall apply to the lands zoned “RM2-310” Zone:

(a) Minimum Lot Frontage.................................................................6.0 metres
(19.68 feet) per dwelling unit, except:

(i) For a dwelling end unit which does not abut a flanking street, the minimum lot frontage shall be 7.9 metres (25.9 feet).

(b) Minimum Lot Area.................................................................200 square metres
(2,152.78 square feet) per dwelling unit, except:

(i) On an end lot which does not abut a flanking street, the minimum lot area shall be 260 square metre (2,798.61 square feet).

(c) Maximum Lot Coverage..........................................................55 percent

(e) Minimum Side Yard

(i) End dwelling unit not abutting a flanking street.......................1.9 metres

(k) Dwelling Unit Placement

(ii) Not more than four (4) attached dwelling units shall be erected in a row without offsetting or staggering the front face or wall of the dwelling a minimum of 1 metre (3.3 feet) or without varying the exterior design.

2) In addition to the regulations of SECTION 7: GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR ALL ZONES, Subsection 7.26 – ENCROACHMENTS INTO YARDS, the following regulation shall apply to the lands zoned “RM2-310” Zone:

(h) An alcove, without foundation, may encroach into any required yard to a maximum of 0.5 metres. No such feature shall have a width greater than 3.0 metres.

3. 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.
PASSED and ENACTED this XX day of XXX, 2018.

----------------------------------------
Fred Eisenberger
Mayor

----------------------------------------
Rose Caterini
City Clerk
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RECOMMENDATION

(a) That **Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment Application UHOPA-17-021, by LJM Developments (Grimsby) Inc., Owner**, to establish a site specific policy for a proposed thirteen (13) storey, 211 unit multiple dwelling with a maximum net residential density of 379 units per hectare, for lands located at 2782 Barton Street East, Hamilton as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18022, be APPROVED on the following basis:

(i) That the draft Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18022, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council; and,

(ii) That the proposed Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017).

(b) That **Amended Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-17-050, by LJM Developments (Grimsby) Inc., Owner**, for a change in zoning from the “E-2/S-306” and “E-2/S-306a” (Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified to the “E-3/S-306b” (High Density Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified to permit a 211 unit multiple dwelling with a maximum building height of thirteen (13) storeys (41 metres) on
SUBJECT: Applications for an Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for Lands Located at 2782 Barton Street East, Hamilton (Ward 5) (PED18022) - Page 2 of 31

lands located at 2782 Barton Street East, Hamilton as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18022 be APPROVED on the following basis:

(i) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED18022 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 “C” to Report PED18022 be added to District Map No. E123 of Zoning By-law No. 6593 as “E-3/S-306b”; and,

(iii) That the proposed change in zoning is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014), conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017) and will comply with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan upon finalization of Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment No. XX.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Owner, LJM Developments (Grimsby) Inc., has applied for an Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) Amendment and a Zoning By-law Amendment to permit a thirteen (13) storey condominium multiple dwelling with 211 units on a vacant parcel of land. A total of 264 parking spaces are proposed, including 215 resident parking spaces within two underground levels and 49 visitor parking spaces at grade.

The purpose of the UHOP Amendment is to increase the permitted net residential density for the subject property within the High Density Residential category of the “Neighbourhoods” designation from a maximum of 200 units per hectare to a maximum of 379 units per hectare.

The purpose of the Zoning By-law Amendment is to rezone the subject lands from the “E-2/S-306” & “E-2/S-306a” (Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified to the “E-3/S-306b” (High Density Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified. Modifications to the “E-3” District have been requested for an increased maximum building height and floor area ratio, and reduced front, side and rear yard depth, landscaped area, parking space dimensions, visitor parking rate and number of loading spaces to permit the proposed development.

The applications have merit and can be supported as the proposal is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014), conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017), and will comply with the UHOP upon finalization of the UHOP Amendment. The proposed multiple dwelling represents an appropriate level...
intensification at this location, respects and enhances the character of the neighbourhood and diversifies the housing type, form and tenure in the area.

Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 30

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 applications for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Proposal:

The subject property is located at the southwest corner of Barton Street East and Bell Manor Street, one block west of the intersection of Barton Street East and Grays Road. It is located at the northern edge of the Riverdale East Neighbourhood. The property is rectangular in shape, has a lot area of approximately 0.5655 ha (5,655 m²) and is municipally known as 2782 Barton Street East.

The property is currently vacant and was subject to previously approved Zoning By-law Amendment Applications that established site specific Zoning “E-2/S-306” and “E-2/S-306a”, implemented by By-law Nos. 74-7 and 87-77 respectively. A Site Plan Control Application (File No. DA-09-055) to construct a six (6) storey, 83 unit multiple dwelling geared towards seniors was conditionally approved but the approval has lapsed.

The applicant is proposing to construct a thirteen (13) storey, 41 metre high multiple dwelling with 211 dwelling units and 264 parking spaces, including 215 resident parking spaces within two (2) levels of underground parking and 49 visitor parking spaces at grade. A total of 170 bicycle parking spaces will be provided, including 159 long term spaces and 11 short term spaces.

The applicant applied to amend the UHOP to create a site specific policy to permit a maximum net residential density of 379 units per hectare in the High Density Residential category of the “Neighbourhoods” designation. The existing “Neighbourhoods” policies permit a maximum net residential density of 200 units per hectare in the High Density category.
The applicant has applied for a change in zoning from the “E-2/S-306” & “E-2/S-306a” (Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified to a site specific “E” (Multiple Dwellings, Lodges Clubs, Etc.) District. Modifications to permit an increased maximum building height and floor area ratio, and reduced front, and side yard depth, landscaped area, parking space dimensions, planting strip adjacent to a loading area, visitor parking rate and number of loading spaces have also been requested.

On October 6, 2017, the applicant submitted a revised concept site plan, underground parking plans, floor plans, elevations and draft zoning by-law in response to comments from Zoning staff seeking clarification. Revisions included proper labelling of site features and dimensions and a recalculation of building height (increased from 39.78 metres to 41.0 metres) and floor area ratio (increased from 3.1 to 3.15) based on Zoning By-law No. 6593 definitions. The proposed number of parking spaces was reduced from 278 to 264 due to clarification on the parking requirements of By-law No. 6593, which include the required visitor parking rate of 0.25 parking spaces per unit as a component of the total parking requirement of 1.25 parking spaces per unit. In response to staff comments, the proposed transformer pad was relocated from the landscaped area abutting the access driveway to the west side of the ramp to the underground parking.

Staff reviewed the revised Zoning By-law Amendment and determined that the increased density contemplated by the proposal is better reflected in a site specific “E-3” (High Density Multiple Dwellings) District. Additionally, staff requested the proposed amendment be revised by adding an increased rear yard setback requirement of 41 metres to limit potential impacts on the low density residential dwellings to the south. Staff requested a reduced building height from 42 metres to 41 metres and a reduced floor area ratio from 3.2 to 3.15 to match the dimensions and site statistics provided on the concept plan and to prevent additional increases in height and density. In order to accommodate the panelling that projects into the required front and westerly side yards, the applicant requested a decreased minimum front yard from 5.5 metres to 4.7 metres and a decreased minimum westerly side yard from 6.0 metres to 4.4 metres. A minimum required easterly side yard setback of 3.7 metres to the hypotenuse of the daylight triangle was requested by staff to maintain the plaza feature at the corner of Barton Street East and Bell Manor Street. The proposed concept plan identifies a minimum 1.5 metre landscape strip along the entire west property line, including adjacent to the proposed loading space. In accordance with the concept plan, staff have identified that the requested removal of the planting strip requirement between the loading space and the west abutting residential district is not necessary and requested it be removed from the proposed amendment. The above revisions to the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment were discussed and agreed upon by staff and the applicant.
Chronology:

June 2, 2017: Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment Application UHOPA-17-021 and Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-17-050 received.

June 30, 2017: Application UHOPA-17-021 and ZAC-17-050 deemed complete.

July 13, 2017: Notice of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation was sent to 322 property owners within 120 m of the subject lands.


October 6, 2017: Revised concept site plan, underground parking plans, floor plans, elevations and draft zoning by-law submitted by the applicant in response to staff comments.

January 10, 2018: Public Notice Sign updated with Public Meeting date.

January 19, 2018: Circulation of Notice of Public Meeting to 322 property owners within 120 m of the subject property.

Details of Submitted Application:

Applicant / Agent: A.J. Clarke and Associates Ltd. (c/o Franz Kloibhofer)

Location: 2782 Barton Street East, Hamilton (see Appendix “A” to Report PED18022)

Owner: LJM Developments (Grimsby) Inc. (c/o Liaquat Mian)

Agent: A.J. Clarke and Associates Ltd. (c/o Franz Kloibhofer)

Property Size: Lot Frontage: 78.95 m

Lot Depth: 73.79 m

Lot Area: 5,655 sq m (0.5655 ha)
**Services:**

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>Subject Property:</td>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>&quot;E-2/S-306&quot; &amp; &quot;E-2/S-306a&quot; (Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Surrounding Land Uses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>One and two storey commercial buildings, a used car lot and an auto repair shop</th>
<th>&quot;M3&quot; (Prestige Business Park) Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Hydro corridor and two storey townhouse dwellings</td>
<td>&quot;L-PN&quot; (Planned Development) District &amp; &quot;DE/S-205&quot; (Low Density Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Two storey townhouse dwellings</td>
<td>&quot;DE/S-306&quot; (Low Density Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Sixteen (16) storey multiple dwelling</td>
<td>&quot;E/S-306&quot; (Multiple Dwellings, Lodges, Clubs, etc.) District, Modified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS**

**Provincial Policy Statement (2014):**

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

The PPS encourages development within settlement areas that promotes the efficient use of land and infrastructure, and supports public transit and active transportation. The proposed multiple dwelling provides an appropriate level of intensification on an underutilized site within the Urban Boundary. The property is adjacent to existing bus routes and is within walking distance of amenities including schools, parks, local commercial and employment uses.

---

**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.
Staff also note Cultural Heritage policies within the UHOP have not been updated in accordance with the PPS (2014). The following policy of the PPS (2014) also applies:

“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.”

A Stage 1 and 2 archaeological assessment was completed by The Fossil Hill Group and submitted by the applicant. The consultants conducted a field survey on May 17, 2017 and encountered no archaeological resources. Based on their findings, the consultants recommended that the development be cleared from any further archaeological assessment. Staff have reviewed the report and concur with the recommendations made by the consultants.

In the opinion of staff, the proposal is consistent with the policies of the PPS (2014).

**Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017)**

As of July 1, 2017, the provisions of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2017 apply to any planning decision.

Policy 2.2.1.2(a) of the Growth Plan directs the majority of growth to settlement areas that have access to municipal water and wastewater systems and can support the achievement of complete communities. Policy 2.2.1.4 supports the achievement of complete communities through the following measures, amongst others:

- **a)** feature a diverse mix of land uses, including residential and employment uses, and convenient access to local stores, services, and public service facilities;

- **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.

The subject lands are located within the Hamilton Urban Boundary and are fully serviced by municipal water and wastewater infrastructure. The proposal will contribute to achieving a complete community by expanding housing options within the Riverdale East neighbourhood and adding to a diverse mix of local land uses that includes low-rise and high-rise residential, local commercial uses, employment uses and public institutions. The proposed multiple dwelling has access to a range of transportation options and an appropriate supply of safe, publically accessible parks and open spaces.
Also, according to Policy 2.2.2.1 of the Growth Plan, by the year 2031, and each year thereafter, a minimum of 60 per cent of all residential development occurring within a municipality must be within the delineated built up area. This proposal represents an appropriate level of intensification within the built up area, consistent with the growth management policies of the Growth Plan.

In the opinion of staff, the proposal conforms with the policies of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017).

Urban Hamilton Official Plan

The subject property is identified as “Neighbourhoods” on Schedule “E” – Urban Structure and designated “Neighbourhoods” on Schedule “E-1” – Urban Land Use Designations of the UHOP. The following policies, amongst others, apply:

Neighbourhoods

“E.2.6.4 The Neighbourhoods element of the urban structure shall permit and provide for a full range of housing forms, types and tenure, including affordable housing and housing with supports.

E.2.6.7 Neighbourhoods shall generally be regarded as physically stable areas with each neighbourhood having a unique scale and character. Changes compatible with the existing character or function of the neighbourhood shall be permitted. Applications for development and residential intensification within Neighbourhoods shall be reviewed in consideration of the local context and shall be permitted in accordance with Section B.2.4 – Residential Intensification, E.3.0 – Neighbourhoods Designation, E.4.0 – Commercial and Mixed Use Designations, and E.6.0 – Institutional Designation.

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."

Policies E.2.6.4, E.3.2.1 and E.3.2.3a) reinforce the importance of providing a range of residential dwelling types and densities within a neighbourhood. The neighbourhood context is made up of a 16 storey multiple dwelling directly to the west of the subject property, a six storey multiple dwelling near the intersection of Barton Street East and Grays Road, commercial / industrial uses to the north and townhouse and single detached dwellings to the south and east. By introducing a multiple dwelling at an appropriate location on the periphery of the neighbourhood, the proposed development would add to the diversity of housing types available in the area and contribute to a more complete community.

Policies E.2.6.7 and E.3.2.4 establish that new development shall be compatible with the existing character of the neighbourhood. The term compatible is defined in the UHOP as being “land uses and building forms that are mutually tolerant and capable of existing together in harmony within the area. Compatibility or compatible should not be narrowly interpreted to mean “the same as” or even as “being similar to”.

The proposed multiple dwelling respects and enhances the existing character of the neighbourhood by providing a street oriented building along a minor arterial road, including ground floor glazing and landscaping adjacent to the public sidewalk. The proposal is compatible with the neighbouring 16 storey multiple dwelling to the west, also fronting on Barton Street East. Measures to ensure an appropriate transition to the low density residential neighbourhood to the south include a minimum 41 metre rear yard depth and a minimum 1.5 metre landscape buffer along the south property line with a 1.8 metre high visual barrier to screen the parking area. In order to limit the visual impact, no portion of the building will penetrate a 45 degree angular plane measured to the south property line. To ensure compatibility with the low density residential neighbourhood to the east, the building has been placed towards the front of the site, and the side building facade narrows towards the east property line across from the parking area for the east abutting townhouses, further limiting the visual impact. The proposal will be further evaluated against the Residential Intensification and Urban Design policies of the UHOP later in this Report.
High Density Residential

“E.3.6.1 High density residential areas are characterized by multiple dwelling forms on the periphery of neighbourhoods in proximity to major or minor arterial roads.

E.3.6.4 High density residential uses shall be located within safe and convenient walking distance of existing or planned community facilities / services, including public transit, schools, and active or passive recreational facilities.

E.3.6.5 Proximity to the Downtown Urban Growth Centre, Sub-Regional Nodes or Community Nodes, and designated Employment Areas shall be considered desirable for high density residential uses.”

Consistent with Policy E.3.6.1, the proposed multiple dwelling will be located at the northern periphery of the Riverdale East neighbourhood. Barton Street East is classified as a minor arterial road as shown on Schedule C of the UHOP.

With regards to Policies E.3.6.4 and E.3.6.5, the subject lands are located approximately 500 metres, or a five minute walk, from St. Agnes Catholic Elementary School and Riverdale East Park, and 1.3 kilometres, or a fifteen minute walk, from Eastdale Elementary School and Eastdale Park. Public transit is accessible on Barton Road East, including at an HSR bus loop at the southeast corner of Barton Road East and Bell Manor Street.

North of Barton Street East, directly adjacent to the subject lands, is a contiguous Employment Area that extends from the Red Hill Valley Expressway to Winona Road in Stoney Creek. The subject lands are approximately two (2) kilometres from the Eastgate Square Sub Regional Service Node, representing a 20 minute walk, 8 minute cycle or 4 minute drive.

In accordance with the High Density Residential category policies of the UHOP, the proposed multiple dwelling will be located at an appropriate location within the neighbourhood and have convenient access to services, commercial uses and employment opportunities.

“E.3.6.6 In high density residential areas, the permitted net residential densities, identified on Appendix G – Boundaries Map shall be:

b) greater than 100 units per hectare and not greater than 200 units per hectare in all other Neighbourhoods designation areas;”
Policy E.3.6.6 permits a maximum net residential density of 200 units per hectare within the “Neighbourhoods” designation outside of the Downtown. The applicant has proposed a net residential density of 379 units per hectare, requiring a site specific policy amendment to the UHOP. Staff have reviewed the proposal against the Residential Intensification policies and High Density Residential use policies of the “Neighbourhoods” designation and are satisfied that the proposed increase in density is appropriate at this location. The proposed multiple dwelling will be located on the periphery of the neighbourhood along a minor arterial road and will be massed to address the immediate context that includes an adjacent 16 storey multiple dwelling and townhouse dwellings. Furthermore, staff are satisfied that the proposed increase in density will not create adverse impacts on neighbouring land uses. The Traffic Impact Statement submitted by the applicant found that the increased traffic generated by the proposal can be accommodated on existing municipal road infrastructure and the submitted sun / shadow study did not identify adverse shadowing impact on neighbouring residential uses.

“E.3.6.7 Development within the high density residential category shall be evaluated on the basis of the following criteria:

a) Development 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 be permitted direct access to a collector or major or minor arterial road via a local road upon which abut only a small number of low density residential category dwellings.

b) High profile multiple dwellings shall not generally be permitted immediately adjacent to low profile residential uses. A separation distance shall generally be required and may be in the form of a suitable intervening land use, such as a medium density residential use. Where such separations cannot be achieved, transitional features such as effective screening and design features shall be incorporated into the design of the high density development to mitigate adverse impact on adjacent low profile residential uses.

d) Development shall:

i) provide adequate landscaping, amenity features, on-site parking, and buffering where required;

ii) be compatible with existing and future uses in the surrounding area in terms of heights, massing, and an arrangement of buildings and structures; and,
iii) provide adequate access to the property, designed to minimize conflicts between traffic and pedestrians both on-site and on surrounding streets.

e) In accordance with the policies of Section B.3.3 – Urban Design Policies, development shall contribute to an attractive public realm by minimizing the view of the following elements from the abutting public streets (excluding public alleys):

i) surface parking areas;

ii) parking structures;

iii) utility and service structures such as garbage enclosures; and,

iv) expanses of blank walls.

f) The City may require studies, in accordance with Chapter F - Implementation Policies, completed to the satisfaction of the City, to demonstrate that the height, orientation, design and massing of a building or structure shall not unduly overshadow, block light, or result in the loss of privacy of adjacent residential uses.”

In accordance with Policy E.3.6.7a), the proposed development will have direct access to Barton Street East, a minor arterial road, via Bell Manor Street, a local road. There are townhouse dwellings fronting on Bell Manor Street, however most are located south of the proposed access driveway.

In accordance with Policy E.3.6.7b), the applicant has proposed design features to mitigate potential adverse impacts on the low profile residential uses to the south and east of the subject lands. A landscape buffer is proposed, including a 1.8 m high visual barrier to screen the surface parking lot from the townhouse dwellings to the south. In addition, the multiple dwelling has been designed so that no portion of the building penetrates a 45 degree angular plane measured from the south property line, limiting the visual impact and overlook of the building on adjacent low density residential uses. With respect to adjacent low profile residential uses to the east, the neighbouring townhouse dwellings are separated from the proposed multiple dwelling by the Bell Manor Street right-of-way. The proposed building is located towards the front of the subject site across from a hydro corridor and the parking area for the townhouse dwelling units to the east. The side building facade of the proposed multiple dwelling is narrow, limiting the visual impact and overlook to the east.
As per Policy E.3.6.7d), the development features landscaping along the south, east and west property lines. Landscaping and a plaza are located in front of the building providing animation along the Barton Street East frontage. Resident amenities to supplement nearby public parks include an exercise room, yoga room and party room on the ground floor of the building and an outdoor children’s play area at the southwest corner of the site. Adequate parking for residents is provided below grade with visitors parking at grade. The proposal is compatible with existing and future uses in the area as the height is consistent with the 16 storey multiple dwelling to the west and the massing and arrangement of the building on site limits its impact on the low rise residential uses to the east and south. There is one proposed vehicle access to the site off of Bell Manor Street and pedestrian entrances at the front and rear of the building are accessed by walkways extending around the perimeter of the building. The proposed vehicle access is located south of the building, minimizing conflict with pedestrians approaching the building from Barton Street East. In the opinion of staff, the features of the proposed development satisfy Policy E.3.6.7d).

With respect to Policy E.3.6.7e), the development contributes to the public realm by locating parking underground and behind the building. The facades feature extensive glazing and there are no expanses of blank walls. Staff will review the landscape plan required at the Site Plan Control stage to ensure all utility structures and outdoor garbage facilities are adequately screened.

In accordance with Policy E.3.6.7f) and Chapter F of the UHOP, the applicant submitted a sun / shadow study prepared by Icon Architects. The study predicted shadow impact of the proposed development on adjacent residential properties on June 21, September 21 and December 21. Outdoor amenity areas for 75 Berkindale Manor to the southwest and 15 Bell Manor to the east were found to be impacted for one hour and two hours respectively on June 21 only.

The most significant shadow impact of the proposed tower was found to be on the outdoor amenity area for the multiple dwelling directly to the west (2772 Barton Street East). This area would be impacted by shadow from 8:00 am to 12:00 pm on June 21 and September 21, and 10:00 am on December 21. The amenity area would not be impacted in the afternoon or early evening, during which utilization would likely to be higher, especially in the summer months. The existing site specific “E-2” District zoning permits a maximum building height of 39 metres, whereas a 41 metre height is proposed. Staff are satisfied that the additional 2 metres in height above the as-of-right height permission, as well as the massing, orientation and design of the proposed building will not create undue shadow impacts on adjacent residential properties.
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.

B.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;

i) the conservation of cultural heritage resources; and,

j) infrastructure and transportation capacity and impacts."

The proposed multiple dwelling contributes to the range of dwelling types and tenures by providing a high density residential form, as per Policy B.2.4.1.4c). The proposal complements the existing function of the neighbourhood as per Policy B.2.4.2.2(h) as the proposed high density development is located at the periphery of the Riverdale East neighbourhood on a minor arterial road, and has convenient access to public transit, services, employment areas and the Eastgate Square Sub Regional Node. As per Policy B.2.4.1.4e), the Neighbourhoods policies of the Urban Structure encourage a range of dwelling types and tenures and development that complements the form and function of the neighbourhood as described above.

The proposed development respects and enhances the existing neighbourhood character as required by Policy B.2.4.1.4 b) by providing an appropriately designed building on a vacant lot adjacent to a 16 storey multiple dwelling, while providing an adequate transition to adjacent townhouse dwellings. In accordance with Policies B.2.4.1.4 d) and B.2.4.2.2b), c) & d), the proposal is designed to ensure compatibility with the surrounding area, including limited nuisance effects such as shadowing, noise, lighting, traffic and overlook, and provides appropriate massing and scale along with transitions to adjacent low density residential buildings. The 13 storey multiple dwelling will occupy a vacant lot and complement the neighbouring 16 storey multiple dwelling to the west. The building will be placed at the front of the subject site, providing a minimum 41 metre rear setback to the townhouse properties to the south, and will provide a narrow building facade adjacent to the townhouse dwellings to the east. These design features limit shadow and overlook impacts, as confirmed by the sun/shadow study submitted by the applicant. The proposed balconies on the east façade will not directly overlook the adjacent townhouse dwellings and the rear facing balconies will be located a significant distance from the townhouse dwellings to the south, limiting
overlook. The proposed landscape buffers and visual barriers at the south and west property line further limit nuisance affects, including noise and lighting.

Proposed amenities include an exercise room, yoga room and party room on the ground floor of the multiple dwelling and an outdoor children's play area at the southwest corner of the site. As per Policy B.2.4.2.2 f), the proposed amenities will complement the existing public parks within walking distance of the subject site.

The existing lot conforms with the lot pattern of the neighbourhood that generally features larger commercial and high density residential lots at the periphery along Barton Street East, with smaller single detached and townhouse dwelling lots behind. The proposal will enhance the existing streetscape by locating the primary façade close to the street while maintaining appropriate setbacks and separation distances from the neighbouring multiple dwelling to the west and townhouse dwellings to the south and east. The setbacks allow for the implementation of a 45 degree angular plan which is consistent with best practises for minimizing issues of overlook, massing and privacy. Based on the foregoing, the proposal complies with Policies B.2.4.2.2e) & g).

With respect to Policies B.2.4.1.4 f) and B.2.4.2.2 j), the subject site is serviced by municipal water, sewer and stormwater infrastructure. Based on staff review of the Transportation Impact Study submitted by the applicant, the traffic generated by the proposed development can be accommodated within the existing road network.

With respect to Policy B.2.4.2.2i), staff have not identified any impacts from the proposed development on cultural heritage resources and concur with the findings of the Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment, as discussed in the Provincial Policy Statement section of this Report.

Furthermore, the following urban design policies, amongst others, also apply:

Urban Design

"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;

c) recognizing and protecting the cultural history of the City and its communities;
d) conserving and respecting the existing built heritage features of the City and its communities;

e) conserving, maintaining, and enhancing the natural heritage and topographic features of the City and its communities;

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.

B.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.

B.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;

c) including a quality landscape edge along frontages where buildings are set back from the street;

d) locating surface parking to the sides or rear of sites or buildings, where appropriate; and,

e) using design techniques, such as building step-backs, to maximize sunlight to pedestrian areas."

With respect to the above urban design policies, staff are of the opinion that the proposed development respects and enhances the neighbourhood character. The building will be located at the edge of the neighbourhood, adjacent to an existing high density multiple dwelling, and will provide appropriate transitions to low rise residential uses on the interior of the neighbourhood. Shadow impacts on adjacent townhouse dwellings to the south and east have been minimized by massing the building at the front of the site, ensuring that no portion of the building penetrates a 45 degree angular plane measured from the south property line and narrowing the building façade at the east side lot line. Except for some impacts on the multiple dwellings to the west, as per previous comments, the sun / shadow study submitted by the applicant demonstrated that the proposed building has been designed so as not to create undue shadow impact on adjacent residential properties.

The proposal will enhance the pedestrian realm by providing parking at the rear of the building and underground, and locating the principle building façade parallel and close to Barton Street East. The ground floor entrances, amenity spaces, as well as landscaping and a plaza at the front of the building will further animate the street. A Pedestrian Wind Study was prepared by RWDI and submitted by the applicant. The report recommends wind control methods at building corners and entrances, including wind screens, recessed entrances, canopies and landscaping. Staff will continue to work with the applicant to implement such measures and others such as ground floor glazing and quality landscaping adjacent to the public sidewalk in order to further enhance the pedestrian realm. Further design review will occur at the Site Plan Control stage.
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.3.6.3.7 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:

a) 100 metres of a minor arterial road, as identified on Schedule C – Functional Road Classification.”

The proposed residential development will be located 0 metres from Barton Street East, a minor arterial road, and is a noise sensitive use.

A Noise Impact Study was prepared by dBA Acoustical Consultants Inc. and submitted with the application. The report analysed noise levels in the area and recommended noise control measures including warning clauses, central air conditioning and noise reducing wall and window construction. Staff are satisfied with the report for rezoning purposes, however an addendum study will be required at the Site Plan Control stage providing further detail on the commercial land uses to the north and on noise impacts to the proposed outdoor play area at the rear of the site. Noise warning clause will be included in all future purchase or lease agreements and noise control measures recommended in the addendum report will be implemented at the Site Plan Control stage.

Servicing

“C.5.3.5 All new development and redevelopment within the urban area shall be connected to the City’s water and wastewater system.

C.5.3.11 The City shall ensure that any change in density can be accommodated within the municipal water and wastewater system.

C.5.3.15 The City shall be satisfied that adequate infrastructure services can be provided prior to any development or intensification proceeding and, where technically and economically possible, the City shall require such services to be located underground.
C.5.4.9 All land designated on Schedule E-1 – Urban Land Use Designations shall meet the following conditions:

a) development and / or redevelopment shall be connected to, or serviced by, a storm water drainage system or other appropriate system such as ditches, or any other techniques acceptable to the City, Conservation Authorities, or the Province and/or detailed in a Storm Water Master Plan or other relevant study;

b) development shall be in accordance with the system capacity for drainage and storm water management and where relevant, will conform to storm water site management plans, a Storm Water Master Plan, site plans and/to other relevant studies, guidelines or regulations; and,

c) storm water systems shall be designed and constructed, in accordance with the City’ standards and guidelines, provincial guidelines, storm water master plans, master drainage plans and any other relevant study or legislation."

A Functional Servicing Report (FSR) and Stormwater Management Report dated May 2017, prepared by S. Llewellyn & Associates was submitted with the application and reviewed by staff.

Growth Management staff are satisfied that the existing water, waste water and storm water infrastructure is adequate to service the proposed development. The detailed infrastructure and servicing design will be reviewed and approved through the Site Plan Control process.

Neighbourhood Plans

The following policy related to Neighbourhood Plans, amongst others, applies:

“F.1.2.7 Neighbourhoods 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.”

The subject site is designated “Commercial and Apartments” in the Riverdale East Neighbourhood Plan. The proposed multiple dwelling conforms to the policies of this designation, therefore an amendment to the Riverdale East Neighbourhood Plan is not required.
Based on the foregoing, the proposal complies with the UHOP.

City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 6593

The subject property is currently zoned “E-2/S-306” & “E-2/S-306a” (Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified (By-law No. 74-7 and By-law No. 87-77) which permits a range of residential uses including multiple dwellings, but limits gross floor area to not greater than the area of the lot multiplied by a floor area ratio of 1.19 and building height to 39 metres or 12 storeys. The proposed multiple dwelling would have a floor area ratio of 3.15 and a building height of 41 metres and 13 storeys. The existing site specific modifications (S-306 and S-306a) rezoned the property from “DE” (Low Density Multiple Dwellings) District to “E-2” (Multiple Dwellings) District to allow for an 83 unit multiple dwelling with additional permitted commercial uses to facilitate a development concept that was never finalized.

In order to implement the proposed 13 storey multiple dwelling, a change in zoning from the “E-2/S-306” & “E-2/S-306a” (Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified to the “E-3/S-306b” (High Density Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified is required. By-law No. 87-77 (S-306a) will be repealed in its entirety and the property will be exempt from the requirements of By-law No. 74-7 (S-306). 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 proposal:

- Alectra Utilities (formerly Horizon Utilities);
- Hamilton Street Railway (HSR); and,
- Recreation Division, Community & Emergency Services Department.

The following Departments and Agencies have provided comments with respect to the proposed applications:

Corridor Management, Public Works Department have reviewed the applicant’s Traffic Impact Study (TIS) and are satisfied that the proposed 211 unit multiple dwelling can be accommodated without modifications to the existing road network. Corridor Management identified the following requirements:
• All access works within the road allowance must be completed by a bonded contractor;

• 5 metre by 5 metre visibility triangles are required between the driveway limits and the road allowance limit, with landscaping not to exceed 0.7 metres in height;

• A minimum of 1.2 metre separation must be provided within the City’s road allowance area between a fence and any pole, utility, fire hydrant, tree, sign, etc. Any costs for traffic sign or utility relocation are the sole responsibility of the Owner.

• All construction equipment is to remain on private property.

These requirements will be reviewed and addressed at the Site Plan Control stage.

Forestry and Horticulture Section, Public Works Department has advised that there are municipal tree assets on site and therefore a Tree Management Plan will be required. A Landscape Plan prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect is required, showing the placement of trees on City and private property. These requirements will be reviewed and addressed at the Site Plan Control stage.

Public Health Services, Health Protection Division, identified a requirement for a pest control plan focusing on rats and mice, to be addressed at the Site Plan Control stage.

Transportation Management, Public Works Department, identified that a 12.19 m by 12.19 m daylight triangle is required at the intersection of Barton Street East and Bell Manor Street. The Applicant has shown the daylight triangle on the concept site plan and would be required to convey these lands to the City as a condition of Site Plan approval.

The existing road allowance widths of Barton Street East (36.58 m) and Bell Manor Street (20.1 m) are sufficient. No additional road widening dedications are required.

Transportation Management staff have reviewed the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) report submitted by the applicant and concluded that the TDM meets the objectives of the City pending the demonstration of the proposed elements at the Site Plan Control stage. The applicant has provided sufficient bicycle parking, including 160 long-term interior bicycle parking spaces and 11 short-term exterior bicycle parking spaces. Transportation Management staff further recommend that dedicated carshare vehicle parking be provided and that travel planning resources (bike maps, bus schedules, etc.) be made available in a central location. TDM strategies will be further reviewed at the Site Plan Control stage.
Waste Management Section, Public Works Department has advised that the site would be eligible for municipal waste pickup with respect to garbage, organics and recyclables. Staff note that the applicant intends to provide an interior garbage room and outdoor garbage pad adjacent to the loading space at the west side of the site. The Owner may choose to pursue the services of a private waste contractor and this will be further reviewed at the Site Plan Control stage.

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 322 property owners within 120 m of the subject property on July 13, 2017. A Public Notice sign was posted on the property on July 13, 2017 and updated with the Public Meeting Date on January 10, 2018.

Public Consultation Strategy

In accordance with their submitted Public Consultation Strategy, the applicant held a Public Open House on August 29, 2017. The applicant provided mail correspondence to all 322 landowners within 120 m of the subject lands on July 26, 2017 and five (5) residents attended the Open House.

To date, two (2) public submissions have been received, raising concerns related to traffic and property values. These issues and concerns are discussed in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation section of this Report.

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 (2014) and conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017). Both policy documents encourage intensification within settlement areas.

   (ii) It complies with the general intent and purpose of the UHOP, in particular the function, scale and design of the High Density Residential use category of the Neighbourhoods designation; and,

   (iii) It provides appropriately designed and scaled residential intensification at an appropriate location within the neighbourhood and will diversify the types of housing available in the area, contributing to a more complete community and supporting redevelopment of a vacant site.
2. **Official Plan Amendment**

   The proposed multiple dwelling use is permitted in the UHOP as the subject site and proposed development meet the criteria of the High Density Residential category of the “Neighbourhoods” designation. However, Policy E.3.6.6 of the UHOP limits net residential density within the High Density Residential category, outside of the Downtown, to 200 units per hectare. In order to facilitate the proposed net residential density of 379 units per hectare, a site specific policy amendment to the UHOP is required.

   The intent of the “Neighbourhoods” policies of the UHOP is to provide for a range of housing forms, types and tenures while ensuring that new development is compatible with the existing character of the neighbourhood. The proposed 13 storey multiple dwelling would be located at an appropriate location at the periphery of the Riverdale East Neighbourhood, fronting a minor arterial road. The subject site provides convenient access to schools, parks, public transit, local and sub regional commercial uses, and employment uses. The proposed design of the building, its height and its massing on site incorporate elements that ensure compatibility with the adjacent low density residential neighbourhood.

   The proposed development implements the Residential Intensification policies of the UHOP and the requested increase in permitted net residential density can be supported.

3. **Zoning By-law Amendment**

   A change in zoning is required to facilitate the proposal from the “E-2/S-306” & “E-2/S-306a” (Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified to the “E-3/S-306b” (High Density Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified. The “E-3” and “E-2” Districts have identical requirements with respect to height, however the “E-3” District permits a higher floor area ratio of 2.55 compared to 1.19 for the “E-2” District, consistent with the density increase contemplated by the proposal. The following site specific amendments to the “E-3” (High Density Multiple Dwellings) District of Zoning By-law No. 6593 are required to implement the proposal:

   i) **Maximum Building Height**

   A modification is required to permit a maximum building height of 13 storeys or 41 metres, whereas a maximum height of 12 storeys or 39 metres is permitted.
The intent of the Zoning By-law is to limit the impact of building height on adjacent uses. The proposed building addresses the existing context that includes an adjacent 16 storey multiple dwelling to the west. The applicant has taken measures to mitigate impact on adjacent low density residential uses, including massing the building to the north portion of the site adjacent to Barton Street East, away from nearby low rise residential uses, and providing an uninterrupted 45 degree angular plane from the top of the building to the south property line. The proposed building height represents a modest increase above the existing 12 storeys or 39 metres permitted as-of-right in the “E-2” District.

Based on the foregoing, staff support the proposed increase in building height.

ii) Minimum Front Yard Depth

A modification is required to permit a minimum front yard depth 4.7 metres, whereas 7.23 metres is required. For zoning purposes, the Barton Street East frontage (north property line) has been deemed the front lot line.

The existing streetscape along Barton Street East is generally auto-oriented, with buildings set back away from the street and parking located within the front yard of neighbouring commercial and employment uses, and the multiple dwelling to the west. The proposed primary building façade would be located parallel to Barton Street East. Locating the building close to the street will enhance the pedestrian realm and appropriately frame the Barton Street East frontage, consistent with the Urban Design policies of the UHOP. The proposal includes ground floor glazing, and patios and a plaza within the front yard that will enhance the streetscape along Barton Street East and make it more pedestrian friendly.

Based on the foregoing, staff support the proposed reduction in front yard depth.

iii) Minimum Side Yard Depth

A modification is required to permit a minimum easterly side yard depth of 1.9 metres, except 3.7 metres to the hypotenuse of the daylight triangle, and a minimum westerly side yard depth of at least 4.4 metres. The minimum required depth of both side yards is 10.53 metres.
The westerly side yard abuts the parking and outdoor amenity area of the neighbouring 16 storey multiple dwelling while the neighbouring building is itself setback further to the west. The easterly side yard abuts Bell Manor Street. Across Bell Manor Street is a Hydro Corridor with an HSR bus loop, and two storey townhouse dwellings. The proposed building is located across from the bus loop and the parking area for the townhouse dwellings. Staff are satisfied that the proposed reduced side yard depths will not create adverse privacy or overlook impacts on adjacent residential uses. Additionally, the proposed easterly side yard will be increased to 3.7 m to the hypotenuse of the required visibility triangle, limiting any impact on visibility for traffic at the intersection of Barton Street East and Bell Manor Street.

Based on the foregoing, staff support the proposed reduced side yard depths.

iv) Minimum Rear Yard Depth

The proposal provides a minimum rear yard depth of 41 metres to limit the impact of the building on the low rise residential uses to the south. In order to ensure the proposed rear yard depth is implemented in the final design, the required minimum rear yard depth will be modified from a minimum 10.53 metres to a minimum 41 metres.

Staff support the proposed increased rear yard depth.

v) Maximum Floor Area Ratio

A modification is required to permit a gross floor area equal to the lot area multiplied by a floor area ratio of 3.15 (17,578 square metres), whereas a gross floor area equal to the lot area multiplies by a floor area ratio of 2.55 (14,229 square metres) is permitted.

The proposed increase in permitted gross floor area reflects the density increase contemplated by this development against the policies of the UHOP and Zoning By-law No. 6593. As discussed previously in this report, staff are satisfied that the proposed density increase can be accommodated at this location and that appropriate design measures have been taken to limit adverse impacts on neighbouring land uses.

Based on the foregoing, staff support the proposed increase in gross floor area.
vi) **Minimum Landscaped Area**

A modification is required to permit a minimum landscaped area equal to 23% of the area of the lot (1,284 square metres), whereas 40% (2,232 square metres) is required.

The proposal provides adequate landscape buffers to the residential uses to the south, east and west and incorporates an outdoor amenity area into the design. The remaining site area has been utilized to provide adequate visitor parking and loading, and to accommodate the building footprint, appropriately located towards the front of the site. Staff are satisfied that the site layout provides adequate transitions to adjacent residential uses and that additional landscape buffers are not required. A landscape plan will be required at the Site Plan Control stage and reviewed by staff to ensure high quality landscaping is provided.

Based on the foregoing, staff support the proposed reduction in landscape area.

vii) **Balcony Encroachment**

A modification is required to permit a 1.0 metre balcony encroachment into the required side yards.

Further to the discussion of side yard depth earlier in this Report, Staff are satisfied that the proposed balcony encroachments into the side yard will not have adverse privacy or overlook impacts on adjacent residential uses.

Based on the foregoing, staff support the proposed balcony encroachment permission.

viii) **Minimum Parking Space Dimensions**

A modification is required to permit minimum parking space dimensions of 2.6 metres by 5.5 metres for 90 degree perpendicular parking spaces, whereas 2.7 metres by 6.0 metres is required.

Based on the need to balance the requirement to provide adequate resident and visitor parking and landscaping, outdoor amenity areas and buffers from adjacent residential uses, the reduced parking space dimensions are requested. The proposed parking dimensions allow for
adequate resident parking to be provided below grade and for a reduction in the at-grade paved area allocated for visitor parking. The reduced surface parking lot size allows for more generous landscape buffers, particularly along the south property line adjacent to nearby townhouse dwellings. The buffers range in size from 4.99 metres to 3.53 metres along the south property line and 3.16 metres to 3.47 metres along the west property line. It also allows for a larger outdoor amenity space (children’s play area) for use by residents.

Based on the foregoing, staff support the proposed reduced parking space dimensions.

ix) **Minimum Visitor Parking Rate**

A modification is required to permit a visitor parking rate of 0.23 parking spaces per dwelling unit. A parking rate of 1.25 spaces per residential dwelling unit, of which 0.25 spaces are allocated for visitors, is required.

The proposal complies with the required residential parking rate of 1.25 spaces per unit, however the parking areas have been designed so that resident parking will be located underground and visitor parking will be located at grade. A total of 115 resident parking spaces will be located underground, or 1.02 parking spaces per dwelling unit, and 49 visitor parking spaces will be located at grade. This results in a visitor parking rate of 0.23 space per unit provided at grade, or a deficiency of 4 parking spaces. In addition, a total of 159 long-term and 11 short-term visitor bicycle parking spaces will be provided and the site is located on a bus route, further limiting the impact of the visitor parking space deficiency.

Staff are satisfied that this change is minor and adequate visitor parking will be provided.

x) **Number of Loading Spaces**

A modification is required to permit one (1) loading space with dimensions of 18.0 metres by 6.0 metres. For a multiple dwelling with greater than 100 units, By-law No. 6593 requires two (2) loading spaces: one (1) with dimensions of 9.0 metres by 3.7 metres, and the other with dimensions of 18.0 metres by 3.7 metres. The applicant will not be amending the required loading space height of 4.3 metres.
The proposed loading space is located at the west side of the site and has direct access to an outdoor garbage pad. There is also access via a walkway to two indoor garbage rooms, a moving room and large items moving entrance. Given that all proposed loading facilities can be accessed by the proposed loading space and provision of a second loading space would require eliminating visitor parking spaces or landscaping, staff are satisfied that providing a second loading space for the development is not necessary. Loading operations will be examined in further detail at the Site Plan Control stage.

Based on the foregoing, staff support the provision of one (1) loading space with the proposed dimensions.

4. The proposed multiple dwelling would be subject to Site Plan Control as required by the City’s Site Plan Control By-law (By-law No. 15-176). This requirement would allow for detailed review of the grading and drainage of the lands, servicing connections, design and layout of the development, and landscaping.

5. The Owner intends to develop the multiple dwelling with condominium tenure. A Plan of Standard Condominium application would be required as per the requirements of the Planning Act.

6. Existing servicing for the site includes a 375 mm sanitary sewer, 450 mm storm sewer and 1200 mm, 500 mm and 300 mm watermains on Barton Street East, and a 250 mm sanitary sewer, 600 mm storm sewer and 150 mm watermain on Bell Manor Street.

A Functional Servicing Report and Stormwater Management Report have been reviewed by Growth Management staff. Staff determined that the existing water, waste water and storm water infrastructure is adequate to service the proposed development. The detailed design will be reviewed and approved through the Site Plan Control process.

7. The circulation of the applications has resulted in the submission of correspondence from two (2) property owners (see Appendix “E” to Report PED18022). The issues identified are as follows:

i) Increase in Traffic
Concerns were raised that the proposed development would generate additional traffic impacts in an already high traffic area, including adjacent to the HSR Bus Loop at the corner of Bell Manor Street.
Street and along Bell Manor Street, Berkindale Street and Varga Street.

The Transportation Impact Study (TIS) submitted by the applicant concluded that the increased traffic generated by the development can be accommodated on the existing road network and that local intersections should continue to operate at satisfactory levels. Corridor Management staff have reviewed the report and agreed with this conclusion.

Staff are of the opinion that the increased traffic generated by the proposed development would not have undue adverse impact on nearby residents.

ii) Property Values
There is a concern that the property values in the neighbourhood directly adjacent to the property will decline. Staff do not have any empirical evidence to suggest that the proposed development would result in either an increase or devaluation of nearby property values.

iii) Benefit to the Community and Assistance to Tax Payers
A question was raised as to whether the development will benefit the community and assist taxpayers. In the opinion of staff, the proposed development will be a benefit to the community as it will utilize a vacant parcel of land and add to the range of dwelling types and tenures available to community members. Staff do not have empirical evidence to suggest that the development will increase or decrease tax assessment values on adjacent lands. All costs associated with municipal servicing for the site will be carried by the developer, not taxpayers.

ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION

Should the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications be denied, the property could be utilized in accordance with the existing “E-2/S-306” & “E-2/S-306a” (Multiple Dwellings) District zoning which would permit an 83 unit multiple dwelling at a height of 39 metres or 12 storeys.
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.

APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED

- Appendix “A”: Location Map
- Appendix “B”: Draft Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment
- Appendix "C": Draft Amendment to Zoning By-law No. 6593
- Appendix "D": Concept Plan
- Appendix “E”: Public Correspondence
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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 attached hereto, constitutes Official Plan Amendment ___ to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.

1.0 **Purpose and Effect:**

The purpose and effect of this Amendment is to establish a Site Specific Policy for the lands located at 2782 Barton Street East, to permit a 13 storey multiple dwelling with a maximum net residential density of 379 units per hectare.

2.0 **Location:**

The lands affected by this Amendment are known municipally as 2782 Barton Street East, in the former City of Hamilton.

3.0 **Basis:**

The basis for permitting this Amendment is as follows:

- The proposed development complies with the function, scale and design of the High Density Residential use category of the Neighbourhoods designation;

- The proposed development implements the Residential Intensification policies of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan; and,

- 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 Volume 3 – Special Policy Areas

Text

4.1.1 Chapter C – Hamilton Urban Site Specific Policies

a. That Volume 3: Chapter C – Hamilton Urban Site Specific Policies be amended as follows:

"UHN-XX – 2782 Barton Street East, City of Hamilton

1.0 Notwithstanding Policy E.3.6.6 b) of Volume 1, for the lands designated “Neighbourhoods” located at 2782 Barton Street East, the maximum net residential density shall be 379 units per hectare."

Schedules and Appendices

4.1.2 Appendices

a. That Volume 3: Map 2 – Urban Site Specific Key Map be amended by identifying the subject lands as "UHN-XX" as shown on Schedule “A” to this amendment.

5.0 Implementation:

An implementing Zoning By-Law Amendment and Site Plan 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 day of month, 2018.

The
City of Hamilton

__________________________  ____________________________
Fred Eisenberger              Rose Caterini
MAYOR                        CITY CLER
CITY OF HAMILTON
BY-LAW NO.

To Repeal By-law No. 87-77 and To Amend Zoning By-law No. 6593, as Amended by By-law No. 74-7 Respecting Lands Located at 2782 Barton Street East, Hamilton

WHEREAS the City of Hamilton Act, 1999, Statutes of Ontario, 1999 Chap. 14, Schedule 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 and Official Plans of the former area municipalities and the Official Plan of the former regional municipality continue in full force in the City of Hamilton until subsequently amended or repealed by the Council of the City of Hamilton;

AND 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);

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 Xnd day of XXX 2018, recommended that Zoning By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton), be amended as hereinafter provided; and,

AND WHEREAS this By-law is in conformity with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, upon finalization of Official Plan Amendment No. ___;

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

1. That By-law No. 87-77 is hereby repealed in its entirety.

2. That for the purposes of this By-law, Section 2(a), 2(b)2 and 3 of By-law No. 74-7 shall not apply.

3. That Sheet No. E123 of the District Maps appended is amended to and forming part of Zoning By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton), is amended by changing the zoning from the “E-2/S-306” and “E-2/S-306a” (Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified to
To Amend Zoning By-law No. 6593, as Amended by By-law No.
Respecting Lands Located at 2782 Barton Street East, Hamilton

the “E-3/S-306b” (High Density Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified; the extent
and boundaries of which are shown on a plan here to annexed as Schedule “A”.

4. That the “E-3” (High Density Multiple Dwellings) District provisions, as contained
in Section 11C of Zoning By-law No. 6593, applicable to the subject lands, be
further modified to include the following special requirements:

a) That notwithstanding Section 11C (b), where a building or structure is
distant not greater than 30.0 metres from a “DE”, “DE-2”, “DE-3”, “RT-10”,
“RT-20” or “RT-30” District, the height of a building or structure shall not
exceed thirteen storeys or 41.0 metres in height.

b) That notwithstanding Section 11C(2)(a), a front yard having a depth not
less than 4.7 metres. For the purposes of Zoning conformity, the front lot-
line shall be defined as the lot line abutting Barton Street East (northerly
lot line).

c) That notwithstanding Section 11C(2)((b), an easterly side yard having a
depth not less than 1.95 metres, except 3.7 metres to the hypotenuse of
the daylight triangle, and a westerly side yard having a depth not less than
4.4 metres.

d) That notwithstanding Section 11C(2)(c), a rear yard having a depth not
less than 41 metres.

e) That notwithstanding Section 11C(4), no building or structure shall have a
gross floor area greater than the area within the district of the lot on which
it is situate, multiplied by the floor area factor of 3.15.

f) That notwithstanding Section 11C(5), for every building or structure, there
shall be provided and maintained on the lot and within the district at least
23% of the area of the lot on which it is situate, as landscaped area.

g) That notwithstanding Section 18(3)(vi)(cc)(ii), a balcony may encroach
into the required side yard not more than 1.0 metres.

h) That notwithstanding Section 18A(7), every required parking space, other
than a parallel parking space, shall have dimensions not less than 2.6
metres wide by 5.5 metres long.

i) That notwithstanding Section 18A (Table 1) & (Table 2), a multiple
dwelling shall provide 1.25 parking spaces per Class A dwelling unit of
which 0.23 spaces per unit shall be allocated for visitor parking.
To Amend Zoning By-law No. 6593, as Amended by By-law No. Respecting Lands Located at 2782 Barton Street East, Hamilton

j) That notwithstanding Section 18A (Table 3) one (1) loading space shall be provided for a multiple dwelling with greater than 100 dwelling units, with a minimum size of 18.0 metres in length and 6.0 metres in width.

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 “E-3” (High Density Multiple Dwellings) District provisions, subject to the special requirements referred to in Sections 3 and 4.

6. That Sheet No. E123 of the District Maps is amended by marking the lands referred to in Section 1 of the By-law as “E-3/S-306b”.

7. That By-law No. 6593 is amended by adding this By-law to Section 19B as Schedule S-306b.

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 __ day of ______, 2018.

______________________________    ________________________________
Fred Eisenberger                  Rose Caterini
Mayor                            City Clerk
To Amend Zoning By-law No. 6593, as Amended by By-law No.
Respecting Lands Located at 2782 Barton Street East, Hamilton

Schedule "A"
Map Forming Part of
By-law No. 18-_____
to Amend By-law No. 6593

Subject Property
2782 Barton Street East
- "E-2/S-305" and "E-2/S-305a" (Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified to "E-3/S-306b"
  (High Density Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified

This is Schedule "A" to By-law No. 18-
Passed the ........... day of ......................, 2018

Mayor

Clerk

Scale: N.T.S.
File Name/Number: ZAC-17-050
Date: January 12, 2018
Planner/Technician: MK/AL
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July 17, 2017

Tiffany Singh, City of Hamilton          David B McVittie, gsc
Planning and Economic Development Department  9-151 Berkindale Drive
Development Planning, Heritage & Design,        Hamilton, Ontario
Urban Team.                                      L8E-1M6
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P-4Y5
Via: email: Tiffany.Singh@hamilton.ca

Subject Quoting: UHOPA-16-21 and ZAC-17-050. Application by LJM Developments Inc. (c/o Liaguat Mian) By-Law Amendment for Lands located at 2782 Barton Street E.

Dear Tiffany:

I have read over the correspondence delivered to my residence this date and understand the physical location of this property.

It is difficult considering the limited information provided in the letter provided by the City to properly assess the impacts this density structure will have on the community however, I wish to put on the record some thoughts the City may consider in the approval of this venture.

- This development will be in close proximity to the HSR bus turn around at BELLMANOR Street, where Stoney Creek and Hamilton Bus service intersect? I struggle with this intersect as Busses are entering BELLMANNOR ingress and egress on left hand turns on and off a main though fare.

- Has traffic control examined the impact of some potential 278 vehicles accessing this intersect in combination with the Bus traffic moreover, the impact of increased traffic along BELLMANOR, BEREKINDALE, VARGA streets

- What commitments if any, has the City obtained from the developer in its concept plan? i.e. (what improvement to community?)

- Will the development assist resident tax payers?
In closing, I have no real objection to this undeveloped land, but do request the planning department consult with experts in various fields such as HRS, Hydro One, Traffic Control, to name a few.

Respectfully

David B McVittie
July 28, 2017

Tiffany Singh, City of Hamilton
Planning & Economic Development Dept.
Development Planning, Heritage & Design-Urban Team
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Re: UHOPA-17-21 and ZAC-17-050

Dear Ms. Singh:

I would like to voice my concerns regarding the rezoning proposed in the above. The current population is already dense in this neighbourhood and I firmly reject the proposed amendment. I also reject the construction of another highrise in such close proximity of this neighbourhood and to my house.

The reasons are as follows:
- More noise and traffic in an already high traffic area
- Most of all, the real estate value will go down even further in this neighbourhood as compared to as little as a couple of blocks south of this location. I do not want the value of my house lowered due to this insane plan.

I would suggest a strip plaza or restaurant be built in the above vacant land. - NO MORE HIGHRISES! (Please see attached note.)

Sincerely,
RECOMMENDATION

(a) That Amended Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment Application UHOPA-16-007, by 1186559 Ontario Inc., (Owner) to refine the Natural Heritage mapping within Volume 1 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, and to re-designate a portion of the subject lands from “Low Density Residential 1” to “Low Density Residential 3a” within the Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan to permit a forty-seven (47) unit townhouse development on a private (condominium) road, as well as re-designate a portion of the lands from “Low Density Residential 1” to “Natural Open Space” for lands located at 503 and 515 Garner Road West, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18032 be APPROVED, on the following basis:

(i) That the draft Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18032, 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) (Places to Grow).

(b) That Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-16-017 by 1186559 Ontario Inc., (Owner) for a change in zoning from the Agricultural “A-216” Zone
SUBJECT: Applications for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for Lands Located at 503 and 515 Garner Road West (Ancaster) (Ward 12) (PED18032) – Page 2 of 30

to the Residential Multiple “RM2-690” Zone, Modified, to permit a forty-seven (47) unit townhouse development on a private (condominium) road for lands located at 503 and 515 Garner Road West, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18032, be APPROVED on the following basis:

(i) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED18032, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council; and,

(ii) That the proposed change in zoning is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014), conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017) (Places to Grow), and will comply with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, upon finalization of UHOPA No. XX.

(c) That Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-16-017 by 1186559 Ontario Inc., (Owner) for a change in zoning from the Agricultural “A-216” Zone to the Conservation / Hazard Land (P5) Zone to permit a stormwater management pond, natural open space and vegetation protection zone for lands located at 503 and 515 Garner Road West, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18032, be APPROVED on the following basis:

(i) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “D” to Report PED18032, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council; and,

(ii) That the proposed change in zoning is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014), conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017) (Places to Grow), and will comply with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, upon finalization of UHOPA No. XX.

(d) Should the abutting properties wish to derive benefit, cost recovery would be based on the flat rate identified under the funding methodology of Infrastructure Policy plus actual drain cost.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposed Official Plan Amendment is to refine the Natural Heritage mapping within Volume 1 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, and re-designate a portion of the subject lands from “Low Density Residential 1” to “Low Density Residential 3a” within the Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP) to permit a forty-seven (47) unit townhouse development on a private (condominium) road. A portion of the subject lands is to also be re-designated from “Low Density Residential 1” to “Natural Open Space”, while the balance of the subject lands are to remain “Natural Open Space”.

OUR Vision: To be the best place in Canada to raise a child, promote innovation, engage citizens and provide diverse economic opportunities.

OUR Mission: WE provide quality public service that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Values: Accountability, Cost Consciousness, Equity, Excellence, Honesty, Innovation, Leadership, Respect and Teamwork.
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The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment to the former Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 is to change the zoning of a portion of the subject lands shown as Block 1 on Appendix “A” to Report PED18032 from the Agricultural “A-216” Zone to a Modified Residential Multiple “RM2” Zone to permit a forty-seven (47) unit townhouse development on a private (condominium) road.

The proposed Zoning By-law Amendment under Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200 is to rezone a portion of the subject lands shown as Block 2 on Appendix “A” to Report PED18032 as Conservation / Hazard Land (P5) Zone in order to permit a stormwater management pond, natural open space and vegetation protection zone.

The proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendments have merit, and can be supported, since the proposal is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014), conforms to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017) (Places to Grow), and comply with the UHOP, as well as the Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan, subject to the recommended Amendment.

It should be noted that the subject lands include a 0.06 hectare parcel of land directly adjacent to the subject lands and currently owned by the City of Hamilton. The parcel was part of additional lands that were to be utilized for a future pedestrian and cyclist connection. The applicant is proposing a similar trail elsewhere on the property that will be deeded to the City and therefore, this parcel is no longer required. The applicant is currently seeking to acquire the subject parcel shown as Part 8 on Plan 62R-19552 in Appendix “F” to Report PED18032. The subject parcel has therefore, been added to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications. If the applicant is unsuccessful in acquiring the parcel, then a minor redesign will be required to eliminate up to two (2) proposed townhouse units shown within the north-west quadrant of the development concept, attached as Appendix “E” to Report PED18032.

Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 29

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 applications for an amendment to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law.
HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Proposal

The subject lands, 503 and 515 Garner Road West (Ancaster), is an assembly of two separate properties and are located on the north side of Garner Road West, approximately 275 metres west of Hamilton Drive. Currently, there is a single detached dwelling with accessory structures located on each of the properties. The subject lands, being both properties, are approximately 4.3 hectares in area with a total frontage on Garner Road West of 147 metres and a depth of 308.9 metres. In addition, as previously mentioned, the subject lands also include a 0.06 hectare parcel of land, owned by the City of Hamilton, shown as Part 8 on Plan 62R-19552 and included in the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments.

The applicant proposes to redevelop a portion of the subject lands at a density of approximately 35 units per hectare for a maximum of forty-seven (47) two storey townhouse units fronting on a private condominium roadway. In addition, twenty-three (23) visitor parking spaces are proposed, as well as a block for a stormwater management pond. The balance of the lands will be used for open space purposes. Through discussions with City staff, a public trail is also proposed that will link with Garner Road West and the existing trail at the northerly limit of the subject lands. The trail, the remaining open space, as well as the road widening will be deeded to the City with future planning approvals, as shown on Appendix “E” to Report PED18032.

The purpose and effect of the proposed Official Plan Amendment to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan is to refine the Natural Heritage mapping within Volume 1, and re-designate the subject lands from “Low Density Residential 1” to “Low Density Residential 3a” within the Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan to permit a forty-seven (47) unit townhouse development on a private (condominium) road, as well as re-designate a portion of the subject lands from “Low Density Residential 1” to the “Natural Open Space” designation.

The purpose and effect of the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment is to change the zoning of a portion of the subject lands from the Agricultural “A-216” Zone to a site specific Residential Multiple “RM2” Zone within the former Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 in order to permit the proposed development. An Amendment to the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200 is also proposed in order to zone a component of the subject lands as Conservation / Hazard Land (P5) Zone to permit a stormwater management pond, natural open space and a vegetation protection zone.

Site specific modifications to the “RM2” Zone have been requested and will include the establishment of: the proposed built form; minimum lot area per unit; minimum lot frontage per unit; minimum lot depth per unit; maximum lot coverage per unit; minimum
SIDE YARD (INTERNAL); MINIMUM YARD ABBUTING GARNER ROAD WEST; MINIMUM REAR YARD PER UNIT AND MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT.

**Chronology:**

**February 3, 2016:** Submission of Applications UHOPA-16-007 and ZAC-16-017.

**February 26, 2016:** Applications UHOPA-16-007 and ZAC-16-017 deemed complete.

**March 11, 2016:** Circulation of Notice of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation for Applications UHOPA-16-007 and ZAC-16-017, to 29 property owners within 120 m of the subject lands.

**March 15, 2016:** Public Notice Sign installed on subject lands.

**January 10, 2018:** Public Notice Sign updated with Public Meeting Information.

**January 19, 2018:** Circulation of the Notice of Public Meeting to 29 property owners within 120 m of the subject lands.

**Details of Submitted Application:**

**Location:** 503 and 515 Garner Road West (see Appendix “A” to Report PED18032)

**Owner/Applicant:** 1186559 Ontario Inc. (c/o Charles Wah)

**Agent:** Fothergill Planning & Development Inc. (c/o: Ed Fothergill, President)

**Property Description:**

- **Lot Frontage:** 147 metres (Garnet Road West)
- **Lot Depth:** 308.9 metres (irregular)
- **Lot Area:** 4.3 Hectares
- **Servicing:** Existing Municipal Water Available Municipal Sanitary / Storm Not Currently Available
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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>Single Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>Agricultural “A-216” Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surrounding Land Uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North</th>
<th>South</th>
<th>East</th>
<th>West</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>Garner Road West and Single Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwellings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Open Space “O2” Zone</td>
<td>Rural (A2) Zone</td>
<td>Agricultural “A-216” Zone</td>
<td>Agricultural “A-216” Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS

Provincial Policy Statement (2014)

The following policies, amongst others, from the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) are considered to be applicable to the applications.

The proposal provides for an efficient and resilient development and land use pattern that is healthy, liveable and safe as per Policy 1.1.

Furthermore, staff recognizes that the applications are consistent with the policies that focus growth and development in Settlement Areas (Policy 1.1.3.1). In particular, as per Policy 1.1.3.2, the proposed land use pattern will contribute to a mix of densities that efficiently use the land and resources, and is appropriate for the infrastructure and public service facilities planned or available for this area, including transit.

Policy 2.1.8 restricts development and site alteration on lands adjacent to natural heritage features and areas identified in policies 2.1.4, 2.1.5, and 2.1.6 unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions.
The proposed developable portion of the subject lands are located adjacent to a Core Area (tributary of Big Creek, unevaluated wetland, significant valleylands and a significant woodland) within the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. An Environmental Impact Statement, entitled, “503 & 515 Garner Rd W, Environmental Impact Statement” prepared for 1186559 Ontario Inc. by LGL Limited, dated January, 2016 and further revised in January, 2017 was reviewed by City staff. In addition, the City’s Environmentally Significant Areas Impact Evaluation Group (ESAIEG) also reviewed the aforementioned document.

Initially, City staff expressed concerns with the proposed development and the intrusion into the significant woodland, as well as the inadequate vegetation protection zone proposed. ESAIEG expressed the same concerns at their meeting on August 10, 2017. City staff subsequently met with the applicant and their agent a number of times and ultimately a revised vegetation protection zone was provided and supported by City staff.

Furthermore, policy 1.5.1 provides that healthy, active communities should be promoted by planning and providing for a full range and equitable distribution of publicly-accessible built and natural settings for recreation, including facilities, parklands, public spaces, open space areas, trails and linkages, and where practical, water-based resources. As mentioned, as part of the proposed development, a public trail is proposed that will be dedicated to the City, linking Garner Road West with the existing trail system to the north of the subject lands.

Policy 2.6.2 restricts development and site alteration on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant archaeological resources have been conserved. Accordingly, a Stage 1-2 Archaeological Report (P046-0101-2015), dated January 8, 2016, was submitted to the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport and entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports, without technical review, on January 20, 2016. Therefore, all archaeological concerns have been addressed.

Based on the foregoing, as the subject lands are located within a settlement area, and the subject proposal is to be developed with appropriate infrastructure, while also protecting the Provincial interest with respect to natural and cultural heritage resources, the subject proposal is consistent with the PPS.


As of July 1, 2017, the policies of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017) (Places to Grow) apply to any Planning decision. Therefore, development proposed in this application conforms to the plan as follows.
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 lands are located within a settlement area where it will be developed with full municipal services, will provide for a complete community through a compact design that includes an additional housing type and form for the area and is located on an existing transit route. Therefore, the proposal conforms to the policies of the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (2017) (Places to Grow).

**Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP)**

The subject property is identified as “Neighbourhoods” on Schedule “E” – Urban Structure, designated as “Neighbourhoods” and “Open Space” on Schedule “E-1” – Urban Land Use Designations in the UHOP and shown outside of the Built Boundary on Appendix “G” – Boundaries Map. The subject property is also designated “Low Density Residential 1” and “Natural Open Space” on Map B.2.2-1 – Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan. The following policies, amongst others, are applicable to the subject applications.

**Policy Goals**

The following goals of the “Neighbourhoods” designation apply to the proposed applications:

“E.3.1.1 Develop compact, mixed use, transit-supportive, and active transportation friendly neighbourhoods.
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E.3.1.2 Develop neighbourhoods as part of a complete community, where people can live, work, shop, learn, and play.

E.3.1.3 Plan and designate lands for a range of housing types and densities, taking into account affordable housing needs.

E.3.1.4 Promote and support design which enhances and respects the character of existing neighbourhoods while at the same time allowing their ongoing evolution.

E.3.1.5 Promote and support residential intensification of appropriate scale and in appropriate locations throughout the neighbourhoods.”

Per Section 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;

b) open space and parks;”

The proposed development complies with the above-noted policy goals as the proposed form of townhouses contributes to a compact urban form and complete community, is transit supportive as it is located on a major arterial roadway, contributes to a range of housing types, respects the existing character of the neighbourhood and provides an appropriate scale and location for the development. In addition, the proposed public trail will contribute to a complete community by providing access from the north to Garner Road West.

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 relation 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;

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.

B.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;

i) the conservation of *cultural heritage resources*; and,

j) infrastructure and transportation capacity and impacts."
The existing neighbourhood is comprised of large lot single detached dwellings to the south, east and west, as well as open space to the north. The proposed forty-seven (47) townhouse dwellings will be of a size and scale that is compatible with the existing scale of development in the area. Adequate servicing will be made available, as well as transportation capacity is also available to meet the needs of the proposed development. In addition, there are no anticipated shadowing, overlook, noise, lighting, and traffic issues. The height of the 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.

The proposed residential intensification of the property is an appropriate height, massing, and density with the existing neighbourhood and therefore, is considered compatible.

Urban Design

The UHOP has a detailed set of policies related to urban design for new development.

“B.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.

B.3.3.3.3 New development shall be massed to respect existing and planned street proportions.

B.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;

c) including a quality landscape edge along frontages where buildings are set back from the street;

d) locating surface parking to the sides or rear of the sites or buildings, where appropriate; and,
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   e) using design techniques, such as building step-backs, to maximize sunlight to pedestrian areas."

The proposed development is appropriate in respect to the transition in scale to the neighbouring buildings, which maintain a height of one to two storeys, and the development is massed to respect the existing street proportions. Given that the townhouses will be a maximum of two storeys in height, adequate privacy will be maintained and the proposed townhouses will not create adverse shadow and wind impacts. Parking is within the interior of the property, off of the private condominium road and the townhouses will be set back from the street. The proposed development will include landscaping within the site and along the street edge, as well as the integration of a landscaped entrance feature at the access point to the development. Further, a detailed landscape plan will be required with the Site Plan Control application. Based on the foregoing, staff are satisfied that the applicable urban design policies of the UHOP will be met.

Archaeology

With respect to archaeological concerns, the UHOP identifies the applicable policy under Section B.3.4.4.2:

   "B.3.4.4.2 In areas of archaeological potential identified on Appendix F-4 – Archaeological Potential, an archaeological assessment shall be required and submitted prior to or at the time of application submission for the following planning matters under the Planning Act:

   a) official plan amendment or secondary plan amendment unless the development proposed in the application in question or other applications on the same property does not involve any site alteration or soil disturbance;

   b) zoning by-law amendments unless the development proposed in the application in question or other applications on the same property does not involve any site alteration or soil disturbance; and,

   c) plans of subdivision.

B.3.4.4.4 Archaeological assessments shall be prepared in accordance with any applicable guidelines and Policy F.3.2.4 - Archaeological Assessments."

As noted on page 7 of this Report, an Archaeological Assessment was submitted to the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport and entered into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports without technical review on January 20, 2016. Staff are
satisfied that the Archaeological Assessment Requirement policies of the UHOP have been met.

Noise Attenuation

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.”

In regard to the above applicable policies, a noise feasibility study was submitted with the subject applications entitled, “Environmental Noise Impact Study – 503-515 Garner Road West”, prepared by Valcoustics Canada Ltd., and dated June 24, 2016. The aforementioned Study was reviewed by City staff and based on the results of the Study, ventilation requirements, an acoustical barrier and noise warning clauses are required.

City staff further notes that future development applications will be required to facilitate the proposed development. Subsequent Site Plan Control and Draft Plan of Condominium applications are required and therefore, a detailed noise study will also be required to be submitted with the Site Plan Control and Draft Plan of Condominium applications to refine the proposed noise wall heights with grading information and to have specific noise warning clauses registered on title. Based on the foregoing, staff are satisfied that the applicable policies regarding noise attenuation have been met.
Open Space

The UHOP contains policies with respect to the natural heritage system which would apply to the “Open Space” designation to the easterly and northerly portions of the subject lands.

“C.3.3.1 Lands designated as Open Space are public or private areas where the predominant use of or function of the land is for recreational activities, conservation management and other open space uses.

C.3.3.4 The following uses shall be permitted on lands designated Open Space on Schedule E-1 – Urban Land Use Designations:

a) parks for both active and passive recreational activities;

b) pedestrian pathways, trails, bikeways and walkways;

C.3.3.6 Where land is designated Open Space and is under private ownership, it is not intended this land shall necessarily remain so indefinitely, nor shall the Plan be construed as implying these areas are free and open to the general public or shall be purchased by the City.”

Further, within Schedule B – Natural Heritage System and as noted on pages 6 and 7 of this Report, Core Areas have been identified within and adjacent to the subject lands. The relevant policies with respect to Core Areas within the UHOP are as follows:

“C.2.3 It is the intent of this policy to preserve and enhance Core Areas and to ensure that any development or site alteration within or adjacent to them shall not negatively impact their natural features or their ecological functions.

C.2.3.3 The natural features and ecological functions of Core Areas shall be protected and where possible and deemed feasible to the satisfaction of the City enhanced. To accomplish this protection and enhancement, vegetation removal and encroachment into Core Areas shall generally not be permitted, and appropriate vegetation protection zones shall be applied to all Core Areas.

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.
C.2.5.8 New development or site alteration subject to Policies C.2.5.3 to C.2.5.7 requires, prior to approval, the submission and approval of an Environmental Impact Statement which demonstrates to the satisfaction of the City and the relevant Conservation Authority that:

a) There shall be no negative impacts on the Core Area’s natural features or their ecological functions.

b) Connectivity between Core Areas shall be maintained, or where possible, enhanced for the movement of surface and ground water, plants and wildlife across the landscape.

c) The removal of other natural features shall be avoided or minimized by the planning and design of the proposed use or site alteration wherever possible.

C.2.5.9 An Environmental Impact Statement shall propose a vegetation protection zone which:

a) has sufficient width to protect the Core Area and its ecological functions from impacts of the proposed land use or site alteration occurring during and after construction, and where possible and deemed feasible to the satisfaction of the City, restores or enhances the Core Area and/or its ecological functions; and,

b) is established to achieve, and be maintained as natural self-sustaining vegetation.

C.2.5.10 Where vegetation protection zones widths have not been specified by watershed and sub-watershed plans, secondary Environmental assessments and other studies, the following vegetation protection zone widths shall be evaluated and addressed by Environmental Impact Statements. Other agencies, such as Conservation Authorities, may have different vegetation protection zone requirements.

f) Significant woodlands – 15-metre vegetation protection zone, measured from the edge (drip line) of the significant woodland.

C.2.5.11 Vegetation protection zone widths greater or less than those specified in a) to i) above may be required if ecological features and functions warrant it, as determined through an approved Environmental Impact Statement. Widths shall be determined on a site-specific bases, by considering factors such as the sensitivity of the habitat, the potential impacts of the
proposed land use, the intended function of the vegetation protection zone, and the physiography of the site.

C.2.5.12 Permitted uses within a vegetation protection zone shall be dependent on the sensitivity of the feature, and determined through approved studies. Generally, permitted uses within a vegetation protection zone shall be limited to low impact uses, such as vegetation restoration, resource management, and open space. Permitted uses within the vegetation protection zone shall be the same uses as those within the Core Area in Policy C.2.5.1 and the vegetation protection zone should remain in or be returned to a natural state."

As previously mentioned in this Report, the Core Areas have been identified as a Significant Woodland, unevaluated wetland and a tributary of Big Creek. The unevaluated wetland and watercourse are regulated by the Grand River Conservation Authority (GRCA).

Any development or site alteration within or adjacent to Core Areas shall not negatively impact their natural features or their ecological functions (UHOP Volume 1 policy C.2.3). When a development proposal has the potential to negatively impact a Core Area’s natural features or their ecological functions, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required. As a result, an EIS was prepared by LGL Limited (January 2016). Concerns were identified that the proposed development did not meet the intent of the UHOP policies (specifically encroachment into the Significant Woodland and the provision of an inadequate vegetation protection zone). As a result, the EIS was not approved and revisions were required.

A revised EIS was prepared by LGL Limited (January 2017) and recommendations were made regarding the vegetation protection zone, tree protection plan, further details on the public trail, as well as mitigation measures with a future Site Plan Control application:

1. The Core Areas and the VPZ should be zoned as Conservation / Hazard Land (P5) Zone.

2. A Tree Protection Plan (TPP) was submitted as part of the EIS. Since the Concept Plan has changed, a revised TPP will be required as part of the Site Plan Control application. The trees on site are subject to the Urban Woodland Conservation By-law (By-law 14-212) and the Town of Ancaster By-law (By-law 2000-118). Trees are not to be removed prior to the approval of the TPP.

3. The design of the proposed public trail needs to be provided prior to any on-site activities.
4. A variety of mitigation measures have been identified that will be required at the Site Plan Control process, including:

   - Restoration Plan;
   - Vegetation Protection Zone Planting Plan;
   - Locally Uncommon Species Transplant Plan;
   - Invasive Species Management Plan;
   - Stewardship;
   - Fencing;
   - Lighting; and,
   - Grading.

Subject to the aforementioned recommendations and required permit from the GRCA for Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation prior to development, which will be addressed with a future Site Plan Control application, staff are satisfied that the policies with respect to natural heritage have been adequately addressed. It is noted that the GRCA staff are satisfied that their initial concerns have been addressed.

Based on the foregoing, the proposed development meets the overall intent of the UHOP policies and therefore, complies with the UHOP.

Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan

The subject lands are designated “Low Density Residential 1” and “Natural Open Space” on Map B.2.2-1 – Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan. The following policies within Volume 2 of the UHOP, Chapter B – Ancaster Secondary Plans, amongst others, apply.

“B.2.2.1 Residential Designations

The residential policies shall define the location and scale of each type of residential use, and shall help ensure that a variety of residential types are provided to meet the needs of all area residents.

B.2.2.1.2 General Residential Policies
a) Residential buildings shall have no more than three occupied storeys entirely above grade.

B.2.2.1.3 Low Density Residential Designations

Notwithstanding Polices E.3.4.3 and E.3.4.4 of Volume 1, the following policies shall apply to the Low Density Residential designations identified on Map B.2.2-1 – Shaver Neighbourhood – Land Use Plan:

a) In the Low Density Residential 1 designation:
   i) the permitted use shall be single detached dwellings;
   ii) the lot frontages shall be a minimum 10.7 to 18.3 metres or larger; and,
   iii) the density shall not exceed 20 dwelling units per gross / net residential hectare.

d) In the Low Density Residential 3a designation:
   i) the permitted uses shall be street townhouses, block townhouses, and other ground-oriented attached housing forms; and,
   ii) the density shall not exceed 50 dwelling units per gross/net residential hectare.

B.2.2.3 Parks and Open Space Designations

B.2.2.3.1 In addition to Sections B.3.5.3 – Parkland Polices and C.3.3 – Open Space Designation of Volume 1, the following polices shall apply:

a) The open space system for the Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan area includes the following:
   i) Neighbourhood Parks;
   ii) Natural Open Space;
   iii) Notwithstanding Section C.3.3 – Open Space Designations of Volume 1, school playfields;
   iv) pedestrian walkways; and,
v) Big Creek valleylands and wooded areas.

b) Notwithstanding Section 3.3 – Open Space Designations of Volume 1, the City shall encourage the development of a linked open space system in the Shaver Neighbourhood incorporating the Community Park, Neighbourhood Park, schools, Big Creek valleylands, wooded areas and pedestrian walkways through the approval of plans of subdivision.

c) Within the Shaver Neighbourhood the planned residential areas, the westerly Neighbourhood Park, the Community Park/schools complex and the publicly owned Natural Open Space lands shall be linked by a pedestrian/bikeway system utilizing a combination of open space walkways and sidewalks within the roadways. The internal pedestrian/bikeway system shall be connected to the planned Duff’s Corners mixed use commercial/industrial area to the west and the Maple Lane Annex subdivision in the Garner Neighbourhood Secondary Plan area."

An Amendment to the Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan is required to re-designate a portion of the subject lands from the “Low Density Residential 1” designation to the “Low Density Residential 3a” designation to permit the proposed block townhouse development, as well as re-designate a portion from “Low Density Residential 1” to the “Natural Open Space” designation.

In addition, the proposed trail link within the Natural Open Space system will provide connectivity to the broader community to the north, including Shaver Estates Park, contributing to a complete community and liveability of the existing neighbourhood. Internal connectivity, including pedestrian walkways will be addressed in detail as part of the Site Plan Approval process.

As the development proposal meets the intent of the policies of Volume 1 of the UHOP regarding intensification and built form, as well as the secondary plan policies and is consistent with the higher densities contemplated in current Provincial policies, the proposed re-designation can be supported. The analysis of the Amendment is discussed in greater detail in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendations section of this Report.

**Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57**

The subject lands are zoned Agricultural “A-216” Zone within the former Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57. The Agricultural “A” Zone permits agricultural uses, buildings and structures and uses accessory thereto, including one detached dwelling and uses, buildings and structures accessory to the dwelling. Exception A-216 prohibits...
certain agriculture related uses. An Amendment to the Zoning By-law is required to change the zoning to the Residential Multiple “RM2” Zone in order to permit a total of forty-seven (47) townhouse dwellings having access from a private condominium road onto Garner Road West. In addition, a number of site specific modifications are required, including:

- modification to recognize the proposed townhouses on a condominium road;
- modification to the required lot area;
- modification to the required lot frontage per unit;
- modification to the required lot depth per unit;
- modification to the required lot coverage per unit;
- modification to the required side yards;
- modification to the required yard abutting Garner Road West;
- modification to the required minimum number of visitor parking spaces;
- modification to the required rear yards per unit; and,
- modification to the required building height.

A number of these modifications are technical to recognize the lot configuration, housing form and condominium tenure. An analysis of the site specific modifications is included in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation section of this Report.

**City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200**

The Zoning By-law Amendment also proposes to incorporate lands into Zoning By-law No. 05-200 to allow for the stormwater management pond, the vegetation protection zone and the remaining conservation lands. These lands will be zoned Conservation / Hazard Land (P5) Zone, which permits Conservation, Flood and Erosion Control Facilities, Recreation and Passive uses. In addition, Zoning By-law No. 05-200 contains a general provision which requires any building or structure on a property to be setback a minimum of 7.5 metres from a Conservation / Hazard Land (P5) Zone. The applicants have requested a minimum setback of 6.0 metres from the Conservation / Hazard Land (P5) Zone, instead of the required 7.5 metres.
RELEVANT CONSULTATION

The following Departments and Agencies had no comments or objections to the applications:

- Corridor Management, Public Works Department;
- Infrastructure Planning & Source Water Protection, Public Works Department; and,
- Infrastructure Planning, Growth Management Division.

The following Departments and Agencies have provided comments on the applications:

**Forestry & Horticulture Section, Public Works Department** requires that a Tree Management Plan be prepared by a Registered Landscape Architect and submitted at the Site Plan Control stage. All trees within this proposed development area must be surveyed, identified and accurately plotted on the plan to determine ownership, including intentions regarding retention or removal.

**Grand River Conservation Authority** provided comments on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), as well as stormwater, requiring the stormwater management plan include infiltration to predevelopment levels. A Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation (Ontario Regulation 150 / 06) permit from the GRCA prior to development is also required. GRCA staff are satisfied that their concerns have been addressed.

**Recreation Planning, Public Works Department** provided that the Planning Justification Report notes that there will be no children’s play area provided on site due to “the proximity of significant open space features and the close proximity of other parkland areas in the neighbourhood. An internal open space area is available in the north central portion of the site for amenity and recreation purposes for those who live within the development proposal”. The Recreation Division encourages the provision of private recreation amenities (passive or active) within the proposed development limit of the subject lands given the distance to neighbourhood parkland (walking distance approximately 1km for both Shaver Estates Park and James Smith Park). Additionally, Garner Road West is currently a rural cross section which would pose safety and accessibility issues to accessing parkland.

**Landscape Architectural Services, Public Works Department** commented that cash-in-lieu of parkland dedication will be required.

**Transportation Planning Services, Public Works Department** commented that future road widenings will be required and that a TDM will be required, as well as consider...
AODA regulations and sidewalks are required. These items will be addressed at the Site Plan Control stage.

**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 twenty-nine (29) property owners within 120 m of the subject property on March 11, 2016, for the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment applications.

To date, two (2) public submissions objecting to the proposed development (see Appendix “G” to Report PED18032) have been received from nearby residents that express concerns regarding loss of enjoyment of the ravine / forest, sunset view obstruction, out of character for the neighbourhood, additional noise and light pollution, compatibility, as well as an increase in traffic. These concerns are discussed further in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation section.

A Public Notice Sign was posted on the property on March 15, 2016, and updated on January 10, 2018, with the Public Meeting date. Finally, Notice of the Public Meeting was mailed out in accordance with the requirements of the *Planning Act* on January 19, 2018.

**Public Consultation Strategy**

The requirement for the inclusion of a Public Consultation Strategy with a complete planning application was introduced by Bill 73, *Smart Growth for Our Communities Act*, 2015, which regulations came into force on July 1, 2016. The subject applications were received in February, 2016 and therefore, the applicant was not required to submit a Public Consultation Strategy. Nevertheless, the applicant held a Public Information Meeting on May 19, 2015, at which there were twenty (20) attendees. Concerns conveyed at the meeting were that the proposal was not in keeping with the existing residential character of the neighbourhood, as well as traffic, servicing and pedestrian access concerns.

**ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION**

1. The proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments 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 (2017);
(ii) The addition of forty-seven (47) townhouse dwelling units is supportable, as they will permit residential uses that are appropriate for the character and function for the area; and,

(iii) The proposed development represents good planning by, among other things, providing a compact and efficient urban form. In addition, the subject proposal is an efficient use of infrastructure.

2. Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment

The subject properties are located on Garner Road West. The existing properties contain two single detached dwellings that the applicant is proposing to replace with forty-seven (47) townhouse dwellings (see Appendix “E” to Report PED18032).

The subject lands are designated “Low Density Residential 1” and “Natural Open Space” on Map B.2.2-1 – Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan. An amendment to the to refine the Natural Heritage mapping within Volume 1 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, and Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan is required to re-designate a portion of the subject lands from the “Low Density Residential 1” designation to the “Low Density Residential 3a” designation to permit the proposed block townhouse development at a density of approximately 35 units per net hectare, as well as re-designate a portion of the subject lands from “Low Density Residential 1” to the “Natural Open Space” designation.

The existing neighbourhood is comprised of large lot single detached dwellings to the south, east and west, as well as open space to the north. The proposed forty-seven (47) townhouse dwellings will be of a size and scale that is compatible with the existing scale of development in the area. In addition, there are no anticipated shadowing, overlook, noise, lighting, and traffic issues. The height of the 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. In addition, the proposed Conservation / Hazard Land (P5) Zone will buffer the proposed development from the lands to the north and east and only a portion of the subject lands will be used for the proposed townhouse development, while the rest of the lands will remain open space.

The proposed use of townhouses on a condominium road contributes to a compact urban form, contributes to a variety of housing types, as well as a complete community. The development is located on a large parcel of land that is set back from Garner Road West and therefore, respects the existing character of the neighbourhood, as well as provides an appropriate scale and location for the proposed development.
The proposed residential density of 35 units per net hectare allows for the establishment of townhouse dwellings that are of a size and scale that will allow the lots to adequately function with an appropriate sized dwelling, along with adequate space to provide parking and amenity area for each dwelling unit. The “Low Density Residential 3a” designation permits a maximum density of fifty (50) dwelling units per gross / net residential hectare, however, the proposal has a density of 35 units per hectare. In addition, a Transportation Impact & TDM Options Study, prepared by Paradigm Transportation Solutions Limited, dated January, 2016, concludes that the study area intersections are anticipated to continue to operate with generally satisfactory levels of services during the AM and PM peak hours with the addition of the proposed development.

The proposed development complies with the UHOP under the policies established in the Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan, however, due to the built form and density, an Amendment will be required to allow for the proposed development. Based on the foregoing, staff support the proposed Amendment to the Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan.

3. **Zoning By-law Amendments**

**Former Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57**

The applicant has requested a change in zoning to the former Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 from the Agricultural “A-216” Zone to a site specific Residential Multiple “RM2” Zone, in order to permit a total of forty-seven (47) townhouse dwellings with access from a private condominium road as shown on Appendices “A” and “E” to Report PED18032. Site specific modifications are required in order to permit the following:

- modification to recognize the proposed form of townhouses and the condominium road;
- modification to the required lot area;
- modification to the required lot frontage per unit;
- modification to the required lot depth per unit;
- modification to the required lot coverage per unit;
- modification to the required side yards;
- modification to the required yard abutting Garner Road West;
• modification to the minimum number of visitor parking spaces;

• modification to the required rear yards per unit; and,

• modification to the required building height.

A number of these modifications are technical to recognize the lot configuration and housing form.

Change in Zoning

The proposed change in zoning from the Agricultural “A-216” Zone to the Residential Multiple “RM2-690” Zone, Modified, will change the type of residential dwelling(s) that are permitted on-site from a single detached dwelling on a large lot to forty-seven (47) townhouse dwellings on smaller lots. In addition, the Residential Multiple “RM2” Zone permits street townhouse dwellings, however, will allow for a standard condominium block townhouse dwelling on a condominium road. The proposed development complies with the policies of the UHOP with respect to its goals and policies, as well as policies respecting Residential Intensification. The scale of development represents an appropriate level of density along a major arterial road (Garner Road West) and will be of a size and scale that is compatible with the surrounding area. The proposed development will provide adequate on-site parking and adequate amenity space to meet the needs of each unit. Therefore, the proposed change in zoning to permit forty-seven (47) townhouse dwellings has merit and can be supported.

Definition of Frontage, Street, Height and Grade

The applicant is proposing to establish forty-seven (47) freehold townhouse dwellings, however, the townhouse dwellings will be accessed from a private common element condominium road. A modification is required in order to clarify that for the purposes of the site specific Zoning By-law, the definition of frontage shall be permitted on a common element condominium road, the definition of street shall include private condominium roads and height shall be measured on the basis of each individual unit for the proposed development. With respect to the height modification, there is a grade difference and therefore, where walk-out units are proposed, additional height is required to reflect the change in grade.

These modifications are administrative in nature and in the opinion of staff, do not generate any impacts to the proposed development or to the surrounding neighbourhood. Therefore, the proposed modifications have merit and can be supported.
Lot Area (Unit)

The proposed modifications to reduce the minimum lot area (parcel) requirement of 1,850 square metres (0.18 hectares) and 280 square metres to a minimum unit area of 150 square metres can be supported. The current requirement for unit area would only generate seven (7) units within the net developable area of the subject lands and does not meet the intent of provincial or UHOP policies. The proposed unit area will also maintain adequate space on site to permit the establishment of appropriately sized dwelling units and amenity space. The proposed modification has merit and can be supported.

Minimum Lot Frontage (per unit)

The applicant is requesting a minimum lot frontage on a condominium road of 6.0 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum of 9.0 metres per dwelling unit. Staff considers this a minor modification, as it permits a more compact urban form, maintains the intent of the UHOP, maintains the intent of the By-law and provides appropriate sized units and amenity area. This modification is required to recognize the tenure form (condominium) and is supported by staff.

Minimum Lot Depth (per unit)

The applicant is requesting a minimum lot depth per unit of 25 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum lot depth per unit of 30 metres. The lot depth is a reasonable depth for the proposed townhouse units and can be supported. Staff consider this a minor modification, as it permits a more compact urban form, maintains the intent of the UHOP, maintains the intent of the By-law provides appropriate sized units, amenity area and parking.

Maximum Lot Coverage (per unit)

The applicant is requesting a maximum lot coverage of 55% (unit), whereas the By-law requires a maximum lot coverage of 35%. The proposed lot coverage represents a reasonable area for the proposed townhouse unit, as well as front and rear yards. Therefore, staff consider this a minor modification. Also, this development backs onto a large open space area that is anticipated to become part of the public realm. This open space / core area off-sets the density of this development and allows for more protection of the core area by allowing for a more compact development. Therefore, staff are in support of the modification.

Minimum Side Yard (Per Unit, Internal and External)

Modifications to the minimum required side yard are also being requested for 1.2 metres (external) and 0.0 metres (internal), whereas the By-law requires a
minimum of 1.75 metres. The applicant has requested specific regulations for the proposed built form and staff are satisfied that the 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.

Minimum Side Yard Setback from Garner Road West

The By-law requires that a minimum setback of 7.5 metres be provided from Garner Road West, whereas the applicant has proposed a setback of 2.5 metres for the proposed porch areas, whereas the dwellings will be setback a minimum of 3.1 metres. The required minimum is typically for units fronting or backing onto Garner Road West. The applicant has proposed side yards for these units, which will provide an urban edge with the construction of a future sidewalk. In addition, the applicant has proposed special architectural treatment for these side facades and therefore, from the streetline, it will appear they have a front entrance approach allowing for a more pedestrian streetscape. Based on the foregoing, staff are satisfied that this modification is minor and can be supported.

Minimum Rear Yard (per unit)

The applicant has requested a minimum rear yard setback of 6.0 metres, whereas the By-law requires a minimum of 7.5 metres. Staff are satisfied that this is a minor modification in that it accommodates a more compact built form, while still creating a satisfactory amenity space in the rear yard of each unit. It maintains the intent of the UHOP and maintains the intent of the By-law. Staff support this modification.

Minimum Number of Visitor Parking Spaces

The applicant has requested a minimum visitor parking ratio of 0.5 parking spaces, whereas the By-law requires a minimum of 0.66 visitor parking spaces. A total of forty-seven (47) dwelling units are proposed and therefore, 31 visitor parking spaces are required. The applicant is proposed to provide 23 visitor parking spaces. This proposed reduction allows for the compact form of development and can be considered minor, as it maintains the intent of the UHOP and maintains the intent of the By-law. Staff support this modification.

Maximum Building Height

The maximum height has been increased from the permitted 10.5 metres to 13.0 metres to reflect grading differences, as some of the units will be walk outs and will ensure the height for the project is measured for each individual unit, and not on a block basis, while still maintaining two storeys. As there are sufficient
setbacks from other developments, including open space to the east and north, this modification can be supported by staff.

**Encroachment of Air Conditioning Units and Heat Pumps, Privacy Screens and Dwelling Unit Placement**

Due to the built form of block townhouses and the proposed 0.0 metres internal side yard, the applicant has requested flexibility with respect to the placement of air conditioning units and heat pumps, as well as privacy screens, whereas the By-law requires minimum front, rear and side yard setbacks. In addition, dwelling unit placement requirements with respect to staggering and minimum number of units are typically for street townhouses on a public street, however, the proposed development is to be block townhouses on a private condominium road. Staff are in support of these modifications, as they maintain the intent of the UHOP and By-law.

**City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200**

With respect to Zoning By-law No. 05-200, it is proposed that the stormwater management pond, the natural open space and the vegetation protection zone be rezoned to Conservation / Hazard Land (P5, 670) Zone in the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200. Conservation, Flood and Erosion Control Facilities, Recreation, Passive uses are permitted within the Conservation / Hazard Land (P5) Zone. Zoning By-law No. 05-200 contains a general provision which requires any building or structure on a property to be setback a minimum of 7.5 metres from a Conservation / Hazard Land (P5) Zone. The applicants have requested a minimum setback of 6.0 metres from the Conservation / Hazard Land (P5) Zone, instead of the required 7.5 metres. Appropriate tree protection measures during the construction of the proposed development will be secured as part of the Site Plan Control application process and no active recreation uses are proposed within the open space lands. Therefore, staff are supportive of this modification.

4. Development Engineering reviewed the subject applications and indicated that an external works agreement is required for the sanitary sewer construction on Garner Road West at the Site Plan Stage. The future right of way width of this section of Garner Road West is 36.576 m. As a condition of approval, the Owner is required to dedicate to the City sufficient lands to establish a property line 18.288 m from the original centreline of Garner Road West. Water service for the proposed development can be provided by the existing 400 mm dia. municipal watermain on Garner Road West. For information the static pressure at the street line is approximately 90 psi. At the Site Plan Control application stage, the owner has to submit a detailed fire flow and water demand calculations to the satisfaction of the City. There is neither municipal sanitary
sewer nor municipal storm sewer available within the Garner Road West right of way to service the subject lands. As such, the owner has to extend the sanitary sewer at their cost to service the proposed development. Further, the owner is also proposing to construct a stormwater management pond within the subject lands to control the minor and major storm events in accordance with MOECC and City guidelines.

5. Concerns were raised by nearby residents regarding traffic congestion created by the proposed development, loss of ravine / forest, street lighting and sidewalks for pedestrians. With respect to traffic congestion, it is staffs opinion that the proposed forty-seven (47) units is of a size and scale that will be in keeping with the existing satisfactory levels of traffic for Garner Road West. In addition, the open space is proposed to become part of the public realm, as well as introduce a trail, thereby, now providing public access to the north from Garner Road West. Finally, street lighting and sidewalks are proposed for the subject development, which will be addressed through the Site Plan Control process.

6. **Implementation**

If approved, the applicants will be required to obtain Site Plan Approval, as well as Standard Draft Plan of Condominium Approval for the subject proposal.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION**

Should the proposed Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment applications be denied, the property could be utilized in accordance with the Agricultural “A-216” 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.
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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.

APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED

- Appendix “A”: Location Map
- Appendix “B”: Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment
- Appendix “C”: Zoning By-law No. 87-57 Amendment
- Appendix “D”: Zoning By-law No. 05-200 Amendment
- Appendix “E”: Concept Plan
- Appendix “F”: Plan 62R-19552
- Appendix “G”: Public Submissions

GZ:jp
Location Map

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

File Name/Number: ZAC-16-017/UHOPA-16-007
Date: Jan. 8, 2018

Appendix "A"

Subject Property
503 & 515 Garner Road West

Block 1 - Change in zoning from Agricultural "A-216" Zone to the Residential Multiple "RM2-690" Zone, Modified

Block 2 - Change in zoning from Agricultural "A-216" Zone to the Conservation / Hazard Land (P5, 670) Zone

Key Map - Ward 12

N.T.S.
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-2 – Detailed Natural Heritage Features – Significant Woodlands

Appendix “C” – Volume 2, Map B.2.2.1 - Shaver Neighbourhood 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 and effect of this Amendment is to amend the land use designations of the Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan to permit the development of a maximum of forty-seven (47) Block Townhouse Dwellings and to protect the natural heritage features on the subject lands.

2.0 Location:

The lands affected by this Amendment are known municipally as 503 & 515 Garner Road West, in the former Town of Ancaster.

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 Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan to provide a diversity of housing opportunities that are suitable for different segments of the population in order to make the best use of urban lands, especially along a major arterial road.

- The proposed Amendment further refines the boundaries of the Core Area.

- The proposed development is considered to be consistent with, and
complimentary 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 **Volume 1 – (Urban Hamilton Official Plan – Schedule B – Natural Heritage System)**

4.1.1 Schedule B – Natural Heritage System be amended by removing and adding Core Areas, as shown on Appendix “A” attached to this Amendment.

4.1.2 Schedule B-2 – Detailed Natural Heritage Features – Key Natural Heritage Feature – Significant Woodlands be amended by removing and adding Key Natural Heritage Feature Significant Woodlands, as shown on Appendix “B” attached to this Amendment.

4.2 **Volume 2 – (Urban Hamilton Official Plan – Map B.2.2-1, Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan)**

4.2.1 That Volume 2, Map B.2.2-1 – Shaver Neighbourhood Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan be amended by:

a) re-designating a portion of the subject lands from “Low Density Residential 1” to “Low Density Residential 3a”; and,

b) re-designating a portion of the subject lands from “Low Density Residential 1” to “Natural Open Space”;

as shown on Appendix “C” attached to this Amendment.

5.0 **Implementation:**

An implementing Zoning By-Law Amendment and Site Plan 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 day of month, 2018.

The
City of Hamilton

Fred Eisenberger
MAYOR

Rose Caterini
CITY CLERK
CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW NO. 18-XXX

To Amend Zoning By-law No. 87-57
Respecting Lands Located at 503 and 515 Garner Road West (Ancaster)

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. 87-57 (Ancaster) was enacted on the 22nd day of June, 1987, and approved by the Ontario Municipal Board on the 23rd day of January, 1989;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton, in adopting Section of Report 18- of the Planning Committee at its meeting held on the 6th day of February 2018, recommended that Zoning By-law No. 87-57 (Ancaster), be amended as hereinafter provided; and,

AND WHEREAS this By-law will be in conformity with the Urban Hamilton Official Plan upon adoption of UHOPA No.____;

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

1. That Map No. 1-B to Schedule “B”, appended to and forming part of By-law No. 87-57 (Ancaster) is amended by changing the zoning from the Agricultural “A-216” Zone to the Residential Multiple “RM2-690” Zone, Modified on the lands the extent and boundaries of which are shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule “A”.
2. The Section 34: Exceptions, to Zoning By-law No. 87-57 (Ancaster), as amended, is hereby further amended by adding the following Sub-sections:

**RM2 - 690**

That notwithstanding the provisions of Sections 3.43 and 3.132, Section 7.14 (a)(i) and (x), (b)(i)(B), Section 7.12(c) and (d), Section 9.5, Section 9.3(b), Section 15.1, and Section 15.2 (a), (b), (c), (d), (f), (g) and (h), the following special provisions shall apply to the lands zoned “RM2-690”:

**PERMITTED USES**

(a) Block Townhouse dwellings and uses, buildings and structures accessory thereto shall also be permitted.

**REGULATIONS**

(a) Minimum Lot Area: 150 square metres per dwelling unit  
(b) Minimum Lot Frontage: 6.0 metres per dwelling unit  
(c) Minimum Lot Depth: 25 metres per dwelling unit  
(d) Maximum Lot Coverage: 55 percent per dwelling unit  
(e) Minimum Side Yard - External: 1.2 metres Internal: 0.0 metres  
(f) Minimum Side Yard Abutting Garner Road West: 2.5 metres  
(g) Minimum Rear Yard: 6.0 metres per dwelling unit  
(h) Maximum Building Height: 13 metres  

Frontage on a Condominium Road  

(i) For the purpose of this By-law, a Common Element Condominium road shall be deemed to be a street, and that visitor parking and landscaping for the dwelling units fronting the common element condominium road are permitted within the common element condominium road.
Definition of Front Lot Line

(j) The lot line fronting onto a common element condominium road shall be considered the front lot line. In the case where two lot lines abut a common element condominium road, the shorter of the two shall be considered the front lot line.

Minimum Required Visitor Parking

(k) A minimum of 0.5 visitor parking spaces per unit within a condominium driveway shall be provided and maintained.

Encroachment of Air Conditioning Units and Heat Pumps


Privacy Screens

(m) The provisions of Sub-section 9.5, "Privacy Screens", shall not apply.

Dwelling Unit Placement

(n) Sub-section 15.2, Paragraph (k), "Dwelling Unit Placement", shall not apply.

Definition of Height and Grade

(o) Notwithstanding the definition of "height" and "grade" in Section 3 of the Town of Ancaster Zoning By-law 87-57, for the purposes of this by-law, height shall be measured on the basis of each individual unit.

Encroachment of Porches and Steps

(p) Notwithstanding the provisions of Section 7.12(d), a maximum encroachment for porches, including steps, of 2.0 m shall be permitted.

Parking and Loading – General Provisions

Encroachment of Eaves and Gutters

(r) Notwithstanding Section 7.12(d) “Yard Encroachments”, eaves or gutters may project into any yard a distance of not more than 1.5 metres.

All of the other provisions of Section 15.2 of the by-law apply.

3. 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 Residential Multiple “RM2” Zone provisions, subject to the special requirements referred to in Section 2 of this By-law.

4. 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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Authority:

Ward: 12

Bill No.

CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW NO._______

A by-law to amend Zoning By-law No. 05-200 respecting lands located at 503 and 515 Garner Road West (Ancaster)

WHEREAS Council approved Item____ of Report_____ of the Planning Committee, as its meeting held on the February 6, 2018;

AND WHEREAS this By-law conforms to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan;

NOW THEREFORE Council enacts as follows:

1. That Map No. 1435 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 Conservation / Hazard Land (P5, 670) Zone, to the lands the extent and boundaries of which are shown as Schedule “A” to this By-law.

2. That Schedule “C” – Special Exceptions, of By-law No. 05-200 is hereby amended by adding an additional exception as follows:

   “670 Within the lands zoned Conservation / Hazard Land (P5) Zone, identified on Map No. 1435 of Schedule “A’ – Zoning Maps and described as 503 and 515 Garner Road West, the following special provisions shall apply:
   a) Notwithstanding Subsection 4.23 d), all buildings or structures located on the subject property shall be setback a minimum of 6.0 metres from the Conservation / Hazard Land (P5) Zone.
3. 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 February, 2018.

_______________________________  ______________________________
F. Eisenberger                  R. Caterini
MAYOR                          CLERK
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This is Schedule “A” to By-law No. 18-____
Passed the ........... day of ....................., 2018

Mayor

Clark

Schedule “A”

Map Forming Part of
By-law No. 18-____
to Amend By-law No. 05-200
Map 1435

Subject Property
503 and 515 Garner Road West

Block 1 - Refer to By-law 87.57
Block 2 - Change in zoning from Agricultural “A-216” Zone to Conservation / Hazard Land (P5, 670) Zone

Scale: N.T.S.  
File Name/Number: ZAC-18-017/UHCPA-16-007
Date: Jan. 9, 2018
Planner/Technician: GZNS

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
Is this by-law derived from the approval of a Committee Report? No

Committee: Chair and Members  Report No.: PED18032  Date: 02/06/2018
Ward(s) or City Wide: Ward: 12  (MM/DD/YYYY)

Prepared by: George T. Zajac  Phone No: 905-546-2424, ext. 1024

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
Thomas, Cameron

Sent: March 26, 2018 3:44 PM
To: Thomas, Cameron
Cc: 
Subject: UHOPA-16-07 and ZAC-16-017 response

Dear Mr. Thomas -

We are writing to express our opposition to the above mentioned developments on the following grounds:

1) The lands if developed would obstruct our enjoyment of the ravine/forest which we paid a premium for when we moved to our address 12 years ago.

2) We are concerned that the view of the sunsets will be obstructed by the development.

3) The lands if developed would be out of place and character of this area of Ancaster. A townhouse development does not meet the quiet, peaceful, rural theme and feeling which we enjoy. Existing homes in the area are single dwelling residences, not cramped together town homes.

4) Noise and light pollution from the development will interfere with our enjoyment of our backyard.

5) There will be increased traffic to our area.

We wish to have our personal information removed from public viewing.

Sincerely,
March 30, 2016

Dear Mr. Cam Thomas

Senior Planner

City of Hamilton

Re: File No. UHOPA-16-07 and File No. ZAC-16-017.

Please be advised that I strongly object to the proposed development located at 503 and 515 Garner Road West, Ancaster for the following reasons:

- 46 townhouse units is far too congested for the existing site.
- the proposed development does not fit in with the neighbouring properties which are single family homes on larger type properties.
- the water retention pond at the front of the property will be an eye sore along Garner Road similar to the one constructed at the corner of Garner Road and Hamilton Drive, full of weeds, smelly algae and garbage.
- Garner Road is very busy to allow for the safe entry and exiting of the development. It is located in a valley where traffic races along including transport trucks over the speed limit. I have seen many accidents in front of my property including people sliding off the road during snowy conditions. There has been one fatality.
- the proposed townhouses are located too close to the road and does not fit with the neighbourhood.
- there is no street lighting for the safety of the pedestrians.
- there are no sidewalks for the safety of the pedestrians.
- there is farmland across the road from the proposed development which may not be favourable to the residences. For example, farmers are allowed to raise livestock, operate large farm equipment, carry out a controlled burn of brush, as well as recreational activities such as motocross riding and paintballing.
- I do not agree with the proposed variances as the requests are too extreme from the minimums and maximums indicated in the by-laws.

If the property is going to be developed I would much rather see single family houses that would fit in with the surrounding neighbourhood.

Yours truly,
| **TO:** | Chair and Members Planning Committee |
| **COMMITTEE DATE:** | February 6, 2018 |
| **SUBJECT/REPORT NO:** | Application for an Amendment to the Rural Hamilton Official Plan and the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200 for Lands Located at 1051 Green Mountain Road East, Stoney Creek (Ward 11) (PED18029) |
| **WARD(S) AFFECTED:** | Ward 11 |
| **PREPARED BY:** | June Christy 905-546-2424 Ext. 5863 |
| **SUBMITTED BY:** | Steve Robichaud Director, Planning and Chief Planner Planning and Economic Development Department |
| **SIGNATURE:** | |

**RECOMMENDATION**

(a) **Amended Rural Hamilton Official Plan Amendment Application RHOPA-15-22, by Waterford Sand & Gravel Limited (Owner),** to establish a Site Specific Policy Area to permit the extraction of mineral aggregate resources, for lands located at 1051 Green Mountain Road, East (Stoney Creek), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18029, be **APPROVED** on the following basis:

(i) That the draft Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18029, be adopted by City Council;

(ii) That the proposed amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014), and conforms to the Greenbelt Plan.

(b) **Amended Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-15-052 by Waterford Sand & Gravel Limited, (Owner),** for a change in zoning from the Agricultural (A1) Zone in the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200 to the Extractive Industrial (M12) Zone in the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200, for lands located at 1051 Green Mountain Road East, (Stoney Creek), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED18029, be **APPROVED** on the following basis:
SUBJECT: Application for an Amendment to the Rural Hamilton Official Plan and the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200 for Lands Located at 1051 Green Mountain Road East, Stoney Creek (Ward 11) (PED18029) - Page 2 of 39

(i) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED18029, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council; and,

(ii) That the proposed change in zoning is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014), conforms to the Greenbelt Plan and will comply with the Rural Hamilton Official Plan upon finalization of Rural Hamilton Official Plan Amendment No. _____.

(c) That staff be directed to notify the Ministry of Natural Resources that the City of Hamilton’s objections to the Aggregate Resources Act License Application, by Waterford Sand and Gravel Limited, for the subject lands, have been resolved; and that the City of Hamilton no longer has an objection to the issuance of a licence under the ARA for the subject lands, in accordance with the revised ARA Site Plans, dated August 29, 2017, once the subject Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment are in full force and effect.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Waterford Sand and Gravel Limited (Waterford) has applied for an amendment to the Rural Hamilton Official Plan and the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200 to permit an extension to the approved Vinemount Quarry located at 1051 Green Mountain Road East, Stoney Creek. At the same time, Waterford has also applied for a Category 2, Class A licence under the Provincial Aggregate Resources Act (ARA) to permit the quarry extension. The total area proposed to be licensed is 45.2 ha, with the proposed extraction area limited to 37.7 ha.

Several technical studies have been completed by Waterford Sand and Gravel, including an Aggregate Assessment, Agricultural Impact Assessment, Agricultural Soil Assessment, Level 2 Hydrogeological Study, EIS and Level 1 and 2 Natural Environment Report, Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Report, Fish Aquatic Resource Inventory, Noise Assessment, Vibration / Blasting, Dust / Air Quality and Visual Impact studies. These studies have undergone review by City staff and outside agencies, and in some cases, additional peer review. The overall findings of these studies demonstrate that either there is no negative impact to the surrounding area or that appropriate mitigation can be provided to address any potential impacts on nearby property owners or natural features.

Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 39
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 applications for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendments. The Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR) is the approval authority for license applications to extract mineral aggregate resources under the Aggregate Resource Act (ARA).

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The subject property is located directly west of the existing Vinemount Quarry, located northwest of the Green Mountain Road and the Tenth Road East intersection as shown on Appendix “A to Report PED18029 and comprise an area of 45.3 ha. The lands are occupied by agricultural uses (soy bean fields).

Proposal:

Waterford Sand & Gravel Limited has applied for an amendment to the Rural Hamilton Official Plan and the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law to permit an extension to the approved Vinemount Quarry. Waterford has also simultaneously applied for a Category 2, Class A licence under the Provincial Aggregate Resources Act (ARA) to permit the quarry extension. The total area proposed to be licensed is 45.2 ha, with the proposed extraction area limited to 37.7 ha.

The quarry will operate with a combined annual tonnage limit of extraction of 900,000 tonnes, which is the same annual limit as the existing quarry, and is anticipated to take approximately 25 to 30 years to extract. The hours of operation will be from 7 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. six days a week from Monday to Friday excluding statutory holidays and from 8:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Saturdays. The existing quarry has approximately two years left before the material is completely extracted, and then the quarry extraction will move to the proposed extension site to the west where extraction will take place in three phases in a north to south direction as indicated in Appendix “F” to Report PED18029. The quarry extension will continue to utilize existing facilities at the existing quarry including the existing truck access off Tenth Line East and the existing re-fueling facilities and weigh scale. Processing (crushing, washing, screening and blending) will occur on the quarry floor until such time as suitable and sufficient space is available within the expansion lands.
Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments

Applications to amend the Rural Hamilton Official Plan and the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law are required to permit the proposed quarry extension. The subject lands are currently designated Specialty Crop in the RHOP. The application submitted by Waterford proposed a re-designation of the subject lands to the Mineral Aggregate Resource Extraction Area designation. In this regard, staff note that Provincial planning policies (Provincial Policy Statement and Greenbelt Plan) do not permit the re-designation of prime agricultural land (Specialty Crop Lands) to another designation; however the policies do allow additional uses to be added to Specialty Crop lands, including mineral aggregate extraction. As such, staff are proposing that the required Official Plan Amendment Application be amended to add a site specific policy area to permit extraction of aggregate resources within the lands designated Specialty Crop. Further discussion is provided in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation Section below.

The subject lands are currently zoned Agriculture (A1) in the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law. To permit the extraction of mineral aggregate resources, the subject lands require a rezoning to the Extractive Industrial (M12) Zone in the Zoning By-law No. 05-200.

Aggregate Resources Act License Application

In September 2015, Waterford’s ARA License Application was deemed complete by the Ministry of Natural Resources (MNR). Under the ARA, the applicant (Waterford) is required to provide notice of the license application to the local municipality as well as other prescribed agencies. The license application was received by the City on September 16, 2015. On September 17, 2015, Waterford provided public notice of the license application in the Stoney Creek News and the Hamilton Spectator, thus marking the beginning of a 45 day commenting period prescribed under the ARA. The City was required to submit its objections to the proposed license within that 45 day period. On October 20, 2015, Council approved the staff recommendation in Report PED15170 indicating the City’s objections to the ARA License Application on the basis that the application was premature as the land use was not permitted; the OPA and ZBA applications had not been reviewed; peer reviews had not been completed; and that initial concerns related to hydrogeology, noise, vibration, blasting, dust and natural heritage had been identified.

The ARA further directs that, within two (2) years of the public notification, Waterford must respond to all objections received and provide a Notice of Objector Response to all objectors. This response must address all objections submitted by the objector and the actions taken by the proponent to address the objections. The City of Hamilton
received a Notice of Objector Response from Waterford dated June, 28 2017. In accordance with the ARA, the City had to respond to this letter within 20 days (by July 19, 2017) with recommendations that may resolve objections. If the City did not respond, it would be deemed that there is no longer a valid objection. City staff prepared a response and submitted it to the MNR and Waterford Sand and Gravel Limited on July 18, 2017. The 2017 staff letter stated that the City’s objection remained outstanding, but noted that Waterford had been working cooperatively with City staff, however additional issues related primarily to hydrogeology and water resources remained.

It is noted that a licence under the ARA cannot be issued until such time as the subject lands are zoned to permit the extractive use. As such, a decision on the ARA Licence has not been made at this time.

Once the licence is issued by the MNRF, the approved Site Plan will become the primary document used by MNRF to ensure enforcement. The Site Plans incorporate all of the recommendations compiled by both Waterford’s consultants, the relevant Provincial ministries, the NPCA and the City of Hamilton staff/CART.

**Combined Aggregate Review Team (CART)**

A Combined Agency Review Team (CART) was formed to assist in the review of the applications. The CART process has been successfully used in previous quarry applications that the City has reviewed (e.g., Lafarge Canada Inc. in November 2017). The CART was comprised of staff from several City departments and divisions, as well as staff from the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA). Provincial staff, including Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) were kept informed of the CART process and peer reviews, but did not participate as members of CART. Rather than have each agency with an interest in the proposed quarry conduct its own technical reviews, the CART process provides an opportunity for the agencies to be represented on a team that retains expert peer reviews, at the proponent’s expense. The CART approach provides a forum for the agencies to share views and perspectives on the applications, and a shared technical resource in the peer review team that they can draw from in reaching their independent positions and decisions.

Significant supporting studies have been prepared by the applicant and were submitted in support of the applications, including the following:

- Planning Summary Report and Aggregate Resource Assessment;
- Agricultural Impact Assessment;
• Agricultural Survey and CLI Inventory Evaluation;

• Level 2 Hydrogeological Study;

• EIS and Level 1 and 2 Natural Environment Technical Report;

• Tree Preservation Plan;

• Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Report;

• Fish / Aquatic Resource Inventory;

• Noise Assessment;

• Vibration / Blasting Report;

• Dust / Air Quality Study; and,

• Visual Impact Assessment.

The above noted studies have been reviewed by City staff and members of the CART. In addition, peer reviews were completed of the Hydrogeology and Hydrology Report, Noise Study, Air Quality Study and Blasting Study. A complete summary of these studies and peer review results is included as Appendix “E” to Report PED18029 and further discussed in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation Section below.

Chronology:

September 16, 2015: Rural Official Plan Amendment RHOPA-15-022 and Zoning By-law Amendment Applications ZAC-15-052 were received.

October 15, 2015: Applications deemed complete.

September 21, 2015: Notice of ARA License Application to the MNR received by City of Hamilton.

September 17, 2015: Waterford initiates public notification process under the ARA for proposed ARA License Application.

October 20, 2015: Waterford holds Public Information Session, as required under the ARA.
October 20, 2015: Staff Report PED15170 presented to Planning Committee. Report recommended that the City of Hamilton advise the MNR that it objects to the ARA License Application by Waterford due to it being premature.

October 30, 2015: Notice of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation mailed to 40 property owners within 120 m of the subject property.

October 30, 2015: Public Notice Sign erected on the subject lands.

June 28, 2017: Waterford provides Notice of Objector Response to the City of Hamilton, as required under the ARA.

July 18, 2017: City of Hamilton sends response to the Notice of Objector Response to the MNR, stating that the City’s 2015 objection remains outstanding, but notes that consultation with Waterford is ongoing.

January 10, 2018: Public Notice sign updated to reflect Public Meeting date.

January 19, 2018: Notice of Public Meeting mailed to 40 property owners within 120 m of the subject lands.

Details of Submitted Applications

Owner/Applicant: Waterford Sand and Gravel Limited

Agent: IBI Planning Consultants

Location: 1051 Green Mountain Road East, Stoney Creek

Description: Frontage: +/- 415 m

Depth: +/- 1,085 m

Lot Area: +/- 45.2 ha

Services: Not serviced
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></td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Agriculture (A1) Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Surrounding Lands:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>North:</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dofasco 2000 Trail CPR Railway Tracks (Vinemount Meadows Sanctuary owned by Waterford and managed by the Hamilton Naturalists’ Club)</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Agriculture (A1) Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>South:</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green Mountain Road, Agricultural and Residential Outdoor Storage</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Agriculture (A1) Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East:</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mineral Aggregate Operation (Vinemount Quarry)</td>
<td>Extractive Industrial (M12) Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>West:</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural including Tree Farm</td>
<td>Agriculture (A1) Zone, Conservation / Hazard Land Rural (P7) Zone and Conservation / Hazard Land Rural (P8) Zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS

Provincial Policy Statement

The applications have been reviewed against the policies of the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS). Applicable policies of the PPS as related to Rural and Agricultural lands, Mineral Aggregate Resources, Rehabilitation, Natural Heritage, Water Resources, Land Use Compatibility, and Cultural Heritage Resources are summarized in Appendix “D” to Report PED18029.

Based on the policy review in Appendix “D” to Report PED18029, and subject to the mitigation measures and conditions recommended by CART and staff with regard to the licence, the applications are consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

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.
Greenbelt Plan (2017)

The applications have been reviewed against the policies of the Greenbelt Plan, 2017. The subject lands are located within the Protected Countryside Area. More specifically they are located within the Niagara Peninsula Tender Fruit and Grape Area and designated “Specialty Crop Areas” on Schedule 2 of the Greenbelt Plan and RHOP (Schedule D) in accordance with the City’s Rural Hamilton Official Plan designation.


Based on the policy review in Appendix “D” to Report PED18029, and subject to the mitigation measures and conditions recommended by CART and staff with regard to the licence, the applications conform with the Greenbelt Plan, 2017.

Rural Hamilton Official Plan

The subject lands are currently designated “Specialty Crop” on Schedule “D” – Rural Land Use Designations of the Rural Hamilton Official Plan (RHOP). In addition, the subject lands are identified as “Potential Stone Aggregates” on Appendix C – Non-Renewable Resources (Appendix “C” remains under appeal, and therefore the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan Map No. 5 applies, which identifies the lands as Stone Aggregates). There are no Core Areas or Linkages identified on the subject lands on Schedule “B” – Natural Heritage System.

Applicable policies of the RHOP as related to Rural and Agricultural lands, Mineral Aggregate Resources, Rehabilitation, Natural Heritage, Water Resources, Noise and Air Emissions, and Cultural Heritage Resources are summarized in Appendix “D” to Report PED18029.

An Official Plan Amendment is required to permit the mineral aggregate use on the subject lands, discussed in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation Section below.

Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200

The subject lands are zoned Agriculture “A1” Zone in the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200, and are proposed to be rezoned to the Extractive Industrial “M12” Zone.
RELEVANT CONSULTATION

The following Departments and Agencies had no comments or objection to the application:

- Recreation Division (Community and Emergency Services Department);
- Operations Division (Public Works Department);
- Forestry and Horticulture (Public Works Department); and,
- Alectra Utilities (formerly Horizon Utilities).

The following Departments and Agencies had comments on the application:

Source Protection Planning (Hamilton Water), Sustainable Initiatives Section (Public Works Department)

Hamilton Water was a member of the CART team and retained Cambium Engineering to participate in the peer review of the WSP Group Level 2 Hydrogeological Study. Their review focussed primarily on the report entitled “Vinemount Quarry Extension, Level 2 Hydrogeological Study” by WSP Canada Inc. (WSP) in 2015. The following provides a summary of the issues identified in the peer review and how these issues were resolved with Waterford and WSP. A more detailed discussion is found in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation Section of this report, and further in Appendix “E” to Report PED18029.

The Vinemount South Swamp complex, and environmentally sensitive area, falls within the projected radius of influence of dewatering that will occur in the proposed extension. Since the Vinemount Swamp may be partially groundwater fed, there is a possibility that the swamp will be impacted. As such, Cambium recommended that WSP complete a pumping test on the western extent of the proposed extension to simulate the dewatered conditions of the proposed extension. Pumping tests and the installation of two new piezometers in the swamp showed no observable impacts from pumping and indicate that there is little concern for under draining from the quarry dewatering.

- Extraction depth of the proposed extension will be restricted to the top of the Decew formation, instead of a pre-determined depth which will also reduce the possibility of extracting lower quality material;
- WSP agreed to monitor the water levels in the deeper aquifer system found in the area, and the pump test included a new monitoring well screened in the deeper unit and the monitoring did not suggest an influence to the deeper system;

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.
Cambium believes that mitigation solutions to existing wells along 8th Road (well deepening, storage, etc.) are satisfactory; and,

Cambium recommended that some of the existing wells in 87-Acre Park be monitored as part of the regular monitoring program. WSP agrees and Waterford will reach an agreement with the City to allow for monitoring on 87-Acre Park.

Through the peer review by Cambium, Source Water Protection is satisfied that appropriate mitigation measures to address surface and groundwater impacts have been identified and included in the updated monitoring and mitigation plan by WSP. Further, the improvements to the monitoring and mitigation plan will ensure that all potentially impacted wells will be included in the plans and that appropriate response to the well owner’s concerns will be provided.

Cambium monitored other agencies who provided comments on the supporting studies of the proposed quarry extension which included MNRF, MOECC, and the NPCA. Cambium advised that the issues raised were relatively minor and were resolved through subsequent discussions. Some of the resolutions to the issues raised included the following:

- WSP provided the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA) with construction details of the Forty Mile Creek diversion and clarified well construction details for MW3c;
- WSP provided the NPCA with additional details with regards to the water budget;
- WSP updated the bedrock topography map to include recent data;
- WSP clarified how wetland features were determined and the extent of water level measurement data prior to extraction (as per MNRF comments). Additionally, the stream hydraulics of Forty Mile Creek were discussed in more detail as per Source Water Protection comments;
- WSP clarified why the deeper aquifer systems can be monitored by only one well (since the system should not impact the deeper aquifer systems) as per Hamilton Water comments; and,
- The analytical parameters for the dewatering discharge were altered by WSP as per Hamilton Water comments.

Cambium and Hamilton Water staff are satisfied with the proposed modifications from Waterford. The ARA Operational Plan has been updated to include the above Notes.
Health Protection Division (Public Health Services)

Public Health Services was a member of the CART team and participated in the review and peer review of the technical studies, including the air and noise studies and the hydrogeological studies. They noted that the peer review should consider the dispersion modelling analysis. They recommended that a complaint response mechanism be incorporated and details provided about the type of logging system and how its maintenance will resolve current issues and prevent future similar complaints. The complaint system should address all potential areas of air, water, vibration environmental impacts and other nuisance issues. Dust management will be incorporated into a proper record keeping system which will demonstrate that mitigative actions are taking place.

Public Health were in support of the recommendations made in the peer reviews for the air, noise and hydrogeological studies, and Waterford is in agreement with the recommendations, and appropriate Notes have been included in the Operational Plan.

Corridor Management Section (Public Works Department)

Corridor Management had no concerns and noted that since there will be no change to the extraction tonnage as Waterford will be moving their operations to their adjacent lands to the west when extraction is completed, the proposed expansion will not increase vehicular demand to and from the site. Further, the haul route will not change and will continue to follow the designated truck routes of the City (Green Mountain Road, Eleventh Road East and Mud Street). They advised that the existing March–April Reduced Load restriction for quarry trucks is still applicable on the designated haul route. All proposed berm materials and fencing along Green Mountain Road must be maintained on private property. No upgrading of the existing farm gate access along Green Mountain Road is required as long as it is used for passenger vehicles and not for trucks.

Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA)

The NPCA was a member of the CART team and participated in the review and peer review of the Hydrogeological Report and the Natural Environment Report. The NPCA had some high level concerns which are summarized as follows:

- Address impacts to potential habitat in Forty Mile Creek and the southwest creek / ditch and maintain appropriate setbacks and buffers including the submission of a plan which identifies the vegetated buffers surrounding the fish habitat on site;
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- Provide setbacks of 40 metres from the bank of any watercourse at all blasting events;

- Provide details for the realignment of the intermittent creek/ditch;

- Ensure that potential damage to Species at Risk and their habitat is mitigated;

- Provide a Flood Conditions Protocol;

- Submit a Sediment and Erosion Control Plan to ensure there is no sediment release into the adjacent watercourse both during construction and during the ongoing operation;

- Show the mitigation measures as outlined in the EIS and Natural Environment Report on the mitigation plan;

- Initiate baseline hydrologic monitoring for the swamp and provide a contingency plan; and,

- Provide a protocol for determining the scale of fractures within Forty Mile Creek and any identify the mitigation measures.

The NPCA has received additional information (e.g., Sediment and Erosion Control Plan, details of the realignment of the intermittent creek/ditch) from Waterford and its consultants to address the above noted concerns. Based on all of the submitted information, the NPCA advised that they do not object to the quarry extension, provided appropriate notes are included on the ARA Operational Plan. As well, the NPCA is satisfied with the volume and rate of sump water being proposed (and currently) being discharged into Forty Mile Creek. All of the NPCA comments have been incorporated into the Site Plans.

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH) One-Window Response

The MMAH provided a consolidated set of comments from its partner ministries on July 6, 2017. The comments noted concerns from the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) and from the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) regarding:

- surface water impacts to the area’s water resources;
assumptions / calculations made with insufficient data or monitoring equipment, questions about the extent of the groundwater monitoring program;

rehabilitation post-operations of the quarry including mitigation measures pertaining to the Vinemount Swamp Complex;

groundwater impacts;

more data and analysis with regard to air quality, dust and noise impacts. The MNRF requested that Waterford demonstrate how they will protect significant wildlife habitat including that the proposed protection and relocation of the Snake Hibernaculum be completed to the satisfaction of the MNRF; and,

more information about how potential impacts to Species at Risk habitats for both Bobolink and Eastern Meadowlark will be addressed and to demonstrate how these species and their habitat will be affected, protected and registered under the ESA.

MNRF noted that they were working with Waterford to ensure the successful relocation of a Peregrine Falcon pair that nests on the eastern wall of the existing quarry.

The Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Affairs (OMAFRA) recommended that Waterford demonstrate whether they considered other sites more suitable for aggregate extraction outside of the immediate area, and that those other sites not necessarily be lands adjacent to the existing quarry. They also recommended that if an alternative location cannot be found, that agricultural rehabilitation of all remaining lands within the licensed area be maximized as a first priority to allow the future production of specialty crops. The Ministry also wanted more information on the potential impact of the proposed quarry expansion on surrounding agricultural operations.

The comments also noted that the application was reviewed by the Ministries of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTSC) and Northern Development and Mines (MNDM).

Waterford has provided supplementary information to the above noted Ministries to address the concerns. A full description of the hydrogeological impacts on ground and surface water and nearby wells and the mitigation measures for the Vinemount Swamp Complex is included in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation Section and Appendix “E” to Report PED18029.

As for the agricultural comments by OMAFRA, IBI Planning Consultants provided additional information about lands they considered as alternative locations, not only lands near the existing quarry, but outside Hamilton as well. These included lands within a 35 km radius from Hamilton City Hall and extended to other local municipalities.
including Beamsville, Smithville (Niagara Region), Canborough, Cayuga, Hagersville (Haldimand Region), and Brantford (Brant County). IBI Planning Consultants chose a + / - 35 km radius from Hamilton City Hall to create a larger study area as this created a radius to numerous local municipalities on lands east, south and south-west of Hamilton, which is a significant market area, and one which extends well beyond the boundaries of the City of Hamilton. They found that there were only two available resource deposits on the lands; however, those lands had areas of significant ecological importance on them.

Waterford also submitted an Agricultural Impact Assessment from DBH Soil Services Inc. dated November 30, 2017 that concluded that the proposed Vinemount extension would have minimal impact on the surrounding agricultural activities in the surrounding area.

Public Consultation:

In accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act, and Council’s Public Participation Policy, Notice of Complete Application and Preliminary Circulation for the Rural Hamilton Official Plan Amendment and the Zoning By-law Amendment Applications were sent to 40 property owners within 120 m of the subject lands on October 30, 2015, and a Public Notice sign was placed on the property on October 30, 2015 and was updated on January 18, 2018. Three letters were received as a result of the circulation, attached as Appendix “G” to Report PED18029. The letters identified concerns related to blasting, dust and noise, impact on wells and water supply and impact on property value. These concerns are addressed in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation Section of this Report. Notice of the Public Meeting was given in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act.

ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

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

   i) The application is consistent with the PPS (2014) and conforms to the Greenbelt Plan;

   ii) The proposed quarry extension has undergone a thorough technical review by the Combined Aggregate Review Team, comprising City staff, outside agencies, and peer reviewers and concerns have been satisfactorily addressed; and,
iii) The proposed quarry extension includes appropriate provisions to ensure protection of the natural environment, agricultural uses nearby and to minimize impacts to surrounding residents.

2) The subject lands are currently designated “Specialty Crop” in the Rural Hamilton Official Plan. An Official Plan Amendment is required in order to permit the proposed mineral aggregate use on the subject lands. In addition, the subject lands are identified as “Potential Stone Aggregates” on Appendix “C” – Non-Renewable Resources (Appendix “C” remains under appeal, and therefore the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan Map No. 5 applies, which identifies the lands as Stone Aggregates).

All existing licensed mineral aggregate operations in Rural Hamilton are designated Mineral Aggregate Resource Extraction Area on Schedule “D” to the RHOP. This includes the existing Vinemount Quarry. The application submitted by Waterford proposed a re-designation of the lands to the Mineral Aggregate Resource Extraction Area designation. However, staff note that the 2014 Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) amended the policies related to Prime Agricultural Areas, as follows:

“2.3.5.1 Planning authorities may only exclude land from prime agricultural areas for expansions of or identification of settlement areas in accordance with policy 1.1.3.8.

2.3.6.1 Planning authorities may only permit non-agricultural uses in prime agricultural areas for:

a) extraction of minerals, petroleum resources and mineral aggregate resources, in accordance with policies 2.4 and 2.5;”

The above policies prohibit a municipality from re-designating lands from prime agriculture to any other designation with the exception of a settlement area boundary expansion (Policy 1.2.3.8 referred to above identifies criteria for settlement area expansion.). Further, Policy 2.3.6.1 identifies that a mineral aggregate operation may be added as a permitted use to a prime agricultural designation, subject to compliance with other policies.

Based on the above, staff are proposing to add a Special Policy Area to the subject lands which will permit mineral aggregate extraction within the “Specialty Crop” designation. While staff understand that the intent of the PPS policies above is to maintain the designation of prime agricultural lands for agriculture, this approach does not seem reasonable when reviewing aggregate operations.
below the water table, for which the requirement for full agricultural rehabilitation is not required, or often, not feasible. In the case of the subject lands, agricultural rehabilitation is not proposed due to the extensive amount of below the water table extraction. Staff note that the requirement to add a Special Policy Area to permit aggregate extraction on the subject lands rather than re-designating the subject lands to Mineral Aggregate Extraction Area is inconsistent with the structure of the City’s RHOP. However, this is a requirement of the PPS and Greenbelt Plan. As such, staff are supportive of the Official Plan Amendment.

3) In considering an amendment to permit a mineral aggregate use, the RHOP identifies the following studies that must be submitted to support the proposed re-designation:

- Environmental Impact Study;
- Hydrogeological Study;
- Transportation and haul route study; and,
- Noise, vibration and air quality studies.

The applicant has submitted all of the above noted studies except for the Transportation and haul route study. It is noted that the 2013 City of Hamilton Formal Consultation for the proposed extension did not require a Transportation and haul route study since the haul route for the existing Vinemount Quarry will be retained. However, the applicant, in their Planning Justification Report, provided a summary of how the internal and external haul routes meet the Official Plan policies. The haul route to be used is an existing and established route and since the annual extraction limit of the quarry extension will remain the same, the number of trucks exiting and returning to the quarry will remain consistent with historical levels.

The applicant also submitted an Archaeological Assessment of the subject lands. A full review of the results of these technical studies, including peer review where required, is provided in Appendix “E” to Report PED18029, and also further summarized below:

Natural Environment Report (Environmental Impact Study)

Waterford submitted an “EIS and Level 1 & 2 Natural Environment Technical Report” (EIS), completed by Dance Environmental Ltd. and dated August 24, 2015. This report, along with the Hydrogeology and Technical report completed
by WSP, the Tree Preservation Plan (IBI Group), Fish Resource Inventory (WSP Group, Soils Survey (DBH Soils Services) and the Agricultural Impact Assessment (DBH Soils Services), were reviewed by City staff and the NPCA. Since, after consultation with the NPCA and MNRF, it was found that the natural features on and adjacent to the site were not highly sensitive or extensive, it was agreed that it was not necessary to retain a consultant to peer review the EIS. Instead, the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA), the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), the City of Hamilton Planning and the Environmentally Significant Areas Impact Evaluation Group (ESAIEG) reviewed and commented on the report.

Field studies were completed by Dance Environmental Ltd. from February to October 2014 to identify amphibians, fish, plants, snakes, breeding birds, Ecological Land Classification (vegetation communities), incidental wildlife observations, aquatic habitat assessment, crepuscular bird survey (Common Nighthawk and Eastern Whip-poor-will), winter raptors and owls and acoustic bat surveys.

It was found that the proposed extension lands contain a variety of habitats, including deciduous forests, a pond, streams, meadow, agriculture and hedgerows.

The main identified issues were potential impacts to:

- Significant wildlife habitat such as waterfowl stopover and staging areas (terrestrial, aquatic and shorebird migratory stopover areas) including Short-eared Owl wintering habitat found on the berms surrounding the quarry and in 87-Acre Park;

- Significant wildlife such as Peregrine Falcon, Common Raven, and Bank Swallows nesting on the west quarry wall (six species of bat were identified however no Species at Risk bats were found);

- Grasslands Species At Risk on lands to the north of the proposed quarry and a Snake Hibernaculum on the subject lands;

- Grassland birds found in the lands to the north (Wilson’s Snipe and Upland Sandpiper);

- Noise on the wildlife populations; and,
Woodland in the vicinity of the old quarry (it is noted that during the preparation of the “EIS and Natural Environment Technical Reports, the woodlot located within the southern section of the subject property was deemed by Dance Environmental to be a “significant woodland” because it met the minimum of two criteria including: 1) proximity to a water source and 2) habitat for a Species of Concern, Eastern Milksnake. Subsequent to the preparation of the report, Eastern Milksnake was delisted as a species of concern. Dance Environmental advised Planning staff that no other rare species were observed in the woodlot, and Planning staff since confirmed that the woodlot no longer meets the criteria as “significant”).

Other possible impacts included:

- Hydrogeological impacts to surrounding natural areas (Vinemount Swamp ESA and PSW), the wet meadows and ponds in 87-Acre Park (Vinemount Quarry ESA) and wet meadows Saltfleet Northeast Woods ESA and the Green Ash woodland to the west of the extension area;

- Tree stress caused by lowering the water table; and,

- Impacts to the Vinemount Swamp PSW and how groundwater recharge will decrease as a result of expansion, and how this will affect the wetlands and ponds in the surrounding ESAs.

Also discussed was the possible restoration and improvement to the existing Forty Mile Creek and realignment with natural channel design.

The following are examples of some of the mitigation measures proposed by Waterford to address potential impacts to natural heritage features and functions:

- Silt control fencing and inspection;

- Timing windows to avoid impacts to fish and breeding birds;

- Setbacks from Forty Mile Creek and ESAs (which range from 34 to 44 metres);

- Continued discharge of water from the quarry into Forty Mile Creek;

- Creation of an ecological linkage between the new hibernaculum and the Vinemount South Swamp ESA to the north;
Dust Management Plan; and,

Temporary plantings and pond habitat on the quarry floor.

Groundwater levels in the swamp will be monitored to determine if there is any impact on the vegetation or wildlife in the swamp. The NPCA has approved the Monitoring Program for the Vinemount South Swamp: Understorey and Vernal Pool which will be undertaken by an ecologist. Two years of baseline monitoring will be followed by on-going monitoring in three year intervals. If quarry dewatering is found to be causing negative impacts to the flora and fauna, remedial action will be initiated. If required, these actions will be done in collaboration with the NPCA and include surface water being added to the swamp water balance.

Waterford is working with the MNRF to re-create a new Snake Hibernaculum on lands to the west of the proposed extension. If the hibernaculum is not successfully created and utilized by snakes, the existing hibernaculum within the Phase 3 lands cannot be removed. When the MNRF determines the replacement hibernaculum site has been functional for three years and the old hibernaculum site is decommissioned, extraction within this phase may proceed.

A nesting platform has been placed on the east quarry wall to encourage the Peregrine Falcons to nest there. A soil structure will be piled on the existing quarry floor to create temporary nesting habitat for Bank Swallows until the quarry fills with water post-extraction. Since the Woodland is to be removed, MNRF recommended compensation tree planting near the new hibernaculum site. The Rehabilitation Plan now includes one hectare of restored woodland near the new hibernaculum.

Waterford has committed to continuing the ecological habitat enhancement on lands they own to the north of the site. Waterford has partnered with the Hamilton Naturalists’ Club (HNC) to develop the “Vinemount Meadows Sanctuary”, a 26 hectare former agricultural field which is being restored to meadow (grassland bird and pollinator habitat). These lands include important existing grassland bird habitat and 6.6 hectares of agricultural land to be restored. The public will be able to access the site, which will benefit breeding birds, wintering raptors, reptiles and amphibians, insects and mammals.

Removal of habitat within the extension site is being mitigated by expanding the habitat within the berms (from 4 metres wide to 7 metres wide), planting clusters of vegetation and creating two small ponds on the existing quarry floor to provide temporary habitat. Habitat surrounding the site will be improved by restoration
and adding habitat structures (bat roosts and maternity structures and a Purple Martin nesting house).

Through the mitigation and monitoring measures provided in the Site Plan Notes, the City of Hamilton is satisfied that the issues related to Natural Heritage features and functions have been addressed.

Hydrogeology Study

Waterford submitted a Hydrogeology report titled “Vinemount Quarry Extension, Level 2 Hydrogeological Study” prepared by WSP Canada Inc. (WSP) and dated June 23, 2015 which was peer reviewed on behalf of CART by Cambium Inc. The following is a summary prepared by Cambium that describes the extraction and impacts.

- Proposed Quarry Extension – Background

The proposed quarry extension is located within the Haldimand Clay Plain, between two east-west trending moraines (the Vinemount Moraine and the Niagara Falls Moraine). The Site is also located within the Forty Mile Creek sub watershed, just east of the drainage divide with the Stoney Creek sub watershed. The Eramosa bedrock escarpment is a predominant feature in the area of the Site and creates two relatively flat lying steppes within the proposed extension lands (the lower, more northern steppe occupying the majority of the extension lands footprint). Agricultural lands surround the site in addition to several Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) including, the Vinemount Quarry (87-Acre Park), Saltfleet Northeast Woods and Vinemount South Swamp (which includes the woodlot/wetland complex in Lots 7 and 8, Concession 5).

Two branches of the Forty Mile Creek flow through/adjacent to the proposed extension lands. Currently the Forty Mile Creek has been diverted around the Site via a series of berms and ditches and reconnects with the original creek bed just south of the north eastern corner of the existing quarry (WSP Canada Inc., 2015).

Extraction in the proposed extension will not extend deeper than the Decew Formation, ~181 metres above sea level (mASL) in the north-west and deeper to the south and east, due to the presence of low quality bedrock source (from an aggregate product perspective) found at depth. The current quarry is developed below the groundwater table, therefore to maintain dry working conditions, the excavation is dewatered under Permit to Take Water (PTTW No. 3221-5VVN7L). The proposed quarry extension will be dewatered by the current dewatering
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infrastructure and it is anticipated that the current PTTW will be able to encompass the additional dewatering volumes.

The following section outlines the high level issues and their resolutions.

- **Potential Impacts to the Vinemount South Swamp Complex**

The Vinemount South Swamp Complex (VSSC) falls within the projected radius of influence of the dewatering that will occur in the proposed quarry extension. WSP had previously installed piezometers in the area of the Vinemount South Swamp Complex and, upon review of the data generated by those piezometers, Cambium concluded that a portion of the VSSC may be groundwater fed (however, data generated from these piezometers were not reliable from a surface water / groundwater interaction perspective due to their construction).

Since the VSSC may be partially groundwater fed, and that it falls within the projected radius of influence of the proposed extension, there is a possibility that the VSSC will be impacted from the development of the extension. As such, Cambium recommended that WSP complete a pumping test on the western extent of the proposed extension to simulate the dewatered conditions of the proposed quarry extension. The pumping test did not adequately represent the effects of dewatering from the quarry. The long term pumping test did influence a drawdown in the shallow bedrock near the VSSC. Two new piezometers were installed in the swamp complex and had drastically reduced precipitation influenced head fluctuations than the early piezometers, indicating a much better seal. These two piezometers had no observable impacts from pumping and as such indicate that there is little concern for under draining from the quarry dewatering.

**Extraction Depth**

The extraction depth of the proposed expansion should be restricted to the top of the Decew formation, instead of a pre-determined depth. This will reduce the possibility of extracting lower quality material (which had happened in the existing quarry). WSP determined the elevation of the Decew formation from the new pumping well and monitoring wells, and has suggested this contact is at elevation 181 masl at the northwest extent of the proposed excavation area.

**Groundwater Declines in Deeper Aquifer Systems**

Cambium indicated that groundwater declines have been observed in the deeper aquifer systems found in the area, possibly as a response to the existing operations. WSP agreed to monitor the water levels in the deeper aquifer
The pump test included a new monitoring well screened in the deeper unit and the pump test monitoring did not suggest an influence to the deeper system.

Pumping Test

A pumping test report was provided by WSP documenting the methodology and observations of a pump test program that included the installation of two new well monitoring locations, two new drive points in the VSSC, and a single pumping well. The pumping included a stepped drawdown test that concluded the optimal pumping rate and indicated a poor well efficiency, suggesting the available groundwater in the upper bedrock aquifer and its inflow to the well was limited by the well construction or placement. As such, the pumping was a poor indication of dewatering influences expected from the quarry dewatering. The pumping test proceeded for 212 hours (almost nine days), with three interruptions due to equipment malfunction. The pumping rate was a nominal 13.3 L/min, equating to a cumulative pumping volume of roughly 160 m$^3$ over the 8+ days of pumping. The drawdown effect was reported as a circular cone of influence, however the figures indicated a preferential drawdown in the east-west direction, stemming from the observed drawdown of ~20cm in a well ~340m east of the pumping well (BH 14-17) and a ~4cm drawdown in a well a similar distance south of the pumping well (BH 104). The distance – drawdown plot indicated a cone of influence ~ 224m while the report indicates a radius of influence in the ~400m range. Cambium believes the distance drawdown plot incorporates less than observed drawdown in monitoring wells given it uses the drawdown reported in Table 2.1 (WSP Level 2 Hydrogeological Study, June 23, 2015) and not the greater drawdown observed from Figure C-2 (WSP Hydrogeological Study, 2015) for the same monitoring wells (MW 14-17 and MW 15-17) and Figure C-6 (WSP Hydrogeological Study, 2015) for monitoring well BH 204. Considering the preferential elongation, which Cambium notes coincides with the earlier comments of an east-northeast – west-southwest trending regional joint pattern, coupled with the understated distance drawdown relationship suggests a higher potential for influence in the residential supply wells along 8th Road East than reported.

The time-drawdown plot for the pumping well appears to steepen through the course of the pump test while the distance drawdown plot appears to flatten in distance from the well. This suggests the radius of influence intercepted a barrier boundary. The existing quarry 440 m to the east presents a plausible barrier and as such Cambium believes the barrier effect is due to the current excavation. This observation suggests the drawdown extends further once the barrier is intercepted as the potential for recharge from this direction is absent.
The effect may include a greater influence in those residential supply wells along 8th Rd E than originally reported, these wells are currently included in the monitoring and mitigation program and if such influences materialize, Cambium is of the opinion that the mitigation solutions will be adequate (well deepening, storage, etc.) to maintain sustainable drinking water supplies.

The report suggests the isolation between the surface water (swamp complex and Forty Mile Creek) and the underlying bedrock is present as earlier presented, and Cambium believes the report adequately addresses these concerns.

87-Acre Park

Cambium recommended that some of the existing wells in 87-Acre Park be monitored as part of the regular monitoring program. WSP agreed with this recommendation; however as these wells are monitored by the City Landfill Group, who have agreed that an arrangement will be made with Waterford to monitor.

Issues Raised by Other Agencies

The other Agencies that provided comments on the original supporting documentation included the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC), City of Hamilton Source Protection Planning (SPP) and the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA). Cambium has advised that the issues raised from each of these parties were relatively minor or were resolved through subsequent discussions. Some of the resolutions to the issues raised included the following:

- WSP provided the NPCA with the construction details of the Forty Mile Creek diversion and clarified well construction details for MW3c;
- WSP provided NPCA with additional details with regards to the water budget;
- WSP updated the bedrock topography map to include recent data;
- WSP clarified how wetland features were determined and the extent of water level measurement data prior to extraction (as per MNRF comments). Additionally the stream hydraulics of Forty Mile Creek were discussed in more detail as per SPP comments; and,
WSP clarified why the deeper aquifer systems can be monitored by only one well (since the system should not impact the deeper aquifer systems) as per SPP comments.

The analytical parameters for the dewatering discharge were altered by WSP as per SPP comments.

The MOECC indicated that the water well survey completed by WSP was not completed to the specifications of the “Technical Guidance Document for Hydrogeological Studies in Support of Category 3 Applications for Permit to Take Water”. However WSP considers the water well survey to be in compliance with the aforementioned document. Cambium agrees with WSP on this matter.

Summary of Quarry Effects

The MOECC, MNRF, NPCA and City of Hamilton Source Water Protection outlined several issues associated with the proposed extension of the quarry. The issues raised included the:

- Assumptions / calculations made with insufficient data or monitoring equipment,

- extent of the groundwater monitoring program as the proposed extension falls within a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer Zone; and,

- mitigation measures pertaining to the Vinemount South Swamp Complex.

WSP indicated that since the publication of the Hydrogeological Study, seven (7) monitoring wells and three (3) drive points were installed west of the proposed extension property, and subsequently, two new monitoring wells, two new drive points and one pumping well. The results of the installations indicated that downward gradients exist within the Vinemount South Swamp Complex (although Cambium interpreted the information differently, as outlined above). Therefore, WSP provided clarification with regards to their assumptions / calculations and indicated that there is in-fact sufficient monitoring equipment installed at the Site, particularly in consideration of the new wells and the observed nil pumping effect on the new drive points.

WSP indicates that modelling is not required since the expansion will be almost identical to the current quarry, and as such, the existing conditions should be assumed to exist within the future development. The monitoring program was further clarified by WSP, and that there should be no impact to the groundwater and surface water quality since the only threat to these systems would be spills.
of fuels or other chemicals (of which there are controls / best management plans in place).

Cambium considers the response of WSP to the comments of the Agencies and themselves are satisfactory and are satisfied that appropriate mitigation measures to address surface and groundwater impacts have been identified and included in the updated monitoring and mitigation plan provided by WSP. Further, they believe that the proposed improvements to the Monitoring and Mitigation Plan will ensure that all potentially impacted wells will be included in the plans and that appropriate response to the well owner’s concern will be provided. Finally, Hamilton Water staff are satisfied with the proposed modifications from Waterford. The ARA Operational Plan has been updated to include the above Notes.

**Noise**


The noise predictions were based on the predictable worst case noise impact for each of the aggregate quarry operation areas at each of the receptors. This represented a design case where the quarry is running at full capacity with all of the equipment operating simultaneously and at locations where noise impact is highest for each receptor. The majority of the time during quarry extraction operations, the work would be occurring in other areas of the site with lower associated noise impacts. Noise impacts of the operation were predicted and where MOECC sound limits were calculated to be exceeded, noise control measures were modelled and the noise impact recalculated. This process was repeated until the sound level limits were satisfied.

The study found that with the recommended Noise Control Measures in place, the sound levels at all sensitive points of reception would be within MOECC recommended sound level limits during quarry operation. It is noted that Noise Control Measures must be identified and detailed on the ARA Operational Plan. The measures are separated into those required overall and those required per each individual phase. At a high level, the measures relate to:

- berming requirements;
• hours of operation limited to daytime hours only;

• operating equipment limited to:
  • 1 quiet rock drill;
  • 2 extraction loaders;
  • 2 shipment loaders;
  • 1 processing plant; and,
  • 30 truck trips per hour.

• maximum noise emission levels for specific quarry equipment (e.g., portable processing plant can’t exceed 85 dBA);

• processing equipment must occur on the quarry floor at an elevation of 171 mASL or lower; and,

• maximum sound power levels of equipment.

During phase 1 of the extraction operations, the portable processing plant shall be positioned within 100 m of the south working face. During phase 2, an acoustic barrier with a minimum height of 10 m shall be located between the processing equipment and specific receptors. The barrier must be solid, with no gaps or openings and take the form of a quarry face, stockpile, acoustic fence, ISO container or combination of any of these.

During phase 3, Berm A shall be installed at the south portion of the Phase 3 lands and extend to a length of 380 m. The berm shall remain for the lifetime of the quarry. A portable processor cannot operate within 200 m of the south extraction limits. An acoustic barrier with a minimum height of 10 m shall be located between the processing equipment and specific receptors and be within 50 m of plant equipment.

It is noted that the annual tonnage limit for the existing quarry is 900,000 tonnes, which is the same annual tonnage limit as the proposed extension. Shipment trucks will continue to exit onto Tenth Road East and proceed east on Green Mountain Road East. This is the existing haul route that is currently used. As such the off-site truck noise will not change.
The Noise Study was peer reviewed by Jade Acoustics. The peer review generally agreed with the recommendations of the noise study, but required some revisions and clarifications. Aeracoustics Engineering Ltd. responded to the requests as appropriate and provided the additional clarifications required as well as additional notes on the Operational Plan.

Blasting (Vibration)

Exploitech Engineering Ltd. prepared a blasting impact assessment entitled “Blasting Impact Assessment – Waterford Sand & Gravel Limited, Vinemount Quarry Extension”, dated April 8, 2015. The Report assessed the vibration levels based on the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) Model Municipal Noise Control By-law (NPC-119) in regard to guidelines for blasting in Mines and Quarries in order to assess the impact of proposed blasting operations and extraction methods on the surrounding third-party receptors and waterbodies, as it pertains to ground borne vibrations and air overpressures induced by such operations.

They carried out a field study at the existing quarry in order to establish a site-specific vibration and overpressure database for the purpose of developing ground vibration and overpressure prediction regression relationship (formula) based on the USBM model.

The Blast Impact Analysis concluded that vibration and blast impacts from the Vinemount Quarry extension which could impact adjacent sensitive land uses will meet the MOECC Model Municipal Noise Control By-law limits subject to the recommendations noted implementing the following to meet MOECC requirements of NPC-119 monitoring plan:

- All blasts shall be monitored for both vibration and overpressure at the closest privately owned sensitive receptor adjacent to the site and monitoring will be performed by an independent third party engineering firm;

- If NPC-119 limits are exceeded, blast designs and protocol shall be reviewed prior to any subsequent blasts and revised accordingly in order to return the operations to compliant levels;

- Blast designs shall be continually reviewed with respect to fragmentation, ground vibration and overpressure and shall be modified as required;

- Once the blasting (in future phases) reaches a 200 metre separation distance from any off site structure or residence, accumulated blast vibration data and...
designs shall be reviewed by a qualified blast consultant prior to proceeding closer in order to ensure suitable parameters are employed;

- Blasting procedures such as drilling and loading shall be reviewed on a yearly basis and modified as required; and,

- Detailed blast records shall be maintained and the use of MOECC recommended information for the body of blast reports be used.

The Blasting Impact Assessment was peer reviewed by DST Consulting Engineers, the CART peer reviewer, on December 7, 2016. The peer review was in agreement with the findings of the Blasting Impact Assessment, and agreed with the assessment of the structural impacts and water well impacts. The review noted that the existing Vinemount Quarry has been in operation for many years, and has not received any significant reported complaints from the closest neighbouring properties related to vibration and overpressure induced by the blasting operations. The peer review also notes that the blasting parameters and depth of the proposed extraction will remain the same as those presently employed in the existing licensed quarry.

The review advised that the recommendations of their drilling and blasting experts and consultants should be followed to address any complaints in a timely and professional manner and that on-going monitoring of blasting occur throughout the quarry operation to ensure that compliance is achieved. This monitoring requirement has been included on the ARA Operation Site Plan.

Air

RWDI prepared an air quality study entitled “Vinemount Quarry Expansion – Air Quality Assessment”, dated May 4, 2015. The report reviewed potential air quality emissions resulting from the proposed quarry extension, and compared them to provincial standards to determine if there would be any health or nuisance aspects arising from the proposed extension.

Based on the modelling, the Study concluded that there will be no health impacts expected from the proposed quarry extension. With regard to nuisance dust impacts, the Study found that there are a small number of residences that could be impacted, but that the proposed noise and dust berms will provide adequate mitigation. The Study also noted that Waterford must post on-site and implement the MOECC-approved Best Management Practices Plan for the Control of Fugitive Dust Emissions.
The Air Quality Study was peer reviewed by Jade Acoustics. The peer review was in agreement with the overall conclusions of the Study, but required some additional information and clarification which was subsequently provided to the satisfaction of the peer reviewer. The requirement to post and implement the Best Management Practices Plan has been included as a Note on the Operational Plan.

Archaeology

Archaeological Research Associates (ARA) prepared an archaeological assessment, entitled “Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment of the Vinemount Quarry Extension”, and dated July 3, 2014. As part of the assessment, four find spots were located, three of which were not recommended for further assessment. A Stage 3 Assessment was recommended in the fourth find spot (AhGw-294), located in the Phase 3 extraction area of the subject lands. Subsequently, the Ministry of Tourism, Sport and Culture (MTSC) approved a request by Waterford that the required Stage 3 Assessment not be undertaken until after the subject property is licensed, but to ensure protection of the site in the interim. The following Notes were added to the Operational Site Plan:

- A 20.0 metre Protection Area must be provided around the area and marked by a temporary barrier prior to the commencement of construction / extraction and be considered a “no-go” zone until the associated Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment report (and Stage 4 mitigation report, if required) has been accepted by the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports and revised recommendations are made;

- Within 50 metres of the Protective Area: Waterford must retain a licensed consultant archaeologist to monitor all construction activities occurring within 50 metres of the protected area;

- Waterford must instruct all on-site quarry employees and subcontractors that no construction activity can occur within 50 metres of the protected area unless a licensed consultant archaeologist is present;

- All grading and soil activities within 50 metres of the protected area must be inspected and monitored to verify the effectiveness of the avoidance and protection strategy;

- The Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS) must be notified immediately if alteration of the site is observed at any time during construction;
After grading and other soil disturbing activities within 50 metres of the protection area is completed, a licensed consultant archaeologist must inspect and report to the MTCS on the effectiveness of the avoidance strategy; and,

If any new archaeological remains are uncovered during construction, the licensed consultant archaeologist is empowered to stop construction. The consultant archaeologist, in consultation with Waterford and the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, will then conduct any follow-up archaeological assessment as deemed appropriate, whether it’s a Stage 3 assessment or Stage 4 mitigation of development impacts.

With the exception of the findspot AhGw-294 (and its protection area), the assessment received clearance on July 30, 2014 from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport for the remainder of the extension lands. In addition, Planning Staff, as part of the CART review, also reviewed the documents and are of the opinion that Findspot 1 will be adequately avoided and protected during any on-site disturbance. They concur with the assessment and MTCS that the balance of the lands may be considered partially cleared for the purposes of extraction with the exception of Findspot 1 and the corresponding buffer. Staff advise that Findspot 1 and its 20 metre protective buffer should be marked by a temporary barrier (silt fence) prior to the commencement of soil disturbance and that a licensed archaeologist should monitor all construction activities occurring within 50 m of the protected area. This has been included as a condition on the Site Plan Notes.

Agricultural Soil Assessment

DBH Soil Services Inc. prepared a soil survey in their report “Soil Survey and Canada Land Inventory (CLI) Classification”, dated April 2015. Their findings indicate that the property is characterized by three separate soil classifications including: a) Haldimand Silty Clay Loam, b) Lincoln Silty Clay Loam and c) Chinquacousy Silt Loam with the majority of the property defined as “disturbed soil” or low quality agricultural land. Only 18.4 percent of the subject lands are identified as being Class 1 – 3 soils within the Canada Land Inventory and those soils are found in three fragmented pockets, none of which is larger than 3.0 hectares. Notwithstanding that the subject lands were designated “Specialty Crop” in the Greenbelt Plan and the RHOP, DBH concluded that the soils identified on the subject lands have predominantly Poor, Very Poor and Unsuitable ratings for the production of specialty crops.
Agricultural Impact Assessment

DBH Soil Services Inc. prepared an Agricultural Impact Assessment in their report entitled “Waterford Sand and Gravel Limited – Vinemount Quarry Extension Agricultural Impact Assessment”, dated November 30, 2017. DBH evaluated operations and agricultural activities in a study area approximately 1 km radius from the proposed extension lands. The report documented the methodology, findings, conclusions and mapping that were completed for the Assessment. A total of six agricultural facilities were noted in the Study Area, with four facilities associated with cash crop operations, one with a vineyard and one facility with livestock. The remaining lands were described as areas in decline for agriculture, land fragmentation, non-local ownership and rural nonfarm residences. The proposed quarry extension is not expected to be a great source of an increase in traffic or an increase in traffic related impacts to agriculture as the transportation routes in the area are already well travelled by non-farm vehicles. Further, quarry traffic will continue to use the existing entrance/exit and haul routes, and that the tonnage limit will remain unchanged from the present condition. As well, the assessment indicated that there would be no agricultural water use impacts on any of the adjacent lands.

Cultural Heritage

The subject property does not contain any Built Heritage properties (e.g., properties designated under Part IV and Part V of the Ontario Heritage Act). There are no built heritage resources, categorized as per the above, within 50 m of the subject lands.

Based on all of the above, it is staff’s opinion that the applicant has addressed the requirements of the Rural Hamilton Official Plan with regard to the requirement to submit technical studies in support of the mineral aggregate application. These studies have been fully reviewed by members of CART, and peer reviewed where required. Thus, staff are supportive of the amendment to the RHOP in this regard.

4) Additional policies that must be considered with regard to evaluating the propose Official Plan Amendment relate to requirements for site rehabilitation. These policies are summarized in Appendix “D” to Report PED18029, and further considered herein.

Upon completion of extraction in approximately 25 to 30 years, the subject lands, including the existing quarry, are proposed to be rehabilitated to a lake and associated features, as rehabilitation to an agricultural standard is not possible or
desirable due to the extensive below water table extraction which will occur. This will occur naturally over several years as ground water and rain water fill the excavated area. The proposed lake and associated natural features (wetlands, woodlands, grasslands and other vegetated area) will contribute to the ecological function of the area, and has been planned in consideration of the surrounding area, including future rehabilitation plans of adjacent lands owned by Waterford. The plan includes the creation of the following:

- Approximately 80 ha of permanent lake when dewatering ceases and appropriate fish species to be introduced into the quarry to provide a food base for water birds;

- Offsite ecological linkages to the west associated with the Ash Swamp and grassy wetland will be maintained, widening of berms along the western and northern quarry extension and enhancement of meadow habitat off site to the north in the Vinemount Meadows Sanctuary to increase the extent of ecological linkages for grassland birds, pollinators and other wildlife;

- Native species planting of a wildlife corridor from the 991 Green Mountain Road pond;

- Ongoing partnership with Hamilton Naturalist Club to create and manage the 16 ha meadow nature sanctuary to the north on lands owned by Waterford;

- Approximately 4.6 ha for berms (3.0 – 6.0 m perimeter berms along the western boundary and 1.0 – 2.0 m high berms along the western and northern boundary which, after extraction will be retained with vegetated grass and herb covering to provide grassland bird and winter raptor habitat);

- Approximately 1.1 ha along the western portion, for a 4.0 high perimeter berm prior to extraction in Phase 3 is proposed to provide noise attenuation but after extraction is complete, the topsoil will be used for rehabilitation, and though the lands are only 15.0 m wide, will be available for agricultural use;

- 0.4 ha along the southern limit to be occupied by a 4.0 berm; and,

- 0.2 ha along the southern boundary will, in Phase 3, include a 7.0 m high berm extending across the entire frontage for noise, blasting, air quality and visual attenuation. After extraction, the lands will be returned to an agricultural use.
Provincial and local planning policies include requirements related to rehabilitation. With regard to mineral aggregate extraction on prime agricultural lands, the policy direction requires prime agricultural lands to be rehabilitated to an agricultural condition, except if a substantial amount of quarrying below the water table prohibits agricultural rehabilitation. In such a case, agricultural rehabilitation is not required, provided alternative locations were considered by the applicant and found unsuitable, and that agricultural rehabilitation in remaining areas (not below the water table) is maximized where possible.

For the proposed Vinemount extension, 83% percent (37.7 ha) of the extraction area will be below the water table. The 37.7 ha will be extracted / rehabilitated to a lake with the undisturbed balance limited to the north, west and south perimeter / fringe of the site. As a result, agricultural rehabilitation is not proposed. The remaining undisturbed balance (7.0 ha) of the lands that would not be extracted and not be rehabilitated to a lake will be rehabilitated to other uses which are discussed in the following section.

As required by the policy framework, the applicant has reviewed alternative locations for the proposed quarry extension. Not only did the applicant review alternate locations in proximity to the existing Vinemount Quarry, but also lands within a 35 miles radius from Hamilton City Hall (including Niagara Region, Brant County and Haldimand Region). Limiting the search for alternative sites to those in proximity to the existing quarry operations is justified and acceptable given the benefits in using existing haul routes, processing area and other infrastructure. The applicant notes in the Planning Justification Report that the lands to the east are owned by the City and referred to as 87-Acre Park and contain sensitive ecological features. The lands to the south contain eight separate parcels that are mostly rural residences and designated as Core Environmental Area and Greenbelt Natural Heritage System. These lands contain sensitive ecological features and are fragmented into smaller parcels and therefore are not suitable as extraction lands. Lands to the north are owned by Waterford and are designated Greenbelt Natural Heritage and do not have access from Tenth Road East and would necessitate the relocation of the Dofasco 2000 Trail and rerouting Forty Mile Creek. Even if appropriate access could be secured, the individual parcel is too small to warrant the up-front cost of the planning and licensing process. Finally, a parcel of land to the west is also owned by Waterford, and although these lands contain a similar quality of bedrock, quarrying these lands in advance of the subject lands (“skipping over the subject lands”) would be an illogical progression especially in terms of the required infrastructure to operate the quarry. As well, the western portion of the lands contain a Core (Environmental) Area Greenbelt Natural Heritage System. An additional parcel to the west and fronting onto Green Mountain Road has been
recently acquired by Waterford, but it is isolated by the Forty Mile Creek (South Branch) on the northern boundary and by a 20 m wide unopened road allowance on the east side. Finally, as an individual parcel, the parcel is too small to warrant extraction as the maximum extraction depth could not be achieved, resulting in sterilization of much of the bedrock material. As such, staff are satisfied that alternative locations were examined and not deemed to be preferred alternatives.

With regard to rehabilitation of the remaining area not below the water table, there is a benefit to rehabilitating these lands to natural features which will promote connectivity and biodiversity.

With regard to natural heritage features, the policies require that rehabilitation will be carried out to a state of equal or greater ecological value and that the long term integrity of the entire site shall be maintained or restored. The health and diversity of key natural heritage or hydrologic features shall be maintained or restored / improved, and remaining aquatic features after extraction shall be enhanced. In this regard, it is noted that the rehabilitation plan includes 7.7 ha that will not be extracted and will not be rehabilitated to a lake and will be rehabilitated to the following uses post extraction:

- A 4.6 ha area which are lands currently occupied by 3.0 – 6.0 m perimeter berms along the western boundary and 1.0 – 2.0 m high berms along the western and northern boundary of the site. Post extraction, they will be open space and integrated into the surrounding eco system and will be retained with vegetated grass and herb covering to provide grassland bird and winter raptor habitat. A 2.0 high berm along the northern perimeter boundary encompasses the documented Category 3 Bobolink Habitat;

- A 1.1 ha area along the western portion, currently in agricultural production, and where a 4.0 m high perimeter berm is proposed prior to Phase 3 for noise attenuation. Once extraction is completed and the berm removed, the topsoil will be used for rehabilitation and will be available for agricultural use even though they are only 15 m wide;

- A 0.4 ha along the southern frontage is occupied by an existing 4.0 high berm. An additional 0.2 ha area along the southern boundary is currently in agricultural production (row crops). Prior to extraction in Phase 3, the 4.0 m high berm will be increased in height to 7.0 m and enlarged so that it extends across the entire frontage to provide necessary noise / visual buffer attenuation. Post extraction, the berm will be removed with the material
5) An application to amend the Zoning By-law to permit the mineral aggregate use is also required. A license under the Aggregate Resources Act cannot be issued by the MNRF until such time as the site is appropriately zoned. The subject lands are currently zoned Agriculture “A1” Zone in the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200. In order to permit the aggregate use, the lands must be rezoned to the Extractive Industrial (M12) Zone in the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200.

The Extractive Industrial (M12) Zone contains regulations requiring minimum setbacks for excavation and buildings or structures from property lines, residential uses and street lines. The Zone also restricts the location of stockpiles in relation to residential uses and property lines, and further requires fencing around the perimeter of the licensed area, and a planting strip adjacent to a street line or a residential use. The applicant has indicated that they will conform to all of the M12 regulations.

6) Three letters have been received from local residents regarding the subject applications. The letters raise concerns related to blasting, dust and noise, impact on wells and water supply, impact on property value and compensation to land owners, impact on agricultural land (Attached in Appendix “G” to Report PED18029)
Blasting, Dust and Noise

The letters raised concerns over the potential impact of blasting (vibration), dust and noise on nearby homes resulting from the proposed extension. In this regard, staff note that technical studies have been completed and peer reviewed related to blasting (vibration), air quality (dust) and noise impact of the proposed extension. The studies recommend mitigation measures to be employed by Waterford which will ensure that the quarry operates within all applicable provincial guidelines related to vibration, air quality and noise. The mitigation measures include a combination of berming, restriction on hours of operation / equipment, restriction on location of certain machinery, and restriction on the size of blasts in proximity to residential uses. In addition, Waterford must employ and follow a Best Management Practices Plan for the mitigation of fugitive emissions.

Property Value

A concern was raised regarding the loss of property value resulting from the proposed quarry extension. While staff acknowledge this concern, it is noted that an aggregate operation already exists adjacent to the subject site. Staff have no empirical evidence to support the loss of property values resulting from the extension of the quarry.

Landscaping and Tree Protection

The letters raise concern over the impact of the quarry extension on the changes to the natural landscape and that trees will be removed and wildlife forced from their habitat. During the start-up stage of Phase 1, Waterford will plant a mixture of native deciduous and coniferous trees (red maple, sugar maple, red oak, white oak, honey locust, white spruce, blue spruce, larch and bald cypress) along the Green Mountain Road frontage every 20.0 metres to create a long-term shade canopy. The tree stock shall be a minimum of 1.5 metres in height at time of planting.

Haul Route and Maintaining Road Conditions

The letter raised concern over the poor road conditions along the designated truck route from the quarry caused by the heavy dump truck loads and numerous trips especially on Mud Road between 10th Road and Centennial Parkway. Staff note that designated truck routes are managed and maintained by the City who maintain the roads on a regular basis.
The letter also requested that berms be constructed along the entire perimeter of the existing and proposed quarry and that vegetation on the berms along Green Mountain Road and around the quarry perimeter include some deciduous trees as well as shrub clusters. As noted elsewhere in the report, berms will be constructed around the perimeter of the quarry and vegetation (vegetated grass and herb covering) will be planted and maintained to provide grassland bird and winter raptor habitat. With regards to the planting of trees and shrubs, 1.5 meter high boulevard trees will be planted (some have been already) along the Green Mountain Road frontage at the toe of the berm and include red maple, sugar maple, elm and black oak. Native trees and shrubs will be planted along the north side of Green Mountain Road along the frontage of the existing Vinemount Quarry frontage. This vegetation will be planted randomly in clusters and planted 2.0 metres on centre and include Serviceberry, Nannyberry, Gray Dogwood, High Bush Cranberry and White Cedar.

Steel Grating System

The letter requested that the steel grating system on the internal haul road be cleaned out whenever the accumulated debris reaches the bottom the grating. This has been done by Waterford and is part of their ongoing operations. They also requested more information about what whether any scrap will be stored within the existing quarry which is not the case.

Holding Annual Meetings

One letter raised concern about potentially cancelling the annual meetings that Waterford holds with the residents and that all property owners within 1 km should be invited. Waterford hosts an annual community meeting at the Stoney Creek Library each fall where they answer all questions and respond to issues raised. Also invited are MNRF, MOECC, the Ward Councillor and the City’s Traffic Department. In advance of the meeting, Waterford circulates a survey to nearby residents to inquire whether they have noted any negative changes over the past year that could be attributed to the operation of the quarry. As well, and as prescribed by the ARA, the quarry phone number is posted at the entrance / exit. If written or call-in complaints are received during the year, Waterford attempts to be responsive to each of their concerns. As part of the proposed extension, and as a condition of their license, annual meetings will continue based on a protocol in their Operational Plan (e.g., meeting held at least 30 days after the release of the annual groundwater monitoring report; 10 day notice of meeting; records of dates when portions of the primary haul route were swept; summary of complaints, etc.).
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It should be noted that Waterford representatives have been in contact with the three letter writers several times during the application process, as they were also objectors to the ARA licence, and Waterford advises that their concerns have been addressed. The letter writers have notified the MNRF by way of a sign-off letter that they are satisfied with the resolution of their concerns.

Alternatives for Consideration

If the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment are not approved, the subject lands could continue to be used for the uses permitted under the Agricultural “A1” Zone of the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law, including agricultural uses or one single detached dwelling per lot.

If the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment is not approved, the MNRF will not approve the license under the Aggregate Resources Act.

Alignment to the 2016 – 2025 Strategic Plan

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

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

Subject Property
1051 Green Mountain Road

Change in zoning from "A1" Agriculture to Extractive Industrial (M12) Zone
DRAFT Rural Hamilton Official Plan
Amendment No. X

The following text, together with Appendix “A” – Site Specific Key Map – Volume 3: Appendix A, attached hereto, constitutes Official Plan Amendment No. X to the Rural Hamilton Official Plan.

1.0 Purpose and Effect:

The purpose and effect of this amendment is to create a new site specific policy to permit the extension of the Vinemount Quarry.

2.0 Location:

The lands affected by this Amendment are a portion of the lands located northwest of the intersection Green Mountain Road East and Tenth Road East, known municipally as 1051 Green Mountain Road East, in the former City of Stoney Creek.

3.0 Basis:

The amendment allows for the subject lands to be utilized for mineral aggregate extraction as an extension to the existing Vinemount Quarry. The basis for permitting this amendment is as follows:

- The proposal has undergone a thorough technical review by the Combined Aggregate Review Team, comprising City staff, outside agencies, and peer reviewers.

- The proposal includes appropriate provisions to ensure protection of the natural environment and to minimize impacts to surrounding agricultural uses and residents.

- The Provincial Policy Statement and Greenbelt Plan do not allow lands to be removed from a Specialty Crop designation. Therefore, the subject lands will remain in the Agriculture designation with a site specific policy added to permit mineral aggregate extraction.

- The proposal is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 and conforms to the Greenbelt Plan, 2017.
4.0 Actual Changes:

4.1 Volume 3 – Special Policy and Site Specific Areas

Text Changes

4.1.1 Chapter B – Rural Site Specific Areas

That Volume 3 – Chapter B - Rural Site Specific Areas be amended by adding a new site specific policy to a portion of the lands, as follows:

“R-XX Part of lands known municipally 1051 Green Mountain Road East, former City of Stoney Creek

1.0 In addition to the uses permitted in Volume 1, Sections D.2.0 – Agriculture Designation and D.3.0 – Specialty Crop Designation, the lands known municipally as part of 1051 Green Mountain Road East, designated Specialty Crop on Schedule “D”, and identified as Site Specific Policy R-XX, may also be used for the extraction of mineral aggregate resources and related accessory uses, in accordance with Volume 1, Policy D.6.4 and a license issued under the Aggregate Resources Act.”

Schedules and Appendices

4.1.2 Appendices

That Volume 3: Appendix A – Site Specific Key Map, be amended by identifying a portion of the lands known municipally as 1051 Green Mountain Road East as Site Specific Area R-XX 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 Amendment is Schedule “1” to By-law No. _____ passed on the XX day of Month, 2018.

The
City of Hamilton

____________________________  ______________________________
F. Eisenberger               Rose Caterini
MAYOR                       CITY CLERK
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 of the former Municipalities identified in Section 1.7 of By-law No. 05-200;

WHEREAS the first stage of Zoning By-law, being By-law No. 05-200 came into force and effect on the 25th day of May, 2005;

WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton, in adopting item XX of Report 18029 of the Planning Committee, at its meeting held on the 6th Day of February, 2018 recommended that Zoning By-law No. 05-200 be amended as hereinafter provided; and,

WHEREAS this By-law amendment is in conformity with the Rural Hamilton Official Plan.

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

1. That Map Nos. 1514, 1515, 1561, 1562, 1606 and 1607 on Schedule “A” – Zoning Maps, to Zoning By-law No. 05-200, is amended by incorporating additional Extractive Industrial (M12) Zone, on the lands the extent and boundaries 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.
3. That this by-law No. XXX shall come into force and deemed to come into force in accordance with Subsection 34(21) of the Planning Act, either upon the date of passage of the By-law or as otherwise provided by the said subsection.

PASSED this _______ day of __________, 2018.

_________________________________  ________________________________
F. Eisenberger                        Rose Caterini
          MAYOR                          City Clerk
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**Theme: Rural Areas and Rural Lands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Policy References</th>
<th>Rationale for Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Provincial Policy Statement, 2014 | 1.1.4.1 Healthy, integrated and viable *rural areas* should be supported by:  
  a) building upon rural character, and leveraging rural amenities and assets;  
  f) promoting diversification of the economic base and employment opportunities through goods and services, including value-added products and the sustainable management or use of resources;  
  h) conserving biodiversity and considering the ecological benefits provided by nature;  
  i) providing opportunities for economic activities in *prime agricultural areas*, in accordance with policy 2.3. | The PPS differentiates between Rural Areas, Rural Lands and Prime Agricultural Areas. Rural Areas are the lands outside of the urban boundary which incorporate Rural Lands (non-prime) and Prime Agricultural Lands. Different levels of protection apply depending on whether the lands are Prime or non-prime (Rural). Vinemount Quarry is located in a Prime Agricultural Area. The policies identify that a variety of land uses shall be permitted on rural (non-prime) lands, including agriculture, rural residential, management or use of resources, and other rural uses. The proposed quarry extension is a permitted use, expanding the economic base and employment opportunities of the rural area. The proposed quarry extension is estimated to have 22 million tons of bedrock material that will be available to supply the local Hamilton market over the next 25 years and therefore provide economic opportunities in the local and provincial economy through employment. It will provide construction material close to market source and thereby reduce transportation costs. Appropriate studies (summarized in Appendix “E” to Report PED18029) have been completed to ensure that surrounding land uses and the natural environment are protected and any impacts are mitigated. |
| 1.1.5.2 On *rural lands* located in municipalities, permitted uses are:  
  a) the management or use of resources;  
  c) limited residential development;  
  e) cemeteries; and  
  f) other rural land uses |  
| Greenbelt Plan, 2017 | 3.1.4 For lands falling within *rural lands* of the Protected Countryside, the following policies shall apply:  
  1. *Rural lands* support and provide the primary locations for a range of recreational, tourism, institutional (including cemetery) and resource-based commercial / industrial uses. They also contain many historic highway commercial, non-farm residential and other uses which, in more recent times, would | The subject lands are designated “Specialty Crop” in the RHOP. The plan acknowledges that non-agricultural uses, including mineral aggregate operations (section 4.3) may be permitted. |
be generally directed to *settlement areas* but which are recognized as *existing uses* by this Plan and allowed to continue and expand subject to the policies of section 4.5. Notwithstanding this policy, official plans may be more restrictive than this Plan with respect to the types of uses permitted on *rural lands*, subject to the policies of section 5.3.

4. Other uses may be permitted subject to the policies of sections 4.1 to 4.6. Where non-agricultural uses are proposed, with the exception of a *mineral aggregate operation*, the completion of an *agricultural impact assessment* should be considered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHOP</th>
<th>C.3.1.1 The following uses shall be permitted in all land use designations as set out in the policies below:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td><em>Mineral aggregate resource</em> operations shall be permitted by amendment to this Plan provided the proposed mineral aggregate extraction use complies with Section D.6.0, Mineral Aggregate Resource Extraction Areas and Section C.2.6-Natural Heritage System - Mineral Aggregate Operations policies of this Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The subject lands are designated “Specialty Crop” in the RHOP. An Official Plan Amendment is required to permit the mineral aggregate use on the subject lands.
**Theme: Prime Agricultural Lands**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Policy References</th>
<th>Rationale for Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Policy Statement</td>
<td>2.3.1 <em>Prime agricultural areas</em> shall be protected for long-term use for agriculture. <em>Prime agricultural areas</em> are areas where <em>prime agricultural lands</em> predominate. <em>Specialty crop areas</em> shall be given the highest priority for protection, followed by Canada Land Inventory Class 1, 2, and 3 lands, and any associated Class 4 through 7 lands within the <em>prime agricultural area</em>, in this order of priority.</td>
<td>Prime agricultural areas are afforded the highest degree of protection in planning policy. Lands cannot be redesignated from Prime Agriculture to another designation. However, policy 2.3.6.1 does allow for certain non-agricultural uses to be permitted in Prime Agricultural areas, including mineral aggregate extraction, subject to policies in section 2.5, discussed below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.3.1 In <em>prime agricultural areas</em>, permitted uses and activities are: <em>agricultural uses</em>, <em>agriculture-related uses</em> and <em>on-farm diversified uses</em>.</td>
<td>It is noted that the policies do not allow for the redesignation of Prime Agricultural lands to a Mineral Aggregate designation. Rather, the policy direction requires that the mineral aggregate use be added to the Prime Agriculture designation so that the lands do not lose the Prime Agriculture designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.5.1 Planning authorities may only exclude land from <em>prime agricultural areas</em> for expansions of or identification of <em>settlement areas</em> in accordance with policy 1.1.3.8.</td>
<td>As such, and because the subject lands are designated Specialty Crop and are considered Prime agricultural lands, a Site Specific Policy will be added to the subject lands in the RHOP to permit the mineral aggregate use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3.6.1 Planning authorities may only permit non-agricultural uses in <em>prime agricultural areas</em> for:</td>
<td>Notwithstanding that the lands are designated Specialty Crop Area, the soil survey study by DBH Soil Services concluded that the site soils have a predominately “Poor, Very Poor and Unsuitable’ rating for the production of specialty crops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) extraction of <em>minerals, petroleum resources</em> and <em>mineral aggregate resources</em>, in accordance with policies 2.4 and 2.5;</td>
<td>Approximately 7.3 hectares (about 18%) of the subject lands were classified as Prime Agricultural Lands (Class 2), but it is fragmented into three separate and discontinuous pockets of land. An additional 15.2 hectares (38%) contain soils being Class 4 through 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelt Plan</td>
<td>3.1.3 For lands falling within <em>prime agricultural areas</em> of the Protected Countryside, the following policies shall apply:</td>
<td>The subject lands are designated “Specialty Crop – Prime Agricultural” in accordance with the City’s RHOP designations. Prime agricultural areas are to be protected for agricultural uses. However, the Plan allows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. All types, sizes and intensities of <em>agricultural uses and normal</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
farm practices shall be promoted and protected and a full range of agricultural uses, agriculture-related uses and on-farm diversified uses are permitted based on provincial Guidelines on Permitted Uses in Ontario’s Prime Agricultural Areas. Proposed agriculture-related uses and on-farm diversified uses shall be compatible with and shall not hinder surrounding agricultural operations.

3. Non-agricultural uses may be permitted subject to the policies of sections 4.2 to 4.6. These uses are generally discouraged in prime agricultural areas and may only be permitted after the completion of an agricultural impact assessment.

5. Where agricultural uses and non-agricultural uses interface, land use compatibility shall be achieved by avoiding or, where avoidance is not possible, minimizing and mitigating adverse impacts on the Agricultural System, based on provincial guidance. Where mitigation is required, measures should be incorporated as part of the non-agricultural uses, as appropriate, within the area being developed.

4.1.1 For non-agricultural uses, the following policies apply:

1. Non-agricultural uses are not permitted in the specialty crop areas as shown on Schedule 2 and Schedule 3 of this Plan or within prime agricultural areas in the Protected Countryside, with the exception of those uses permitted under sections 4.2 to 4.6 of this Plan.

2. Proposals for non-agricultural uses must demonstrate that:

   a) The use is appropriate for location on rural lands;

   b) The type of water and sewer servicing proposed is appropriate for the type of use;

   c) There are no negative impacts on key natural heritage features or key hydrologic features or their functions; and

   d) There are no negative impacts on the biodiversity or
The following uses shall be permitted in all land use designations as set out in the policies below:

d) Mineral aggregate resource operations shall be permitted by amendment to this Plan provided the proposed mineral aggregate extraction use complies with Section D.6.0, Mineral Aggregate Resource Extraction Areas and Section C.2.6- Natural Heritage System - Mineral Aggregate Operations policies of this Plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHOP</th>
<th>C.3.1.1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The following uses shall be permitted in all land use designations as set out in the policies below:</td>
<td>As noted above, an Official Plan Amendment is required to permit the mineral aggregate use on the subject lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) Mineral aggregate resource operations shall be permitted by amendment to this Plan provided the proposed mineral aggregate extraction use complies with Section D.6.0, Mineral Aggregate Resource Extraction Areas and Section C.2.6- Natural Heritage System - Mineral Aggregate Operations policies of this Plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Theme: Mineral Aggregate Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Policy References</th>
<th>Rationale for Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Provinical Policy    | 2.5.1  
Mineral aggregate resources shall be protected for long-term use and, where provincial information is available, deposits of mineral aggregate resources shall be identified. | Provincial planning policy affords a high degree of protection to mineral aggregate resources, and encourages mineral aggregate resources to be made available as close to market as possible. Map 5 of the former Region of Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan “Mineral Aggregate Resource Areas” identifies the subject lands as being within an isolated “Stone Aggregates” area (Note: Map 5 still applies because Schedule C of the RHOP which identifies Potential Mineral Aggregate Resource Area remains under appeal). |
| Statement            | 2.5.2.1  
As much of the mineral aggregate resources as is realistically possible shall be made available as close to markets as possible. Demonstration of need for mineral aggregate resources, including any type of supply / demand analysis, shall not be required, notwithstanding the availability, designation or licensing for extraction of mineral aggregate resources locally or elsewhere. | The submitted Planning Justification Report notes that the extracted material will be used in the local construction and road building markets of east Hamilton and other markets within the Niagara Peninsula. Accessing the bedrock resources underlying the subject lands will continue to provide quality aggregate resources to the local market. |
|                      | 2.5.2.2  
Extraction shall be undertaken in a manner which minimizes social, economic and environmental impacts. | The policies require that extraction be undertaken in a responsible manner, minimizing social, economic and environmental impacts. Waterford has undertaken a significant number of studies to demonstrate that potential impacts from the quarry will be mitigated to the greatest extent possible and provided specific recommendations with respect to potential social and environmental impacts. |

To protect the residents in the vicinity of the quarry, Noise, Blasting, and Air Quality studies were completed.

From a noise perspective, the study found that with proper berming and operational restrictions on certain equipment, it is possible to mitigate noise impacts to acceptable levels.
With regard to blasting and vibration impacts, the proposed restrictions on blasting procedures in proximity to residential dwellings will result in vibration levels being below provincial standards.

With regard to air quality, the study reviewed levels of several potential contaminants resulting from the blasting, and found that all contaminant levels would be below provincial criterion (with berming in place) and that there would be no health impacts from the proposed quarry extension.

Waterford also has a Best Management Practices Plan for Dust Control which is in use at its existing quarry.

Finally to protect the Natural Environment, mitigation measures include rehabilitation plans on the floor of the existing quarry (soil replacement, vegetation planting, habitat creation) as an interim measure until dewatering ceases and the quarry fills with water to form a 20-25 metre deep lake and fish will be introduced to provide a food base for water birds; long term ecological habitat enhancement on lands they own abutting the subject lands by partnering with the Hamilton Naturalist Club to develop the Vinemount Meadows Sanctuary to provide long-term birding habitat; creating two small shallow ponds on the floor of the existing Quarry to mitigate the loss of two on-site ponds; and wooden nesting boxes will be installed to attract Peregrine Falcons and Common Ravens away from the west quarry wall. Bat roost and bat maternity / nursery structures will be installed at the Vinemount Meadows Sanctuary, vegetating grass and herb covering the berms shall be maintained to provide grassland bird and winter raptor habitat, and creating a snake hibernaculum at 991 Green Mountain Road to compensate for an existing snake hibernaculum on the subject lands.
### Greenbelt Plan

4.3.2 For lands within the Protected Countryside, the following policies shall apply:

1. Non-renewable resources are those non-agriculture-based natural resources that have a finite supply, including mineral aggregate resources. Aggregates, in particular, provide significant building materials for our communities and infrastructure, and the availability of aggregates close to market is important for both economic and environmental reasons.

2. Activities related to the use of non-renewable resources are permitted in the Protected Countryside, subject to all other applicable legislation, regulations and official plan policies and by-laws. The availability of mineral aggregate resources for long-term use shall be determined in accordance with the PPS, except as provided below.

### RHOP

**D.6.1** Mineral Aggregate Resource Areas where there is a high potential for resource extraction are identified as Potential Mineral Aggregate Resource Areas on (Appendix / Schedule C – Non renewable Resources – deferred – until the deferral is resolved, Map No. 5 of the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan shall apply), to this Plan.

**D.6.12** Applications for new or expanded aggregate operations are subject to the requirements of the Aggregate Resources Act.

**D.6.13** The establishment of a new mineral aggregate operation or extensions to existing operations requiring license approval under the Aggregate Resources Act will require an amendment to this Plan and the Zoning By-law and the Niagara Escarpment Plan, where applicable.

**D.6.16** The City shall consider an amendment to this Plan to redesignate lands for a new mineral aggregate operation or the expansion to an existing operation when the applicant has submitted all of the above studies for review by staff and CART (and peer review where required). Results of these studies are reviewed in detail in Appendix “E” to Report PED18029 and highlighted in the Analysis and

- The above studies were peer reviewed, and the recommendations from the studies are included as notes on the ARA Operational Plan.
- Mineral aggregate resource extraction is subject to the policies of section 4.3 (Non-Renewable Resources). As noted above, the subject lands are not located within the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System, and therefore policies relating specifically to lands within the Natural Heritage System do not apply.
- The Greenbelt Plan permits mineral aggregate extraction within the Protected Countryside, subject to compliance with all other policies and legislation.

The subject lands are identified as Potential Stone Aggregates on Appendix “C” to the RHOP. However, this Appendix remains under appeal, and until the appeal is resolved, Map No. 5 of the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan continues to apply. In this regard, the subject lands are identified as Stone Aggregates area on Map No. 5 to the Region of Hamilton-Wentworth Plan.

Section D.6 identifies the requirements that must accompany an application for the extension of an existing mineral aggregate operation, including an environmental impact study, hydrogeological study, transportation study and noise, vibration and air quality studies. As previously noted, the applicant has submitted all of the above studies for review by staff and CART (and peer review where required). Results of these studies are reviewed in detail in Appendix “E” to Report PED18029 and highlighted in the Analysis and
 submitted all site plans and studies required under the Aggregate Resources Act as well as the following:

a) All Environmental Impact Studies required by this Plan in accordance with Section F.3.2.1, Environmental Impact Statements and Section C.2.6, Natural Heritage System - Mineral Aggregate Operations. In the event of a conflict Section C.2.6 shall prevail;

b) A hydrogeological study;

c) A transportation and haul route study; and

d) Noise, vibration, and air quality studies.

D.6.17 The City shall work with adjacent municipalities, agencies, the Province, the aggregate industry and other stakeholders to encourage the best design and operational practices in licensed aggregate extraction operations.

D.6.20 The City shall coordinate with the Province, the Niagara Escarpment Commission and Conservation Authorities, to ensure that all appropriate conditions resulting from the review of studies required under the Aggregate Resources Act are imposed and enforced as:

a) Conditions of the license or notes on the Site Plan in accordance with the Aggregate Resources Act;

Rationale for Recommendation Section of this Report.

Throughout the review of the applications, the City has worked with the Province, other agencies and the applicant to determine the best operational practices for the proposed extension, with all recommendations being reflected on the ARA Operational Site Plan.
### Theme: Rehabilitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Policy References</th>
<th>Rationale for Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Policy</td>
<td>2.5.3.1 Progressive and final rehabilitation shall be required to accommodate subsequent land uses, to promote land use compatibility, to recognize the interim nature of extraction, and to mitigate negative impacts to the extent possible. Final rehabilitation shall take surrounding land use and approved land use designations into consideration.</td>
<td>Additional considerations apply to rehabilitation of mineral aggregate operations in Prime Agricultural Areas. The policies promote rehabilitation of Prime Agricultural lands back to an agricultural use. However, subject to certain criteria outlined in policy 2.5.4.1, complete agricultural rehabilitation is not required if significant extraction below the water table is required, other alternatives have been considered, and agricultural rehabilitation is maximized where possible. The Hydrogeological Study confirmed that the groundwater elevation of the subject lands is approximately 2.0 metres below grade, and the bedrock material extends 25.0 metres lower and therefore, below water table extraction is necessary and the depth of planned extraction makes restoration of pre-extraction agricultural capability unfeasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>2.5.3.2 Comprehensive rehabilitation planning is encouraged where there is a concentration of mineral aggregate operations.</td>
<td>Any progressive rehabilitation (e.g., soil replacement, vegetation planting, habitat creation), that occurs during the life of the Vinemount Quarry Extension will be temporary since once the quarry is completed and dewatering stopped, those rehabilitation efforts will eventually be flooded and remain at the bottom of a 25 m deep lake. However, since the proposed quarry will be operating for at least 25 years, temporary rehabilitation efforts will be undertaken at the bottom of the existing adjacent quarry floor to the east. The final land use of a lake is in keeping with the existing water features within the City of Hamilton 87-Acre pond to the east which was the result of past quarrying activity there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5.4.1 In prime agricultural areas, on prime agricultural land, extraction of mineral aggregate resources is permitted as an interim use provided that the site will be rehabilitated back to an agricultural condition. Complete rehabilitation to an agricultural condition is not required if:</td>
<td>As for b), the Hydrological Study confirms that quality of the insitu bedrock for commercial use and the Planning Justification Report details calculations related to the substantial volume of the aggregate underlying the site – 22 MT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) outside of a specialty crop area, there is a substantial quantity of mineral aggregate resources below the water table warranting extraction, or the depth of planned extraction in a quarry makes restoration of pre-extraction agricultural capability unfeasible;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) in a specialty crop area, there is a substantial quantity of high quality mineral aggregate resources below the water table warranting extraction, and the depth of planned extraction makes restoration of pre-extraction agricultural capability unfeasible;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) other alternatives have been considered by the applicant and found unsuitable. The consideration of other alternatives shall include resources in areas of Canada Land Inventory Class 4 through 7 lands, resources on lands identified as designated growth areas, and resources on prime agricultural lands where rehabilitation is feasible. Where no other alternatives are found, prime agricultural lands shall be protected in this order of priority: specialty crop areas, Canada Land Inventory</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class 1, 2 and 3 lands; and
d) agricultural rehabilitation in remaining areas is maximized.

Discussion of the site Rehabilitation can be found in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation Section of this Report.

Further to policy 2.5.4.1(c) above, the applicant has reviewed alternative locations for the proposed quarry extension. Limiting the search for alternative sites to those in proximity to the existing quarry operations is justified and acceptable given the benefits in using existing entrance, existing haul routes, processing area (crushing, screening, loading, scale house) and other infrastructure.

The applicant notes in the Planning Justification Report that lands to the east are the existing Vinemount Quarry (License 5463 and License 103139) which are currently being extracted with an estimated 4 years of reserves remaining. Further to the east are lands owned by the City of Hamilton, “87-Acre Park” of which a large portion is designated Core (Environmental) Area and Greenbelt Natural Heritage System. Further to the east are a block of eight separate parcels that are mostly rural residences and are designated as Core (Environmental) and Greenbelt Natural Heritage System and do not have potential because of the sensitive ecological features, and fragmented nature of the lands.

Lands to the north of the subject lands are owned by Waterford and are located north of the Dofasco Trail and are designated Greenbelt Natural Heritage. They do not have road access from Tenth Road East. Any access would involve the relocation of the Dofasco Trail. The parcel is considered too small to warrant the up-front cost of planning and licensing. Lands to the north west are owned by others and designated Core (Environmental and Greenbelt Natural Heritage), do not have legal road access from Eighth or Tenth Road and would necessitate the relocation of the Dofasco Trail.
Lands to the west are owned by Waterford and considered high quality but would involve skipping over the subject lands which would not be a logical progression in terms of the required infrastructure to operate the quarry and to continue to use the existing Tenth Road East entrance / exit. As well, the western portion contains Core (Environmental) Area Greenbelt Natural Heritage System. Another parcel to the south of the one noted above is owned by Waterford and is isolated by the Forty Mile Creek (South Branch) on the northern boundary and by a 20 metre wide City of Hamilton unopened road allowance. As a single parcel, the site is too small to warrant extraction as the maximum extraction depth could not be achieved.

As such, staff are satisfied that alternative locations were examined and not deemed to be preferred alternatives. Finally, in relation to 2.5.4.1(d), as noted above, the majority of the extraction will take place below the water table. The perimeter surrounding the extraction site will not be extracted below the water table. However, agricultural lands outside the extraction area would be limited to the narrow setbacks between the property line and the extraction limit and using these lands for agricultural production would not be practical. Instead, the existing berms that are situated in these setbacks have been determined to be existing habitat for grassland birds.

There is a benefit to rehabilitating these lands to natural features which will promote connectivity and biodiversity for the lake feature. Further, the Soil study determined that the subject lands do not meet the minimum quality characteristics to support the growing of specialty crops. The lands will not be returned to an agricultural use but rather become part of an 80 hectare lake in conjunction with existing Vinemount quarry lands to the east.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenbelt</th>
<th>4.3.2.5 New and existing <em>mineral aggregate operations</em> and wayside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Detailed discussion of the Rehabilitation Plan is provided</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan</td>
<td>pits and quarries within the Protected Countryside shall ensure that:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) The rehabilitated area will be maximized and disturbed area minimized on an ongoing basis during the life cycle of an operation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) Progressive and final rehabilitation efforts will contribute to the goals of the Greenbelt Plan;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) Any excess disturbed area above the maximum allowable disturbed area, as determined by the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry, will be rehabilitated. For new operations, the total disturbed area shall not exceed an established maximum allowable disturbed area; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d) The applicant demonstrates that the quantity and quality of groundwater and surface water will be maintained as per Provincial Standards under the Aggregate Resources Act.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHOP</th>
<th>Rehabilitation of all mineral aggregate operations, including wayside pits and quarries shall be undertaken in accordance with the site plans approved under the Aggregate Resources Act and be compatible with and have minimal impact upon the surrounding natural and visual environment and existing uses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D.6.21</td>
<td>The subject lands are designated “Specialty Crop”, which represents prime agricultural lands. Please refer to the discussion above under the Provincial Policy Statement, policy 2.5.4.1 regarding consideration of Rehabilitation in Prime Agricultural lands.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D.6.23</th>
<th>In the Agriculture designation, on prime agricultural land, extraction of mineral aggregate resources is permitted as an interim use provided the rehabilitation of the site will be carried out to substantially the same area and average soil quality for agriculture.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The proposed end land use is a lake, as rehabilitation to an agricultural standard is not possible or desirable due to the extensive below water table extraction which will occur. The proposed lake and associated natural features (wetlands, woodlands, grasslands and other vegetated area) will contribute to the ecological function of the area, and has been planned in consideration of the surrounding area, including future rehabilitation plans of adjacent aggregate operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On prime agricultural lands, complete agricultural rehabilitation is not required if:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) A substantial quantity of mineral aggregate resources below the water table warranting extraction, or the depth of planned extraction in a quarry makes restoration of pre-extraction agricultural capability unfeasible;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>As previously noted, the proposed end land use is a lake, as rehabilitation to an agricultural standard is not possible or desirable due to the extensive below water table extraction which will occur. The proposed lake and associated natural features (wetlands, woodlands, grasslands and other vegetated area) will contribute to the ecological function of the area, and has been planned in consideration of the surrounding area, including future rehabilitation plans of adjacent aggregate operations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) Alternative locations have been considered by the applicant and found unsuitable. The consideration of other alternatives shall include resources in areas of Canada Land Inventory Class 4 to 7 soils, resources identified in designated growth areas, and resources on prime agricultural land where rehabilitation is feasible. Where no other alternatives are found, prime agricultural lands shall be protected in this order of priority: Specialty Crop Areas, and Canada Land Inventory Class 1, 2 and 3 lands; and

c) Agricultural rehabilitation in remaining areas is maximized.

D.6.24 Applications for Official Plan or Zoning By-law amendments for establishment or expansion of a mineral aggregate operation within the Protected Countryside shall be accompanied by information which demonstrates that rehabilitation will be carried out as follows:

a) The disturbed area of a site shall be rehabilitated to a state of equal or greater ecological value, and the long-term ecological integrity of the entire site will be maintained or restored, and to the extent possible improved;

b) If there are key natural heritage features or key hydrologic features or if such features existed on the site at the time of application:

i) The health, diversity and size of these key natural heritage features and key hydrologic features will be maintained or restored and, to the extent possible, improved so as to promote a net gain of ecological health; and

ii) Any permitted extraction of mineral aggregates that occurs in a feature will be completed, and the area will be rehabilitated, as early as possible in the life of the operation; and

C) Aquatic areas remaining after extraction are to be
rehabilitated to enhance aquatic areas which shall be representative of the natural ecosystem suitable for the eco-district, so that the combined terrestrial and aquatic rehabilitation in remaining areas shall meet the intent of Section D.6.24 b).
Theme: Natural Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Policy References</th>
<th>Rationale for Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Policy Statement</td>
<td>2.1.1 Natural features and areas shall be protected for the long term.</td>
<td>The applicant submitted an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Level 1 &amp; 2 Natural Environment Technical Reports prepared by Dance Environmental, in support of the proposed quarry extension. The report also addresses the conclusions of on-site snake monitoring by North-South Environmental and two other supplementary environmentally related reports including, Aquatic Resources Inventory by WSP and a Tree Preservation Plan by IBI.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2 The diversity and connectivity of natural features in an area, and the long-term ecological function and biodiversity of natural heritage systems, should be maintained, restored or, where possible, improved, recognizing linkages between and among natural heritage features and areas, surface water features and ground water features.</td>
<td>In regards to Policy 2.1.2, the north, west and south boundary of the subject lands will be bermed which have been identified for use by grass-land birds. These bern profiles will remain after the quarry is completed and the buffer lands returned to grass-land bird habitat. Within the west and north setbacks is the realigned (1949) Forty Mile Creek. Several species of fish within the west and north setbacks were identified and no activity will occur within or near the creek which will also be supported by 5.0 m vegetated buffers where no activity including bern construction will occur. Erosion Control measures such as siltation fencing will also be instituted. A 40 m setback will be established between the Creek and quarry blasting. Waterford has also partnered with the Hamilton Naturalist Club in the development of a site for ecological habitat enhancement on a 26.3 hectare parcel that Waterford owns to the north of the proposed extension. These lands, called the “Vinemount Meadows Sanctuary” will provide long-term public access to habitat for grassland bird habitat and pollinators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3 Natural heritage systems shall be identified in Ecoregions 6E &amp; 7E1, recognizing that natural heritage systems will vary in size and form in settlement areas, rural areas, and prime agricultural areas.</td>
<td>In regards to Policy 2.1.3, the EIS and Natural Environment Report identified that several ecological functions exist on the site and / or within 120 m of the site and assessed against the future quarry operations. The EIS provided several recommendations to address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.4 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in: a) significant wetlands in Ecoregions 5E, 6E and 7E1; and b) significant coastal wetlands.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.5 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in: b) significant woodlands in Ecoregions 6E and 7E (excluding islands in Lake Huron and the St. Marys River); c) significant valleylands in Ecoregions 6E and 7E (excluding islands in Lake Huron and the St. Marys River); d) significant wildlife habitat; e) significant areas of natural and scientific interest; and unless it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.6 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in fish habitat except in accordance with provincial and federal requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.7 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted in habitat of endangered species and threatened species, except in accordance with provincial and federal requirements.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1.8 Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on adjacent lands to the natural heritage features and areas identified in policies 2.1.4, 2.1.5, and 2.1.6 unless the ecological function of the adjacent lands has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or on their ecological functions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In regard to Policy 2.1.4, a provincially significant wetland (Vinemount South Swamp) exists within 120m of the subject site. Potential impacts have been investigated and will be mitigated. A Monitoring Plan will be implemented.

In regard to Policy 2.1.5, woodlands (Deciduous woodland) and significant wildlife habitat (Milksnake, Monarch Butterfly, Peregrine Falcon, Short-Eared Owl etc.) exist on the site and/or within 120 m. The EIS assessed these features against the proposed quarry operation and potential impacts to the significant woodlands and wildlife habitat have been addressed or mitigated, subject to their recommendations.

The study confirmed that an ANSI has been identified which is the underlying Vinemount bedrock formation in the existing Vinemount quarry. The proposed quarrying activity will provide an opportunity for additional exposure of this bedrock feature. However, once dewatering ceases and the quarry fills with water, this ANSI will be submerged. This is acceptable to the MNRF.

In regard to Policy 2.1.6, several species of fish were identified in the realigned Forty Mile Creek and, as discussed above, no activity will occur in the creek and suitable berms and vegetated buffers will be put in place. As well, there is a small .02 hectare man-made pond located along the western boundary (the West Pond) with Brassy Minnow being observed. This pond will be removed and existing fish will be relocated to the Forty Mile Creek, subject to consultation with Department of Fisheries and Oceans (DFO).

In regard to Policy 2.1.7, habitat of endangered and threatened species exist on the site and subject to the Recommendations provided in the EIS and Technical Reports, potential impacts to the habitat of endangered
and threatened species have been addressed and/or mitigated.

In regard to Policy 2.1.8, natural heritage features exist on the site and/or within 120 m, and subject to the recommendations provided in the Report, potential negative impacts to the natural features and their ecological functions have been addressed and/or mitigated.

The applicant has consulted with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Fisheries, and confirmed that the habitat may be removed, provided that suitable replacement habitat is created off-site, in accordance with the *Endangered Species Act*. The applicant has initiated a Notice of Activity with the MNRF to initiate this process. Suitable notes have been placed on the Operational Plan in this regard.

| Greenbelt Plan | N/A | The subject lands are not located within the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System, as defined. While the subject lands do contain a key natural heritage feature (habitat of endangered species and threatened species) and a key hydrologic feature (wetland – not provincially significant), the policies of section 3.2.5 indicate that aggregate operations shall be governed by section 4 (Natural Resources) regarding key natural heritage and key hydrologic features. |
| RHOP | C.2.6.1 | Tables C.2.6-1 and C.2.6-2 in conjunction with Sections C.2.6.1 to C.2.6.5 shall apply to a new *mineral aggregate operation*, an expansion to an existing *mineral aggregate operation*, a new wayside pit and quarry located in the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside, both inside and outside the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System, or outside the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside. Section C.2.6 identifies restrictions on the location of new or expanding mineral aggregate operations depending on the type of feature(s) on or in the vicinity of the subject lands. In the case of the subject applications, Table C.2.6.2 is applicable as the applications are for an extension to an existing quarry, outside of the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System. The table indicates that an expansion to an existing operation is not permitted within significant habitat of threatened or endangered species or within significant wetlands (both denoted by ‘C’ in the
| | C.2.6.2 | Tables C.2.6-1 and C.2.6-2 cross reference the type of *mineral aggregate operation* use, with natural heritage features, areas

| RHOP | C.2.6.1 | Tables C.2.6-1 and C.2.6-2 in conjunction with Sections C.2.6.1 to C.2.6.5 shall apply to a new *mineral aggregate operation*, an expansion to an existing *mineral aggregate operation*, a new wayside pit and quarry located in the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside, both inside and outside the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System, or outside the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside. Section C.2.6 identifies restrictions on the location of new or expanding mineral aggregate operations depending on the type of feature(s) on or in the vicinity of the subject lands. In the case of the subject applications, Table C.2.6.2 is applicable as the applications are for an extension to an existing quarry, outside of the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System. The table indicates that an expansion to an existing operation is not permitted within significant habitat of threatened or endangered species or within significant wetlands (both denoted by ‘C’ in the
| | C.2.6.2 | Tables C.2.6-1 and C.2.6-2 cross reference the type of *mineral aggregate operation* use, with natural heritage features, areas
and systems. The policies applicable to each use and feature, area or system combination are identified by a capital letter (A, B, C or D).

C.2.6.5 An expansion to an existing *mineral aggregate operation* within the Greenbelt Plan Natural Heritage System and a new *mineral aggregate operation* or the expansion to an existing *mineral aggregate operation* outside the Greenbelt Plan Natural Heritage System, listed in Table C.2.6-2:

a) shall not be permitted in the natural features and areas listed in Table C.2.6-2 and identified by the letter C.

b) shall not be permitted in the natural features and areas listed in Table C.2.6-2 and identified by the letter D, unless it has been demonstrated through an Environmental Impact Statement that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions.

c) shall not be permitted in adjacent lands to the natural features and areas listed in Table C.2.6-2 identified by the letters C and D, unless it has been demonstrated through an Environmental Impact Statement that there will be no negative impacts on the natural features or their ecological functions.

d) shall demonstrate through an Environmental Impact Statement how the diversity and connectivity of natural features in an area, and the long term ecological function and biodiversity of the natural heritage system should be maintained, restored or, where possible, improved recognizing the linkages between and among natural heritage features and areas, surface water features and ground water features.

C.2.3.4 New *development* or *site alteration* shall not be permitted within provincially significant wetlands, *significant coastal wetlands*, or *significant habitat of threatened or endangered species*, except in accordance with applicable provincial and federal regulations table). With regard to the subject lands, it is noted that there are no significant wetlands present on the lands. However, significant habitat of threatened or endangered species has been identified on the lands. Significant Wildlife such as Peregrine Falcon, Common Raven and Bank Swallows were found nesting on the west quarry wall. In this regard, the table above refers to Policies C.2.6.5 and C.2.3.4. Mitigation measures by the applicant included providing a nesting platform on the east quarry wall to encourage Peregrine Falcons to nest there. A soil structure will be piled on the existing quarry floor to create temporary nesting habitat for Bank Swallows until the quarry fills with water post-extraction. The applicant has committed to continuing the ecological habitat enhancement on lands they own to the north of the site. Waterford has partnered with the Hamilton Naturalists’ Club (HNC) to develop the “Vinemount Meadows Sanctuary”, a 26 hectare former agricultural field which is being restored to meadow (grassland bird and pollinator habitat). These lands include important existing grassland bird habitat. Throughout the life of the quarry, efforts will be undertaken by the applicant to implement mitigation plans to avoid impacts on cliff nesting birds species including the Bank Swallow, Peregrine Falcon and Common Raven. Through the mitigation and monitoring measures provided in the Site Plan notes, the City of Hamilton believes that Policies C.2.6.5 and C.2.3.4 have been complied with.

Policy C.2.3.4 confirms that development is not permitted in significant habitat of threatened or endangered species, except in accordance with applicable provincial and federal regulations. In this regard, the applicant has consulted with the Ministry of Natural Resources and Fisheries, and confirmed that the habitat may be removed, provided that suitable replacement habitat is created off-site, in accordance with the *Endangered Species Act*. 
with respect to *significant habitat of threatened or endangered species.*
## Theme: Water Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Policy References</th>
<th>Rationale for Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Policy Statement</td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Planning authorities shall protect, improve or restore the <em>quality and quantity of water</em> by:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) using the <em>watershed</em> as the ecologically meaningful scale for integrated and long-term planning, which can be a foundation for considering cumulative impacts of development;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) minimizing potential <em>negative impacts</em>, including cross-jurisdictional and cross-<em>watershed</em> impacts;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) identifying water resource systems consisting of <em>ground water features, hydrologic functions, natural heritage features and areas, and surface water features</em> including shoreline areas, which are necessary for the ecological and hydrological integrity of the <em>watershed</em>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d) maintaining linkages and related functions among <em>ground water features, hydrologic functions, natural heritage features and areas, and surface water features</em> including shoreline areas;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>e) implementing necessary restrictions on <em>development and site alteration</em> to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1. protect all municipal drinking water supplies and <em>designated vulnerable areas</em>; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. protect, improve or restore <em>vulnerable</em> surface and ground water, <em>sensitive surface water features</em> and <em>sensitive ground water features</em>, and their <em>hydrologic functions</em>;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f) planning for efficient and sustainable use of water resources, through practices for water conservation and sustaining water quality;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>g) ensuring consideration of environmental lake capacity,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The applicant has submitted a Level 2 Hydrogeological Investigations Study by WSP which was peer reviewed by Cambium Inc. and reviewed by members of CART.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The WSP report reviewed the proposed quarry extension for impacts on groundwater, including neighbouring wells, and surface water. A detailed summary of these reports, including the peer review by Cambium, is included in Appendix “E” to Report PED18029, and discussion of the findings of the reports is addressed in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation Section of this report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>At a high level, the studies have concluded that impacts to ground and surface water in the region can be mitigated, and notes have been included on the Operational Plan in this regard. Impacts to neighbouring wells are not expected to be greater than impacts from the existing quarry, but should they occur, Waterford has a complaint protocol in place to respond to the issue. The complaint protocol has been expanded based on recommendations by Cambium. Source Protection Planning and Public Health Services are satisfied with this proposal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
where applicable; and

h) ensuring stormwater management practices minimize stormwater volumes and contaminant loads, and maintain or increase the extent of vegetative and pervious surfaces.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greenbelt Plan</th>
<th>3.2.3 The following Water Resource System policies apply throughout the Protected Countryside:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1. All planning authorities shall provide for a comprehensive, integrated and long-term approach for the protection, improvement or restoration of the quality and quantity of water. Such an approach shall consider all hydrologic features, areas and functions and include a systems approach to the inter-relationships between and or among key hydrologic features and key hydrologic areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Watersheds are the most meaningful scale for hydrological planning. Municipalities, partnering with conservation authorities as appropriate, shall ensure that watershed planning is undertaken to support a comprehensive, integrated and long-term approach to the protection, enhancement or restoration of the quality and quantity of water within a watershed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RHOP</th>
<th>C.2.12.3 Development and site alteration shall be restricted in or near sensitive surface water features and sensitive ground water features such that these features and their related hydrologic functions will be protected, improved, or restored. Mitigative measures and or alternative development approaches may</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please refer to the discussion above regarding the Level 2 Hydrogeological Investigations Study undertaken by WSP, which was submitted by the proponent and peer reviewed by Cambium Inc. and reviewed by members of CART.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At a high level, the studies have concluded that impacts to ground and surface water in the region can be mitigated, and notes have been included on the Operational Plan in this regard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The City and the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority have worked co-operatively to review the applications at the watershed level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Please refer to the discussion above regarding the Level 2 Hydrogeological Investigations Study, prepared by WSP, which was submitted by the proponent and peer reviewed by Cambium Inc. and reviewed by members of CART.
be required in order to protect, improve, or restore sensitive surface water features, sensitive ground water features, and their hydrologic functions.

C.5.1.1 No draft, conditional, or final approval of development proposals shall be granted by the City for any development in the rural area that could impact existing private services or involves proposed private services until the development proposal has complied with the all of the following:

a) Prior to or at the time of application for a proposal that could impact existing private services or involves proposed private services, development proponents shall submit complete information regarding existing or proposed private water and wastewater services. This information shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City. Where sufficient information is not available to enable a full assessment of on-site and off-site water supply and/or sewage disposal impacts or if the proponent does not agree with the City’s calculations, the proponent shall be required to submit a hydrogeological study report completed in accordance with Section F.3.2.2 – Hydrogeological Studies of this Plan and Hydrogeological Study Guidelines as may be approved or amended from time to time.

b) Any information submitted or study required in Policy C.5.1.1 a) shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City in accordance with Section F.3.2.2 of this Plan and Hydrogeological Study Guidelines as may be amended from time to time. The City may request or conduct a peer review of the study or servicing information, which shall be completed by an agency or professional consultant acceptable to the City and retained by the City at the applicant’s expense.

At a high level, the studies have concluded that impacts to ground and surface water in the region can be mitigated, and notes have been included on the Operation Plan in this regard.

The City and Conservation Authority have worked cooperatively to review the applications at the watershed level.
# Theme: Land Use Compatibility (Noise, Air, Blasting)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Policy References</th>
<th>Rationale for Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Policy Statement</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>The applicant has completed Noise, Air Quality, and Blasting Impact studies to identify mitigation requirements for the protection of adjacent uses. These studies have been peer reviewed, and all recommendations from the studies are implemented through the ARA License on the Operational Plan. These studies demonstrate that the proposed quarry extension will not cause environmental or public health or safety concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2.6.1 Major facilities and sensitive land uses should be planned to ensure they are appropriately designed, buffered and/or separated from each other to prevent or mitigate adverse effects from odour, noise and other contaminants, minimize risk to public health and safety, and to ensure the long-term viability of major facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelt Plan</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RHOP</td>
<td>B.3.6.3.19 The City shall ensure that all development or redevelopment with the potential to create conflicts between sensitive land uses and point source or fugitive air emissions such as noise, vibration, odour, dust, and other emissions complies with all applicable provincial legislation, provincial and municipal standards, and provincial guidelines, and shall have regard to municipal guidelines. The City may require proponents of such proposals to submit studies prior to or at the time of application submission, including the following: noise feasibility study; detailed noise study; air quality study; odour, dust and light assessment; and any other information and materials identified in Section F.1.9 – Complete Application Requirements and Formal Consultation.</td>
<td>As noted above, the applicant has completed Noise, Air Quality, and Blasting Impact studies to identify mitigation requirements for the protection of adjacent uses. These studies have been peer reviewed, and all recommendations from the studies are implemented through the ARA License on the Operational Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Theme: Cultural Heritage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Policy References</th>
<th>Rationale for Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Policy</td>
<td>2.6.1  Significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage</td>
<td>A Stage 1 &amp; 2 Archaeological Assessment (PO89-0034-2013) was submitted to City staff and the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport. The report recommended that Findspot 1 be subjected to a Stage 3 site-specific assessment. The report recommended no further work for the remainder of the assessed lands and provides an avoidance and protection strategy for Findspot 1. The report recommends that the subject property be considered partially cleared for the purposes of development except Findspot 1 and the recommended buffer. The Stage 1 &amp; 2 Archaeological Assessment lays out an avoidance strategy that includes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>landscape shall be conserved.</td>
<td>- That a temporary barrier be installed around Findspot 1 and its 20 m protective buffer prior to and maintained during construction / site alteration;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6.2  Development and site alteration shall not be permitted on lands containing</td>
<td>- That all construction and site alteration activities within 50 m of the protected area be monitored by a licensed archaeologist;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential unless significant</td>
<td>- That all employees working on the construction site be informed that the protected area is not to be disturbed; and,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>archaeological resources have been conserved.</td>
<td>- That the area be inspected by a licensed archaeologist after the completion of the grading and other soil disturbance activities and that the effectiveness of the avoidance and protection strategy is reported to the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTSC).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.6.3  Planning authorities shall not permit development and site alteration on</td>
<td>The applicant confirms that the terms of the avoidance strategy have or will be complied with, including photographic documentation of the temporary fence around the Findspot 1 and its 20 m protective buffer, and confirmation of a commitment that the area will be inspected after the completion of the soil disturbance and that any further information provided to the MTSC is also</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjacent lands to protected heritage property except where the proposed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>development and site alteration has been evaluated and it has been demonstrated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that the heritage attributes of the protected heritage property will be conserved.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ARA has made a recommendation for partial clearance for the project and Waterford has committed to implementing the strategy and confirmation that ground alterations (e.g., servicing, landscaping) will avoid archaeological sites with outstanding concerns and their protective buffer area and confirmed that a licensed consultant archaeologist will monitor construction in areas within the 50 m monitoring buffer zone, and that they are empowered to stop construction if there is a concern for impact to an archaeological site. An avoidance strategy has been implemented for Findspot 1, and the strategy will be followed until such time as the appropriate Stage 3 report (and Stage 4 mitigation report, if required) has been accepted into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports.

In response to comments by Planning staff when the application was initially submitted to the City in September 2015, the applicant submitted an assessment by Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. (ARA). Questions had been raised concerning the archaeological recommendation for partial clearance of Findspot 1 (Vinemount 1; AhGw-293 - please note that Findspot 2 became incorporated into Findspot 1 as a part of a report revision required by the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTSC). Findspot 1 comprised a barn in the east and Findspot 2 comprised a house in the west. In the revised report, they became part of the same site (Findspot 1). MTSC has approved the recommendation for partial clearance.

The assessments have received clearance from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport, and signed off by City staff. Details are provided in Appendix “E” to Report PED18029.

| Greenbelt Plan  | 4.4 | For lands within the Protected Countryside, the following policies shall apply: | As noted above, the applicant has completed a Stage 1, 2 Archaeological Assessment which was submitted to and submitted to municipal staff. |
### 1. Cultural heritage resources shall be conserved in order to foster a sense of place and benefit communities.

- **RHOP B.3.4.2.1** The City of Hamilton shall, in partnership with others where appropriate:
  
  a) Protect and conserve the tangible cultural heritage resources of the City, including archaeological resources, built heritage resources, and cultural heritage landscapes for present and future generations.

  d) Avoid harmful disruption or disturbance of known archaeological sites or areas of archaeological potential.

  e) Encourage the ongoing care of individual cultural heritage resources and the properties on which they are situated together with associated features and structures by property owners, and provide guidance on sound conservation practices.

  g) Ensure the conservation and protection of cultural heritage resources in planning and development matters subject to the Planning Act either through appropriate planning and design measures or as conditions of development approvals.

- **D.6.29** The development of Mineral Aggregate Resource Extraction Areas shall not adversely impact significant cultural heritage resources either directly or indirectly unless suitably conserved or mitigated by the proponent to the satisfaction of the City and in accordance with studies required under the Aggregate Resources Act. (OPA(R)-5)

- **D.6.30** The rehabilitation of areas impacted by mineral aggregate resource extraction operations shall reflect and conserve elements of the pre-extraction character of the significant...
| D.6.31 | Where possible, public or private rehabilitation of lands impacted by *mineral aggregate resource* extraction shall reflect and represent the pre-extraction land uses and character of the *significant cultural heritage resources*. The reflection and representation of these *significant* cultural heritage elements shall not preclude the rehabilitation of natural heritage features and ecological function, but shall ensure that the cultural history of the lands is appropriately represented in the rehabilitated site. (OPA(R)-5) |
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1.0 Introduction

Waterford Sand and Gravel has applied for an amendment to the Rural Hamilton Official Plan and City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 05-200 to permit an extension to the approved Vinemount Quarry. Waterford has also applied for a Category 2, Class A license under the Provincial Aggregate Resources Act (ARA) to permit the quarry extension. The total area proposed to be licensed is 45.2 ha, with the proposed extraction are limited to 37.7 ha. The license application is for a 6 day a week operation with a 900,000 tonnage limit for all quarries. The total amount of aggregate to be extracted is 22.0 million tonnes. The proposed quarry extension would operate below the water table, meaning that dewatering activities would occur. The extension is proposed to operate in 3 phases. At the end of the extraction period anticipated to be approximately 25 years, the existing and proposed quarry will be turned into a lake.

A Combined Agency Review Team (CART) was formed to assist in the review of the applications. The CART process has been successfully used in previous quarry applications that the City has reviewed. The CART was comprised of staff from several City departments and divisions (Planning and Economic Development Department, Planning Division; Source Protection Planning, Hamilton Water, Public Works Department; Health Protection Division, Public Health Services; and Development Approvals, Growth Management), as well as staff from the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority. Provincial staff, including from the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) and Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), were kept informed of the CART process and peer reviews, but did not participate as members of CART. Rather than have each agency with an interest in the proposed quarry conduct its own technical reviews, the CART process provides an opportunity for the agencies to be represented on a team that retains expert peer reviews, at the proponent’s expense. The CART approach provides a forum for the agencies to share views and perspectives on the applications, and a shared technical resource in the peer review team that they can draw from in reaching their independent positions and decisions.

Significant supporting studies have been prepared by the applicant and were submitted in support of the applications, including the following:

- Planning Summary Report Vinemount Quarry Extension;
- Natural Heritage;
- Water Resources;
- Noise;
- Air Quality;
- Blasting and Vibration; and,
- Built Heritage and Archaeology.

The above noted studies have been reviewed by City staff and members of the Combined Aggregate Resources Team (CART). In addition, peer reviews have been
completed of the Water Resources, Noise Assessment, Air Quality Assessment, and Blasting and Vibration Assessment. A complete summary of these studies and peer review results is included herein.
2.0 Natural Heritage

1. Overview
2. Natural Heritage Features (Existing Conditions)
3. Potential Impacts
4. Mitigation and Monitoring
5. Conclusion

Overview

Natural heritage includes the natural features, such as woodlands, wetlands, and streams, the fish and wildlife that occupy these areas, and the ecological functions (e.g. clean water, biodiversity, flood control) that they provide. Natural heritage also relates to the landscape, soils, geology, air, and water, and how they interact to create an ecological system that supports life.

This section of the report includes a summary of the existing information on the site and the surrounding area, which may be affected by the quarry extension. It also includes a discussion of the potential impacts and mitigation and monitoring measures.

The main sources of information used for assessing natural heritage were:

- Dance Environmental EIS and Level 1 and 2 Natural Environment Technical Reports for the Proposed Vinemount Quarry Extension, Stoney Creek;
- Aquatic Resource Inventory Assessment, WSP Canada, July 2015;
- Dance Environmental Response to City of Hamilton Letter of 15 December 2015, dated February 4, 2017;
- January 30, 2017 letter from IBI Group regarding Follow-up Aquatic Samples;
- May 1, 2017 letter from IBI Group responding to ESAIEG Recommendations;
- Nature Counts, 2003 Inventory of Natural Areas in Hamilton, completed by the Hamilton Naturalists’ Club;
- Hydrogeology and Hydrology Technical Report by Golder Associates; and,
- Rural Hamilton Official Plan (RHOP).

Since the natural features on and adjacent to the site were not highly sensitive or extensive, it was agreed that it was not necessary to retain a consultant to peer review the EIS. Instead, the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA), Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (OMNRF), City of Hamilton, and the Environmentally Significant Areas Impact Evaluation Group (ESAIEG) reviewed and
provided comments. ESAIEG reviewed the Dance Environmental EIS at its meetings on July 14, 2016 and September 8, 2016.

Field studies were completed by Dance Environmental from February to October, 2014 to identify amphibians, fish (electrofishing), plants, snakes, breeding birds, Ecological Land Classification (vegetation communities), incidental wildlife observations, aquatic habitat assessment, crepuscular bird survey (Common Nighthawk and Eastern Whip-poor-will), winter raptors and owls and acoustic bat surveys.

The proposed extension lands contain a variety of habitats, including deciduous forests, a pond, streams, thickets, meadow, agriculture, and hedgerows.

**Natural Heritage Features**

**Physiography**

The site is within the Haldimand Clay Plain physiographic region, which is generally flat, and is located approximately 3 km from the Niagara Escarpment. The ground elevation within the proposed extension is stepped, and the Eramosa scarp separates the two steps at 192 and 197 metres above sea level (masl).

On site, shallow bedrock is overlain by 1 to 5 metres of overburden between the Vinemount Moraine and the Eramosa Scarp. There is no evidence of significant karst features on the extension lands.

**Hydrology**

A Level 2 Hydrogeological Study, dated September 14, 2015, was prepared by WSP. Groundwater monitoring wells (continuous data loggers) were installed to monitor baseline water levels. Additional monitors were added later, adjacent to Vinemount South Swamp Complex (VSSC), at the request of NPCA and OMNRF. Groundwater flow is from west to east, consistent with surface flow along Forty Mile Creek.

Since water levels in 87 Acre Pond (within the Vinemount Quarry ESA to the east of the existing quarry) are being maintained despite its proximity to the active quarry, WSP concluded that the quarry has a limited draw-down cone and, as a result, is not affecting the groundwater conditions in the surrounding ESAs. Surface water features are separated from deep groundwater by low permeability clay at the top of the Vinemount shale.
Streams and Watersheds

The proposed quarry extension is located within the Forty Mile Creek watershed, which is within the jurisdiction of the NPCA.

On-Site Natural Heritage Features

The proposed quarry extension is located within the Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside, with the northern portion within the Natural Heritage System. The Hamilton Rural Hamilton Official Plan (RHOP) shows the following Core Areas on the Vinemount Quarry property:

- Woodland;
- Earth Science Area of Natural and Scientific Interest (ANSI); and,
- Stream.

A Woodland was identified by the City of Hamilton in the vicinity of the old quarry (the former quarry is shallow – 3 -4 m deep and approximately 13 ha in size and operated after 1954) on the extension lands which was in operation in the 1800’s.. The EIS concluded that it did not meet the criteria for Significant Woodland and milk snake has been delisted as a Species At Risk. OMRF has advised that since the woodland may serve other life cycle functions for the snakes using the hibernaculum, the woodland would contribute to Significant Wildlife Habitat. Based on this, OMNRF recommended treating the woodland as significant, but not considered highly sensitive because it did not meet the minimum of two criteria originally noted which included: 1) proximity to a water source and 2) habitat for a Species of Concern, Eastern Milksnake. This is because, subsequent to original assessments that were conducted, Eastern Milksnake was delisted as a species of concern, and Dance Environmental advised that no other rare species were observed in the woodlot. Planning staff confirmed that the woodlot no longer met the criteria as “significant” or “highly sensitive”.

The Earth Science ANSI was identified for the rock cut of the active face of the existing quarry.

The tributaries of Forty Mile Creek have been channelized and run around the northern and western boundaries of the existing and proposed quarry site and are regulated by NPCA. Forty Mile Creek is a losing stream and a flashy system, which dries out most summers. It provides habitat for a number of tolerant fish species. An intermittent
tributary in the southwest corner of the extension site has been proposed for realignment.

In addition to the Core Areas identified in the RHOP, field studies completed for the EIS determined that the extension site contains:

- Significant Wildlife Habitat – Raptor Wintering Area - Wintering Raptors were found on the berm along the northern boundary of the quarry and proposed extension and in the surrounding marsh and meadow habitat off site;
- Significant Wildlife Habitat – Snake Hibernaculum - A small, abandoned quarry on the extension lands provided a hibernaculum for three species of snakes;
- Significant Wildlife Habitat - Open Country Bird Breeding Habitat – Grassland birds (species at risk and locally rare species) were found breeding on the berms within the existing and proposed quarry and off site;
- Habitat for Bobolink and Eastern Meadowlark, threatened species regulated by the *Endangered Species Act, 2007*;
- Portions of the site contained habitat for Monarch butterfly (milkweed plants); and,
- An on-site pond called West Pond.

**Off-Site Natural Heritage Features**

The following Core Areas are identified in the RHOP, adjacent to the proposed quarry extension:

- Vinemount South Swamp (Provincially Significant Wetland, Environmentally Significant Area, and Significant Woodland) to the west;
- Saltfleet Northeast Woods ESA to the north; and,
- Vinemount Quarry ESA to the east.

Vinemount South Swamp is a 169-hectare natural area which contains interior forest habitat, provides habitat for significant plant and wildlife species, contains rare vegetation communities, and provides significant hydrologic functions. It is located to the west of the proposed quarry extension.

Saltfleet Northeast Woods ESA is approximately 77 hectares in size and contains meadow and deciduous forest communities which provide habitat for significant plant and wildlife species.
Vinemount Quarry ESA includes the City-owned lands (87-Acre Park) and an abandoned quarry pond, just to the east of the existing quarry. It is 38 hectares in size and includes significant earth science bedrock exposures and provides habitat for grassland birds and migrating waterfowl.

**Potential Impacts**

The main potential impacts from the proposed quarry extension include:

- Blasting noise which may affect wildlife;
- Surface and ground water loss from surrounding natural features to the Quarry;
- Loss of the Significant Woodland:
- Removal of habitat (meadow, thicket, woodland, snake hibernaculum);
- Impacts to birds nesting within the existing quarry (Peregrine Falcon, Common Raven, and Bank Swallow); and,
- Impacts to Species at Risk (Barn Swallow, Eastern Meadowlark, and Bobolink).

Vinemount Quarry typically does 10 to 14 blasts per year, from March to December; there is never more than one blast on a given day. Since blasting is already occurring on site, this is not considered a new impact. The EIS noted that wildlife may be startled by blasts, but they quickly resume their activities. Some species may become habituated to blasts. It is expected that wildlife present will continue to use the site.

Agencies were concerned about the effect that quarry extension and dewatering could have on the adjacent natural areas, including Vinemount South Swamp and Vinemount Quarry ESA. Surface water features are separated from deep groundwater by low permeability clay at the top of the Vinemount shale. Since water levels in 87-Acre Pond (located within Vinemount Quarry ESA to the east of the existing quarry) are maintained despite its proximity to the active quarry, WSP concluded that the quarry has a limited draw-down cone and, as a result, is not affecting the groundwater conditions in the surrounding ESAs. NPCA and OMNRF were satisfied with this conclusion, but monitoring will be required.

Significant cliff-nesting bird species (Peregrine Falcon, Common Raven, and Bank Swallow) are breeding on the west face of the existing quarry wall. These bird species are known to successfully nest at active quarry sites. Since the quarry extension will require removal of the west face, efforts will be made to attract the birds to another location within the quarry where extraction will not occur. For example, a nesting platform has been placed on the east quarry wall to encourage the Peregrine Falcons to
nest there. Also, benches / rock shelves could be installed near the top of the final quarry wall above the high-water line to attract these species after the quarry has been completed and rehabilitated.

OMNRF advised that since the total amount of Bobolink and Eastern Meadowlark habitat is less than 30 hectares, the proposed removal of this habitat must be registered under the Endangered Species Act. A Habitat Management Plan will need to be prepared and implemented as a requirement of the registration and exemption process with OMNRF.

**Mitigation and Monitoring**

Mitigation measures to address potential impacts to natural heritage features and functions include:

- Silt control fencing and inspection;
- Timing windows to avoid impacts to fish and breeding birds;
- Setbacks from Forty Mile Creek and ESAs (which range from 34 to 44 metres);
- Continued discharge of water from the quarry into Forty Mile Creek;
- Creation of new snake hibernaculum and one hectare of woodland;
- Creation of an ecological linkage between the new hibernaculum and the Vinemount South Swamp ESA to the north;
- Management for cliff-nesting birds;
- Dust management plan;
- Temporary plantings and pond habitat on the quarry floor;
- Placement of Peregrine Falcon nest boxes;
- Restoration of disturbed and new berms; and,
- Management of adjacent Vinemount Meadows Sanctuary for grassland birds and pollinators.

Groundwater levels in the swamp will be monitored to determine if there is any impact on the vegetation or wildlife in the swamp. The NPCA has approved the 'Monitoring Program for the Vinemount-South Swamp: Understorey and Vernal Pool', (dated October 17, 2016) which will be undertaken by an ecologist. Two years of base line monitoring will be followed by on-going monitoring in three year intervals. If quarry dewatering is found to be causing negative impacts to the flora and fauna, remedial action will be initiated. If required, these actions will be done in collaboration with Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA) and include surface water being added to the swamp water balance.
Waterford Sand and Gravel is working with the OMNRF to re-create a new snake hibernaculum on lands to the west of the proposed expansion (991 Green Mountain Road). If the hibernaculum is not successfully created and utilized by snakes, the existing hibernaculum (within the Phase 3 lands) cannot be removed. When the OMNRF determines the replacement hibernaculum site has been functional for three years and the old hibernaculum is decommissioned, extraction within this phase may proceed.

Since the Significant Woodland is to be removed, OMNRF recommended compensation tree planting near the new hibernaculum site. The Rehabilitation Plan now includes one hectare of restored woodland near the new hibernaculum.

Waterford has committed to continuing the ecological habitat enhancement on lands that they own to the north of the subject site. Waterford has partnered with the Hamilton Naturalists’ Club (HNC) to develop the “Vinemount Meadows Sanctuary”, a 26-hectare former agricultural field which is being restored to meadow (grassland bird and pollinator habitat). These lands include important existing grassland bird habitat and 6.6 hectares of agricultural land to be restored. The public will be able to access the site, which will also benefit breeding birds, wintering raptors, reptiles and amphibians, insects and mammals.

Removal of habitat within the extension site is being mitigated by expanding the habitat within the berms (from 4 metres wide to 7 metres wide), planting clusters of vegetation and creating two small ponds on the existing quarry floor to provide temporary habitat. Habitat surrounding the site will be improved by restoration and adding habitat structures (bat roosts and maternity structures and Purple Martin nesting house).

**Conclusion:**

The natural heritage features and functions on and adjacent to the proposed Vinemount Quarry extension were assessed by Dance Environmental in a Natural Environment Technical Report, dated August 28, 2015. A Level 2 Hydrologic Study (WSP) and an Aquatic Resource Inventory Assessment (WSP) were also reviewed by staff of the City, NPCA, OMNRF, and ESAIEG.

Through the mitigation and monitoring measures provided in the Site Plan Notes, the City of Hamilton is satisfied that the issues related to natural heritage features and functions have been addressed.
3.0 Water Resources & Hydrogeology

Cambium Inc. (Cambium) was retained by the City of Hamilton to provide a technical peer review of the supporting documentation for a proposed expansion of the existing Vinemount Quarry. The peer review focussed primarily on the report titled *Vinemount Quarry Extension, Level 2 Hydrogeological Study* completed by WSP Canada Inc. (WSP) in 2015 (hereafter referred to as the *Hydrogeological Study*). This summary provides an overview of the issues identified in the peer review and how these issues were resolved with the proponent and WSP. Additionally this summary includes comments from other interested parties and the resolutions provided by the proponent and WSP.

The existing quarry (owned by Waterford Sand & Gravel Limited, hereafter referred to as WSG) is located in Lot 5, Concession 5, former Township of Saltfleet in the City of Hamilton and occupies a footprint of approximately 40 hectares. The proposed extension will allow for the extraction of bedrock material on the adjacent property to the west of the existing quarry on Lot 6, Concession 5. Upon approval the expansion lands will be included into the extraction at the current quarry and will not be excavated as a separate quarry, but rather as an extension of the existing excavation. The extension lands cover an area of approximately 40 hectares, there-by doubling the footprint of the current operations (approximately). Extraction in the proposed extension will not extend deeper than the Decew Formation, ~181 metres above sea level (mASL) in the northwest and deeper to the south and east, due to the presence of low quality bedrock source (from an aggregate product perspective) found at depth. The current quarry is developed below the groundwater table, therefore to maintain dry working conditions the excavation is dewatered under Permit to Take Water (PTTW No. 3221-5VVN7L). The extended quarry will be dewatered by the current dewatering infrastructure and it is anticipated that the current PTTW should be able to encompass the addition dewatering volumes. In this summary reference made to the “Site” indicates those lands encompassed by the current excavation and the proposed extension lands.

The Site is located within the Haldimand Clay Plain, between two east-west trending moraines (the Vinemount Moraine and the Niagara Falls Moraine). The Site is also located within the Forty Mile Creek subwatershed, just east of the drainage divide with the Stoney Creek subwatershed. The Eramosa bedrock escarpment is a predominant feature in the area of the Site and creates two relatively flat lying steppes within the proposed extension lands (the lower, more northern steppe occupying the majority of the extension lands footprint). Agricultural lands surround the Site in addition to several Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs) including, the Vinemount Quarry (87–Acre Park), Saltfleet Northeast Woods and Vinemount South Swamp (which includes the
woodlot / wetland complex in Lots 7 and 8, Concession 5). Two branches of the Forty Mile Creek flow through / adjacent to the proposed extension lands. Currently the Forty Mile Creek has been diverted around the Site via a series of berms and ditches and reconnects with the original creek bed just south of the northeastern corner of the existing quarry (WSP Canada Inc., 2015).

The supporting documentation has been reviewed by several different agencies and City staff. Outlined below are the major issues and resolutions reached by the proponent. The list below begins with the issues raised from the peer review completed by Cambium. The issues raised from other agencies and City staff are discussed in the subsequent sections.

**Issues Raised from the Cambium Peer Review**

The peer review completed by Cambium (dated February 22, 2017) outlined several issues regarding the Hydrogeological Study. Many of the issues raised by Cambium were resolved through a subsequent letter by WSP dated June 19, 2017. The noteworthy issues and their resolutions have been outlined in the following sections.

**Potential Impacts to the Vinemount South Swamp Complex**

The Vinemount South Swamp Complex falls within the projected radius of influence of the dewatering that will occur in the proposed quarry extension. WSP had previously installed piezometers in the area of the Vinemount South Swamp Complex and, upon review of the data generated by those piezometers Cambium concluded that a portion of the swamp may be groundwater fed (however, data generated from these piezometers were not reliable from a surface water / groundwater interaction perspective due to their construction).

Since the Vinemount South Swamp Complex may be partially groundwater fed, and that it falls within the projected radius of influence of the proposed extension there is a possibility that the swamp will be impacted from the development of the extension. As such Cambium recommended that WSP complete a pumping test on the western extent of the proposed extension to simulate the dewatered conditions of the proposed quarry extension. WSP agreed to complete a pumping test, the results of which are outlined in the section below, entitled “Pumping Tests”. The pumping test did not adequately represent the effects of dewatering from the quarry. The long term pumping test did influence a drawdown in the shallow bedrock near the swamp complex. Two new piezometers were installed in the swamp complex and had drastically reduced precipitation influenced head fluctuations than the early piezometers, indicating a much
better seal. These two piezometers had no observable impacts from pumping and as such indicate that there is little concern for under draining from the quarry dewatering.

Extraction Depth

The extraction depth of the proposed expansion should be restricted to the top of the Decew formation, instead of a pre-determined depth. This will reduce the possibility of extracting lower quality material (which had happened in the existing quarry). WSP determined the elevation of the Decew formation from the new pumping well and monitoring wells, and has suggested this contact is at elevation 181 mASL at the northwest extent of the proposed excavation area.

Groundwater Declines in Deeper Aquifer Systems

Cambium indicated that groundwater declines have been observed in the deeper aquifer systems found in the area, possibly as a response to the existing operations. WSP agreed to monitor the water levels in the deeper aquifer system. The results of the pumping test are outlined in the Pumping Test discussion below. The pump test included a new monitoring well screened in the deeper unit and the pump test monitoring did not suggest an influence to the deeper system.

Pumping Test

A pumping test report was provided by WSP documenting the methodology and observations of a pump test program that included the installation of two new well monitoring locations, two new drive points in the swamp complex, and a single pumping well. The pumping included a stepped drawdown test that concluded the optimal pumping rate and indicated a poor well efficiency, suggesting the available groundwater in the upper bedrock aquifer and its inflow to the well was limited by the well construction or placement. As such the pumping was a poor indication of dewatering influences expected from the quarry dewatering. The pumping test proceeded for 212 hours, nearly 9 full days, with three interruptions due to equipment malfunction. The pumping rate was a nominal 13.3 L/min, equating to a cumulative pumping volume of roughly 160 m$^3$ over the 8+ days of pumping. The drawdown effect was reported as a circular cone of influence, however the figures indicated a preferential drawdown in the east-west direction, stemming from the observed drawdown of ~20cm in a well ~340m east of the pumping well (BH 14-17) and a ~4cm drawdown in a well a similar distance south of the pumping well (BH 104). The distance – drawdown plot indicated a cone of influence ~ 224m while the report indicates a radius of influence in the ~400m range. Cambium believes the distance drawdown plot incorporates less than observed drawdown in monitoring wells given it uses the drawdown reported in Table 2.1 (WSP...
Hydrogeological Study, 2015) and not the greater drawdown observed from Figure C-2 (WSP Hydrogeological Study, 2015) for the same monitoring wells (MW 14-17 and MW 15-17) and Figure C-6 (WSP Hydrogeological Study) for monitoring well BH 204. Considering the preferential elongation, which Cambium notes coincides with the earlier comments of an east-northeast – west-southwest trending regional joint pattern, coupled with the understated distance drawdown relationship suggests a higher potential for influence in the residential supply wells along 8th Road East than reported.

The time-drawdown plot for the pumping well appears to steepen through the course of the pump test while the distance drawdown plot appears to flatten in distance from the well. This suggests the radius of influence intercepted a barrier boundary. The existing quarry 440m to the east presents a plausible barrier and as such Cambium believes the barrier effect is due to the current excavation. This observation suggests the drawdown extends further once the barrier is intercepted as the potential for recharge from this direction is absent.

The effect may include a greater influence in those residential supply wells along Eight Road, East than originally reported. These wells are currently included in the monitoring and mitigation program and if such influences materialize, Cambium is of the opinion that the mitigation solutions will be adequate (well deepening, storage, etc) to maintain sustainable drinking water supplies.

The report suggests the isolation between the surface water (swamp complex and 40 mile creek) and the underlying bedrock is present as earlier presented, and Cambium believes the report adequately addresses these concerns.

87-Acre Park

Cambium recommended that some of the existing wells in 87-Acre Park be monitored as part of the regular monitoring program. WSP agreed with this recommendation and will attempt to reach an agreement with the City of Hamilton to allow for monitoring on 87-Acre Park.

Issues Raised By Other Agencies and the City of Hamilton Source Protection

Other agencies and City staff provided comments on the supporting documentation of the proposed quarry extension including the Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF), the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC), City of Hamilton Source Protection Planning (SPP) and the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA). The issues raised from each of these parties were relatively minor or were
resolved through subsequent discussions. Some of the resolutions to the issues raised included the following:

- WSP provided NPCA with the construction details of the Forty Mile Creek diversion and clarified well construction details for MW3c;
- WSP provided NPCA with additional details with regards to the water budget;
- WSP updated the bedrock topography map to include recent data; WSP clarified the how wetland features were determined and the extent of water level measurement data prior to extraction (as per MNRF comments); Additionally the stream hydraulics of Forty Mile Creek were discussed in more detail as per SPP comments;
- WSP clarified why the deeper aquifer systems can be monitored by only one well (since the system should not impact the deeper aquifer systems). As per SPP comments;
- The analytical parameters for the dewatering discharge were altered by WSP as per SPP comments; and,
- The MOECC indicated that the water well survey completed by WSP was not completed to the specifications of the “Technical Guidance Document for Hydrogeological Studies in Support of Category 3 Applications for Permit to Take Water”. However WSP considers the water well survey to be in compliance with the aforementioned document. Cambium agrees with WSP on this matter. In addition, Source Protection Planning and Public Health Services have no concerns.

Summary of Quarry Effects

The MOECC, MNRF, SPP and NPCA initially outlined several issues associated with the proposed extension of the quarry. The issues raised included assumptions / calculations made with insufficient data or monitoring equipment, the extent of the groundwater monitoring program, the proposed extension falls within a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer Zone and mitigation measures pertaining to the Vinemount South Swamp Complex.

WSP indicated that since the publication of the Hydrogeological Study, seven (7) monitoring wells and three (3) drive points were installed west of the Site, and subsequently two new monitoring wells, two new drive points and one pumping well. The results of the installations indicated that downward gradients exist within the Vinemount South Swamp Complex (although Cambium interpreted the information differently, as outlined above). WSP provided clarification with regards to their assumptions / calculations and indicated that there is in-fact sufficient monitoring equipment installed at the Site, particularly in consideration of the new wells and the observed nil pumping effect on the new drive points.
WSP indicates that modelling is not required since the expansion will be almost identical to the current quarry, as such the existing conditions could be assumed to exist within the future development. The monitoring program was further clarified by WSP, that there should be no impact to the groundwater and surface water quality since the only threat to these systems would be spills of fuels or other chemicals (of which there are controls / best management plans in place).

Cambium considers the response of WSP to the comments of the above parties to be satisfactory and through the peer review by Cambium, members of CART are satisfied as well.

Conclusion

Through the peer review by Cambium, the City of Hamilton is satisfied that appropriate mitigation measures to address surface and groundwater impacts have been identified and included in the updated monitoring and mitigation plan provided by WSP. Further, the improvements to the monitoring and mitigation plan will ensure that all potentially impacted wells will be included in the plans and that appropriate response to the well owner’s concern will be provided.
Aercoustics Engineering Limited (Aercoustics) prepared a noise / acoustical assessment of the proposed quarry extension entitled "Proposed Vinemount Quarry Extension – Noise Impact Study" dated June 15, 2015. The noise predictions were conducted by Aercoustics and based on the predictable worst case noise impact for each of the aggregate quarry operation areas at each of the receptors. This represented a design case where the quarry is running at full capacity with all of the equipment operating simultaneously and at locations where noise impact is highest for each receptor. The majority of the time, work would be occurring in other areas of the site with lower associated noise impacts.

The Noise Study was peer reviewed by Jade Acoustics (Jade), dated December 20, 2016. In addition, they also reviewed the Operational Plan prepared by IBI Group, dated October 14, 2014. They found that the noise report was generally prepared in accordance with accepted Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MOECC) procedures.

Jade’s comments and Aerocoustic’s responses are below:

- Clarification over the use of semi-permanent sound barriers such as stock piles which vary in height and width as material is being moved from the stockpile to trucks. Jade suggested that any mitigation proposed should maintain the same width / extent and height throughout the entire time of the specific operation that is being attenuated. While the use of stockpiles is acceptable on a limited basis, the preference is to use one of the other mitigation measures outlined in the report;

**Aerocoustics Response:** Generally, the use of local stockpile barriers surrounding a portable processing plant is a common and very effective method of controlling noise in aggregate operations, and they agree that at certain times and at certain sites, a stock At the subject quarry, this is not expected to be an issue for the following reasons:

- As the portable processing plant is repositioned during Phases 1 to 3 in the proposed extension area, it would be moved close to the south quarry face. This quarry face is expected to meet the acoustic barrier requirement at these times. The proposed top of the quarry face is more than 20 m above the proposed quarry floor elevation, which is 10 m higher than the required barrier height.
• While the portable processing plant is in an established location, the operator has confirmed that the required stock piles can be maintained indefinitely without difficulty. Further, the steady preservation of these large stockpiles has been proven during operation of the existing quarry operations. If for any reason a stockpile barrier must be depleted, the operator shall use stacked shipping containers to supplement the acoustic barrier.

• The portable processing plant area has stayed in the same general location for the last three years, and can be expected to be repositioned every four years. Equipment layout may be altered during that time but the general plant area and associated stockpiles would remain.

• The stockpiles can be generated at a rate of 25,000 tonnes per week. Therefore, the acoustic barrier requirements after relocation could be met within a few days or up to about a week, when “full buildout” is reached. As discussed above however, the quarry face should provide the required shielding during plant relocation, so stockpiles are not expected to be required during that time.

• Many of the receptors are located in areas considered to be Class 3 as defined by NPC-300. This requires that 30 m around the dwelling be assessed. It does not appear that the noise analysis has considered these receptors. Please clarify and update the analysis and mitigation measures, if necessary, if these locations have not been analyzed;

• Aerocoustics Response: Aerocoustics generally assumes that the plane of window at an upper story is the worst-case point of reception. Ground-level receptors at a distance of 30 m from the dwellings were modified per the reviewer’s request. Aerocoustics confirmed the upper storeys were the worst case locations and all maximum predicted sound levels remained unchanged. Three of the receptors were single-storey dwellings and the 30 m setback distance increased the predicted sound level at one location (R06), during some Phase 3 scenarios, by 1 dB (from approximately 38 dBA to 39 dBA).

• Please explain why R07 and R07-2 are considered to be located in a Class 3 area while R011 which is directly adjacent to R07 and R07-2 is designated as a Class 2 receptor. The same explanation is required for R01 and R10. Based on the response, the analysis will need to be updated and the mitigation may need to be modified;
Aerocoustics Response: The majority of the receptors in the area should currently be considered Class 2 because of the man-made activities which dominate the background noise, particularly receptors near busy roads and those close to the existing quarry operation.

However, since much (but not all) of the man-made noise, such as truck traffic and quarry operations, is generated by the existing quarry, and several of the houses were there first, it was decided to consider them “grandfathered” Class 3 receptors.

For the noise sensitive zoned lot (vacant lot) receptors R10 through R12, if a dwelling was constructed it should be considered Class 2 based on the current background noise environment. The maximum predicted sound level at these receptors satisfied both the Class 2 and Class 3 sound level limits, except for receptor R10.

To address R10 specifically, the sound levels predicted to be above the Class 3 sound level limits occur only during Phase 1 while the plant is still located on the existing Vinemount #2 Quarry property. Once the operation moves fully into the proposed extension lands, the predicted sound levels would be within the Class 3 limits.

The Aerocoustic’s report provides sound levels for the equipment to be used for the operation. Not all of the equipment was measured at the Vinemount quarries. Therefore, as the sound levels specified for each piece of equipment is part of the mitigation, a procedure needs to be in place to ensure that the equipment to be used will comply with these sound levels.

Aerocoustics’s Response: The reference sound levels for the proposed equipment are based on multiple measurements of equipment both at the existing site and at various other similar operations. The levels are considered conservative and allow for some wear and tear of the existing equipment. If a complaint situation arises in the future, the equipment should be measured then to confirm that it is consistent with the noise study.

As the proposed extension of the quarry is moving closer to residences (R07, R07-2 and R08), and there are several mitigation measures and restrictions required in the operating procedures to meet the MOECC guidelines, consideration should be given to incorporating a sound monitoring program or a minimum, a protocol for addressing any noise complaints;
• **Aerocoustic’s Response**: It is Aerocoustic's position that periodic Acoustic Audits which are not associated with complaints provide minimal benefit. Aerocoustics agrees that a complaint response protocol is appropriate and recommends the following note be added to the Operational Plan:

“The licensee will institute a complaint procedure. As part of this procedure, complainants will be requested to identify the location of the incident, as well as the time of the day that the incident occurred and any other information that they feel is relevant. The licensee will keep a complaints log book containing a record of all complaints as well as all complaint responses, which log book shall be accessible to the MNRF and City on request. A noise consultant may be retained to address complaints, if required.”

• The proposed expansion will require an Environmental Compliance Approval (ECA) from the MOECC. Has an ECA been issued?

• **Aerocoustic’s Response**: The proposed operation will consist of mobile crushing or screening of aggregate below grade in a quarry. Per O. Reg. 524/98, all proposed equipment is considered exempt from requiring an ECA.

The CART peer reviewer, Jade Acoustics, reviewed the response from aerocoustics, and, in a letter dated September 6, 2017, Jade confirms that the Aerocoustic's responses above are acceptable.

**Conclusion**

Through the peer review by Jade Acoustics, members of CART are satisfied that appropriate mitigation measures to address noise impacts have been identified and included as required notes on the ARA Operational Plan.
5.0 Air Quality

RWDI Ltd. prepared an air quality dust impact assessment “Vinemount Quarry Expansion – Air Quality Assessment” dated May 4, 2015. The report reviews potential air quality emissions resulting from the Vinemount Quarry extension, and compares them to provincial standards to determine if there will be any health or nuisance impacts arising from the proposed extension.

The report assessed fenceline impacts using the standards set out in Ontario Regulation 419/05. Additionally, the report considered criteria for cumulative contaminant concentrations (i.e., site emission plus background) at sensitive impact locations using criteria established by the Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change (MOECC), the Canadian Council of Ministers of the Environment (CCME) and the World Health Organization (WHO). For the most part, the emission estimates followed the approaches set in “Procedure for Preparing an Emission Summary and Dispersion Modelling Report”, published by MOE in March 2009.

The assessment included a cumulative assessment insomuch that the dispersion model was expanded to include not just the processing plant and material handling operations, but also on-site roadways and storage piles. The predicted contaminant concentrations were added to an estimate of the background concentration in the surrounding area. The background concentration used in the assessment was the 90th percentile of the most recent complete data recorded at the nearest air quality monitoring station operated by the MOECC.

Since Provincial Standards under the Aggregate Resources Act require dust mitigation, and it is RWDI’s experience that some level of mitigation is needed, their first iteration of the dispersion model incorporated an initial estimate of the level of mitigation that would be required and readjusted until the predicted concentrations fell within the standards and criteria.

RWDI concluded that Waterford will need to implement the following dust management recommendations all which have been incorporated onto the Site Plans under Recommendations from Technical Studies – Dust.

- Dust will be mitigated on site;
- Water or another provincially approved dust suppressant will be applied to internal haul roads and processing areas as often as required to mitigate dust. The operator must have the capacity to apply water to the unpaved haul roads at a rate of 1.5 Litres M2/h during hot, dry, windy conditions. The actual watering rate shall be
adjusted based on weather and road surface moisture conditions, so as to suppress visible dust behind moving vehicles;

- Processing equipment will be equipped with dust suppressing or collection devices;
- The maximum processing rate of 500 tonnes per hour is not exceeded;
- Stripping of overburden should be limited to times when extraction, production and shipping activities are less than 50% of the estimated peak rate of 500 tonnes per hour;
- The processing plant shall be located outside the exclusion areas shown in the Noise Impact Assessment, prepared by Aerocoustics;
- When extraction operations move to within 125 metres of lands not owned by Waterford, blasting operations shall be allowed only when winds are blowing interior to the quarry;
- The paved entrance ramp shall be kept free of accumulations of silt using a combination of the permanent water spray system and wet-sweeping;
- Diesel-powered heavy equipment at the site will meet Tier 1 emission limits; and,
- Diesel-fired electrical generating equipment will meet Tier 2 emission limits.

The Air Quality Assessment report completed by RWDI concluded that MOECC air quality standards due to dust impacts from the Vinemount Quarry Extension, that may impact adjacent sensitive land uses, can be mitigated subject to the inclusion of the 10 recommendations noted above.

The Air Quality Study was peer-reviewed by Pinchin Ltd., the CART peer reviewer, in a letter dated February 27, 2017. Pinchin reviewed the RWDI report to note any gaps or discrepancies observed and reviewed the methodologies employed by RWDI within the report and provide comments on the applicability of those methods compared to common industry standards and practices and Ontario Ministry of the Environment and Climate Change guidelines.

The following conclusions were provided based on Pinchin’s review of the Air Quality Assessment Report:

- The contaminants selected for assessment for airborne dust were reasonable. Though the report did not assess any constituents in the aggregate material beyond
Silica, it has been Pinchin’s experience that the MOECC does not typically request substances beyond Silica be assessed;

- Silica content was based on a 1971 report for the A. Cope and Sons Limited quarry. From this study, it found silica content to be in the range between 1.06% to 4.12% with the average being 1.85%. Based on this RWDI rounded up the average and used 2% in their assessment. The difficulty with this approach is that while 2% may reflect an average value, there is no way to say for certain that the Vinemount quarry silica content is not closer to the maximum 4.12% or that the study from another quarry truly represents the Vinemount site. As such, it may be prudent for the site to conduct an analysis of their own quarry material;

- Nitrogen oxides was the only contaminant assessed from the generator set. Though the MOECC states that nitrogen oxides is the only contaminant that requires assessment for emergency diesel generators, if the generator set is being used for a length of time of time longer than a typical testing period it may be prudent to assess additional contaminants such as sulphur dioxide and carbon monoxide; and,

- All sources not assessed in report have been rationalized and tabulated. It should be noted that section 3.12.4 references the version of the “Procedure for Preparing an Emission Summary and Dispersion Modelling Report” from 2005 (not 2009). This should be confirmed and corrected.

Recommendations

Based on the results of the Air Quality Assessment Report Peer Review, the following recommendations were identified:

- Perform an analysis of the quarry material to determine both the content of the material, in order to determine if there are any constituents of concern, but also to obtain a more accurate site-specific percent content of silica. This would also support the use of an average silt loading (8.2 g/m2) used in assessing paved haul routes;

- Document the emission estimates used to deem emissions from wind erosion from piles insignificant. Also document the frequency of wind conditions which may result in the generation of emissions (to support that it is infrequent);

- Assess all contaminants from the diesel generator set, including sulphur dioxide and carbon monoxide, or provide further justification for their exclusion from the assessment (as they are not considered insignificant from the MOECC when operated beyond testing scenarios);
• Document, at a regular frequency, the moisture level (i.e., moisture ratio) achieved by watering measures on unpaved roadways to ensure the 90% control applied is reasonable; and,

• Confirm dispersion modelling was completed with the MOECC’s currently accepted version (AERMOD version 14134) to ensure all contaminants remain in compliance.

• RWDI Ltd. responded to the peer review in a letter dated April 24, 2017 and included the following:

• Samples were taken on March 17 and sent to SGS Lakefield for silt and silica analysis. The results of this sampling were incorporated into the air quality assessment for PM44, PM10, PM2.5 and NOx. The relevant tables and appendices from the RWDI Air Quality Assessment report have been updated and are attached. Materials sampled included several major products (3/2” clear stone), as well as road surface material from 3 locations within the site. For convenience, updated values have been highlighted in green;

• The emission factors in Chapter 13.2.5 of AP-42 deal with wind erosion of material from disturbed surfaces. Table 13.2.5-2 provides threshold wind;

• Velocities at which erosion would occur. While “scoria” (roadbed material) and overburden would be most similar to surfaces at the quarry, the lowest threshold wind speed (for coal dust on a concrete pad, which is highly erodible) a wind speed of 11 m/s is required for erosion to occur. A review of data from Hamilton International Airport for 2011 through 2015 indicates that winds in excess of 11 m/s occur less than 0.5% of the time during the operating season for the quarry. Thus, while short term wind erosion events can occur, they are not significant compared to emissions from blasting, extraction, processing, and vehicle movements;

• RWDI has undertaken a thorough review of contaminants from diesel-fired engines in both stationary and on-road applications. Relative to the applicable standards or guidelines, nitrogen oxides are always the limiting contaminant. Numerically, the ratio between the relevant emission rate and the applicable criteria show this to be true. As an example, for a generator of this size, with Canadian regulations allowing no more than 0.0015% sulphur in fuel, the emissions are estimated to be 3E-6 g/s, while the relevant short term standard is 275 ug/m3. The same logic applies to other contaminants such as carbon monoxide;

• Waterford will conduct regular visual monitoring of surface of the unpaved roads to ensure the surface is wet. During dry periods, the frequency of this inspection shall
be hourly. Periodic moisture samples will be collected and recorded to support the visual monitoring. The results will be recorded in the log book at the site office; and,

- The facility will implement a record keeping process to ensure that the relevant information is recorded.

Conclusion

Through the peer review by Pinchin Ltd., members of CART are satisfied that appropriate mitigation measures to address air quality impacts have been identified and included as required notes on the ARA Operational Plan.
### 6.0 Blasting and Vibration

Explotech Engineering Ltd. prepared a blasting impact assessment entitled “Blasting Impact Assessment – Waterford Sand and Gravel Limited, Vinemount Quarry Extension, dated April 8, 2015. The Report reviews the environmental effects from future blasting operations within the proposed quarry extension, specifically whether or not MOECC guidelines related to ground and air vibration effects can be met.

Vibration levels assessed in the Explotech report are based on the MOECC Model Municipal Noise Control By-law with regard to guidelines for blasting in Mines and quarries. Explotech assessed the area surrounding the proposed license area with regard to potential damage from blasting operations and compliance with the aforementioned by-law document. They also reviewed blast and vibration reports collected at the existing licensed quarry for the operation period 2012 to 2014.

Explotech also undertook a vibration attenuation study at the existing Waterford Quarry from May 2014 to July 2014 with the resultant data being analyzed in order to develop site specific vibration attenuation characteristics and equations.

Explotech concluded that Waterford will need to implement the following to meet MOECC requirements of NPC-199 monitoring plan, all of which have been incorporated into the Site Plan.

The Blasting Impact Assessment was peer reviewed by DST Consulting Engineers, the CART peer reviewer dated December 7, 2016. Following review DST concurs with Explotech’s employment of standard engineering practice for predicting vibration and overpressure levels for the proposed extension and their conclusion that the proposed drilling and blasting can be carried out safely and within the MOECC guidelines.

The quarry operator is advised to follow the recommendations of their drilling and blasting experts and consultants and address any complaints in a timely and professional manner.

The report analysis concludes that vibration and blast impacts from the Vinemount Quarry Extension which could impact adjacent sensitive land uses, will meet MOECC Model Municipal Noise Control By-Law limits.

**Conclusion**

Through the peer review by DST Consulting Engineers, members of CART are satisfied that appropriate mitigation measures to address blasting impacts have been identified and included as required notes on the ARA Operational Plan.
8.0 Archaeology

On July 3, 2014, a Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment (P089-0034-2013) prepared by Archaeological Research Associates (ARA), was submitted to City staff and the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport (MTCS). As part of the Stage 1 and 2 Archaeological Assessment, four find spots were located, 3 of which were not recommended for further assessment, and one (AhGw-294) where a Stage 3 Assessment was recommended. MTSC subsequently approved a request by Waterford that the required Stage 3 Assessment is not required to be undertaken until after the site is licensed but to ensure protection of the site in the interim. Notes are required to be included on the Site Plans where protective areas were to be instituted (e.g., a 20 metre “no-go” zone until the associated Stage 3 Archaeological Assessment Report (and Stage 4 mitigation report, if required) has been accepted into the Ontario Public Register of Archaeological Reports and a 50 metre protective area where a consultant archaeologist monitors during construction activity).

In congruence with the recommendations made in the report, Planning staff recommended that Findspot 1 (Vinemount 1: AhGw-294) be subject to a Stage 3 site-specific assessment and that the subject property be considered partially cleared for the purposes of development with the exception of Findspot 1 and the corresponding buffer.

As part of these comments, staff initially required that an ‘H’ Holding Provision be applied to Findspot 1 and its 20 m protective buffer, prohibiting the development of the subject properties until such time that the proponent conducts an archaeological assessment of the subject properties and mitigates, through preservation or resource removal and documentation, adverse impacts to any significant archaeological resources found. Staff also required confirmation that no work will be done within 50 m of the protected area without the supervision of a licensed archaeologist, confirmation that all employees working on site will be informed of the protected area, and lastly confirmation of a commitment that the area will be inspected after the completion of the soil disturbance and that any further information provided to the MTCS is also submitted to municipal staff.

In January of 2016, Planning staff received a letter from Mr. Paul Racher from Archaeological Research Associates Ltd. (ARA) requesting that the City of Hamilton reconsider the application of the proposed ‘H’ Holding Provision. On July 27, 2017, Planning staff met with the owner/applicant, team specialists, consultants, and other city staff at a project CART meeting. After discussing archaeological considerations with the project team as well as reviewing all relevant documents Planning staff are of the opinion that Findspot 1 will be adequately avoided and protected during any on site disturbance and the previously applied ‘H’ Holding provision in question need not be
applied. The Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment as well as the July 30, 2014 letter from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Sport (MTCS) support partial clearance of the site without the requirement of restrictive zoning.

Conclusion
As such, the City of Hamilton only require that Findspot 1 (Vinemount 1: AhGw-293) be subject to a Stage 3 site-specific assessment. In concurrence with the view of the MTCS, that the balance of the property may be considered partially cleared for the purposes of development with the exception of Findspot 1 and the corresponding buffer. Planning Staff do not have a Stage 3 site-specific archaeological assessment for Findspot 1 on file and request that the assessment be completed and submitted in order to ensure municipal interests regarding archaeology have been satisfied. Staff also reiterate that Findspot 1 (Vinemount 1: AhGw-293) and its 20m protective buffer should be marked by a temporary barrier (silt fence) prior to the commencement of soil disturbance and that a licensed archaeologist should monitor all construction activities occurring with 50m of protected area.
9.0 Built Heritage:

Planning staff reviewed the surrounding area and subject property for built heritage resources, and, as a result of a review of built heritage resources in the immediate area, Cultural Heritage staff confirm that the property located at 1051 Green Mount Road East, Stoney Creek does not contain any of the following:

- Properties designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act*;
- Properties designated under Part V of the *Ontario Heritage Act*;
- Properties protected by a municipal Conservation Easement Agreement;
- Properties protected by a provincial (OHT) Conservation Easement Agreement.
- Properties listed on the City of Hamilton’s *Register of Properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest*;
- Properties included in the City of Hamilton’s *Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and / or Historical Interest*; or,
- Properties included within the City of Hamilton’s Cultural Heritage Landscapes.

In addition, Planning staff confirm that there are no built heritage resources, categorized as per the information above, within 50m of the subject property. The following properties included in the City of Hamilton’s *Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and / or Historical Interest* are located within 1km of the subject property:

- 1185 Green Mountain Road – ca. 1865 Gothic Revival Cottage dwelling;
- 953 Mud Street East – ca. 1850 Georgian dwelling;
- 923 Green Mountain Road – ca. 1925 brick dwelling;
- 1342 Ridge Road – ca. 1880 brick dwelling refurbished and modernized;
- 1092 Ridge Road – ca. 1860 frame or brick dwelling; and,
- 1156 Ridge Road – ca. 1862 frame or brick dwelling.

Conclusion

The City of Hamilton is satisfied that inventoried properties of interest within the vicinity of the subject area will be conserved.
9.0 CONCLUSIONS:

A Combined Agency Review Team (CART) was formed to assist in the review of the supporting studies that were submitted with the Vinemount Quarry extension Application. The CART was comprised of staff from several City departments and divisions, as well as staff from the Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority. The studies included Natural Heritage, Water Resources, Noise, Air Quality, Blasting and Vibration and Built Heritage and Archaeology. The results of the review indicate the following:

Through the mitigation and monitoring measures provided in the Site Plan Notes, the City of Hamilton is satisfied that the issues related to natural heritage features and functions have been addressed.

Through the peer review by Cambium, the City of Hamilton is satisfied that appropriate mitigation measures to address surface and groundwater impacts have been identified and included in the updated monitoring and mitigation plan provided by WSP. Further, the improvements to the monitoring and mitigation plan will ensure that all potentially impacted wells will be included in the plans and that appropriate response to the well owner’s concern will be provided.

Through the peer review by Jade Acoustics, members of CART are satisfied that appropriate mitigation measures to address noise impacts have been identified and included as required notes on the ARA Operational Plan.

Through the peer review by Pinchin Ltd., members of CART are satisfied that appropriate mitigation measures to address air quality impacts have been identified and included as required notes on the ARA Operational Plan.

Through the peer review by Pinchin Ltd., members of CART are satisfied that appropriate mitigation measures to address air quality impacts have been identified and included as required notes on the ARA Operational Plan.

With regards to archeology, the City of Hamilton has determined that only Findspot 1 (Vinemount 1: AhGw-293) be subject to a Stage 3 site-specific assessment. In concurrence with the view of the MTCS, that the balance of the property may be considered partially cleared for the purposes of development with the exception of Findspot 1 and the corresponding buffer. Planning Staff do not have a Stage 3 site-specific archaeological assessment for Findspot 1 on file and request that the assessment be completed and submitted in order to ensure municipal interests regarding archaeology have been satisfied. Staff also reiterate that Findspot 1
(Vinemount 1: AhGw-293) and its 20m protective buffer should be marked by a temporary barrier (silt fence) prior to the commencement of soil disturbance and that a licensed archaeologist should monitor all construction activities occurring with 50m of protected area. This requirement is a condition of the Site Plan Notes. With regards to built heritage, The City of Hamilton is satisfied that inventoried properties of interest within the vicinity of the subject area will be conserved.

Through the thorough review of the technical studies noted above, the City has determined that all concerns have been satisfactorily addressed.
Ross & Cathy Ferrier
1186 Green Mountain Rd. E.
Stoney Creek, ON
L8J 3B2

Greg Macdonald
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development Planning, Heritage and Design - Rural Team
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P 4Y5
Fax: 905-546-4202
E-mail: Greg.Macdonald@hamilton.ca

November 26, 2015

Subject: Objection to Vinemount Quarries Application for a Rural Hamilton Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for lands located at 1051 Green Mountain Road East, Stoney Creek

In response to the application by Waterford Sand & Gravel Limited for a Class A, Category 2 Licence to excavate aggregate material from a quarry of 45.1 hectares, located at Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, in the City of Hamilton, and for a Rural Hamilton Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for lands located at 1051 Green Mountain Road East, Stoney Creek, we submit the following objections.

We object on the grounds that we find that Waterford Sand & Gravel Limited has not maintained the vegetation on the existing Vinemount Quarry licence no. 5463 and 103931. We request that they be required to replace all dead vegetation in a timely manner and do what is required to ensure their survival, along the entire perimeter of the existing quarry as well as the new quarry.

We also suggest that Waterford Sand & Gravel Limited would be a responsible business to minimize their impact on all the neighbours by building attractive berms along the entire perimeter of the existing and new quarry. This would go a long way to facilitate co-operation with the community, if they seek to double the quarry size, and expand even more in the future.

We request the vegetation on the berms along Green Mountain Road and around the quarry perimeter to include some deciduous trees as well as shrub clusters to further enhance the view for the neighbourhood.

We have concerns about the possibility of a car going off the road at the corner of Green Mountain Road and Tenth and into the depths of the quarry. A proper berm needs to be built here. This hazard to the neighbourhood needs to be addressed.

We object that a dust monitoring and mitigation study has not been included in the site plan notes. We request that provision be included that a dust monitoring and mitigation study will be
undertaken by Waterford Sand & Gravel Limited if a complaint is made regarding dust and upon request by an affected neighbour.

We require the steel grating system on the internal haul road be cleaned out whenever the accumulated debris reaches the bottom of the grating.

We request more information about what kind of scrap will be allowed to be stored within license 5463 annually.

Given that the site plan notes of the existing quarry requires Waterford Sand & Gravel Limited to hold annual meetings in order to operate the current quarry, we object to cancelling the annual meetings three years after extraction begins on the new quarry. If the purpose of these meetings is for the exchange of information, then the meetings should continue, especially considering Waterford Sand & Gravel Limited has purchased other lands in the vicinity presumably for future expansion. As well, all homeowners located within a kilometer of the perimeter of the entire operating quarry ought to be invited to the meeting. This would allow new property owners who have moved into the community to be informed as well. Considering the size of all the lands Waterford Sand & Gravel Limited owns and the potential for impact on our community, we request an independent conflict resolution committee be formed. This would allow the neighbourhood to have some assurance that issues will be resolved fairly and help us to accept this business expanding in our community.

We request that we would be allowed to openly discuss these issues and other issues as they arise out of this process.

We wish to be notified of the adoption of the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment, or of the refusal of a request to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-law and will make a written notification request to the Coordinator.

Thank you for your time and consideration. Please call us at 905-643-7891 if you have any questions.

[Signatures]

Ross & Cathy Ferrier
VINEMOUNT QUARRY EXTENSION LICENCE APPLICATION

I object to the new licence application for the Vinemount Quarry Extension due to the following reasons:

- The noise and air pollution emanating from the quarries daily operation, depending on the wind direction, makes sitting in our backyard unbearable.

- The blasting operation creates air and ground vibrations shaking our house to the point where the dishes rattle and the wall pictures shake.

- The structural damage to our house caused by the blasting vibrations has resulted in ongoing repairs to cracks in the drywall and concrete basement walls.

- Lower property values due to the close proximity of the quarry and its related issues.

- The poor road conditions along the designated truck route from the quarry caused by the heavy dump truck loads and numerous trips especially on Mud Road between 10th road and Centennial Parkway.

Wayne Smith  
328 Eighth Road East  
Stoney Creek L8J3M3
Waterford Sand & Gravel Limited (Vinemount Quarries Division)

c/o Bill Kester
70 Ewart Avenue
Brantford, Ontario N3T 5M1

To whom it may concern,

We strongly object to the application on behalf of Waterford Sand & Gravel Limited (Vinemount Quarries Division) to expand their operations and excavation of an extra 45 hectares located at Part of Lot 6, Concession 5, City of Hamilton.

Firstly, the expansion of the quarry will strip the natural beauty of the landscape causing it to never return to its original form. Trees will be uprooted, fields will be demolished and wildlife will be forced from habitats leaving only an eye sore for hundreds of years to follow. While reviewing the Planning Summary Report, 4.9 Visual assessment, Provincial Policy 5.2.2, extraction shall be undertaken in a manner which minimizes social and environmental impacts. There is no way that the impact can be minimized when you are removing 45 hectares of stone. Our retirement plan of farming and living in a quiet rural setting will no longer be possible with you moving towards us. The environmental impact has been clearly stated at the top of this paragraph and throughout this objection letter.

Living within very close proximity to the quarry, our family will suffer from a loss of our well water. If the quarry expands approximately 1,000 feet closer to our property, our well water supply will dissipate entirely. The loss of water will surely impact our ability to continue our livestock operation. The well water has been an on-going concern. When the quarry originally opened and drained all the water, our well was no longer able to provide water year round. The quarry has denied any responsibility for our loss of water.

Another major concern is the threat to the stability of the foundation of our home, our cistern and well from the continual blasts. The foundation of our home sits on a bed of shale rock. Our house has already suffered damage, a cracked window for one, due to previous blasts. The quarry again denied any wrongdoing, but replaced the window as a good neighbour gesture. Currently, there are no procedures or steps put in place to address any conflicts that arise between home owners and the quarry. Ultimately, the home owner is S.O.L as the quarry can manage the problem or deny any responsibility without any threat or anyone holding them accountable. There is no independent Conflict Resolution Committee that could review and assist in a solution. What will happen to our home when the quarry operations move south west and closer to our house?

Also, the noise and dust pollution caused by the blasting and the day to day operations of machinery, equipment and trucks are disruptive to our lives and the natural environment. [The Quarry now owns the land that was designated for the possible construction of Ninth Rd. What will stop them from building that road and having truck traffic exit onto Green Mountain Road?]

We are also very concerned that once this land has been stripped of its stone that a landfill site will be the next phase. Bill Kester assured us that the hole will be allowed to fill with water. Nothing will stop the owners of this Quarry from selling the land to a private company and wash their hands of their responsibilities. We have been told that Hamilton's existing Landfill has a forty five year life span. We have also been informed that it will take five years to complete the existing Quarry and forty five years to complete the expansion. Let's all do the math. Waterford Sand and Gravel will make large profits from the expansion and should be responsible for protecting this land and not be allowed to sell or give this property to anyone who could potentially apply for a landfill site agreement, including the City of Hamilton.

Now we are being forced to live in even closer proximity to the already existing quarry. Who will watch over our life long investment? This expansion towards our farm will deprecate the value of our property. The existing Quarry has five more years of operation. The expansion will begin at the same time as our retirement. Our dream has always been to happily retire here and enjoy the tranquility of living on this beautiful farm. We have been farming this land for thirty one years and have raised our children here because of the beauty and the peacefulness. It is our dream to see our future grandchildren grow up on this farm and share in the experience and fond memories similar to those of their parents. It is very disturbing to know that our way of life and our future dreams will be severely impacted with the Quarry slowly bearing down on us. This notice of expansion has and will continue to add great anxiety and stress to us. We have been forced to live with the operations of this Quarry for the past twenty five years and now we are being asked to continue for years to come, with the operations moving closer to our home. When is enough, enough? We are strongly opposed and do not want this expansion to proceed.

We are requesting that this letter remains an open document so we can add any concerns that may arise during this process.

Sincerely,

John & Marilyn Pavao
January 19, 2018

Bill Kester
Waterford Sand & Gravel
Vinemount Quarries
451 Tenth Road East
Stoney Creek, Ontario

Dear Bill,

I am writing on behalf of the Hamilton Naturalists’ Club to express our appreciation for the strong relationship we have built with Waterford at the Vinemount Quarries site. Waterford was interested in looking at a unique opportunity to conserve natural lands by entering into a long-term lease with the HNC on property that is adjacent to the quarry.

Waterford saw the ecological importance of the property, particularly for many species of both unique and common birds. HNC members have been visiting the area for years and were thrilled to hear the property was conserved.

Waterford also helped to install the interpretive sign, something that would have been very difficult for volunteers, particularly with the shallow soil. We appreciate Waterford’s support with our tree planting and stewardship activities and know that you will be there to help with our restoration plans in 2018 and in the coming years. This includes planting at the site, as well as very generously contributing rocks to help with our urban planting projects.

We look forward to continuing to work with Waterford to steward this important property!

Sincerely,

Jen Baker
Hamilton Naturalists’ Club

Hamilton Naturalists’ Club is a non-profit organization dedicated to the study, appreciation and conservation of our wild plants and animals.
Promoting Code Compliant, Affordable, Safe, Clean and Healthy Rental Housing

February 6, 2018

prepared by
Brad Clark
Maple Leaf Strategies
151 Bloor Street West, Suite 810
Toronto, Ontario, M5S 1S4
Preface

In October 2017, the Hamilton & District Apartment Association, in cooperation with a broad range of rental housing stakeholders, held a Rental Housing Roundtable to discuss problems and challenges within the rental housing market based on the following goal:

“Find the means to legalize rental housing and ensure that all tenants are living in safe, clean and healthy units.”

The participants of the Hamilton Rental Housing Roundtable provided reasonable, pragmatic, effective and innovative ideas to improve the quality of rental housing through the tenants’ affordability lenses with consideration of the landlords’ ability to capitalize building improvements and the efficacy of city by-laws.

Special Thanks to Rental Housing Roundtable Participants

Donna Bacher, The REALTORS® Association of Hamilton-Burlington
Michelle Ball, Student Life at Mohawk College
Tom Cooper, Hamilton Poverty Reduction Roundtable
Graham Cubitt, Indwell
John Hawker, Citizen
Joe Hoffer, Cohen Highley, LLP
Larry Huibers, Hamilton Housing Help Centre
Jennifer Klevin, McMaster Housing
Keanin Loomis, Hamilton Chamber of Commerce
Paul Martindale, Wink Properties
Suzanne Mammel, Hamilton Halton Home Builders Association
Paul McAlister, Hamilton Housing Help Centre
Ivan Murgic, Effort Trust
Matteo Patricelli, Flamborough Chamber of Commerce
Michael Ollier, Hamilton Community Legal Aid Clinic
Arun Pathak, Hamilton & District Apartment Association
Valerie Webster, The REALTORS® Association of Hamilton-Burlington
Renee Wetselaar, Social Planning Research Council
Rental Housing Licensing History

In January 2007, the Ontario government provided a new “tool box” for municipalities which gave Councils the authority to charge a number of new levies, fees, and licenses on residents and businesses. This new set of revenue generating tools was ostensibly meant to relieve the growing financial pressures on the local property tax. Licensing landlords was just one of the many new instruments. The concept was controversial given that license fees could be passed to tenants through “Above the Guideline Rent Applications” at the Landlord Tenant Board or subsequently through higher rents for new tenants at unit turnover.

In 2008, the Hamilton City Council approved a Residential Rental Housing Community Liaison Committee to ostensibly explore the feasibility of a new program to license landlords. The driving force for such action was the ongoing issues with student housing, primarily in Wards 1 and 8. After much debate, the recommended solution was to develop proactive property standards enforcement in Wards 1 and 8. Council adopted a pilot project for 18 months called, “Project Compliance”.

This pilot project was extended by Council to give city staff the time to explore the legality, models, and implementation mechanisms of licensing.

On September 28, 2012, at a regular City Planning Committee meeting, the city staff Report on Regulation of Rental Housing (PED10049(h)) was presented for the first time. The report recommended a hybrid solution to proactively enforce property standards and to proceed with a new landlord licensing regime.

The HDAA, in partnership with the REALTORS® Association of Hamilton-Burlington, presented a joint submission to respond to the staff report and appeared as delegates before the Planning Committee. There were nine delegates who appeared at the committee to oppose the staff recommendations.

Subsequently, the planning committee approved the following motion:

(Clark/Collins)
That the recommendations be amended by deleting the words, “the Planning Committee for approval by November 2012” and replacing with “a Special Public Meeting of the Planning Committee to be held before December 15, 2012 and that the report be released to the public one week prior to the public meeting”, and to add a new subsection item (d), to read as follows:
(a) That the concept of licensing rental housing in low-density buildings, as detailed in Report PED 10049(h), be received;
(b) That staff be directed to prepare comprehensive recommendations, a draft by-law amendment and cost-recovery analysis to be presented to a Special Public Meeting of the Planning Committee to be held before December 15, 2012 and that the report be released to the public one week prior to the public meeting;
(c) That all future reports related to the Vital Services By-law be submitted to the Planning Committee with notification provided to the Emergency and Community Services Committee;
(d) That staff report back to the Special Public Meeting of the Planning Committee with a comprehensive report on proactive enforcement:
(i) Rentals/Singles;
(ii) Any limitations within the Landlord Tenancy Act as to whether or not a landlord can apply licensing and inspection fees to a tenant’s rent;
(iii) Does the tribunal have authority to enforce non-compliant landlords to live in non-compliant units;
(iv) report on the City of Waterloo’s successes and issues;
(v) Reconsider our residential care facilities by-law with rental licensing by-law;
(vi) Feasibility of utilizing a longer compliance order;
(vii) Review fire codes pursuant to current technology;
(viii) Constitutional use of the rental licensing by-laws as means to gain access without search warrant through Justice of the Peace. (1)

On December 11, 2012, a Special Meeting of the City of Hamilton Planning Committee was held to address the earlier staff report and any information arising from the direction given at the September 28th meeting.

The committee also received written communications from twenty-five citizens. The committee heard verbal presentations from twenty-seven delegates: twenty-five opposed the proposal, one supported the proposal for safety reasons, and one raised concerns about the problems with student housing.

The Committee passed two motions:

(Ferguson/Partridge)
That the Hamilton Real Estate Board and the Hamilton Apartment Association be requested to provide a solution to illegal apartments and, in particular, student residences in an effort to respect neighbourhood concerns and tenants’ safety and that staff be directed to provide necessary statistics to both associations.

(Farr/Johnson)
That Report PED10049(j), Rental Housing Licensing Model, be referred back to staff for further consultation.

In 2013 the Joint Rental Housing Taskforce: composed of Hamilton and District Apartment Association with the REALTORS® Association of Hamilton-Burlington met seven times and developed a report that was presented to the Planning Committee on June 18, 2013. The Committee directed city staff to come back with some alternates for licensing rental housing.

On September 25, 2013, the City Council passed the following motion:
(a) That a permanent Proactive Enforcement Program to enforce rental housing conditions be approved, subject to the approval of items (i) and (ii) below:
   (i) An additional 5 FTEs (4 enforcement officers and 1 support clerk) at an estimated net levy impact of $275,000 annually until 2017 when the levy impact would be reduced to approximately $175,000 annually;
   (ii) A one-time Capital (cost to an upset limit of $160,000) to purchase 4 vehicles funded from Unallocated Capital Reserve Account No. 108020.
(b) That a sub-committee be established to work with interested stakeholders to assist with implementation of an approach to enforcement and legalization of appropriate rental housing including, but not limited to, process, fees, and by-law regulations.

With the passage of this motion, the City Council voted NOT to license rental housing providers and instead adopted a permanent proactive property standards enforcement program. The Council also voted to establish a Rental Housing Sub-Committee with a mandate to work with interested stakeholders to assist with the implementation of an approach to enforcement and legalization of appropriate rental housing including, but not limited to, process, fees, and by-law regulations.

The Rental Housing Sub Committee was provided terms of reference that included the mandate, “to work with interested stakeholders to assist with the implementation of an approach to enforcement and legalization of appropriate rental housing including, but not limited to, process, fees, and by-law regulations.” (4)
While this mandate seems to be clear and unequivocal, some members of the sub-committee interpreted the language as approval to move forward with a licensing regime, leaving a fractured committee looking for common ground.

In February 2017, Chair (Councillor) Matthew Green resigned from the sub-Committee, citing a conflict of interest. Councillor Doug Conley was appointed as his replacement. Councillor Terry Whitehead was elected Chair.

The new Chair, Councillor Whitehead made it clear that he wants the sub-committee to find common ground and make recommendations to the Planning Committee. He also publicly stated his personal opposition to any form of voluntary registry and his personal support for some form of mandatory registry/licensing.

**What Problems Are We Trying to Solve?**

Generally, the establishment of a task force, working group or sub-committee is first predicated on the identification of a problem to solve.

During our research, Maple Leaf Strategies conducted face to face confidential interviews with numerous housing stakeholders, advocates, landlords, municipal staff, Councillors, and members of the Rental Housing Sub-Committee. Our interviews revealed a general feeling of exasperation and frustration with the style, substance and decorum of the Rental Housing Sub-Committee.

It was clear that there was ambiguity about the mandate of the sub-committee. Some members truly believed that they were on the sub-committee to implement rental housing licensing while others understood the Council approved mandate. Every interviewee expressed in some way or another their concern that the sub-committee had NOT identified the problem(s).

Identifying a problem can be a challenge in itself. Anecdotally, there are many issues, symptoms and challenges that Councillors are facing everyday regarding rental housing in their wards. Each issue needs to be thoroughly assessed to establish if it is a legitimate problem that warrants new legislation or if it can be more easily addressed through existing provincial legislation, municipal by-laws, policies and enforcement.

**Increase in Off-campus Student Housing**

In recent years, there has been a great deal of community discussion about the increase of off-campus student housing.

In the meantime, Universities and Colleges have found it challenging to meet the demand for student housing through their on-campus student residences. With demand far out-pacing supply for on-campus residences, local property owners saw an opportunity to benefit by offering their properties for off-campus student housing. These properties are most prominent in Ward 1 with proximity to McMaster University, as well as Wards 8 and 10 with proximity to the Mohawk College campuses.
The challenge for the City is that not all off-campus student housing is in contravention of the city’s by-laws. Some landlords purchased houses with the intent of supplying student housing in full compliance of local codes and statutes. Some students or their families purchased properties and subsequently invited other students to live with them through some private agreement. There are even some students who combined their capital to purchase a house. Finally, there are live-in landlords who rent some rooms to students.

For all intents and purposes, some of these modified off-campus student homes are operating much like a lodging or rooming house. Each tenant gets a bedroom with shared or common access to the kitchen, living room and bathroom(s). Given that the general operations of such off-campus student housing closely resemble rooming houses, the City of Hamilton should utilize the existing Lodging Home by-law to ensure Code compliance to ensure fire and building code compliance.

**Single Family Home Conversion to Multi-Unit Housing**

The Province’s 2008 policy change making “granny flats” or secondary units “a right” of home ownership forced many municipalities to amend their zoning by-laws. Hamilton includes this as a right under Section 19 of Hamilton’s zoning by-law. Specifically, the zoning by-law permits conversions without a zoning application for an additional dwelling unit. Building permits are required.

The low mortgage interest rates have also prompted a booming new real estate sales tool, “rental income”. Many home buyers are being encouraged to consider “rental income” on homes that may be larger than they wanted. It has become common for Realtors® to point to the provincial government’s decision to allow secondary units as a right in planning law regardless of whether the local zoning by-laws are permissive.

**Confusing Residential Housing Zoning By-laws**

In January 2001, the former municipalities of Hamilton Wentworth Region were amalgamated. As a result of this merger, the new city was faced with the challenge of merging former town by-laws. While the City Council has approved many new by-laws, an Urban Official Plan and a Rural Official Plan, city staff is still administering all planning applications through six unique zoning by-laws from the former municipalities. For example, the Hamilton zoning by-law has secondary units permitted as a right while the other former municipality by-laws do not allow secondary units as a right and they prescribe one dwelling unit per single family home. Given the incongruities with Hamilton’s residential zoning by-laws, the City of Hamilton has started a comprehensive review of the six zoning by-laws with the goal of created one citywide by-law with an expected completion date of Fall 2019.

**Not in My Backyard Issues**

Under the “Places to Grow Act”, the province of Ontario has prescribed that by 2015 a minimum of 40% of all annual residential development in all municipalities should have been within the 2006 built-up area. The intent was to minimize greenfield development and increase density across all communities. While the City of Hamilton has yet to meet this goal, the impacts of such a policy are now being felt within mature communities. Homeowners are seeing redevelopments and rezoning applications for conversions of
In neighbourhoods in proximity to post-secondary institutions, residents frequently complain to Councillors about the impacts of having a student rental housing on properties that are zoned as single-family homes. Noisy parties, too many cars, littering, theft, vandalism, drunk and disorderly students and the reduction of property values are the most common complaints received by Councillors.

We wish to thank and congratulate the City of Hamilton and the Hamilton Police Service for adopting one of the previous recommendations made by the Hamilton & District Apartment Association and the REALTORS® Association of Hamilton-Burlington. We have been advised that a noise response team has been established for weekends. We understand that Councillor Ferguson was instrumental in finding the resources within the Hamilton Police Service’s budget.

**Municipal Right of Access to Tenant’s Home**

There seemed to be some confusion as to whether a new licensing by-law would enable municipal right of access to a dwelling unit. In some interviews, we were told that the primary purpose to moving forward with licensing is to gain access to rental dwellings for inspection purposes. Some Councillors expressed concern that the city cannot enter alleged non-conforming rental units to inspect for health and safety risks without a search warrant. They argue that the city has been “stymied” by the long standing legal requirements for search warrants.

The underlying desire by Councillors to enable municipal right of access as a condition of any rental housing licensing by-law is a Pandora’s box waiting to be opened for the first time. The Courts are reticent to acquiesce to any government authority an automatic right to access any private domicile. The often-expressed political position that Hamilton needs a municipal right of access to tenant’s homes to ensure safe rental dwellings is severely hampered by the fact that the current judicial thresholds for securing a search warrant have never been problematic for the city.

> “In Hamilton’s case, however, staff have pioneered the use of search warrants to ensure their ability to act on complaints or evidence of illegal conversions. Once a rarely used aspect of existing legislation, search warrants have been incorporated into Hamilton’s regular enforcement program, as a periodically employed ‘last resort’. Even when search warrants are not used, the fact that they are secured on a regular basis has likely encouraged compliance with access requests, and thus enhanced the capacity of enforcement authorities to inspect premises suspected of being non-compliant.”

Michael Fenn, A Review of the Effectiveness and Implications of Municipal Licensing of Residential Apartments - September 2013 (5)

Even from the landlord’s perspective, gaining access to a tenant’s unit for an inspection can get complicated. The landlord gives 24 hours notice with a request to inspect. If the tenant refuses, the landlord may file an N5 application for eviction with the Landlord and Tenant Board (LTB) and again provide 24 hours’ notice to inspect. If the tenant refuses again, then the landlord must file another N5 application to evict. A hearing will be held within 3-6 weeks with a possible eviction within 3-5 months from application.
Generally, the LTB will advise the tenant that if they do not permit access than they can be legally evicted.

Discussions with current and past staff confirmed that securing search warrants has never been an issue for Hamilton. In fact, search warrants are rarely used in Hamilton as most tenants freely invite by-law enforcement staff into their units. Municipalities like Guelph, which rejected licensing rental housing, is finding success in gaining entry for safety inspections by shifting the paradigm from mandatory inspections to encouraging tenants to request FREE 15-minute safety inspections.

“City inspectors check rental units to identify safety concerns related to Ontario building and fire code regulations. Safe rental units have:

- working smoke alarms on every level and outside every sleeping area (houses built after 2013 must also have a smoke alarm in every bedroom).
- working carbon monoxide alarms installed outside of sleeping areas if the unit contains a fuel burning appliance, fireplace or attached garage.
- a large enough window or door to be able to get directly outside from basement bedrooms, and
- fire separation(s) between each unit.” (6)

Property Standards Enforcement

In 2008, the City Council approved a pilot proactive property enforcement plan for Wards 1 and 8 only. The other 13 wards did not have proactive enforcement, rather enforcement was reactive or complaint based.

Today, there is some confusion as to what is the actual policy for property standards enforcement. The Rental Housing Sub-Committee was advised, at their July 18, 2017 meeting, that there is no longer any proactive property standards enforcement. However, the City Clerk’s records indicate that on September 25, 2013 the City Council approved a permanent, city-wide proactive property standards enforcement program.

Subsequent meetings with city staff revealed that the City has continued with the proactive enforcement as well as having a complaint driven process.

Studies have shown that proactive property standards enforcement is beneficial to all property owners and tenants as well as the overall tax base.

“Housing policy can play an economic development role through neighborhood effects. Repairing one rundown building has positive effects on the value and attractiveness of the surrounding buildings. In fact, studies have found that neighborhood quality has a substantial impact on property values and housing prices. One research paper examined property values in the New York City metropolitan area. Holding other factors such as income and employment constant, it found that property values were one third higher for properties that were not located in run-down neighborhoods.” (7)
At the present time, the City has a well-established and successful Multi-Residential Rental Blitz inspection program. Such programs, when concentrated on areas of need, have proven to beautify the city, lower neighbourhood crime, increase property values for homeowners and increase the local tax base. As such, there is an argument for extending the proactive property standards enforcement program to all wards within the city for both rental and owner-occupied properties.

Analysis of Licensing Rental Housing

Licensing rental housing, as a new municipal policy, was enabled by the Government of Ontario as a new authority in a toolbox with other revenue generating mechanisms. As a result, it has been slowly creeping across the province as a means to raise non-tax revenue and to combat a number of issues such as student housing, rooming houses, parking, noise, litter, thefts, speeding, vandalism, drunken public behaviour, non-conforming rental housing in single family home communities, property maintenance and fire code violations.

The most common public complaints that Councillors receive from the constituents is revealing.

Complaints about lack of parking, noise, litter, speeding, and property maintenance are all issues that fall within the local municipality sphere of authority. As such, municipal by-laws already exist to address many of such complaints.

For example, proactive property enforcement has proven to be an excellent tool to address outside and common property maintenance issues. Parking, noise, litter, and fire code violations are being effectively addressed through By-law Enforcement and Fire Department Inspections.

Speeding, vandalism, drunken public behaviour, and theft are issues more properly dealt with by the Hamilton Police Service.

Rental housing licensing or a mandatory registry will not resolve these community complaints as the landlord has a very limited set of tools to deal with tenants who are NOT good neighbours.

At the present time, (new) City of Hamilton has not adopted city-wide provincial policies which give every homeowner the option of a secondary unit or granny flat as a right.

To be clear, the Hamilton Residential Zoning by-law has been amended to permit, as a right, secondary housing while the zoning by-laws for Ancaster, Dundas, Flamborough, Glanbrook and Stoney Creek prohibits granny flats.

We understand that the planning staff have started the process of reviewing residential zoning across the entire city with consultations planned in 2018 with approval in 2019.
**Who Pays for Licensing Rental Housing?**

One of the most frequent discussions that has occurred in every municipality that has considered licensing rental housing is the question, "Who pays?".

Proponents of licensing rental housing argue that the landlord pays the fees to the benefit of the tenants. They argue that provincial rent control laws prohibit increases in rent beyond set limits. However, a comprehensive review of the Residential Tenancies Act, Above the Guideline policies and recent LTB decisions verifies that tenants can be charged for their share of licensing and inspection fees, as in the Waterloo Case Study.

**Waterloo Case Study** (LTB File Number: SWL-69354-14)

On January 27, 2014, the City of Waterloo adopted licensing of low-rise rental properties under By-law No. 2014-008. The preamble to the Waterloo by-law provides the city’s rationale for adopting the new regulation.

> “The Corporation of the City of Waterloo considers it necessary and desirable to regulate residential rental units in order to:

> (a) protect the health and safety and human rights of the persons residing in rental units; (b) ensure that certain essentials are provided in residential rental units such as plumbing, heating and water; and, (c) protect the residential amenity, character and stability of residential areas.” (7)

The Waterloo by-law requires that the landlord submit the following documents with their application,

1) Police criminal record check (issued within six months of the date of application)
2) Electrical Safety Authority Elec-Check Certificate (issued within six months of the date of application)
3) HVAC certificate (issued within six months of the date of application)
4) Insurance certificate
5) Floor plan
6) Parking plan
7) Proof of ownership (transfer agreement or deed)
8) Property maintenance plan

According to the Residential Tenancies Act and current Landlord and Tenant Board policies, landlords may apply for above the guideline rent increases for any municipal fee including licensing and inspection fees.

**Municipal taxes and charges are defined under section 2 of the RTA and section 41 of O. Reg. 516/06. Municipal taxes and charges include:**

- taxes charged to a landlord by the municipality (which include education taxes levied under Division B of Part IX of the Education Act);
- charges levied on a landlord by the municipality; and
- taxes levied on a landlord's property in unorganized territory. (8)
As such, a landlord filed an application to the Landlord and Tenant Board requesting an above the guideline rental increase for the city’s licensing fees and the municipally required Electrical Safety Authority Elec-check Certificate. Any rent increase that exceeds the maximum annual percentage allowed by the provincial government must be reviewed by the LTB. (Currently, the maximum percentage by which a landlord can increase the rent for most residential tenants without approval from the Landlord and Tenant Board is 1.5% for 2017.)

On November 18, 2015, the Landlord and Tenant Board issued its decision and ordered that the landlord may increase the rent by 6% in addition to the annual guideline (1.5%) in effect on the increase date for the unit (File Number: SWL-69354-14) (appendix i).

This Board decision was affirmed by the Divisional Court of Ontario on December 7, 2017 Houston versus 530675 Ontario, 2017 ONSC 6419 – Divisional Court File DC-17-828) and as such, this decision firmly sets the precedent for future AGI rent increases to tenants may include such levies as municipal license fees and related mandatory inspection or audit fees (appendix ii).

In this case, tenants’ rent increased by 7.5% over the previous year.

According to Rentboard.ca, average rents in Waterloo range from $655 to $1250 and $1580 to $2900 for a 3-bedroom unit. Therefore, in this actual case and based on a 7.5% rent increase, rent increases could range from a minimum of $49 per month to $217 per month just to offset licensing and all inspection fees.

The implementation of rental housing licensing in Waterloo is increasing rents as landlords can now apply for above guideline rent increases for any municipal fees, license fee and all mandatory inspection fees and other charges imposed by by-law.

Risk of Tenant Displacement

Past discussions about licensing rental housing in Hamilton revealed a pressing concern from many stakeholders that some vulnerable tenants may be displaced or lose their units because of zoning and code enforcement action or additional fees placed on landlords. In such cases and where costs are too prohibitive for the landlord to comply with rezoning, tenants may not only be displaced but the rental building itself may come off the rental market.

“In extraordinary cases, when an inspection determines that particular rental units are uninhabitable, tenants might be displaced after an inspection. Funded tenant relocation programs can help ease displacement and help low-income tenants avoid homelessness, if the landlord is unable to provide alternative housing for tenants while repairs are being completed.”

Healthy Housing Through Proactive Rental Inspection by changelabsolutions.org (9)

Such trepidation is warranted given that any new license fees, inspection fees and strict enforcement of zoning by-laws could result in landlords shuttering their buildings and subsequently selling their property.
In December 2013, the Hamilton Housing Services Division publicly released a long-awaited collaborative document entitled, “Hamilton’s Housing & Homelessness Action Plan with the aspiration statement “Everyone has a home… Home is the foundation”. This broadly celebrated document, drafted through a thorough public consultation, addressed the context of precarious housing and homelessness, provided viable strategies for implementation, critical investment strategies, workplans and the need for ongoing evaluation. This comprehensive report identified the secondary rental housing market as an important source of affordable rental housing and raised the legitimate concern of tenant displacement.

Similarly, the Hamilton Planning Staff Report PED10049(j) raised this very concern that large number secondary rental units, most of which are perfectly safe, would be at risk of being converted back to ownership as current landlords would rather sell the housing than pay the fees, be subject to unnecessary inspections and make the changes to become compliant with zoning.

Currently, Hamilton’s primary rental market vacancy rate is 2.7% and the impact would be even greater today.

In our discussions with Social Planning Research Council staff, we learned that by comparing census and CHMC data, it is possible to estimate the number of at risk secondary housing rental units as follows (all data for City of Hamilton only):

There about 13,000 rental units in the secondary rental housing market, representing just over 20% of the total rental stock in Hamilton. The secondary market is an important source of affordable rental housing through units in rented single and semi-detached homes, apartments in houses, multi-plexes and rented condominium units. While providing an important supply of affordable housing, a number of issues are associated with this component of the rental market. In particular, secondary rental market units are not as permanent as purpose-built rental housing apartments. They come into and out of the market relatively quickly through conversion of space to rental and de-conversion back to ownership. This makes the secondary housing market difficult to track and measure. There may also be quality issues with these units and potentially by-law and code compliance issues.

“\textit{It is anticipated that some properties will need to be rezoned due to illegal changes that have been made without the proper permits which may not comply with the current zoning regulations. The potential loss of rental units that are not in compliance with zoning is the single biggest concern raised. It is difficult to estimate the exact number, but it is anticipated that if landlords are required to return to the last legal use (e.g. from a fourplex to a duplex) up to 30\% of rental units could be lost. The other potential loss is where a landlord may choose to de-convert the properties in order to avoid licensing. While Hamilton’s vacancy rate for purpose-built rentals is modestly high at 4\% there would not be enough stock to absorb the estimated losses and displaced tenants of rental units due to licensing, and this may result in a potential increase of homelessness and waiting lists for social housing.}”

(10) Pages 48-49 Housing and Homelessness Action Plan - Hamilton

(11) Hamilton Planning Report PED10049(j)
The risk of tenant displacement as a direct result of licensing rental housing, municipal fees, inspections, and the requisite rezoning applications have proven to be all too real with a projected loss of 7,258 rental units in the sector of the housing market that serves some of the most vulnerable residents in the city.

Rental Housing Licensing: Revenue and Expenses

Every municipality that has implemented new licensing regimes for rental housing has had the goal of full cost recovery with no financial impact on the tenants or the tax payers.

Given recent LTB decisions approving above the guideline rent increases specifically for license and inspection fees, the challenge for municipalities with rental housing licensing is to find a fee schedule that does not unfairly burden tenants while minimizing the impact of the municipal tax levy.

London Case Study

The City of London adopted a Rental Housing Licensing By-law “To address sub-standard housing conditions in rental units and protect the amenity, character and stability of residential areas.” This by-law targeted 12,000 rental buildings containing four or less dwelling units of converted dwellings while exempted apartments and townhouses.

From 2010 to 2013, the City of London received 3,646 new applications for licenses from the estimated 12,000 non-conforming properties. The City issued 4,422 new licenses and renewals. The city refused licenses for 15 properties, 13 non-compliant with zoning, one property could not schedule a Fire Prevention & Protection Act (FPPA) inspection, and one property could not comply with FPPA. The City received one appeal which was deemed invalid.

The cost for the program over the same three-year period totaled $1,260,000 while the total revenue received from licensing was just $91,400. (appendix ii)

The London case study exemplifies that the actual incurred costs to implement their licensing program dramatically exceeded the actual revenue.
Toronto case Study

On July 1, 2017, the City of Toronto implemented a new rental housing licensing by-law for buildings with three or more stories and ten or more units. Toronto City staff estimated that the by-law would capture approximately 3,500 buildings of which 580 buildings are operated by social/supportive housing providers including Toronto Community Housing.

The City would only inspect common areas and NOT individual units. This program was projected to cost about $5 million, with 53 per cent of costs to be recovered through an annual registration fee of $10.60 for each unit; 12 per cent from enforcement action, and 35 per cent from property taxes. While Toronto Community Housing and all social/supportive housing providers are exempt from all fees, inspection portions of the by-law will still apply.

The Toronto by-law sets out standards for apartment building owners and operators by requiring them to:

- Register annually with the City
- Provide key information regarding their building and pay an annual fee
- Have a process for receiving and tracking tenant service requests.
- Conduct regular inspections of the building for cleanliness and pests.
- Take action when pests are detected.
- Develop and maintain a number of operational plans related to cleaning, waste management and capital planning.
- Use licensed contractors for mechanical systems repairs.
- Have a notification board in a central location in the building to communicate key information to tenants.
- Retain records relating to the operations of the building.

The registration fee of $10.60 per unit does not include the administrative fee of $1,800, which covers the cost of doing the administrative work associated with an audit and the cost of the pre-audit inspection. Furthermore, there will be a fee for each hour spent at the building during the audit: $108.80 per hour per inspector, with a minimum fee of $108.80.

At passage, Toronto City Staff argued that any costs incurred by landlords could not be passed on to tenants which has subsequently proven to be incorrect by recent Landlord Tenant Board decisions and Divisional Court appeals.
Hamilton Rental Housing Roundtable Recommendations

These recommendations were drafted holistically with the success of any one recommendation generally being dependent on another. For example, the proposed 24-month amnesty program for rental housing charges and fines for landlords willingly working towards code and by law compliance is essential for the success of other recommendations.

Rental housing amnesty program

1) That 24-month amnesty period be adopted during which time no zoning and property standards enforcement action can be taken against non-conforming rental properties provided the city inspector and the landlord agree to and sign a compliance agreement with an agreed upon timetable to correct any and all deficiencies.

2) That no charges or fines can be laid if the landlord can reasonably demonstrate that the compliance agreement is on schedule.

Safe, healthy rental housing financial support program

3) That a formalized financial assistance and emergency housing program be developed to assist tenants who are displaced due to safety issues or code enforcement.

4) That a support program be developed to prevent displacement of tenants by providing emergency loans and discounted fees to landlords who voluntarily agree to bring their rental units into compliance.

Secondary units, in-law suites, granny flats as a right

5) That Hamilton adopt policies and by-laws that match provincial policies to give each homeowner the legal right to include a secondary dwelling unit within their home without a rezoning requirement, provided building permits are acquired and that any minor variances are approved by the Committee of Adjustment.

Grandfathering of secondary units

6) That Hamilton grandfather all pre-existing secondary units provided they fully comply with the fire code, building code and any applicable property standards by-laws.

Streamlined building permit process for secondary suites (Granny Flats)

7) That Hamilton adopt a one-stop shop service to streamline the process of obtaining a building permit for secondary suites and make it easier for rental unit owners to come to the City to legalize their units.
Streamline process for secondary units

8) That Hamilton eliminate the current policies requiring re-zoning applications for the conversion of a single-family home to include secondary units as a right.
9) That the City adopt reasonable fees and building permit costs for conversions of single family homes to include secondary unit as a right.

Secondary suites public awareness campaign

10) That Hamilton develop a public awareness campaign explaining the provincial policies for secondary suites and the positive impact such suites can have on the affordable housing deficit.

Off-campus student housing

11) That Hamilton apply and enforce the Lodging Home By-law to include off-campus student housing, as rooming houses.

Extend and expand proactive property standards enforcement

12) That Hamilton develop a permanent proactive property standards enforcement program for all classes of properties including owner-occupied homes, rental and commercial properties in all city wards.
13) That Hamilton continue to resource the proactive property standards enforcement program through the general levy.
14) That Hamilton monitor and report annually on the efficacy of the program and any change in property values in the subject properties.

Reporting non-conforming rental housing

15) That Hamilton remove any policies prohibiting anonymous tips and adopt a new process by which citizens can report a suspected unlicensed rooming house or off-campus student housing to by-law enforcement while protecting their privacy as per their rights under the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.
16) That any complainant be advised that their identity is protected under MFIPPA.

Merge the zoning by-laws of the former municipalities of the Hamilton-Wentworth Region

17) That Hamilton create one modern zoning by-law for the entire city providing reasonable and fair policies that treat all residents equally.

NOTE: we understand that the City of Hamilton Planning Department is consulting and hopes to present a new by-law in 2019.
Adopt a zoning by-law that is congruent with the Ontario Building Code

18) That pursuant to Section 9.5 of the Ontario Building Code, Hamilton:
   a) amend its Zoning By-law 6593, Section 19 by replacing “the minimum dwelling size from each dwelling unit has a floor area of at least 65 square metres (699.65 square feet)” with the minimum 145 square feet floor areas of for studios, 223 square feet for one-bedroom units, 298 square feet for two-bedroom units and 373 square feet for three-bedroom units,
   b) Set the definition of “basement” in the new Residential Zoning By-law to "BASEMENT - A story of a dwelling which is below ground level, and includes a cellar."
   c) Make clear what the City’s requirements for ceiling height are, and ensure the information is easy to both find and interpret and not impose ceiling heights in excess of the Ontario Building Code requirements. Remove the minimum lot size or change to a minimum 120m2.
   d) Review the parking provisions and amend requirements to meet the actual need and encourage maximum compliance.

Tenants’ and Landlords’ rights and responsibilities charter

19) That Hamilton, in consultation with rental housing stakeholders, develop a charter outlining rights and responsibilities for tenants and landlords including a complaint resolution protocol with progressive steps of action for the tenant.
20) That Hamilton provide public education to encourage tenants and landlords to follow this suggested complaint protocol:
   a) The tenant should first contact the Property Manager or on-site superintendent, to file their complaint. The tenant should be required to document the complaint and response for possible future by-law enforcement. If the complaint remains unresolved, after a reasonable period of time, then the tenant should contact the Landlord or Property owner.
   b) If the Property Owner does not resolve the tenant’s issue then they should contact a local mediation service provider such as Housing Help Centre.
   c) If the issue is related to health and safety concerns that the Tenant should contact Municipal By-law enforcement for assistance through a free tenants’ inspection.
   d) If the issue still remains unresolved, the tenant can contact the Ontario Rental Housing Enforcement Unit. Tenants in Ontario may report any offence under the Residential; Tenancies Act Toll-free 1-888-772-9277
   e) If the Ontario Rental Housing Enforcement Unit fails to resolve the issue then the tenant should file an application with the Landlord Tenant Board.

NOTE: The Province has indicated its intent to bring forward legislation in 2018 that would set a province wide requisite lease, which may cover items18-19.

Free rental unit inspections

21) That Hamilton adopt a new program whereby tenants may request a free tenant safety inspection to identify safety concerns related to Ontario building and fire code regulations.
22) That Hamilton develop a public awareness campaign to inform the general public,
tenants and landlords about the free tenant safety inspection.

23) That Hamilton request local universities and colleges provide information about the free rental unit inspection to all students

24) That upon a tenant inspection request, Hamilton inspectors will identify themselves to the tenant and explain that the inspection is provided to identify any safety concerns related to Ontario building and fire code regulations specifically, that safe rental units must have
   a. working smoke alarms on every level and outside every sleeping area (houses built after 2013 must also have a smoke alarm in every bedroom).
   b. working carbon monoxide alarms installed outside of sleeping areas if the unit contains a fuel burning appliance, fireplace or attached garage.
   c. An egress or large enough window or door to be able to get directly outside from basement bedrooms, and fire separation(s) between each unit.”

Support the establishment of the Hamilton Rental Housing Roundtable

25) That Hamilton support the establishment of an independent community based Hamilton Rental Housing Roundtable (HRHR), consisting of a broad cross section of rental housing stakeholders as an advisory/liaison committee to assist the city on all rental housing matters.

Conclusions

Adoption of rental housing licensing by-laws by Ontario municipalities is far from universal. In most cases, the initial catalyst to adopt rental housing licensing is to gain new revenue opportunities from license and inspection fees. The results of such programming decisions reveal significant new costs being added to the municipality and limited opportunities to secure full cost recovery from landlords given their ability to legally pass such costs onto their tenants.

As a result, the financial impacts on tenants through above guideline rent increases that are permitted to offset such municipal license and inspection fees can be overwhelming and life altering to some of the most vulnerable people in our city. Above guideline increases and/or the subsequent rent increases at unit turnover all but certainly guarantee substantial rent increases, in a market where affordability is a real challenge.

Our review shows that the risk of displacement remains especially real for secondary housing tenants. The landlord’s unwillingness or inability to pay fees required to meet zoning and code compliance puts a projected 30% or 7,258 of such tenants in jeopardy of displacement which, given the current state of the affordable rental housing market, could substantially increase local homelessness for the most vulnerable tenants.

It is reasonable to conclude given the current housing market in Hamilton that adopting rental housing licensing will not encourage new construction of rental housing, the legalization of rental housing, improve safety, or improve housing affordability. In fact, the opposite is quite true. Adopting a licensing by-law for rental housing will dampen if not eliminate any new investments in the rental market, encourage more underground rentals, and adversely impact rent affordability.
The Hamilton Rental Housing Roundtable is confident that the City of Hamilton can make a real difference by collaborating with the community and stakeholders and adopting our reasonable, pragmatic and holistic recommendations.

On balance, the risks and negative impacts of licensing rental housing outweigh any potential gains.

Therefore, we respectfully request the following considerations:

1) that City Council make a definitive decision to NOT license rental housing
2) that any work in relation to the investigation and consideration of the licensing of rental housing be suspended until such time as staff has an opportunity to review and make recommendation as to findings of this report
3) that City staff be directed to work with the Hamilton Rental Housing Roundtable to promote code compliant rental housing with safe, clean and healthy dwelling units.
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Appendices

Appendix (i) LTB Decision File Number: SWL-69354-14

Order under Section 126
Residential Tenancies Act, 2006

[Company name removed] (the 'Landlord') applied for an order permitting the rent charged to be increased by more than the guideline for one or more of the rental units in the residential complex because of an extraordinary increase in the cost for municipal taxes and charges.

This application was resolved by written hearing. The Board received submissions from Tenants LS, LG, GA, JS and LH.

It is determined that:

1. The Landlord justified a rent increase above the guideline because of an extraordinary increase in the cost for municipal taxes and charges.

2. The municipal taxes and charges claimed by the Landlord have been adjusted to remove the licensing fees and ESA charges applicable to the 3 units not covered by the application.

3. Although the Landlord has failed to file a Certificate of Service as required by subsection 188(3) of the Act, based on Tenant submissions received by the Board on August 7th, 21st and 27th, 2015, I am satisfied that the parties have been notified of the written hearing.

4. The Board received submissions from Tenants LS, LG, GA, JS and LH. In their submissions, some of the tenants raise maintenance issues. These submissions were taken into consideration in as much as we can under the legislation.

It is ordered that:

1. The Landlord may increase the rents charged by 6.00% for the units set out in Schedule 1.

2. The Landlord may increase the rents charged within the time period of April 1, 2015 to March 31, 2016.

3. The percentage increase set out in paragraph 1 may be taken in addition to the annual guideline in effect on the increase date for the unit.

4. The Landlord or the Tenants shall pay to the other any sum of money that is owed as a result of this order.

November 18, 2015
Date Issued

Greg Joy
Member, Landlord and Tenant Board

Eastern-RO
Important Notes:

1. The landlord may increase the rent charged by the ordered increase within the time period specified if at least 12 months have passed since the last rent increase or since the tenant moved in, and if the landlord has given the tenant at least 90 days proper Notice of Rent Increase. Any part of the ordered increase that is not taken within the time period specified cannot be added to subsequent rent increases in subsequent time periods.

2. If the landlord has given a Notice of Rent Increase for a rent increase that is less than the ordered increase, the landlord may only take the rent increase set out in the Notice.

3. The ordered increase does not affect tenants who moved into the complex on or after January 1, 2015. The landlord cannot add the ordered increase to the rents these tenants pay.
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[1] The appellants are tenants of the respondent landlord. They appeal three related orders of the Landlord and Tenant Board (the "Board") which authorized an above-guideline rent increase (an "AGI") for municipal taxes and charges under s. 126(1) of the Residential Tenancies Act, 2006, S.O. 2006, c. 17 (the "RTA").

[2] The Board held that fees paid by the landlord to the municipality for a Rental Housing Licence (a "RHL") and to the Electrical Safety Authority (the "ESA") for a certificate, both of which were required by a by-law, were part of an extraordinary increase in municipal taxes and charges.

[3] The tenants challenge the Board's ruling in four respects. First, they allege that the Board was wrong to find that ESA fees are charges levied by a municipality. Second, they contend that, although the RHL fees qualify as municipal charges, both the RHL fees and the ESA fees are exempted because they relate to an alleged breach by the landlord of health, safety, housing or maintenance standards and the Board was wrong to conclude otherwise. Third, they argue that the Board improperly fettered its discretion by not calculating the AGI in a way that spread the fees and charges more evenly over the period of time for which they were incurred. Lastly, they allege that they were not afforded procedural fairness in the manner in which they received notice of the landlord's application, disclosure of the basis for the application, and the way in which the Board proceeded to deal with it.

[4] These reasons explain why I would dismiss the appeal. The Board's conclusions that the ESA fees qualify as municipal charges and that the RHL fees and ESA fees are not exempt were reasonable. So, too, was the Board's decision that it was required by the RTA to calculate the AGI over a 12 month period only. Finally, although the notice and the disclosure provided to the appellants were inadequate, the procedural unfairness that resulted was cured in this case by the Board's subsequent review of its own decision.

BACKGROUND

[5] In May 2011, the City of Waterloo passed the Rental Housing Licensing By-law (By-law 2011-047). The by-law implemented a new, comprehensive Rental Housing Licensing Program (the "RHL Program"), which required landlords of most low-rise rental units to obtain an RHL annually. In order to obtain an RHL, the landlord was required to pay a fee to the municipality and to certify that the rental property complied with certain statutorily-imposed standards, including those imposed by the Electrical Safety Code, O. Reg. 164/99. In this regard, the by-law required that the landlord submit a certificate from the ESA every five years.
By-law 2011-047 was the subject of an application for judicial review before this Court. The landlord in this case was one of a group of landlords that together challenged the by-law in *1736095 Ontario Ltd. v. Waterloo (City)*, 2015 ONSC 6541 ("173"). For reasons released on October 22, 2015, the court dismissed the application.

In December 2014, the landlord filed an application for an AGI with the Board. The application related to the landlord's residential townhouse rental complex located on Goldbeck Lane, in Waterloo. It was based solely on an alleged extraordinary increase in municipal taxes and charges. The landlord alleged that municipal taxes and charges had increased over the base year of 2014 in the amount of $52,853.60. Of this amount, the sum of $25,112.63 related to RHL licensing fees and the sum of $18,034.80 related to ESA fees.

The Board issued a Notice of Written Hearing on July 9, 2015. The notice required the landlord to give the tenant a copy of the notice by July 29, 2015, and to file a Certificate of Service with the Board by August 3, 2015. The landlord failed to file the certificate.

The appellants filed a joint submission with the Board on August 27, 2015.

On November 18, 2015, Board Member Greg Joy issued an order, without reasons, authorizing an increase of 6.00% above the annual guideline, effective April 1, 2015. As a result, Julia Seirlis' rent increased by 7.6 percent and Leslie Houston's rent increased by 8 percent.

On January 7, 2016, Waterloo Region Co-unity Legal Services ("WRCLS"), acting on behalf of Leslie Houston ("the tenant"), requested reasons for Member Joy's decision and a copy of all of the landlord's submissions on file. The Board had difficulty fulfilling the latter request. To preserve the tenant's rights, counsel from WRCLS requested a review of Member Joy's decision and an extension of time under the Board's Rules of Practice (the "rules"). Reasons for Member Joy's decision were issued on March 10, 2016. The landlord's evidence was received by WRCLS counsel on March 22, 2016, following which counsel amended both the request to review and the request to extend time.

On July 25, 2016, Board Vice-Chair Charron issued an Interim Review Order on behalf of the Board. In the order, Vice-Chair Charron denied the tenant's request for a review hearing relating to the RHL fees and the ESA fees, but allowed a review hearing on the sole question of the proper AGI calculation under s. 31 of the Ontario Regulation 516/06 ("the regulation"), made under the *RTA*.

The review hearing took place on October 26, 2016, and consisted of oral argument only. Board Vice-Chair Usprich issued a Review Order on April 10, 2017, finding that the Board did not have jurisdiction to modify the AGI calculation under the *RTA* over any longer period than 12 months.

The appeal to this Court was launched thereafter.

**ISSUES**
This appeal raises the following issues:

(1) Does the appeal raise questions of law?
(2) If so, what is the proper standard of review?
(3) Does the Board's decision that the ESA fee is a municipal charge meet the standard of review?

(4) Does the Board's decision that the RHL and the ESA fees are not exempted municipal charges meet the standard of review?
(5) Does the Board's decision that it has no discretion to amortize the rent increase over more than 12 months meet the standard of review?
(6) Was the tenant denied procedural fairness?

Although the issues were addressed by the appellants more or less in the order set out above, I propose to deal with the last issue, procedural fairness, first. If the tenant was denied procedural fairness, some or all of the other issues may be moot.

ANALYSIS

Was the tenant denied procedural fairness?

The appellants maintain that the tenant was denied procedural fairness in three ways. The first two relate to the nature of the notice they received of the landlord's application and the pre-hearing disclosure.

The appellants submit that the notice was inadequate because the application form did not particularize the nature of the municipal taxes and charges that formed the basis for the landlord's request. Further, without disclosure of the landlord's evidence or submissions to the Board, the appellants were unable to perform their own calculations concerning the amount or timing of the RHL and ESA fees. As a result, the appellants say that they were unable to properly participate in the written hearing held before Member Joy.

I agree that the appellants received inadequate notice and inadequate disclosure in this case. However, in my view, the procedural unfairness that resulted was remedied by virtue of the reviews that subsequently took place by Vice-Chair Charron and before Vice-Chair Usprich.

The landlord's application for an AGI was brought in compliance with s. 22(1) of the
 regulation, which provides that, in an application under s.126 of the RTA, the application must be accompanied by the following material:

1. If the application is based on extraordinary increase in the cost for municipal taxes and charges or utilities or both,
   1. evidence of the costs for the base year and the reference year and evidence of payment of those costs, and
   11. evidence of all grants, other forms of financial assistance, rebates and refunds received by the landlord that effectively reduce those costs for the base year or the reference year.

2. If the application is based on capital expenditures incurred,
   1. evidence of all costs and payments for the amounts claimed for capital work, including any information regarding grants and assistance from any level of government and insurance, resale, salvage and trade-in proceeds,
   ii. details about each invoice and payment for each capital expenditure item, in the form approved by the Board, and
   111. details about the rents for all rental units in the residential complex that are affected by any of the capital expenditures, in the form approved by the Board.

3. If the application is based on operating costs related to security services, evidence of the costs claimed in the application for the base year and the reference year and evidence of payment of those costs.

[21] Thus, pursuant to the regulation, unlike an application for an AGI based on capital expenditures, the landlord in this case was not required to, and did not, file details about the increased municipal taxes and charges.

[22] In considering the issue of procedural fairness, Vice-Chair Charron pointed out that the tenant never asked that the landlord provide a breakdown of the amounts set out in the application (Interim Order, para. 7). That is correct. However, I agree with the appellants' submission that there was nothing in the notice of application that told them that they could make such a request. In my view, at a minimum, that information should have been provided. The Board regularly deals with tenants who have no legal training, nor any legal representation. As a result, the Board's forms must be legally informative. The prescribed notice in this case was not.

[23] Vice-Chair Charron also held that there was no evidence before her that the tenant was not reasonably able to participate in the written proceeding before Member Joy. I do not agree with that conclusion. As the Vice-Chair herself pointed out, "(t)he arguments raised by the Tenant in this Request to Review were not raised at the initial hearing stage" (Interim Order, para. 8). That is at least some evidence that the tenant was not able to reasonably participate in the earlier written hearing. There is more.

[24] In their written submissions to Member Joy, the appellants wrote (para. 2):

The proposed increase seeks to unfairly place the burden of costs incurred under a new licence fee imposed by the City of Waterloo on tenants rather than on the landlord.
The licence fee, i.e. the RHL, was only one of the charges at issue. The ESA fees were also a significant component of the increase sought by the landlord. This is further evidence that the appellants did not fully understand the basis for the landlord's request.

[25] However, notwithstanding the fact that the tenant had not satisfied Vice-Chair Charron that she had not been reasonably able to participate in the previous hearing, and notwithstanding the fact that the tenant was raising arguments not raised before, Vice Chair Charron went on to carefully consider the arguments raised by the tenant "out of an abundance of caution" (Interim Order, para. 12). I will return to her analysis, below.

[26] The appellants also argue that the effect of the lack of proper notice and disclosure continued after the written hearing and impacted the review later conducted by Vice Chair Charron because they were required to satisfy a higher standard, namely that a serious error had been made.

[27] Vice-Chair Charron's review was conducted under rule 29.2 of the rules, which permits the Board to exercise its discretion to review a previous order where it is satisfied that the order "contains a serious error, a serious error occurred in the proceeding, or the person making the request was not reasonably able to participate in the proceeding."

[28] Although Vice-Chair Charron began by outlining the test under rule 29.2, she went on to consider simply whether the Board had "erred" in allowing the landlord to claim the amount it did for municipal taxes and charges and whether the Board ought to have exercised a discretion to spread out the AGI over several years in order to minimize the impact (Interim Order, para. 12). Vice-Chair Charron did not apply the serious error test until the end of her analysis, by which point she had concluded that no error, let alone a serious error, had occurred.

[29] For these reasons, the effect of the lack of proper notice and disclosure was remedied by virtue of the review undertaken by Vice-Chair Charron.

[30] The appellants' third complaint relating to procedural fairness concerns the nature of the hearing conducted before Member Joy. The appellants contend that this was not a straightforward AGI request because the request involved a "complex and contentious" municipal by-law and non-municipal charges (Appellants' Factum, para. 49). The appellants submit that the landlord's request should have been the subject of an oral hearing. They argue that if it had been, the tenants would have had disclosure of the landlord's evidence on the hearing date, if not earlier.

[31] I do not agree with the appellants' submissions in this regard.

[32] In *Baker v. Canada*, [1999] 2 S.C.R. 817, at paras. 23 - 27, the Supreme Court of Canada held that the specific requirements necessary to provide procedural fairness in any given case depend upon a number of factors, including the following:

1. the nature of the decision being made and of the process followed in making it;

2. the nature of the statutory scheme and the terms of the statute pursuant to which the body operates;
(3) the importance of the decision to the individual or individuals affected;

(4) the legitimate expectations of the person challenging the decision; and

(5) the choices of procedure made by the agency itself.

[33] In my view, the Board's decision to hold a written hearing in the first instance, and the legislative and regulatory framework within which that decision was made, respect the duty of procedural fairness and, in particular, the *audi alteram partem* rule of natural justice.

[34] Section 183 of the *RTA* requires the Board to adopt "the most expeditious method of determining the questions arising in a proceeding that affords to all persons directly affected by the proceeding an adequate opportunity to know the issues and be heard on the matter."

[35] Pursuant to s. 184, the *Statutory Powers Procedure Act*, R.S.O. 1990, c. S.22 (the "*SPPA*") applies with respect to all proceedings before the Board. Section 25.0.1 of the *SPPA* grants the Board the power to determine its own procedures and practices and to make rules for that purpose under s. 25.1 of the *SPPA*.

[36] Section 5.1 (1) of the *SPPA* provides that a tribunal may make a rule permitting written hearings. Section 184 (2) of the *RTA* specifically exempts the Board from s. 5.1(2) of the *SPPA*, pursuant to which a tribunal shall not hold a written hearing if a party satisfies the tribunal that there is a good reason for not doing so.

[37] Rule 22.1 of the rules governs when the Board will hold a written hearing. It provides:

In deciding whether to hold a written hearing, the [Board] may consider any relevant factors, including:

1. the suitability of a written hearing format considering the subject matter of the hearing;

2. whether the nature of the evidence is appropriate for a written hearing, including whether credibility is in issue and the extent to which facts are in dispute;

3. the extent to which the matters in dispute are questions of law;

4. the convenience of the parties;

5. the ability of the parties to participate in a written hearing; and

6. the cost, efficiency and timeliness of proceedings.

[38] Notwithstanding that the *RTA* specifically exempts the Board from the provisions of the *SPPA* that prohibit a tribunal from holding a written hearing in certain circumstances, the rule also provides a procedure pursuant to which a party can object to a written hearing
within a certain time limit and by virtue of which the Board may continue a hearing as either an oral hearing or an electronic hearing.

[39] As Vice-Chair Charron pointed out, the Board routinely deals with AGI increases by way of written hearings (Interim Order, para. 10). As she also pointed out, as with most AGI's dealing with municipal taxes and charges, the issues in this application revolved mainly around numbers, there were no issues of credibility and the facts were straightforward.

[40] If, as the appellants argue, the central issues in this case are questions of law and not questions of fact or mixed fact and law (an argument that I accept for reasons set out below), I cannot see why the duty of procedural fairness required an oral hearing in this case. The fact that the appellants may have received at least last minute disclosure as a by-product of an oral hearing is more properly a reason to question the disclosure process, as I have done, than it is to question the hearing process.

[41] For these reasons, I do not accept the appellants' argument that this matter should not have proceeded as a written hearing.

**Are there questions of law raised?**

[42] This appeal is brought under s. 210 of the *RTA*, which permits an appeal from an order of the Board, "but only on a question of law."

[43] The landlord and the Board argue that the issues raised by the appellants regarding the ESA fees and the RHL fees are both questions of fact or, at best, questions of mixed fact and law. As a result, they argue that the appeal on those issues should be dismissed: *Solomon v. Levy*, 2015 ONSC 2556 (Div. Ct.), at para. 33. I am unable to agree.

[44] The distinction between questions of law, questions of fact, and questions of mixed fact and law was articulated by Iacobucci J. in *Canada (Director of Investigation & Research) v. Southam Inc.*, [1997] 1 S.C.R. 748 (at para. 35):

> Briefly stated, questions of law are questions about what the correct legal test is; questions of fact are questions about what actually took place between the parties; and questions of mixed law and fact are questions about whether the facts satisfy the legal tests.

[45] With respect to both the ESA fees and the RHL fees, the Board was called upon to determine questions of law. With respect to the ESA fees, the question was whether a fee paid by a landlord to a third party pursuant to a municipal by-law could qualify as a charge levied by a municipality. With respect to both the ESA fees and the RHL fees, the Board was required to consider whether, in order to be exempt as municipal charges under s. 2(l)(a) of the *RTA*, a specific allegation had to precede an inspection.

[46] These are both questions of law. As with all questions of law, the questions were set against a factual background. That does not make them questions of fact.

[47] I see no distinction between the nature of the questions raised in this case and the legal
questions raised in the governing cases cited by the landlord and by the Board regarding the standard of review applicable in this matter, addressed below.

[48] In *First Ontario Realty Corp. v. Deng*, 2011 ONCA 54, 274 O.A.C. 338, the Board had decided that tenants were entitled to a rent reduction due to a reduction of facilities provided in a residential rental complex. An appeal to the Divisional Court by the landlord was allowed. A further appeal to the Court of Appeal was dismissed, but not on the basis that the appeal failed to raise a question of law.

[49] The issue before the Board and the courts in *Deng* was whether the landlord's removal of fenced-in gardens, lawns and walkways was a "reduction in coacent recreational facilities" within the definition of"services and facilities" under ss. 1(1) and 142(1) (now ss. 2(1) and 130(1)) of the RTA. Notwithstanding the particular factual matrix giving rise to the question, the issue was still one of statutory interpretation, involving a question of law.

[50] In *Onyskiw v. CJM Property Management Ltd.*, 2016 ONCA 477, the issue was whether tenants were entitled to an abatement of rent as a result of the fact that the elevator in their building was out of service for 96 days in one year. The Board held that they were not. The Divisional Court dismissed the tenants' appeal, as did the Court of Appeal. Again, neither court dismissed the appeal on the basis that the issue was a question of fact or mixed fact and law. As Weiler J.A. acknowledged on behalf of the Court of Appeal, the appeal involved the interpretation of a section of the RTA (s. 20(1)) and whether it was an error of law on the part of the Board to refuse an abatement of rent on the basis that the landlord's behaviour was reasonable (para. 25).

[51] Like *Deng* and *Onyskiw*, this case involves questions of law, namely, the interpretation of the meaning of"municipal taxes and charges" ins. 2(1) of the RTA and the exemption in paragraph (a) under that section.

[52] In my view, therefore, this appeal is properly brought under s. 210.

**What is the proper standard of review?**

[53] The appellants submit that the proper standard of review is correctness with respect to the proper legal characterization of the RHL fees and the ESA fees. They submit that correctness is the test because the Board was not interpreting a provision with which it had particular familiarity or expertise. With respect to the Board's decision that it had no power to amortize the AGI beyond 12 months, the appellants say that correctness is the standard of review because the issue raises a question of true jurisdiction.

[54] I disagree. The proper standard of review with respect to all three issues is reasonableness.

There is no need to proceed from first principles where the standard of review of a tribunal's decisions on a particular issue has already been determined (paras. 57 and 62).

[56] A look at the jurisprudence relating to reviews of the Board's decisions interpreting its home statute quickly reveals that the standard of review is reasonableness.

[57] In *Deng*, the Divisional Court had held that the standard of review was correctness. Writing on behalf of the Court of Appeal, Karakatsanis J. A. (as she then was) began by noting that the standards of review established in *Dunsmuir* apply not only to judicial review, but also to statutory appeals, as well (para. 16). After acknowledging that a tribunal's decision may attract different standards of review depending on the issue involved, Karakatsanis J. A. proceeded to conduct the first principles analysis required under *Dunsmuir*. She concluded that the Divisional Court erred in applying a correctness standard and held that the appropriate standard was reasonableness, even where the issue before the Board involves a pure question of law in which the Board is required to apply general principles of statutory interpretation (paras. 15 and 21).

[58] A similar conclusion was reached by the Court of Appeal in *Onyskiw*, an appeal that involved the interpretation by the Board of s. 20(1) of the RTA. That section imposes a duty on a landlord to provide residential rental units in a good state of repair, fit for habitation, and in compliance with health, safety and maintenance standards.

[59] In *Onyskiw*, the Divisional Court had applied a standard of reasonableness on the appeal. The Court of Appeal upheld the Divisional Court decision to apply that standard. Writing on behalf of the court, Weiler J. A. held (paras. 28 and 29):

> [28] Where an administrative tribunal interprets or applies its home statute, the standard of review is presumptively reasonableness: *Alberta (Information and Privacy Commissioner) v. Alberta Teachers' Association*, 2011 SCC 61, [2011] 3 S.C.R. 654, at para. 39. A correctness standard may apply if the question at issue is both of central importance to the legal system and outside the adjudicator's specialized area of expertise: *Alberta (information and Privacy Commissioner)*, at para. 46. However, this exceptional category must be interpreted conjunctively and not as separate and distinct factors: see *Loewen v. Manitoba Teachers' Society*, 2015 MBCA 13, 315 Man. R. (2d) 123, at para. 48.

> [29] Where, as here, the jurisprudence has already determined the standard of review and thus the degree of deference to be accorded to a particular category of question before a given administrative tribunal, this will end the inquiry: see *Dunsmuir v. New Brunswick*, 2008 SCC 9, [2008] 1 S.C.R. 190, at para. 62; *First Ontario Realty Corporation v. Deng*, 2011 ONCA 54, 274 O.A.C. 338, at para. 20. Subject to the exception stated above, decisions of the Board are subject to review on a standard of reasonableness: *Deng*, at para. 21. In *Deng*, this Court held, at para. 21, that the
Board administers a specialized adjudicative regime for resolving residential tenancy disputes, and where it is required to interpret its "home statute" (the RTA) and regulations, with which it has particular familiarity, in making determinations with respect to its core functions, deference is owed to its decisions.

[60] In my view, Deng and Onyskiw require that we apply a reasonableness standard to the decisions of the Board in this case regarding the RHL and the BSA fees. A similar conclusion was reached by this Court in Helberg Properties Ltd. v. Caldwell, 2015 ONSC 7863, which involved an appeal of an AGI allowed by the Board on the basis of a capital expenditure by the landlord.

[61] I reach the same conclusion with respect to the issue of the amortization of the AGL. The appellants submit that the Board's decision raises a true question of jurisdiction, requiring a correctness standard. They rely on Dunsmuir, where the majority held that administrative bodies must be correct in their determination of "true questions of jurisdiction or vires" (para. 59). The appellants argue that the present case is like the decision in Bellaire v. Ontario Aboriginal Housing Services Corp., 2017 ONSC 2839, in which this court applied the correctness standard to a decision of the Board. In my view, however, Bellaire is readily distinguishable from the case at bar.

[62] In Bellaire, the Board was asked in the course of an eviction proceeding to determine whether it had jurisdiction under s. 203 of the RTA to review the amount of geared-to-income rent that was being paid by the tenant. Section 203 of the RTA reads:

203. The Board shall not make determinations or review decisions concerning,

(a) eligibility for rent-geared-to-income assistance as defined in section 38 of the Housing Services Act, 2011 or the amount of geared-to-income rent payable under that Act; or

(b) eligibility for, or the amount of, any prescribed form of housing assistance.

[63] The Board held that s. 203 precluded it from reviewing the amount of rent allegedly owed by the tenant. This court held that the Board had erred in reaching that conclusion because the Board incorrectly believed that the tenant's income was being paid under the Housing Services Act, 2011, S.O., 2011 c. 6, when it was not.

[64] Bellaire involved a true question of jurisdiction. Quoting from Dunsmuir at para. 59, Heeney J. wrote on behalf of this court at para. 19) that:

"Jurisdiction" is intended in the narrow sense of whether or not the tribunal had the authority to make the inquiry. In other words, true jurisdiction questions arise where the tribunal must explicitly determine whether its statutory grant of power gives it the authority to decide a particular matter. [Emphasis added]
In the subsequent decision in *Alberta (Information and Privacy Commissioner)*, a majority of the Supreme Court of Canada confirmed that the category of true questions of jurisdiction is a narrow one and highlighted the deference owed to a tribunal interpreting its home statute (para 34):

The direction that the category of true questions of jurisdiction should be interpreted narrowly takes on particular importance when the tribunal is interpreting its home statute. In one sense, anything a tribunal does that involves the interpretation of its home statute involves the determination of whether it has the authority or jurisdiction to do what is being challenged on judicial review. However, since *Dunsmuir*, this Court has departed from that definition of jurisdiction ... it is sufficient in these reasons to say that, unless the situation is exceptional, and we have not seen such a situation since *Dunsmuir*, the interpretation by the tribunal of "its own statute or statutes closely connected to its function, with which it will have particular familiarity" should be presumed to be a question of statutory interpretation subject to deference on judicial review.

In the present case, the Board was not being asked if it had the power to make determinations regarding the proper calculation of an AGL. Instead, it was being asked whether the power it did have could be exercised in a particular manner. The question before the Board was much more like the question before the Board in *Deng* than the question before the Board in *Bellaire*. In *Deng*, one of the issues was whether the Board had discretion to adopt a method of calculating a rent reduction for the loss of services or facilities based on the value of the loss to the tenants, as opposed to the cost of the service or facility to the landlord or the rental value of the service or facility. The Court of Appeal held that the Board had no jurisdiction to adopt an alternative method of calculating the rent reduction other than to base it on the cost to the landlord or the rental value of the service or facility. The Court of Appeal held that, notwithstanding the mandatory language of the regulation in question, the standard of review was not converted from one of deference to one of correctness (para. 21).

I see no significant distinction between the question regarding the proper method of calculating a rent reduction in *Deng* and the question of how to calculate a rent increase in this case. Neither question gives rise to a jurisdictional issue.

**Is the Board's decision that the ESA fee is a municipal charge reasonable?**

The landlord's application for an AGI was brought under s. 126(1) of the *RTA*. That section permits the landlord to apply for an AGI where the landlord experiences:
I. An extraordinary increase in the cost for municipal taxes and charges or utilities or both for the residential complex or any building in which the rental units are located.

[69] "Municipal taxes and charges" are defined ins. 2(1) of the RTA:

"municipal taxes and charges" means taxes charged to a landlord by a municipality and charges levied on a landlord by a municipality and includes taxes levied on a landlord’s property under Division B of Part IX of the Education Act and taxes levied on a landlord’s property in unorganized territory, but "municipal taxes and charges" does not include,

(a) charges for inspections done by a municipality on a residential complex related to an alleged breach of a health, safety, housing or maintenance standard,

(b) charges for emergency repairs carried out by a municipality on a residential complex,

(c) charges for work in the nature of a capital expenditure carried out by a municipality,

(d) charges for work, services or non-emergency repairs performed by a municipality in relation to a landlord’s non-compliance with a by-law,

(e) penalties, interest, late payment fees or fines,

(f) any amount spent by a municipality under subsection 219 (1) or any administrative fee applied to that amount under subsection 219 (2), or

(g) any other prescribed charges.

[70] Vice-Chair Charron held that - the ESA fees qualified as a charge levied by the municipality. At paras. 18 and 19 of her Interim Order, the Vice-Chair wrote:

18. In 1736095 Ontario Ltd. v. Waterloo (City) [2015 ONSC 6541], the court held:

"In summary, the RHL Program requires landlords of most low-rise rental units to obtain a rental housing license, renewable annually, and to pay the prescribed license or renewal fee to the City. The rental housing license application process requires landlords to certify that the rental property is in compliance with the Building Code Act, 1992, S.O. 1992, c.23 and the Fire Protection and
Prevention Act, 1997, S.O. 1997, c. 4 and the Electrical Safety Code, O. Reg. 164/99 and to submit, inter alia, the following: (a) a **general inspection certificate report from the Electrical Safety Authority** ("ESA") **(required every five years**; (b) an HVAC certificate (required every five years); (c) proof of insurance (required annually); (d) a criminal record check (required every five years); and, (e) a floor plan for the rental property." [At para. 11 Emphasis Added]

19. The Divisional Court clearly contemplated that landlords were to obtain a general inspection report from the ESA as a component of the licensing program and there is no evidence before me that if the inspection is conducted by ESA, and not directly by the Landlord, that the fee charged for the inspection ceases to be a municipal charge.

[71] The appellants submit that Vice-Chair Charron erred in two important ways in reaching the conclusion she did. First, they submit that whether the ESA inspection is carried out by the landlord is immaterial to the question of whether the inspection fees are a municipal charge. Instead, the appellants submit that what matters is whether the fees are charges levied on a landlord by a municipality. They submit that the ESA is a completely separate entity than the municipality and that the inspection fee bears no similarity to taxes. They also submit that the term "levy" is not one that can properly be used to describe the fee paid by the landlord to the ESA. In summary, the appellants submit that, in order to be a municipal tax or charge, the expense must be paid directly to a municipality and not to a third party, even if required by municipal by-law to do so.

[72] I disagree. To understand why, it is important to bear in mind that we are not called upon to determine if the ESA fee is a municipal tax or charge. Rather, we are called upon to determine if the Board's conclusion that it was reasonable.

[73] As the Supreme Court of Canada explained in *Dunsmuir*, in judicial review, reasonableness is concerned mostly with the existence of justification, transparency and intelligibility within the decision-making process. It is also concerned with whether the decision falls within a range of possible, acceptable outcomes which are defensible in respect of the facts and the law (para. 47). The same concerns apply to the reasonableness standard of review on a statutory appeal such as this one: *Deng*, at para. 16.

[74] Vice-Chair Charron's comments in para 19 of her Interim Order must be read in the context of her reference to the decision in *173*. In *173*, the landlord argued that by-law 2011-047 was, in fact, a taxing statute and, therefore, was **ultra vires** the municipality. This Court held that it was not. Instead, the court found that the RHL fee was a levy (para. 71). On a fair reading of Vice-Chair Charron's Interim Order, it appears that she relied on the decision in *173*, incorrectly in my view, as authority for the proposition that the ESA fees are a charge levied by the municipality within the meaning of s. 2(1) of the
RTA. The court in 173 did not decide the nature of the residential housing by-law in that context. It decided the validity of the by-law in a jurisdictional context. The decision does not stand as authority that fees paid by a landlord to a third party as part of the RHL process are municipal charges. In this sense, Vice-Chair Charron’s decision on the issue cannot be said to meet the requirement of justification.

[75] Absent clear authority on the issue, in order to determine whether the ESA fees are charges levied by a municipality which qualify for an AGI under s. 126(1) of the RTA, Vice-Chair Charron ought to have engaged in a process of statutory interpretation. Presumably because she incorrectly believed that she was bound by this Court’s decision in 173, she did not do so. In these circumstances, this Court is entitled to conduct its own statutory analysis: see 2274659 Ontario Inc. v. Canada Chrome Corp., 2016 ONCA 145 at para. 47, citing British Columbia (Securities Commission) v. McLean, 2013 SCC 67, [2013] 3 S.C.R. 895 (S.C.C.) at paras. 37-70; and Canada (Attorney General) v. Mowat, 2011 SCC 53, [2011] 3 S.C.R. 471 (S.C.C.) at paras. 32-64. When one undertakes the necessary analysis, it is clear that Vice-Chair Charron’s decision fits within a range of reasonable, defensible outcomes.


[77] The object of the RTA is set out ins. 1 of that Act, as follows:

1. (1) The purposes of this Act are to provide protection for residential tenants from unlawful rent increases and unlawful evictions, to establish a framework for the regulation of residential rents, to balance the rights and responsibilities of residential landlords and tenants and to provide for the adjudication of disputes and for other processes to informally resolve disputes.

[78] The appellants argue that, in keeping with the object of the RTA, the scheme of the Act is to require that landlords, and not tenants, bear the costs of routine maintenance. This may be true. However, contrary to the submissions of the appellants, the RHL and ESA fees are not part of routine maintenance. They form part of an inspection scheme designed to ensure that certain standards are met, for the benefit of the tenants. In keeping with the object and scheme of the RTA, where those inspections reveal deficiencies, the landlord, and not the tenant, bears the costs of bringing the premises into compliance.

[79] Section 126(1) of the RTA does not seek to pass on the costs of routine maintenance to tenants. Instead, in keeping with the object of the Act, it seeks to pass on extraordinary increases in municipal taxes and charges in the same way such increases are ordinarily passed on to the occupants of dwellings owned by those occupants.
The intention of the Legislature to flow extraordinary municipal taxes and charges through to tenants becomes obvious when one considers the definition of municipal taxes and charges set out in s. 2(1) of the RTA and, in particular, the exemptions listed thereunder. The Legislature clearly wished to exempt tenants from taxes and charges imposed upon a landlord by a municipality for expenses for which the landlord was to blame, or at least with respect to expenses that could have been avoided by the landlord with due diligence. I will return to discuss these exemptions when I address the RHL fees.

In my view, to interpret the definition of municipal taxes and charges as the appellants suggest would be at odds with the object and scheme of the RTA. To require that charges must be paid directly to the municipality would result in an absurdity by exempting from the flow-through scheme any fee that a municipality demanded a landlord to pay to a third party, regardless of the nature of the fee or charge.

Such an interpretation would also be at odds with the ordinary and grammatical meaning of the words in s. 2(1). If the Legislature wished to add the words "when paid directly to" the municipality, it could have done so. It did not. Instead, it defined municipal taxes and charges by virtue of the authority under which they were imposed, namely the municipality, and not by virtue of the identity of the party to which they were paid.

For these reasons, I believe that, although the reasons of Vice-Chair Charron fail to meet the requirement of justification, her decision nonetheless fits within a range of reasonable outcomes that are defensible in fact and in law.

The second error alleged by the appellants to have been committed by Vice-Chair Charron relates to the evidentiary onus on the question of the ESA fees. The appellants submit that the landlord had the onus of demonstrating that the ESA fees were a municipal charge. I agree with this submission. However, the appellants also submit that Vice-Chair Charron's comment that there was no evidence before her that an electrical inspection ceases to be a municipal charge if conducted by someone other than the landlord shows that she incorrectly reversed that onus. I am unable to agree with this submission.

I do not read the Vice-Chair's comments as suggesting that the tenant bore the evidentiary onus. Instead, I read her comment to mean that there was no reason to conclude from the record before her that the characterization of the ESA fees as a municipal charge changes as a result of who conducts the inspection. Nor do I read Vice Chair Charron's comment as suggesting that the evidentiary onus was not met. This was not a question that turned on the absence of evidence. It was a legal question. The Board had all of the evidence that it required from the landlord, who had submitted a copy.
of the by-law, the ESA fee schedule, and receipts for payment.

[86] For these reasons, I would not give effect to this ground of appeal.

Is the Board's decision that the RHL and ESA fees are not exempt as municipal charges reasonable?

[87] The appellants concede that the RHL fee is a municipal charge. However, they submit that, if the ESA fee is also a municipal charge, both the ESA and the RHL fees fall within the exemption contained in paragraph (a) under the definition of "municipal taxes and charges" in s. 2(1) of the RTA. For the sake of convenience, I will set that clause out again here:

... but "municipal taxes and charges" does not include,

(a) charges for inspections done by a municipality on a residential complex related to an alleged breach of a health, safety, housing or maintenance standard...

[88] The appellants submit that if the ESA fees need not be paid directly to a municipality in order to qualify as municipal charges, then the inspections for which the fees are paid also need not be done directly by a municipality in order to be exempt under paragraph (a).

[89] With respect to both the RHL and ESA fees, the appellants argue that there is no authority to suggest that the words "related to an alleged breach" in paragraph (a) require that the allegation occurs before the inspection (facturn, para. 26). The appellants submit that the effect of the RHL program is to create a presumption that the landlord of a low rise residential rental unit is in breach of health, safety, housing and/or maintenance standards unless and until the requisite inspections are passed.

[90] I cannot agree. There is no authority for the proposition that an allegation must occur before an inspection in order for the exemption to apply under paragraph (a) because no authority is needed. The paragraph is incapable of bearing such a meaning.

[91] There is nothing in the grammatical and ordinary sense of the words used in paragraph (a) that would support the interpretation urged by the appellants. The ordinary and grammatical meaning of the words "related to" (an alleged breach) is that the inspection must have arisen from an alleged breach. In order for an inspection to arise from an alleged breach, the allegation must occur before the inspection.
Moreover, the interpretation urged by the appellants does not accord with the context of the RTA, nor with its scheme and object. As I stated earlier, all of the exemptions set out in paragraph (a) through (f) have in common some element of fault on the part of the landlord for failing to properly maintain a property or some element of unjust enrichment of the landlord by virtue of the municipality having stepped in to do so. The interpretation suggested by the appellants would completely denude these paragraphs of any effect. In essence, it would remove the element of fault or unjust enrichment on the part of the landlord. This would be contrary to the clear intention of the Legislature in exempting the charges set out in paragraphs (a) through (f).

The appellants argue that an allegation need not be proven under paragraph (a) in order to exempt the charges for inspections done as a result thereof. The appellants contend that, in such a case, even an exemplary landlord would still be deprived of the ability to flow the cost of such an inspection through to the tenants as a municipal charge. We have not been provided with any jurisprudence in support of this argument. Without intending to decide the issue, such an interpretation might not survive the modern principle of statutory interpretation relied upon by the appellants in support of their argument that the fees at issue in this case are exempt.

For these reasons, I would dismiss this ground of appeal.

Is the Board's decision that it has no discretion to amortize the AGI over more than 12 months reasonable?

Vice-Chair Charron dismissed the tenant's request for a review hearing regarding the RHL and ESA fees. However, she granted the tenant's request for a review hearing with respect to the manner in which the AGI should be calculated under s. 31 of the regulation and stayed the order of Member Joy pending the hearing. Because the landlord had not had an opportunity to make submissions on the issue, she directed that an oral hearing be held with respect to whether "the Board has, and ought to exercise discretion to spread the AGI over several years" (Interim Order, para. 2).

The relevant parts of s. 31 of the regulation read as follows:

31. The percentage rent increase above the guideline for each rental unit that is the subject of the application shall be calculated in the following manner:

1. Divide the amount of each allowance determined under subsection 29 (2), subsection 29 (3) and section 30 by the total rents for the rental units that are subject to the application and are affected by the operating cost.

2. If the Board is of the opinion that the amount determined under paragraph 1 for an allowance does not reasonably reflect how the rental units that are subject to the application are affected by the operating cost to which the allowance relates,
i. paragraph 1 does not apply in respect to the allowance, and

n. the Board shall determine an amount by another method that, in the opinion of the Board, better reflects how the rental units that are subject to the application are affected by the operating cost to which the allowance relates.

[97] The oral hearing proceeded before Vice-Chair Usprich. The tenant argued before her that the Board had discretion under s. 31 of the regulation to spread the AGI over time and that it ought to do so as a result of the fact that (a) the ESA fee covered a period of five years and (b) the amount of the RHL fees decreased by almost 50% after the first year. The tenant argued that, by spreading the ESA fee over five years and by allocating half of the total RHL fees paid over two years for each of those years, the appropriate rental increase was 3.59 percent above the guideline. The tenant argued that this method of calculating the AGI "better reflected" how the rental units were affected by the operating cost.

[98] Vice-Chair Usprich rejected the tenant's argument. Having found that the appropriate standard of review on this issue is reasonableness, the question now to be considered is whether her decision was reasonable. I have no doubt that it was.

[99] Vice-Chair Usprich held that the Board had no discretion to allocate rent under s. 31 of the regulation because s. 126(10) of the RTA imposed a mandatory obligation on the Board to allocate the AGI over a twelve month period. She referred to s. 126(10), which sets out the order the Board can make if satisfied that an AGI is justified. It reads:

(10) Subject to subsections (11) to (13), in an application under this section, the Board shall make findings in accordance with the prescribed rules with respect to all of the grounds of the application and, if it is satisfied that an order permitting the rent charged to be increased by more than the guideline is justified, shall make an order,

(a) specifying the percentage by which the rent charged may be increased in addition to the guideline; and

(b) subject to the prescribed rules, specifying a 12-month period during which an increase permitted by clause (a) may take effect.

[100] Vice-Chair Usprich compared the language of this section, in which a 12 month period is specified with respect to applications of the type made in this case, with the language of s. 126(11), which permits the Board to allocate a rental increase associated with capital expenditures over two 12 month periods. She concluded that the Board had no discretion in light of this specificity in the RTA to allocate the AGI in question over a period of more than 12 months.

[101] Vice-Chair Usprich held that the RTA took precedence over the regulation and, therefore,
s. 31, clause 2. ii. of the regulation did not give the Board the discretion urged upon it by the tenant. Her decision was a reasonable one. Vice-Chair Usprich’s reasons meet the requirement of transparency, justification and intelligibility. Her conclusion falls within a range of reasonable outcomes that is defensible in terms of both the facts and the law.

[102] For these reasons, I would dismiss this ground of appeal.

CONCLUSION

[103] The appeal does raise questions of law, which questions are reviewable on a standard of reasonableness.

[104] The Board’s decisions that the ESA fee was a municipal charge and that neither the ESA nor RHL fees were exempt, were reasonable. So, too, was the Board’s decision that it had no discretion to allocate the AGI over more than 12 months.

[105] While the appellants were not given proper notice of the landlord’s application or disclosure of the basis upon which it was made, the denial of procedural fairness that resulted was cured by the reviews undertaken by the Board.

[106] For these reasons, the appeal must be dismissed.

COSTS

[107] At the hearing of the appeal, it was agreed that, if the appeal was dismissed, costs would be payable by the appellants to the landlord in the amount of $7,500, all-inclusive.

[108] I would so order.

Ellies J.

I agree

Spies J.

I agree

M. G. J., Quigley J.
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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;
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.

(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:

---
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• 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.
Legal: Municipal infrastructure undertakings such as roads, water and wastewater projects are subject to Ontario’s Environmental Assessment Act. The Act allows for the approval of the project if the planning process follows and completes the requirements set out in the Municipal Engineers Association Class Environmental Assessments document (October 2000, as amended in 2007, 2011).

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.
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September 2017 to November, 2017: Final modifications and refinements made to Secondary Plan based on comments received.

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);
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● 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 changes to 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 a 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:
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- Neighbourhoods;
- 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 meet to 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
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- Hamilton Fire Department
- Hamilton Police Services

- 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
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- Infrastructure Planning and Systems Design

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. Gregory the 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.

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:
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• Ensuring adequate amounts of housing and quality affordable housing options;

• 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 Red Hill 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:
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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><strong>Low Density Residential 2</strong></td>
<td>Singles, Semis, Duplex</td>
<td>0 to 40</td>
<td>Max. 3 storeys</td>
<td>Existing - interior to the neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Density Residential 3</strong></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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Density Residential 2</strong></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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Density Residential 3</strong></td>
<td>Multiple Dwellings, except Street Townhouses, Local Commercial permitted on the ground</td>
<td>75 to 100</td>
<td>Max. 6 storeys</td>
<td>Existing – mainly on the periphery of the neighbourhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor</td>
<td>Permitted Uses</td>
<td>Maximum Building Height</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Reason for Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential 1</td>
<td>Multiple Dwellings, Local Commercial permitted on the ground floor</td>
<td>100 to 200 Provision to increase to 300 subject to specific criteria and public process</td>
<td>Existing High Density sites, mostly on periphery of residential neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Recognizes existing High Density buildings and applies Volume 1 permissions. Permits limited infill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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>Mixed Use - Medium Density</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>Mixed Use – High Density</td>
<td>Permits a range of retail, service commercial, institutional, office, cultural, arts, recreation, entertainment, hotels and</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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Commercial</td>
<td>Commercial uses that cater to the daily and weekly needs of the surrounding neighbourhood, residential uses above the ground floor</td>
<td>None. Size restricts potential height.</td>
<td>Two existing locations (one on Queenston Road, one on Barton Street)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Commercial</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>Arterial Commercial</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>Majority of East Hamilton Industrial Area north of Barton Street East and West of Centennial Parkway North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Industrial</strong></td>
<td>Lands north of the railway and west of Kenora Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full range of industrial uses, including heavy industrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Park</strong></td>
<td>Hotel site abutting QEW and industrial lands on Barton Street East, east of Centennial Parkway North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></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>Henry and Beatrice Warden Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Park</strong></td>
<td>Sam Manson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Subject:** Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan and Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (Wards 5 and 9) (PED18007) - Page 30 of 40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Open Space</th>
<th>Includes opportunities for active and passive recreation, such as golf courses, community gardens, pedestrian and bicycle trails, walkways, picnic areas, and cemeteries</th>
<th>Eastlawn Cemetery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural Open Space</td>
<td>Provides important biological and ecological functions, and may include passive recreation opportunities</td>
<td>Red Hill Valley, lands adjacent to Henry and Beatrice Warden Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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</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 home use 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...
Official Plan Amendment (shown on Appendix K of the Secondary Plan attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED18007).

1.6.3 860 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 PED17196 / PW17088) 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 allows 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, city wide 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.
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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”,
attached to this amendment.

f) That Map B.6.7-4 Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Site Specific Policy Areas be added, as shown on Appendix “I”, attached to this amendment.

g) That Appendix “A” Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan – Transition Areas be added, as shown on Appendix “J”, attached to this amendment.

4.3 Volume 3 – Special Policy Areas, Area Specific Polices 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

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...
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,

l) 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.6.7.5. 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
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.
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.
d) 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).
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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:

   i) drive through facilities; and,

   ii) motor vehicle service stations.

6.7.7.7 District Commercial Designation

   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.
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
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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.
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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.

Any missing sidewalks adjacent to developments, as identified in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan, shall be constructed as part of the development.

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.

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.

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.

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;
v) Other measures that may give bicycles priority; and,

vi) Sustainable stormwater infrastructure (e.g. LID).

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.

6.7.17 Implementation
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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.
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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
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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.
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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.
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v) 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 façade shall not be permitted.

3. Buildings shall have articulated façades 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.

vii) 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
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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.
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.
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.
### 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>MCEA Schedule (see Note 1)</th>
<th>Timeframe for Implementation (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Streets</strong></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>Schedule A</td>
<td>On-going</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Protect right-of-way (no cost) as per Urban Official Plan, Schedule C-2 – Future Road Widenings (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>
<td>On-going</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)</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</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>Years 2017 to 2022</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>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (if known)</td>
<td>APPROX. COST (if known)</td>
<td>MCEA SCHEDULE (see Note 1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 2017 to 2027</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Schedules A+ or B, depending on potential for environmental effects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years 2017 to 2027</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As per City’s B line implementation plans</td>
<td>Cost of rapid transit extensions have not been determined.</td>
<td>Transit Project Assessment Process As per City’s Rapid Transit expansion Plans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preferred Transportation Solution**

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. To be determined Schedule A+ Years 2017 to 2027

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. To be determined Schedule A+ Years 2017 to 2027

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. 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. Transit Project Assessment Process As per City’s Rapid Transit expansion Plans

10. Extend the B-Line LRT from Queenston Traffic Circle to Eastgate Transit Hub. To be determined

11. Extend rapid transit from the Eastgate Transit Hub to the Confederation GO Station. To be determined
### Preferred Transportation Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>The Recreational Trails Master Plan is intended for phased implementation of trail initiatives. Implementation timeframes for Projects 5-4, 5-9, and 5-10 are not identified.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### City-wide Projects

12. Implement Projects in the City of Hamilton’s Recreational Trails Master Plan (2016):
- 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).

#### Recreational Trails

The Recreational Trails Master Plan does not include any estimated construction costs (to be determined).

- Project 5-10 approx. value $2 M

#### Centennial Neighbourhood Specific Projects

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, pedestrian-scale lighting, water fountains, tree or shade canopies, way-finding signage, and green stormwater infrastructure. A description of neighbourhood greenways is provided in Section 5.1.2 and the Glossary.

There are about 7 km of greenways recommended at a cost of about $75 K per kilometre to implement.

#### Sidewalk Construction

14. Construct missing sections of sidewalk along Lake Avenue, Centennial Parkway and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas and schools.

There are about a total of 6 km of new sidewalks required at a cost of about $300 K per kilometre to construct.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Transportation Solution</th>
<th>MCEA Schedule (see Note 1)</th>
<th>Approval Cost (if known)</th>
<th>Timeframe for Implementation (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</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. | Schedule A | Nash Road: Approximately $80 K  
Lake Avenue: Approximately $90 K  
Warrington Street: Approximately $600 K | Year 2017 to 2022 |
| 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. | Schedule A | The cost to improve signage, pavement markings and ramp crossings is estimated to be about $100 K per interchange |  |
| 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 Banff Street to the Confederation GO Station, with access across the railway to the north side of the Confederation GO Station lands to Kenora Avenue (see Preferred Transportation Solutions to include in the Secondary Plan No. 27)  
• Incorporating active transportation facilities on the potential extension of Goderich Road through the City's Transfer Station lands to include in the Secondary Plan No. 27. | Pedestrian / cycling route along Banff Street Schedule A | The cost of a pedestrian / cycling route along Banff Street is approximately $300 K | Implement with Phase 2 development of the Confederation Go Station by Metrolinx (see Preferred Solutions by Other Proponents No. 30). Further studies needed to identify class of EA for Goderich Road extension. Timeframe to implement Goderich Road extension depends on further studies. |
<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>
</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 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. |

**TO INCLUDE IN THE SECONDARY PLAN (SEE NOTE 4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Policy</th>
<th>Developer funded</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</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>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</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>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Improve pedestrian connections through developments. Identify and implement pedestrian connections as part of development applications.</td>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</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>
<td>Address funding in the Secondary Plan.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Address implementation in the Secondary Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Plan Policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MCEA SCHEDULE</strong> (see Note 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>APPROX. COST</strong> (if known)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 Councilor 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>
</tbody>
</table>
| 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. | To be determined | Schedule A | Appendix "C" to Report PED18007
<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>28. Sobi Hamilton</td>
<td>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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 2017 to 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Ministry of Transportation, Ontario</td>
<td>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>30. Metrolinx</td>
<td>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.
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.
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**
- 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 1-1. 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**

**HAMILTON LIGHT RAIL TRANSIT**

**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 systems 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 contain 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 GO Park & Ride Lot
- Future GO Station

Legend:
- Bike Lane
- Multi-Use Trail (Off-Road)
- Signed Bike Route (On-Road)
- Unsigned Bike Route (On-Road)
- "Sharrows" planned in 2015 as part of road construction

Note: 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.)

Hamilton Long Term Rapid Transit System “B.L.A.S.T.” (Conceptual Only)
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

[Map showing truck routes and 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](http://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:

**Capacity**  **Safety**  **Urban Design**  **Mobility Choices**

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

| No. of groups that commented on each alternative | Advantages — what makes sense | Best ideas — what will work best for you and your neighbourhood | Concerns — what might not work |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| **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) | 2 3 3 |  |
| Improve traffic signal timings                  | 4 1 1 |  |
| Implement 3-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years) | 3 2 1 |  |
| Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections | 1 2 1 |  |
| Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional traffic lanes (beyond 25 years) | 1 2 1 |  |
| Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections | 2 2 3 |  |
| **Safety**                                      |                              |                                                               |
| Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park | 2 2 2 |  |
| Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections | 2 3 3 |  |
| Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue | 2 2 1 |  |
| Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas | 2 1 1 |  |
| Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety | 3 1 1 |  |
| Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds | 1 1 1 |  |
| **Urban Design**                                |                              |                                                               |
| Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots | 1 1 1 |  |
| Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50% | 2 1 1 |  |
| Implement cycle tracks on Centennial, and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape options | 2 1 1 |  |
| Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts | 1 1 1 |  |
| Improve pedestrian connections through new developments | 1 1 1 |  |
| Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better | 1 1 1 |  |
| **Mobility Choices**                            |                              |                                                               |
| Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N’ | 1 2 1 |  |
| Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods | 2 2 1 |  |
| Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances | 1 1 1 |  |
| Add local HSR circulator route | 1 1 1 |  |
| Facilitate car sharing | 1 1 1 |  |
| Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road | 1 1 1 |  |
| Extend and modify HSR routes | 1 1 1 |  |
| Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools | 1 1 1 |  |

### 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUPPORT FOR RECOMMENDED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>SUGGESTIONS FOR THE RECOMMENDED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommended solutions for streets:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recommended solutions for transit:</strong></td>
</tr>
<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), including extending the first phase to Eastgate Transit Hub from Queenston Circle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommended solutions for active transportation:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Recommended solutions for other proponents:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Support active transportation with new and enhanced infrastructure</td>
<td></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>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommended solutions for streets:</strong></th>
<th><strong>Recommended solutions for 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></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Locate the LRT on Barton Street East closer to the Confederation GO Station</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></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 cyclists 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.

### COMMENTS OUTSIDE THE CNTMP SCOPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</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>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 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 MNCFN 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>
</table>

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

- **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
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
- 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.
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>
<th>Initial evaluation criteria presented to stakeholders / public:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Transit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pedestrians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cyclists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Drivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrians</td>
<td>Additional evaluation criteria added following consultation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclists</td>
<td>• Comfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit passengers</td>
<td>• Delay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers</td>
<td>• Emergency Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency services</td>
<td>• Goods Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods movement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>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 (b 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>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issue / Opportunity: Safety

<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>A</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>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issue / Opportunity: Urban Design

<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>A</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>See Urban Design Option F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</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.

### Issue / Opportunity: Mobility Choices

<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>Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate car sharing</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend and modify HSR routes</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add local HSR circulator route</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N’ Ride</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</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>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the RHVP</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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></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 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 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>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>
<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><strong>City-wide Activities &amp; Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Centennial Neighbourhoods Specific Program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>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.

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 6-2: 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>
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>7. <strong>City-wide Policy</strong></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>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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. <strong>City-wide Activities &amp; Programs</strong></td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Schedule A+</td>
<td>Years 2017 to 2027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. <strong>City-wide Activities &amp; Programs</strong></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>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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. <strong>City-wide Projects</strong></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>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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. <strong>City-wide Projects</strong></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>Extend rapid transit from the Eastgate Transit Hub to the Confederation GO Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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.
Exhibit 6-5: Map of Preferred Solutions for Transit

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>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>Recreational Trails Master Plan does not include any estimated construction costs (to be determined) Project 5-10 approx. value $2 M</td>
<td>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</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 5-4: 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 Red Hill Valley Parkway 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><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>
### PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centennial Neighbourhoods Specific Projects</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>
</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 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.  
  - 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. |
<p>| 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 |</p>
<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>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)</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+ Further studies needed to identify class of EA for Goderich Road extension</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>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)</td>
<td>Approximate cost for signage of existing and future routes is $10 K</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Implement following implementation of Preferred Transportation Solution for Active Transportation No. 12 (Recreational Trails Master Plan Project 5-10), No. 13 and No. 15.</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.
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.
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.
6.5 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>
<th>Secondary Plan Policy</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>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Improve pedestrian connections through developments. Identify and implement pedestrian connections as part of development applications.</td>
<td></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>
<td></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></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></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></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Require missing sidewalks adjacent to new developments to be constructed as part of the development.</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></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>Metrolinx is proponent (GO Transit Class Environmental Assessment)</td>
<td>To be determined by Metrolinx</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. |
| **Hamiton 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** ≤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)
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 or 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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Appendix A: Focus Group Consultation

Focus Group Meeting #1
Focus Group Meeting #2
Focus Group Meeting #3
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 EA Process

Municipal Class EA process allows for a Master Plan approach, which in this context is 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 31% 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 (65% 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
Centennial Neighbourhoods
Transportation Management Plan Study

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 Roukhian (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).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lack of safety for bike riders vs. cost effectiveness of bike lanes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commercial properties along Centennial / Queenston sometimes don’t plow their sidewalks forcing pedestrians to walk on the road, safety issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enforcement issues (speeding/snow clearing) vs. Regulatory issues (planning changes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Certain landowners/residents are for and others are against a BIA type initiative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If not a BIA, then more collaboration and “working together as a community”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Condition of transit stops can sometimes determine ridership (weather shelter vs. none)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An full terminal at Eastgate where you can go indoors would improve transit attractiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comment made about connecting Arrowhead back to Nash for better connectivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>should take into account retailers who want to have visibility, so need to place them strategically.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Possibility of having “options for beautification” for owners to choose from including trees, light standards, planters etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Try not to force reduced setbacks, some do not wish to have residential buildings directly adjacent to the street/sidewalk.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Try not to force commercial to become mixed use.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a.</td>
<td><strong>Interactive Map Activity (Margaret)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attendees marked maps noting where there were transportation issues or concerns in the study area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b.</td>
<td><strong>Evaluation of Networks Criteria (Margaret)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Attendees reviewed a list of criteria to be used for Transportation Management Plan development, and marked their priorities for consideration.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td><strong>Conclusion and Adjournment</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Focus Group comments
April 8, 2015

“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

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

“Bike borrowing” is coming to this area

Provide bicycle routes from sectors to Confederation Park, Battlefield Park and Redhill Park

Provide long pedestrian “walk” signal at every major intersection

Provide bike lanes and green “bike boxes” at major intersections

TRANSPORTATION ISSUES AND OPPORTUNITIES
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

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.

Issues identified during Phase 1

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 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

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

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 Urban Design

Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan

Mohan Philip, City of Hamilton
Tel: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438
tplanning@hamilton.ca

Norma Moores, IBI Group
Tel: 905-546-1010 ext. 2106
norma.moores@ibigroup.com
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

**Concerns** – what might *not* work

- Barton + Rymrose needs to be expanded
- Not wide enough
- QE/W Confederation would a roundabout work
- Would a roundabout work
- Roadway expansion not possible to widen

**Best ideas** – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood

- Transit service east of Lake – more service needed in east end
- B-Line out to 50 Rd – long-term

**What else** – add your ideas

- 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

- Assistance fee for car share
- Reduced P&G ratio in exchange for car share locations @ businesses
- Underground?

**Concerns** – what might not work

- Avoid red tape
- Already been done in Riverdale
- Land use has to promote jobs so people don’t exit for jobs

**What else** – add your ideas

- Queenston, King
Safety Focus

**Advantages** – what makes sense

- Neighborhoods ➔ 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

- Sync. the traffic signals

- NEW bridge

- Find optimal location for grade crossing (cost effective)
Urban Design Focus

**Advantages** – what makes sense

- Consolidation of lots
- Reduction in access points to my arteries
- Need better quality, quieter, wider联系
- Improve existing areas vs. better standards for new
  - Underground
  - More transit, less spaces

**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

- Cost
- Not enough cycling lanes
- Row is already wide
- Shallows lots - less viable for redevelopment
- Apartment key to end not going to work

**What else** – add your ideas

Integrate 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

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>Best ideas - what will support your neighbourhood development opportunities</th>
<th>Concerns - what might not work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide multi-use foot paths in Centennial Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian and bicycle connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement traffic calming measures to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less where warranted by the Centennial Secondary Plan concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add turn lanes or roundabouts at &quot;hot spot&quot; intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement cycle tracks on Centennial to enhance safety and mobility</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve traffic signal timings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional years west of Centennial &amp; beyond 25 years</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve traffic signal timings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional years east of Centennial &amp; beyond 25 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SAFETY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Solutions</th>
<th>Advantages - what makes sense</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>Provide multi-use foot paths in Centennial Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete Streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian and bicycle connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement traffic calming measures to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less where warranted by the Centennial Secondary Plan concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add turn lanes or roundabouts at &quot;hot spot&quot; intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement cycle tracks on Centennial to enhance safety and mobility</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve traffic signal timings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional years west of Centennial &amp; beyond 25 years</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve traffic signal timings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional years east of Centennial &amp; beyond 25 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

URBAN DESIGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Solutions</th>
<th>Advantages - what makes sense</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>Provide multi-use foot paths in Centennial Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete Streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian and bicycle connectivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement traffic calming measures to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less where warranted by the Centennial Secondary Plan concept</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add turn lanes or roundabouts at &quot;hot spot&quot; intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement cycle tracks on Centennial to enhance safety and mobility</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve traffic signal timings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional years west of Centennial &amp; beyond 25 years</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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve traffic signal timings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect right-of-way on Barton from Red Hill Valley Parkway to Centennial for additional years east of Centennial &amp; beyond 25 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase 2 Consultation

**Mobility Choices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transportation Solutions</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uptown Bike: Creating an active network to reduce travel and right of way for vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are we still biking to serve these neighborhoods?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will work best for you and your neighborhood?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advantages**
- What makes sense
- Best ideas

**Concerns**
- What might not work

Modifications to the Alternatives

- Add: 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 RHVP to the Red Hill Valley Recreational Trail
  - Project 5-10: Connection through QEW / Centennial interchange to Confederation Park
- Add: improve safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through 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 maintenance
- Economic benefits

Recommended Transportation Solutions

**Recommended Solutions:**
- City-wide Policies
- City-wide Activities & Programs
- City-wide Projects
- Secondary Plan Policies
- Centennial Neighborhoods Specific Initiatives
- By Other Proponents
- Not Supported

**Maps:**
- Streets
- Transit
- Active Transportation
- Secondary Plan
- Other Proponents

Review handout and displays

Next Steps

**Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process**

**Stage 1:** Unintended Transportation House

**Stage 2:** Develop Preferred Solution

**Stage 3:** Refine Preferred Solution

**Public Opin House**
- February 18, 2016
- December 13, 2015
- April 28, 2016

Next Steps
- Refine recommendations based on your feedback
- Public Open House
- Refine recommendations
- Prepare report

**Stage 3: WE ARE HERE**

Next Step

**Centennial Neighborhoods Transportation Management Plan**

Thank you!

Mohan Philip, City of Hamilton
Tel: 905-546-2424 ext. 3348
tplanning@hamilton.ca

Norma Moores, IBI Group
Tel: 905-546-1010 ext. 2106
norma.moores@ibigroup.com
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
6:00 pm – 9:00 pm
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

1. **Phase 1:** Problem or Opportunity
2. **Phase 2:** Alternative Solutions
3. **Phase 3:** Alternative Design Concepts
4. **Phase 4:** Environmental Study Report
5. **Phase 5:** Implementation

### Project Processes

**Transportation Management Plan (TMP)**

This TMP study comprises the first two Phases of the MCEA process. It will identify projects that will get carried through Phases 3 to 5.

- **Phase 1:** Understand Transportation Issues
  - Public Open House #1
  - April 30, 2015

- **Phase 2:** Develop Preferred Solution
  - Public Open House #2
  - Fall 2015

- **Phase 3:** Refine the Preferred Solution
  - Public Open House #3
  - Winter 2015 / 2016

### 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

"Sharrows" planned in 2015 as part of road construction


* Confederation Park Master Plan in the Process of Finalization - 2015
Public Transit

Source: HSR Route Map (January 2015), Urban Hamilton Official Plan, Niagara Rail Service Expansion Study (2011)
Potential Future Entrance to Confederation Park

24-Hour Traffic Volumes

Traffic counts conducted between 2009 and 2014

Daily Volumes (Weekday, 24-hour period)

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
**TMP Activity #1 – 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>
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

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
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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>place to place without barriers, in your choice of type of travel; to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how long will it last before it needs replacement, timing of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>
1. DELAFWAN - NO L. R. TURN SIGN GET'S 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 TRAIL 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 LICENSES WENT 70%)
   - HWY. 20 (CENTENNIAL) @ GREEN MOUNTAIN RD. HAS A STOP SIGN - DANGEROUS. RECOMMEND AN UNDERPASS.
7. Transit Accessibility - Walk from neighborhood 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
   Lane widening 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. Where would the go station be located?

11. Do not like No Left turn onto Delawara from Fortino's. I live in this area & cannot drive home directly, I have to drive thru & around mall to exit onto Kenora.
    For Ped.

12. Hard to cross at light from East Gate to Bulk Barn/Giant Tiger - Not enough time even for two bodied people.

13. All Ped. crossings over Cenn. & Queenston - Lights are too short!

14. Garbage pails @ Kenora Rd, Stop/Red 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 IRRITAON @ BOUND ON TO RD. HILL VALLEY N. BOUND)

16. NAS N. BOUND ONTO QUEENSTON EAST BOUND.

17. 3 WAY LG SIGNAL @ NASS & KENTLEN IS WELL LOVED! (TO SOME STILL A BIT CONFUSING - SHOULD WE HAVE A SIGN THAT CLARIFIES RULES?)

18. LOVE OFF RAMP HILL EXPNY. N BOUND

19. ON-RAMP @ IRRITAON TO RD. HILL - N TOO SHORT. IN HEAVY TRAFFIC COME TO COMPLETE STOP - NOT SAFE TO MERGE.

20. SIDEWALK B/W N. DELAWANA & CONFED PArk ALMOST NON-EXISTANT (BOTH E&W).

21. Kenora N to Transfer Sth, dangerous for cars due to Big Trucks - they think they own the road.
To Whom it may concern,

My husband & I care very much we would like to see more places.

I like places as much as every good places as we take it a lot.

I hope this helps with your plans.

Clyde Hall
Clyde of Hamilton
71 Main St. West ( ETH)

Clyde Hall
Clyde of Hamilton
71 Main St. West ( ETH)

Hamilton, Ont.
From: Pham, Melanie  
Sent: May-22-15 4:13 PM  
To:  
Cc: Sergi, Michelle; Newbold, Christine; Robichaud, Steve; Thorne, Jason; Maxwell, Kirstin; Philip, Mohan; Fazio, Margaret; Collins, Chad  
Subject: RE: Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan - Focus Group

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: http://preview.hamilton.ca/city-initiatives/strategies-actions/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 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 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: Margaret Fazio, Project Manager
Margaret,

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@IBIGroup.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; tplanning@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 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 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: 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?
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
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?

- Good communication (with neighbors, businesses, government)

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 and other services in Old Stone Creek (near)
- Original Stone Creek
- Integrating buses better to tie services in Stone Creek together better

What do you feel your community is missing?

- Strong 16 Stone Creek (origin)
- Taxi service and a bus to Upper Stone Creek, Lie Highland, 5C Resort (St. Cyprien)
- bylaw allowing for 1st floor business in upper floor residential building!!!

(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?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

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

Carpool 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
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?
- 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 9-5pm
- 7pm 11pm

(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 timelines for transportation and secondary use plan.
- More in-depth 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></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 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?

- parks, recreation centres, walking areas
- green, trees, and greenery
- traffic calming, 3-phase traffic lights
- (I was missing a lot of trees)

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 King St.
- would like to see lots of trees
- replanted 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
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 accessibility to major highways.
☐ Schools go 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</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 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?

Churches, mosques, temples, etc.
Public transit
Job opportunities
Walkability
Parks & recreation
Safety, fewer 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
Public civic centres connecting to parks, malls, libraries, multipurpose arenas, fountains, trees, greenspace, sports opportunities

What do you feel your community is missing?

Special bike / skateboard / cycle share
Wide sidewalks, street sweeping, bike lanes
LRT / high order transit

(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)

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 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: tpplanning@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?

- One side only parking on our side streets.
- 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?  
(Postcard, 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?

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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Melanie Pham, Planner</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Margaret Fazio, Project Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Economic Development Department</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Works Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71 Main Street West, 6th Floor</td>
<td></td>
<td>77 James Street North, Suite 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hamilton, ON L8R 2K3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 6685</td>
<td></td>
<td>Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 2218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca">Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:tplanning@hamilton.ca">tplanning@hamilton.ca</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**YOUR COMMENTS PLEASE!**

In your opinion, what makes a community great?

- **Widen the Centennial Parkway from Queensferry 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?
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 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? People — supporting each other, the local

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?

- Increasing traffic through Centennial through traffic.
- Housing costs vs. updating.

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>V</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>V</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenter(s)/Project Team</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</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>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of Access</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</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 4
User entered value 7
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 46.86

2. What public or private spaces do you like to visit in the Centennial Neighbourhoods? What makes them special?

Left Blank 3
User entered value 8
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 77.50

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) 6
- Walking or cycling routes 3
- Access to higher order transit (i.e. train, light rail transit, bus rapid transit) 6
- New mixed use developments (commercial and residential together) along Centennial Parkway and Queenston Road 3
- Streetscape improvements (i.e.better lighting, sidewalks, trees and greenery, and seating areas, etc.) 9
- Improvements to the appearances of buildings 4
- Other 3

If other, please specify:

Left Blank 9
User entered value 2
Average submission length in words (ex blanks) 16.50
4. What additional destinations, types of uses or buildings would you like to see in the Centennial Neighbourhoods?

Left Blank
User entered value
Average submission length in words (ex blanks)

5. Are there any places within the Centennial Neighbourhoods where you feel unsafe?

No
Yes

If yes, then where? What makes them unsafe?

Left Blank
User entered value
Average submission length in words (ex blanks)

6. Do you have any other comments you wish to provide?

Left Blank
User entered value
Average submission length in words (ex blanks)

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

If you selected combination, please specify

Left Blank
User entered value
Average submission length in words (ex blanks)
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</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>10.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you selected other way, please specify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Left Blank</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User entered value</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average submission length in words (ex blanks)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How do you travel for other trips you make? Select any that you typically or sometimes use for travelling for other trips.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive by myself</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSR Bus</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DARTS Accessible Transit</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you selected other way, please specify

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</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>17.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What other ways do you sometimes use to travel to work? Select any that you sometimes use.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive by myself</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share a ride or get dropped off</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSR bus</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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>Left Blank</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Left Blank</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Left Blank</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Left Blank</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Left Blank</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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
- [ ] Tell us a little bit about yourself
- [ ] How old are you?
- [x] Gender:
  - [x] You and the Centennial Neighbourhoods Area
- [ ] 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.

- **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.
### Exhibit 1: Evaluation Criteria

<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 (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.

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

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

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: TLCPlanning@hamilton.ca

This Notice issued November 20th, 2015 and November 27th, 2015.
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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 & Why? 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

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 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: tplanning@hamilton.ca
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
8:30 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/centennialTMP

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: tflanannio@hamilton.ca

This Notice issued November 20th, 2015 and November 27th, 2015.
LET'S TALK ABOUT THE DRAFT TALL BUILDING GUIDELINES FOR DOWNTOWN HAMILTON

What?
- CITY OF HAMILTON

When & Where
- Wednesday, April 20th, 7pm
- Presentation begins at 7pm
- Hilton Homewood Suites, 40 Bay Street South
- Hamilton, ON, L8P 0B3

CONTACT:
- Aliya Mohdshid, M.CIP, RPP
- Senior Planner, Community Planning Section

City of Hamilton, 71 Main Street West, 6th floor, Hamilton, ON, L8P 0B3
- Phone: 905-546-2424 Ext. 1250
- Email: Aliya.Mohdshid@hamilton.ca

If you have accessibility requirements to participate in this event please contact us.

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).

When & Where
- Thursday, April 21, 2016
- 7pm
- Lake Avenue Public School, East Gymnasium

CONTACT:
- Melanie Pham, MCIP, RPP
- Planner
- Mohan Philip, M.Eng., P.Eng., Project Manager

157 Lake Avenue North, Hamilton, ON, L8P 0B3
- Phone: 905.546.2424 Ext. 1250
- Email: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca

If you have accessibility requirements to participate in this event please contact us.

City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, ON, L8P 0B3
- Phone: 905.546.2424 Ext. 1250
- Email: Melanie.Pham@hamilton.ca

If you have accessibility requirements to participate in this event please contact us.

CITY OF HAMILTON

SALE OF LANDS FOR TAX ARREARS

TENDER NOTICE

Tenders are invited for the purchase of the land(s) described below and it is to be sold on or before 10:00 a.m., local time, on Monday, May 16, 2016, at the City of Hamilton 1st floor Hall, 71 Main Street West, Hamilton, ON.

The tenders will then be opened in public on the same day at 10:30 a.m., local time in Room 206 of City Hall, 71 Main Street West, Hamilton, ON.

Tenders 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 corporation payable to the City of Hamilton.

PRESERVATION OF TAXES

The municipality makes no representation or guarantee as to the condition of the lands, including an updated list of properties and restricted access to the property, and the municipality will have no responsibility for ascertaining these matters. The municipality makes no representation or guarantee as to the condition of the lands, including any environmental concerns and the municipality makes no representation as to the condition of the lands.

Responsibility for ascertaining these matters will remain on title and may become the responsibility of the potential purchaser. For information on potential purchasers, the potential purchaser should contact the City of Hamilton at 905-546-2424 Ext. 1250. The potential purchaser will be provided with a key or vacant possession. For further information regarding this sale, including the name and address of the City of Hamilton, the property and the land contained therein, or a plan of the property, the City of Hamilton will provide this information to the City of Hamilton.

Session 1
Part 2: 2:00pm-3:00pm
Display Board Reviews
Part 3: 3:10pm-4:00pm
Presentation
Session 2
Part 1: 6:00pm-9:00pm
Display Board Reviews
Part 2: 9:10pm-10:00pm
Presentation

Contact:
- Steve Molloy
- Project Manager
- City of Hamilton
- T: 905.546.2424 x2975
- s.molloy@hamilton.ca

April 15, 2016
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:

1. Create Project and Budget
2. Develop Project Scope (EA if required)
3. Permit Approvals, Pre-design and Base Plans
4. Detailed Design
5. Utilities Coordination, Land and Tender Preparation
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.
Issues Identified in Phase 1 Consultation

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

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.

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 neighborhood 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

Other transit alternative solutions can be found on Capacity: A, B and F, and Urban Design: B

F. Add local HSR circulator route

Other pedestrian alternative solutions can be found on Safety: C, D and F, and Urban Design: C

G. Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington, and South Service Road

Other cycling alternative solutions can be found on Safety: D and F, and Urban Design: E

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
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.

### Transportation Alternative Solutions: ABC-We Activity #1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Ideas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Advantages**    | - Extend the B-Line Rapid Transit from Queenston Circle to Exeter  
|                   |   - Improve cycling and pedestrian networks                            |
| **Best ideas**    | - Improve cycling and pedestrian networks                             |
| **Concerns**      | - Ensure appropriate infrastructure improvements                      |
| **What else**     | - Add additional bike lanes to the network                             |

---

Public Works Department, City of Hamilton
www.hamilton.ca/CentennialNTMP

Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan
Public Information Centre #2
December 1, 2015
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.

Capacity  
Safety  
Urban Design  
Mobility Choices
Next Steps

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

Four areas of focus:
• Capacity
• Safety
• Urban Design
• Mobility Choices

The alternative solutions will be evaluated and recommendations presented at the third PIC Winter 2016

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

Activity #2: Confirm your “investments”
Place 4 poker chips in the jars for the strategies that are most important to you.
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
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
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.

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.
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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

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

F. Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete/Livable/Better Streets

Other pedestrian alternative solutions can be found on Safety: C, D and F, and Mobility Choices: H

Other cycling alternative solutions can be found on Safety: D and F, and Mobility Choices: A, G and H
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

Other transit alternative solutions can be found on
Capacity: A, B and F, and Urban Design: B

F. Add local HSR circulator route

Other pedestrian alternative solutions can be found on
Safety: C, D and F, and Urban Design: C

G. Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington, and South Service Road

Other cycling alternative solutions can be found on
Safety: D and F, and Urban Design: E

H. Create non-auto (walking & cycling) access to GC Station and right-sized Park n’Ride
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

Other transit alternative solutions can be found on
Capacity: A, B and F, and Urban Design: B

G. Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington, and South Service Road

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

H. Create non-auto (walking & cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park n’Ride
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

LRT!! - as promised originally!

**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
- [Diagram showing advantages]

**Best ideas** - what will work best for you and your neighbourhood
- [Diagram showing best ideas]

**Concerns** - what might not work
- [Diagram showing concerns]

**What else** - add your ideas
- [Diagram showing additional ideas]
Transportation Alternative Solutions: ABC-We Activity #1

**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 brain – should extend S-line on Centennial
C. Capacity
   - Signal timing does make sense
F. Capacity = priority measures 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 speed to 40 km/h is essential - Delanora, Kerriy, 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 other in.
- Enough bus shelters in place.

**What else** – add your ideas

- Signal timing already ok
- OK with current turn lanes.
- No show on Queenston because of so many lights – access might along here could help.
- Connection through green spaces to Confederation Park could be made – street in multi-use trail all the way through.
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:

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?

   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
   __________________________________________________________
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:
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.
comment2

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 is 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.

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 reçu 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...
comment 2
from me - I live just to the east off Green Road, but use some of these roads, especially to
connect to Hamilton and sometimes the Centennial Trail. I have a few comments /
questions about this area from a cycling, pedestrian and transit perspective (some
that may not be taken too seriously).

#1. 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 Trail, 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.

#2. Railway Corridor path study - the cycling or trails master plan has a future
study identified along the main east-west corridor - but I notice its not on the
panels? Alternative solution to this connection is below

#3. Transit / Pedestrian Multi-modal Hub and Gateway -
This is a major proposals 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
Page 2
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**
  - West - Bancroft / Arrowhead / Goderich with connections to Nash (bike lanes & above proposed Red Hill crossing & Kenora)
  - 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
- 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)

It 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 at 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 eventualitity 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 where 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>Capacity</th>
<th>Safety</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Mobility Choices</th>
<th>No. of groups</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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve traffic signal timings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</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></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</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 where speeding is an issue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian connections through new developments</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add local HSR circulator route</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate car sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extend and modify HSR routes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Advantages** – what makes sense

**Best Ideas** – what will work best for you and your neighbourhood

**Concerns** – what might not work
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 L9E 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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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**

---

Public Works Department, City of Hamilton

www.hamilton.ca/CentennialNTMP

Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan

Public Information Centre #3

April 28, 2016
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:

1. **Step 1:** Create Project and Budget
2. **Step 2:** Develop Project Scope (EA if required)
3. **Step 3:** Permit Approvals, Pre-design and Base Plans
4. **Step 4:** Detailed Design
5. **Step 5:** Utilities Coordination, Land and Tender Preparation
6. **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>Safety</th>
<th>Urban Design</th>
<th>Mobility Choices</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>Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots</td>
<td>Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N' Rides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve traffic signal timings</td>
<td>Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections</td>
<td>Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50%</td>
<td>Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue</td>
<td>Implement cycle tracks on Centennial, and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape options</td>
<td>Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections</td>
<td>Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas</td>
<td>Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
<td>Add local HSR circulator route</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>Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian connections through new developments</td>
<td>Facilitate car sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections</td>
<td>Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds</td>
<td>Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets</td>
<td>Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Best Ideas</th>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>No. of groups that commented on each alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 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.

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.

### Urban Official Plan Schedule C-2 – Future Road Widening

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road 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>42.672 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash Road</td>
<td>Nash Road</td>
<td>36.576 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>36.576 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash Road</td>
<td>North Service Road</td>
<td>36.576 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Street East</td>
<td>Redhill Creek</td>
<td>36.576 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battlefield Drive</td>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>28.213 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>Redhill Creek</td>
<td>28.213 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>King Street</td>
<td>20.117 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nash Road</td>
<td>Barton Street</td>
<td>28.213 m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>Redhill Valley Parkway</td>
<td>36.576 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
**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 Potruff 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.
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</td>
<td>Recreational Trails</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
<td></td>
<td>Master Plan projects between $3.5 M and $9.5 M</td>
<td>Master Plan projects over $9.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk construction</td>
<td></td>
<td>Streetscape and gateways under $2.7 M</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>Consultation for these projects has been completed through the Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan (CNTMP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These may proceed to implementation*

*Additional study and mandatory consultation required*
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](http://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.

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.

Project Process

Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process

- Phase 1: Development of Policy
- Phase 2: Development of Environmental Impact Statement
- Phase 3: Public Notice
- Phase 4: Public Hearing

WE ARE HERE
Implementing Projects in the TMP

Municipal Class Environmental Assessment Process

Step 1: Identify Opportunity
Step 2: Define Problem
Step 3: Devising Project and Budget
Step 4: Develop Project Options
Step 5: Public Consultations, Consultation and Final Plan
Step 6: Detailed Design
Step 7: Utilities Coordination, Land Tool and Tender Preparation
Step 8: Construction

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 your ideas

Phase 2 Consultation

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

Phase 2 Consultation

Transportation alternatives with concerns:
- Turn lanes / roundabouts at intersections
- Protect ROW on Barton

Phase 2 Consultation

Strategies most important to you:
- Capacity: 29%
- Safety: 27%
- Mobility: 21%
- Urban Design: 22%

Phase 2 Consultation

• 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
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**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 maintenance, 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

---

**Recommended Transportation Solutions**

**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

---

**Recommended Transportation Solutions**

**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

---

**Recommended Transportation Solutions**

**For Secondary Plan Policy**:
- For new developments:
  - Manage access
  - Reduce surface parking
  - Create pedestrian connections
  - Support live / work / play
  - Facilitate car-sharing
  - Identify traffic calming
  - Construct missing sidewalks
  - Improve streetscape and gateways

---

**Recommended Transportation Solutions**

**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

Thank You!

Please submit comments by May 13, 2016

Mohan Philip, City of Hamilton
Tel: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438
tplanning@hamilton.ca

Norma Moores, IBI Group
Tel: 905-546-1010 ext. 2106
norma.moores@ibigroup.com
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

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.

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).

Through the City-wide Transportation Master Plan 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.

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

[www.hamilton.ca/CentennialNTMP](http://www.hamilton.ca/CentennialNTMP)
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?

   I approve of the proposal to revitalise the area of Centennial andQuestion: there is potential.

2. What could be improved?

   Look at traffic flow improve it more efficiently.
   Add more solar panels to power lights. Add to the city power grid. Add more reforest trees to improve air quality. Reduce vases limits growth.
   Allow growth of housing. Consider commercial plans that have multiple uses. Not just offices or stores.
   Better use of space add more methods to gather power to 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 to neglect accountability. Do not use your union workers to go over your budget. I recall your fiscal stadium over budget and 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?

Bike lanes need to be implemented. And there need to be a law for drivers to use these lanes. Offenders need to be held accountable. Part (4) will improve efficiency and flow of traffic. Urban green belt needs 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 unlawful 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 safely.

(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 stop creeks

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?

   Crosswalk at Vineyard across Centennial

   cars making U turns from Vineyard to Centennial - south dangerous
   for pedestrians

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?

   - New GO Station on Centennial Pkwy.
   - Upgrades to buildings & businesses on Centennial Pkwy.
   - Better access through bike paths & pedestrian paths along Centennial Pkwy N.

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?
   
   Life - good sidewalks
   
   protected bike paths

2. Which transportation solutions do you not like and why?

   The on ramp to OEW to Niagara Falls is not needed. Clearly it does create confusion. Do I take the South Service ramp or 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: mphilip@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?

Violet CBEC will be more 90 meters trees
from which of the country?

Darker and shynier around the Hamilton.

2. What could be improved?

The men don't like to

listen for the girls and

which of men 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 Horwathy 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 Dany may open the Hamilton Violet Drive 5

   for the Happy Hall Drive.

THANK YOU!
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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?

- Bus Route Lake Ave N to village of Stoney Creek

- Most important "advance green" street light to turn on to South Service Road from QEW/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!
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 OR Mohan Philip, M. Eng., P. Eng.
Secondary Plan Transportation Management Plan
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. 1287 Phone: 905-546-2424 ext. 3438
Email: kirsten.mccauley@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. 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 Hamilton 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 QUEENSTON

(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?

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

____________________________________________________________________________________

(See Reverse)
3. Do you have any additional comments or suggestions you wish to provide?

*Why is there so much truck traffic on Centennial - why not 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?

   1. Need to take 3 buses to go to King & Lake from Lake & Barton - up to 1 1/2 hrs. at a time. When are you going to improve this? A bus on Lake?possible?

   2. Plan for a ped/bike bridge over G/E/W @ Lake Ave too (especially if MTO says no to Centennial trail for the Waterpark) THANK YOU!
From: 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 yesterday's 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.
comment 2

From: Pham, Melanie
Sent: April-29-16 11:53 AM
To: McCauley, Kirsten; Philip, Mohan
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: Pham, Melanie
Sent: April-28-16 5:10 PM
To: Pham, Melanie
Subject: Feedback re. Centennial Neighbourhoods

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 Confederation Park. I feel Hamilton council members should request Metrolinx to postpone the 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 re development 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.
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,
From:       Tuesday, May 03, 2016 5:24 PM
To:         planning@hamilton.ca; Norma Moores
Subject:    Comment

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: Support better traffic flow and signal timing (2 people)</th>
<th>Transit: Support connections transit hubs, more bus routes, stops and shelters, and feeder bus routes to the Queenston LRT station (6 people)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Support LRT to Eastgate Square (not BRT) (5 people), including extending the first phase to Eastgate Transit Hub from Queenston Circle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active Transportation: Support active transportation with new and enhanced infrastructure</th>
<th>Other Proponents: Support the GO train station at Centennial Parkway (4 people)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support increase in walkability</td>
<td>Support the GO train station at Centennial Parkway (4 people)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support more bike lanes (2 people), specifically on Lake Avenue connecting Confederation Park entrance (2 people)</td>
<td>Locate the LRT on Barton closer to the Centennial GO Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support improving east-west active transportation connections in the study area</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>
<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>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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Suggestions for the Recommended Transportation Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Streets: For Complete Liveable Better Streets, wider sidewalks (2 people). Specific streets mentioned are Nash, Queenston, Centennial, and Barton</th>
<th>Transit: Locate the LRT on Barton closer to the Centennial GO Station</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>
<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>Provide high visibility crosswalks (‘ladder’ markings) throughout the neighbourhoods</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>Connect Battlefield Park to Confederation Park for tourists</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>
## Comments Outside the CNTMP Scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</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>

### 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
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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.
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.

Exhibit 2-4: Detailed Screenline Analysis

<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>South of the QEW</td>
<td>Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>0.55 0.58 0.56</td>
<td>0.67 0.80 0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.55 0.58 0.56</td>
<td>0.67 0.80 0.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| West of Lake Avenue North | Barton Street | 0.55 0.86 0.71 | 0.74 0.78 0.76 |
|                          | Queenston Road | 0.32 0.52 0.42 | 0.60 0.55 0.57 |
|                          | King Street   | 0.62 0.78 0.70 | 0.78 0.91 0.85 |
|                          | Total         | 0.46 0.69 0.57 | 0.69 0.70 0.69 |

| East of Red Hill Valley Expressway | Barton Street | 0.45 0.73 0.59 | 0.79 1.20 0.99 |
|                                 | Queenston Road | 0.49 0.66 0.57 | 0.83 0.90 0.86 |
|                                 | Total          | 0.47 0.69 0.58 | 0.81 1.03 0.92 |

| North of King Street | Nash Road | 0.28 0.21 0.24 | 0.28 0.69 0.49 |
|                      | Centennial Parkway | 0.72 0.31 0.51 | 0.53 0.78 0.66 |
|                      | Lake Avenue Drive  | 0.22 0.27 0.25 | 0.22 0.48 0.35 |
|                      | Total            | 0.47 0.27 0.37 | 0.38 0.69 0.54 |

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.
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 2-5: 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>
### Exhibit 2-6: Existing Conditions (2015) AM Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</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>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Centennial</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>D</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>E</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Centennial</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Nash</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Centennial</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>D</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></td>
<td>#140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Exhibit 2-7: Existing Conditions (2015) PM Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</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>23</td>
<td>NBL</td>
<td>E</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>D</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>#60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>#172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Lake</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>#34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>#72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Nash</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>NBL</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>#43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBTR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>#155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Centennial</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Lake</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>NBL</td>
<td>D</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Centennial</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>#75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EBTR</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>#183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>WBL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>#104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NBL</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>#89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SBT</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>#164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Lake</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Employment</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>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Commercial Floorspace (Growth - ft²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>18,200</td>
<td>18,700</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17,800</td>
<td>18,300</td>
<td>18,975</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Commercial Floorspace (Growth - ft²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>295,000</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td>295,000</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>380,000</td>
<td>30%</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>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Trips</td>
<td>District 1</td>
<td>District 2</td>
<td>District 3</td>
<td>District 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3,950</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,200</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>51</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</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>PM</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Entering</td>
<td>Exiting</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Entering</td>
<td>Exiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>General Office</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></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>276</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>Shopping Centre</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>389</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Site Generated Traffic</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>447</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>575</td>
<td></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.

Exhibit 3-5: Origin-Destination Trip Distribution (Residential)

<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>Total</td>
<td>3,484</td>
<td>100%</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.

Exhibit 3-6: Spatial Distribution per District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spatial Direction</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2*</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To Peel, Halton, and Niagara via N on Centennial</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To West Hamilton via W on Barton</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To West Hamilton via W on Queenston</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To East Hamilton via E on Barton</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To East Hamilton via E on Queenston</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To South Hamilton via S on Centennial</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Brantford via W on Barton</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To Brantford via W on Queenston</td>
<td>-</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

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.
Site generated traffic was then added to determine the overall traffic operations of each option in the study area based on the volume to capacity ratio.

**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

<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>0.59</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Lake Avenue North</td>
<td>Barton Street</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Red Hill Valley Expressway</td>
<td>Barton Street</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.86</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>North of King Street</td>
<td>Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North of King Street</td>
<td>Lake Avenue Drive</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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.
Exhibit 4-4: Future Option 2 Detailed Screenline Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screenline</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>AM V/C Ratio</th>
<th>PM V/C Ratio</th>
<th></th>
<th></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>
<td>SB/WB</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>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.92</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>
<td>0.86</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>
<td>0.62</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>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Red Hill Valley Expressway</td>
<td>Barton Street</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>1.42</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>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.23</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>
<td>0.75</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>
<td>0.86</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>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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>PM V/C Ratio</th>
<th></th>
<th></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>
<td>SB/WB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South of the QEW</td>
<td>Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Lake Avenue North</td>
<td>Barton Street</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.62</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>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of Red Hill Valley Expressway</td>
<td>Barton Street</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Queenston Road</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.26</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>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centennial Parkway</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.86</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>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Synchro Analysis

A summary of the Synchro analysis including delay, 95th 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</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>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Centennial</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>WBTR</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barton and Lake</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>#39 #140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Nash</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Centennial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queenston and Lake</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>SBL</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>#31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Nash</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Centennial</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>EBL</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>#77 #162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King and Lake</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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 Plan 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
### Appendix "C" to Report PED18007

#### Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan

**Evaluation of Alternative Transportation Solutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Opportunity: Capacity</th>
<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>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>Median LRT reduces access mid-block</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>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Significantly improves comfort and reduces delay beyond secondary plan horizon</td>
<td>Shift to transit reduces delay</td>
<td>Shift to transit reduces delay</td>
<td>Median LRT reduces access mid-block</td>
<td>Good</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, HDV or transit only lanes (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>Wider road will increase crossing times and decrease comfort</td>
<td>Wider road will decrease comfort</td>
<td>Reduces delay due to additional road capacity but only in the long term</td>
<td>Provides additional capacity but only in the long term</td>
<td>Provides additional capacity but only in the long term</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Improve traffic signal timings including pedestrian walk times</td>
<td>Improve crossing comfort</td>
<td>Reduce delay somewhat</td>
<td>Reduce delay somewhat</td>
<td>Reduce delay somewhat</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Add turn lanes or roundabouts at &quot;hot spot&quot; intersections</td>
<td>Wider intersection will increase crossing times and decrease comfort</td>
<td>Wider intersection will decrease comfort</td>
<td>Reduces delay for turning movements at some intersections for some bus routes</td>
<td>Reduces delay for turning movements</td>
<td>Reduces delay for turning movements</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Reduces delay</td>
<td>Increases delay offset by shift to transit</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds</td>
<td>Improves comfort but opportunities to apply are limited since most arterials have been reconstructed recently</td>
<td>Improves comfort but opportunities to apply are limited since most arterials have been reconstructed recently</td>
<td>Improves comfort but opportunities to apply are limited since most arterials have been reconstructed recently</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets where speeding is an issue</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Reduce number of drivers exceeding speed limit, improving their comfort with minor increases in delay</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact on truck routes</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lakes, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas</td>
<td>Improve comfort and reduces delay with less cut off of the way travel</td>
<td>Adds an additional 5.9 km to the sidewalk network</td>
<td>Improve comfort to walk to/from transit stops</td>
<td>Improves comfort with fewer pedestrian walking in the roadway</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Improve comfort with fewer pedestrians walking in the roadway</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections</td>
<td>Improves comfort</td>
<td>Adds an additional 7.2 km of bikeways to the existing network</td>
<td>Provides alternate access to destinations using quiet streets instead of busy, arterial roads</td>
<td>Improves comfort to walk to/from transit stops</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Manage access to new, larger development to reduce driveway for improved safety - limited to arterial roads with the potential to combine driveways for deeper properties (see notes in summary)</td>
<td>Improves comfort</td>
<td>Improves comfort</td>
<td>Improves comfort</td>
<td>Reduces driveway options to access buildings</td>
<td>Decreases friction on arterials from traffic turning at driveway</td>
<td>Reduces driveway options to access buildings for providing service</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Issue / Opportunity: Urban Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Transportation Network, Access, Comfort and Delay</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>Improve comfort and access to Confederation Park. Adds an additional 0.6 km to the multi-use trail network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue / Opportunity: Mobility Choices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issue / Opportunity: Urban Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50%</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian connections through new developments</td>
<td>Improve comfort with more direct access to developments</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Neutral</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>Improve comfort by providing buffer between travel lanes and sidewalks. Centennial recently reconstructed so opportunity is very long term. Adds 2.8 km to the bikeway network. Provides alternate access to destinations using less busy minor arterial and collector streets instead of major arterial roads</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issue / Opportunity: Mobility Choices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Opportunity: Mobility Choices</th>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Transportation Network, Access, Comfort and Delay</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances</td>
<td>Improve comfort and access</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools</td>
<td>Improve comfort</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Facilitate car sharing</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>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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>F1 Add local HSR circulator route</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Improves comfort and access for some passengers. About 90% 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>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G1 Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road</td>
<td>Improves comfort by providing buffer between travel lanes and sidewalk</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 (8,500 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>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1 Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N Ride</td>
<td>Improves comfort and access to GO Station</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>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1 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>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J1 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>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan

**Evaluation of Alternative Transportation Solutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Public health</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social interaction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation equity and access</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Active transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collision reduction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Issue / Opportunity: Capacity

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Improves access to jobs</td>
<td>Increases sense of attachment to neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Provides affordable, new mode of transportation</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>Improves access to jobs</td>
<td>Increases sense of attachment to neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Provides affordable, new mode of transportation beyond secondary plan horizon</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>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
<td>Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections</td>
<td>Wider intersection 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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
<td>Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Improves transportation choices through more efficient transit services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Issue / Opportunity: Safety

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
<td>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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
<td>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>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan

### Evaluation of Alternative Transportation Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Public health</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social interaction</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transportation equity and access</strong></td>
<td><strong>Active transportation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections</td>
<td>Supports more pedestrian and cycling activity and reduced speeds on local streets</td>
<td>Improves transportation choices by improving comfort of pedestrians and cyclists on these local streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>Supports pedestrian and cycling activity and access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>Improves transportation choices to access Confederation Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Issue / Opportunity: Urban Design

<p>| A | Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots | Improves social interaction by requiring less land for parking, and more availability for other services and activities | Improves transportation choices by improving comfort of pedestrians, cyclists and transit users accessing these developments | Reduced surface lots improves the development's aesthetics and reduces conflicts with motor vehicles | May encourage more people to access by walking, cycling and transit thus improve air quality | Excellent |
| B | Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30% to 50% | Improves passenger comfort supporting more transit trips and associated walking and cycling | Improves passenger comfort supporting more transit trips and associated walking and cycling | Improves passenger comfort supporting more transit trips and associated walking and cycling | Shift to transit supports improved air quality | Excellent |
| C | Improve pedestrian connections through new developments | More pedestrian activity improves social interaction | Improves the viability of walking | Shortens trips making them more visible by walking or cycling | No impact | Shift to walking supports improved air quality | Excellent |
| D | Improve streetscape and gateways as per the Secondary Plan concepts | Improved streetscapes promote more pedestrian activity and improves social interaction | Improved streetscapes promote more pedestrian activity | Improved streetscapes promote more pedestrian activity | No impact | No impact | Excellent |
| E | Implement cycle tracks on Centennial, and Queenston east of Centennial as per Secondary Plan streetscape options | Supports cycling activity on these streets | Improves transportation choices by improving comfort of cyclists on these streets | Improves cyclist comfort supporting more trips by cycling on these streets | Reduces the risk of crashes by providing a cycle track instead of riding in the roadway | Shift to cycling supports improved air quality | Excellent |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Opportunity: Mobility Choices</th>
<th>Public Health</th>
<th>Transportation Equity and Access</th>
<th>Social Interaction</th>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative Solution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitate car sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extend and modify HSR routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Add local HSR circulator route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N' Ride</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RATING**

- **Excellent**
- **Good**
- **Neutral**
- **Poor**
- **Fair**

**Issue / Opportunity: 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

**Public Health**

- **Social interaction**
  - Design that accommodates all users comfortably improves social interaction
- **Transportation equity and access**
  - Design that accommodates all users comfortably improves transportation choices and access
- **Air quality**
  - Design that accommodates all users comfortably reduces potential conflicts

**Alternative Solution**

- **Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets**: Design that accommodates all users comfortably improves social interaction in the community
- **Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances**: Design that accommodates all users comfortably improves transportation choices and access
- **Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools**: Design that accommodates all users comfortably make walking and cycling more viable
- **Facilitate car sharing**: Design that accommodates all users comfortably reduces potential conflicts
- **Shift from driving to other modes supports improved air quality**: Design that accommodates all users comfortably improves social interaction
- **Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods**: Supports cycling activity in the study area
- **Support live / work / play development so people do not have to travel long distances**: Supports cycling activity in the study area
- **Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and schools**: Increases awareness of travel options
- **Facilitate car sharing**: Provides alternative to individual car ownership
- **Extend and modify HSR routes**: Supports growth in HSR local service, increasing transportation choices
- **Add local HSR circulator route**: Supports growth in HSR local service, increasing transportation choices
- **Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road**: Supports cycling activity on these streets
- **Create non-auto (walking and cycling) access to GO Station and right-sized Park N' Ride**: Supports cycling activity to the GO Station
- **Implement the multi-use recreational trails from the Recreational Master Plan: Project 5-4 in Bow Valley Open Space and Park N' Ride; Project 5-9 connecting Pottruff Road near Eugene Street across the RHVP to the Red Hill Valley Recreational Trail**: Supports greater use of the recreational trails and associated parks and open space

**RATING**

- **Excellent**: Shift to walking and cycling supports improved air quality
- **Good**: Shift to walking and cycling supports improved air quality
- **Neutral**: Shift to walking and cycling supports improved air quality
- **Poor**: Shift to walking and cycling supports improved air quality
- **Fair**: Shift to walking and cycling supports improved air quality
## 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>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>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Environment:</td>
<td>Natural environment: landscape, parks, open space, watercourses, and shorelines</td>
<td>Cultural, heritage and archaeological resources</td>
<td></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>Alternative Solution</td>
<td>Evaluation of Alternative Transportation Solutions</td>
<td>Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue / Opportunity: Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Extend the B-line Rapid Transit (within 15 years of Centennial and beyond 25 years of Centennial)</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Implement S-line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></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>To be determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Improve traffic signal timings including pedestrian walk times</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Add turn lanes or roundabouts at “hot spot” intersections</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Adopt transit priority measures at signalized intersections</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue / Opportunity: Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></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></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Construct missing pieces of sidewalk along Lake, Centennial and local streets that serve commercial and employment areas</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Create neighborhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Manage parking for new developments to reduce surface lots</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue / Opportunity: Urban Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Provide multi-level access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Improve quality and location of bus stops, targeting providing shelters at 30%</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Some traffic calming features may provide opportunities to provide additional street trees or landscaping</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Some sheet trees would be impacted by constructing sidewalks in the boulevard; mitigate with street tree replacement plan in same or nearby location</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Some sheet trees would be impacted by constructing sidewalks in the boulevard; mitigate with street tree replacement plan in same or nearby location</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Some sheet trees would be impacted by constructing sidewalks in the boulevard; mitigate with street tree replacement plan in same or nearby location</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RATING

- Poor
- Fair
- Neutral
- Good
- Excellent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Issue / Opportunity: Mobility Choices</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Bring in SoBi bike share to serve these neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support level, walk, play development so people do not have to travel long distances</td>
<td>Support level, walk, play development so people do not have to travel long distances</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and students</td>
<td>Promote travel options to employers, new immigrants and students</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate car sharing</td>
<td>Facilitate car sharing</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build and modify FRR nodes</td>
<td>Build and modify FRR nodes</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add additional HSR commuter rail</td>
<td>Add additional HSR commuter rail</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide walking and cycling access to GO Station and high-speed rail</td>
<td>Provide walking and cycling access to GO Station and high-speed rail</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May impact vegetation along the roadway and safety</td>
<td>May impact vegetation along the roadway and safety</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian connections through new developments</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian connections through new developments</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve streetscape and gateway as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
<td>Improve streetscape and gateway as per the Secondary Plan concepts</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement Complete/Livable/Better Streets, wider streets and sidewalks</td>
<td>Implement Complete/Livable/Better Streets, wider streets and sidewalks</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets</td>
<td>Protect rights-of-way on all arterials for implementing Complete / Livable / Better Streets</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road</td>
<td>Provide bikeways on Nash, Lake, Warrington and South Service Road</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May impact vegetation along the roadway and safety</td>
<td>May impact vegetation along the roadway and safety</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Physical Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Environment</th>
<th>Natural Environment: landscape, parks, open spaces, waterfronts, and shorelines</th>
<th>Cultural, heritage and archaeological resources</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street design and park design</td>
<td>Street design and park design</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be determined depending on location of gateway</td>
<td>To be determined depending on location of gateway</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be determined depending on location of gateway</td>
<td>To be determined depending on location of gateway</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be determined depending on location of gateway</td>
<td>To be determined depending on location of gateway</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Streetscape/landscape and public spaces will contribute to urban design</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Physical Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Natural environment: landscape, parks, open space, watercourses, and shorelines</th>
<th>Cultural, heritage and archaeological resources</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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 RMP 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>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Improve the safety and comfort of pedestrian and cycling connections through the interchanges at the RMP</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Impact:**
- **I:** Impacts the natural environment in the Bow Valley Open Space, Lawrence Avenue Park and Red Hill Valley
- **J:** No impact

**Increase:**
- **I:** Increases pedestrian activity and recreational amenities in the Bow Valley Open Space, Lawrence Avenue Park and Red Hill Valley
- **J:** No impact

**Rating:**
- **I:** Unknown
- **J:** Neutral
## Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan

### Evaluation of Alternative Transportation Solutions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Opportunity: Capacity</th>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Economic Benefits</th>
<th>Implement</th>
<th>To be determined</th>
<th>RATING</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>Portion of $0.8B (20011 Dollars, as per Cost Estimate Report)</td>
<td>Road ROY modeling obtained from some redeveloped properties, options for development on remnant properties</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Implement S-Line Rapid Transit on Centennial and extend to GO Station (beyond 25 years)</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>No cost to protect ROY</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Good</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 ROY</td>
<td>No cost to protect ROY</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Improve traffic signals including pedestrian walk times</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Road ROY modeling obtained from some redeveloped properties, options for development on remnant properties</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Add turn lanes or roundabouts at &quot;hot spot&quot; intersections Centennial and sections of Barton and King recently reconstructed; high cost due to property and utility constraints</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Some additional lanes to maintain</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Opportunity: Safety</th>
<th>Alternative Solution</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Economic Benefits</th>
<th>Implement</th>
<th>To be determined</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Ensure improvements to streets reflect desirable speeds</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Lower operating speeds support more livable community and commercial activity</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Implement traffic calming to reduce speeds to 40 km/h or less on local streets</td>
<td>Minor increase in repair and maintenance efforts</td>
<td>Lower operating speeds support more livable community and higher real estate values</td>
<td>Minor increase in repair and maintenance efforts</td>
<td>Minor increase in repair and maintenance efforts</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Complete sidewalk network along Lakeshore Road between Barton and King supports more livable community</td>
<td>$200K to $1,000K per traffic calming device</td>
<td>Lower operating speeds support more livable community and commercial activity</td>
<td>$200K to $1,000K per traffic calming device</td>
<td>$200K to $1,000K per traffic calming device</td>
<td>Good</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>Costs</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create neighbourhood greenways to calm traffic, and improve walking and cycling connections</td>
<td>7.2 km of greenways at $75K/km: $0.5 M Combine with Safety Alternative B</td>
<td>Minor increase in repair and maintenance efforts Improved walking and cycling environment supports more livable community and higher real estate values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manage access to new, larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety</td>
<td>No impact No impact May affect vehicular access to specific developments</td>
<td>No impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide multi-use trail access to Confederation Park</td>
<td>$1.6 to 1.9M New multi-use trail to repair / rehabilitate, sweep and remove snow / ice</td>
<td>Enhanced economic and recreational value of Confederation Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Issue / Opportunity: Urban Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Opportunity</th>
<th>Implement</th>
<th>Operate / maintain</th>
<th>Economic benefits</th>
<th>RATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 Enhanced access to commercial areas</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Centennial Neighbourhoods Transportation Management Plan

**Evaluation of Alternative Transportation Solutions**

#### Alternative Solution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue / Opportunity: Mobility Choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implement</th>
<th>Operate / maintain</th>
<th>Economic benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No cost to protect ROW</td>
<td>No cost to protect ROW</td>
<td>Road ROW widening obtained from some redeveloped properties; decrease developable lands on remaining properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>No impact</td>
<td>Shorter trip making can offset investment in transportation infrastructure to meet longer trip needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of on-going Smart Commute Program</td>
<td>Part of on-going Smart Commute Program</td>
<td>Transportation demand management offsets investment in transportation infrastructure to meet travel needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Car ownership efficiencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May require purchase of an additional bus</td>
<td>May require an additional bus with an annual operating cost of $0.3 M or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May require purchase of an additional bus</td>
<td>Approx. $0.75 M (2 buses with service 12 hours a day, Mon-Sat) annually</td>
<td></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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></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/km: $0.2 M 0.9 km of bike lanes through road widening at $70K/km: $0.6 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td></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 TransLink Bus and Train stations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td></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/4km plus pedestrian bridge over RHVP at $15T/m: $2.9 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td></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 crossovers per interchange: $75 K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix D: 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>MCEA Schedule (see Note 1)</th>
<th>Timeframe for Implementation (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>For Streets</strong></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) <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>2. Protect right-of-way (no cost) as per <em>Urban Official Plan, Schedule C-2 – Future Road Widenings (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>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</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>
<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>
### FOR TRANSIT

<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 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>Citywide 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>Citywide 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)

<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>Recreational Trails Master Plan does not include any estimated construction costs (to be determined) Project 5-10 approx. value $2 M</td>
<td>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</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 5-4: 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>Centennial Neighbourhoods Specific Projects</td>
<td>PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION</td>
<td>APPROX. COST (IF KNOWN)</td>
<td>MCEA SCHEDULE (SEE NOTE 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</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>
</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 |
### PREFERRED TRANSPORTATION SOLUTION

| 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)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPROX. COST (IF KNOWN)</th>
<th>MCEA SCHEDULE (SEE NOTE 1)</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME FOR IMPLEMENTATION (IF KNOWN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 (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)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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>Approximate cost for signage of existing and future routes is $10 K</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Implement following implementation of Preferred Transportation Solution for Active Transportation No. 12 (Recreational Trails Master Plan Project 5-10), No. 13 and No. 15.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TO INCLUDE IN THE SECONDARY PLAN (SEE NOTE 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary Plan Policy</th>
<th>19.</th>
<th>Manage access to larger developments to reduce driveways for improved safety. Identify and implement access management as part of development applications for deeper properties.</th>
<th>Developer funded</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20.</td>
<td>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>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Improve pedestrian connections through developments. Identify and implement pedestrian connections as part of development applications.</td>
<td>Developer funded</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td>Address funding in the Secondary Plan.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Address implementation in the Secondary Plan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></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>Schedule A</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td></td>
<td></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>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BY OTHER PROPONEnts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoBiHamilton</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>
<td>Year 2017 to 2022</td>
<td></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>
<td>QEW / Centennial Parkway bridge rehabilitation scheduled by MTO anticipated for 2017.</td>
<td></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>
<td>To be determined by Metrolinx</td>
<td></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.

4. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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. 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 8\textsuperscript{th}, 2015
- Focus Group Meeting #2: Workshop on land use and public realm options, November 10\textsuperscript{th}, 2015;
- Focus Group Meeting #3: Workshop on recommended land use and public realm improvement plans, April 7\textsuperscript{th}, 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.

Above: Interactive Activity from PIC #1 Phase 1, Issues, Opportunities and Vision, April 30th, 2015
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.

**TABLE 5.1: POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT GROWTH POTENTIAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Growth Potential (people), 2011-2031</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>Population Growth Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>3,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Growth Potential (jobs), 2011-2031</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option</td>
<td>Employment Growth Potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3</td>
<td>1,175</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 / Parapet interaction
- Existing roadway to minimize construction
- Shade and ornamental trees.
- Cycletrack for efficient cyclist movement

CENTENNIAL PARKWAY WITH MODERATE ENHANCEMENTS

- Maximized landscape buffer
- Parking relocated to rear, avoid street frontage parking
- Existing roadway to minimize construction
FIGURE 5.8: QUEENSTON ROAD STREETSCAPE CONCEPTS

QUEENSTON ROAD WITH LRT (AS PER ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT)

QUEENSTON ROAD, EAST OF CENTENNIAL PARKWAY (URBAN STREET WITH CYCLE TRACK)
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.

Above: Potential redevelopment visualization for Queenston Road (looking toward Centennial)
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 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.
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.
CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN:
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.
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 6.5: QUEENSTON ROAD STREETSCAPE CONCEPT
FIGURE 6.6: CENTENNIAL PARKWAY STREETSCAPE CONCEPT
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 soft-scaping 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).
CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN:

FIGURE 6.8: SPECIAL POLICY AREAS

LEGEND

Special Policy Areas
GO Station Area

KEY

1. Smart Centres Lands
2. GO Station Lands
3. Evangeline Square Lands
4. North Road on Centennial Railway South Marine
5. Queenston Parcels
6. Existing Waste Management Facility
7. St. David's Catholic Elementary School
8. 26 Arrowsmith Drive

NORTHMAP PREPARED BY: MAK, DILLON CONSULTING
CHECKED BY: PJK, DILLON CONSULTING

Appendix "E" to Report PED18007
Page 1026 of 1156
SPECIAL POLICY AREA 2

Special Policy Area 2 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 (mult-use)

**CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN STUDY CITY OF HAMILTON**

**FIGURE 1 PIC #1 - ACTIVITY #1**

**ISSUES/OPPORTUNITIES IN STUDY AREA**

- **ACTIVE TRANSPORTATION / INFRASTRUCTURE**

  - Sidewalks not in good repair for walking
  - Wider sidewalks, speed bumps?
  - Trees between sidewalks at 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 needed on Lake Ave N
  - Barton Street E

- **GENERAL**
  - Storm sewers are separated but sometimes there are issues
  - Part bike lanes beside sidewalk, not on road

**Note:** The following map shows the specific public comments posted from our April 30th Public Event.
Can't think of any public art in this area (inspired by evening's presentation)

**LAND USE / URBAN DESIGN ISSUES / OPPORTUNITIES**

- More local businesses (specialized)
- More opportunities for better quality non-franchised restaurants with patios
- Convert industrial land into dog parks. The closest one is 25 minutes drive.
- Maintain a supply of affordable housing in the neighbourhood
- No public art - do not like it
- Signage for Hamilton
- Need to strengthen Downtown Stoney Creek
- Signage for waterfalls, trails, parks, rec centre
- Too dense
- Transit improvement may push up rent
- Multiple dwelling taxes make housing less affordable
- Remove Adult Novelty Store
- Intensification
- Interventions along Centennial
- Add benches, plants and cover areas along major walking areas (Queenston, Central, Barton)
- Industrial area needs improvement
- How can we use the land? Will it stay? Are there any changes?
- This may not have been a good idea (commercial development)
- Fewer car dealerships and more hotels to support soccer tournament
- Can we use the landfill lands?
- Why?
- Any changes?
Note: The following map shows the specific public comments posted from our April 30th Public Event.
TRANSPORTATION

- Need transit to recreation areas
- Increase the number of times the Ryndel #50 run

CARPOOLING

- Like Rapid Transit
- More buses outside of peak hours, express to certain locations
- Incentive for people who own cars to use buses
- Transportation lacking to Stoney Creek

RAISE LRT Alt for Queenston

GO Station needs to come NOW

Note: The following map shows the specific public comments posted from our April 30th Public Event.
FIGURE 5
ISSUES/OPPORTUNITIES IN STUDY AREA

- Farmers market at Lake Ave. Public School or Domenic Agostino Rec. Centre
- Neighbourhood is close to the shopping mall and two parks
- Speed is too fast on Riverdale, it’s gotten very busy
- Speeding along Lake Avenue Rd happens when congestion occurs on Queenston/Centennial
- Litter management
- No Littering Zone and/or Major Cleanup - Adopt a Road Program

Other Comments on Issues/Opportunities

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.
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.

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN STUDY
CITY OF HAMILTON

FIGURE 7: DISTRICT 2 - EASTGATE SQUARE / CENTENNIAL PARKWAY LAND USE OPTIONS

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.

Apartments 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.

"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

Appendix "E" to Report PED18007
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**

**Option #1 - Current Official Plan**

- 40 km/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 okay 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 area.
- Mixed use is best.
- Like the mix of high and medium density mixed-use.

**Option #2 - Medium and High Density Mixed Use**

- Buffer between higher rise and low density residential by using parks, setbacks and streetscape.
- Mixed use nice because it animates the streetscape.
- Vacant lot needs to be developed. Ugly.
- Development facing park should have some interaction with park. I.e. people can sit beside park.
- Some areas should be mid rise. Depends on surrounding uses.
- Encourage hotels in area.
- Mixed use is best.
- Like the mix of high and medium density mixed-use.

**Option #3 - Concentrated Density**

- High density around this location. Intersection is key. Should be people friendly, destination place. Outdoor use.
FIGURE 10: PUBLIC OPEN SPACE IMPROVEMENTS

“Green Dots” - Like
“Red Dots” - Dislike

CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN STUDY
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SPECIFIC MAP COMMENTS FROM DECEMBER 1st PUBLIC INFORMATION CENTRE #2

GO Station
Gateway Improvement Area
Streetscaping Improvements
Active Transportation Improvements (Cycling/Walking)

DISTRICT 1

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.

DISTRICT 2

Comments
1. Gateway should be closer to King Street.
2. More improvements not necessary at Eastgate.

DISTRICT 3

Connections between parks (walking/cycling)
Connect to existing trail (Battlefield Park) South of Queenston through park to park on other side of Lake Ave.

Comments
1. Identified Gateway area could be a gateway. Not sure what it is a gateway of.
2. Dog Park wanted.
4. Not work investment for bike lanes everywhere.
5. Some areas could be retrofitted for bike lanes at a low cost.
6. Improvements at places of worship not a good idea.
7. 4 gateways should be identical with common elements.

DISTRICT 4

Comments
1. There should be a greenway/corridor connection between the park and Queenston Commercial Area provided.
**QUEENSTON ROAD (WEST OF CENTENNIAL) - LIGHT RAIL TRANSPORT APPROVED PRELIMINARY DESIGN**

**QUEENSTON ROAD (EAST OF CENTENNIAL) - BIKE LANES**

**QUEENSTON ROAD (EAST OF CENTENNIAL) - CYCLE TRACK**

**Comments**
- 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.

**Comments**
- Combined sidewalk bike lanes should be considered.
- Why is paved median necessary?
- Cycle track safer for cyclists.
- Sidewalk cafe.

**General Comments on Queenston Streetscape Options**
- Street furniture is important.
FIGURE 12: CENTENNIAL PARKWAY - STREETSCAPE OPTIONS

“Green Dots” - Like
“Red Dots” - Dislike

CENTENNIAL PARKWAY - CYCLE TRACK

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

Comments
• Where are bikes?

General Comments
• Get trucks off Centennial Parkway south of Queenston.
• Street furniture is important.
CENTENNIAL NEIGHBOURHOODS SECONDARY PLAN STUDY
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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).
Figure 15 - Special Policy Areas

Comments

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.
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.
## Summary of Comments on Final Draft

<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.</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>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of the Go Station should be to bring people to Hamilton and not to take them to jobs away from Hamilton.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop the establishment of further auto business or retail-car-lots on Centennial that have inherent limits on the number they employ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move the Drivers Examination Centre to make the area available for high rise dwellings or office towers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move recycling plant on Kenora to make the area available for high rise dwellings or office towers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The station will provide better transportation options to and from the area, both of which are beneficial for the area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The policies will not permit new auto oriented uses such as drive-throughs, gas stations, vehicle dealerships and car washes on Centennial Parkway.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Secondary Plan cannot force a legally existing use to relocate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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 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 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 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

## 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.
| Fred Pizzoferrato | 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:  
- The lots directly to the south are more suitable for medium density development.  
- The current designation does not reflect the potential for higher densities.

| | 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.  
- The lots directly to the south are more suitable for medium density development.  
- The current designation does not reflect the potential for higher densities. |
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.

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.

<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 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>Description</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.</td>
<td>density and height is not appropriate in this area. To address these concerns, staff have extended the Mixed Use – High Density designation across the whole site, but have applied a site specific policy to the lands which maintains the original policy intent to have a lower density and height on the southern half of the site. Staff notes that both designations are similar and generally permit the same range of uses. 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.</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>
<td>N/A</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</td>
<td>Staff are satisfied that the maximum building heights and Policy 6.7.5.1 j) appropriately address the site. Staff have amended the land use designation for the southerly half of the site from Mixed Use – Medium Density to Mixed Use – High Density, as noted in the response to Zelinka Priamo’s comments for this same site, on page 7 of Appendix H above. To maintain the intent of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Richard Herlick, Laurier Group (for 826-840 Queenston)</strong></td>
<td>Redevelopment of the site, similar to Eastgate Square site specific policy area. 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.</td>
<td>Plan, staff have developed a site specific policy area for the site to provide guidance for future development. 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><strong>Parkway Nissan (191 Centennial Parkway North)</strong></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.</td>
<td>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>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Appendix "G" to Report PED1807** |
| **Page 1063 of 1156** |
| Urban Solutions (for 71, 83 and 85 Centennial Parkway South) | 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. | greater conformity with the Pedestrian Focus Streets and Urban Design policies of the Secondary Plan. | Policies noted have been removed. General urban design policies are sufficient to deal with transitions and appropriate design. |
| GSP Group (for SmartREIT, 210 Centennial Parkway North and 502-560 Centennial Parkway North) | Request confirmation that Policy 6.7.5.1 K) would apply to a phased approach of redevelopment.  
Policy 6.7.7.4 c) states that the minimum building height shall be 3 storeys. Three storey buildings are not typically financially feasible. We suggest a minimum height of 2 storeys for the site at 210 Centennial Parkway North. | | 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.  
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. |
| **Urban Solutions (for 140 Centennial Parkway North)** | Suggest that Policy 6.7.5.1 k) permit limited 1 and 2 storey development. | Change is not necessary as 2 storey development is permitted across site. This policy is removed in final version as policy 6.7.5.1 j) adequately addresses transitional development. |
| **Spears and Associates Inc. Planning Consultants (for Eastgate Mall)** | A height of greater than 20 storeys should be considered for the site. Only Eastgate Mall permits 20 storeys. | No change recommended. Heights are based on a number of factors. Eastgate Mall is intended to be the focal point for the Secondary Plan, and is the largest and most prominent site. Node must also be secondary to downtown in terms of heights and densities. Eastgate Mall is also much larger than other Mixed Use – High Density sites within the Secondary Plan, allowing for greater separation distances between tall buildings and existing residential and sensitive land uses. |
| **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 Policies revised to eliminate numerical values. Requires that where a proposal on a large site will be reducing the amount of retail floor space, the City may require a retail impact study. The City to request on a case-by-case basis depending on a specific proposal. |
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

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.
development. Trying to come up with an arbitrary formula for redevelopment or development of each and every site in the Node does not work.

This draft is a significant improvement over the previous draft released in April 2017. Many of our concerns expressed previously have been addressed.

| MHBC Planning (for 640 Queenston Road) | 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 with... |

| 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... |
| 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

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 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:"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Policies</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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 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:"
| That the policy is amended by adding "Volume 2 or" to the text as follows:
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:"
| One of the 4 sites is within Secondary Plan. Site specific policies in Volume 3 for this site are being relocated to Volume 2. |

4.2.9
d) at 480 and 500 Centennial Parkway North and 20 Warrington Street.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| That the address be changed to:
d) at 502 to 560 Centennial Parkway North. |
| Address of site has changed. |

4.3.1, Table 4.3.1
List of all street segments which are “Pedestrian Focus Streets”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Add 2 street segments.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Streets in Centennial Secondary Plan which are intended to be “Pedestrian Focus Streets” |

Volume 1 – Schedules and Appendices
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Schedule /Appendix</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schedule “E-1” designates subject lands as Arterial Commercial.</td>
<td>Revise Schedule “E-1” to redesignate lands from Arterial Commercial to Industrial. (Subsection 4.1.2 a) i) of OPA)</td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule “E-1” designates subject lands as Arterial Commercial.</td>
<td>Revise Schedule “E-1” to redesignate lands from Arterial Commercial to Mixed Use – High Density Designation. (Subsection 4.1.2 a) ii) 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>
<tr>
<td>Schedule “E-1” designates subject lands as District Commercial.</td>
<td>Revise Schedule “E-1” to redesignate lands from District Commercial to Mixed Use – Medium Density Designation. (Subsection 4.1.2 a) iii) of OPA)</td>
<td>Redesignation identifies a greater mixture of land uses along the corridor and within the Node, which is more appropriate than the existing designations.</td>
</tr>
<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 Neighbourhoods Designation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule “E-1” designates subject lands as Mixed Use – Medium Density.</td>
<td>Revise Schedule “E-1” 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)</td>
<td>Redesignations identify a higher density in key areas of the Node, which is more appropriate than the existing designations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule E-1</td>
<td>Schedule “E-1” designates subject lands as Business Park</td>
<td>Revise Schedule “E-1” to redesignate lands from Business Park to District Commercial Designation (Subsection 4.1.2 a) vii) of OPA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule E-1</td>
<td>Schedule “E-1” designates subject lands as Mixed Use – Medium Density</td>
<td>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)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

they complement the existing neighbourhood uses and are outside of the Node.
<p>| Schedule E-1 | Schedule “E-1” designates subject lands as District Commercial | Revise Schedule “E-1” to redesignate lands from District Commercial to Business Park Designation (Subsection 4.1.2 a) vii) of OPA) | Minor boundary adjustment based on actual lot severance and build-out of lands. |
| 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 Open Space Designation (Subsection 4.1.2 a) viii) of OPA) | Recognizes lands which form part of Core natural area. |
| Schedule E-1 | Schedule “E-1” designates subject lands as Industrial Land | Revise Schedule “E-1” to redesignate lands from Industrial Land to Open Space Designation (Subsection 4.1.2 a) ix) of OPA) | Recognizes lands which form part of Core natural area within Red Hill Valley. |
| Schedule E-1 | Schedule “E-1” designates subject lands as District Commercial | Revise Schedule “E-1” to redesignate lands from District Commercial to Mixed Use – High Density (Subsection 4.1.2 a) x) of OPA) | 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. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix A</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 “Proposed GO Station” (shown in blue)</th>
<th>Recognition of the approved transportation projects in the area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Appendix A**

Appendix A identifies the Parks Classification and Secondary Plans

Revising Appendix A to add Secondary Plans

Map needs to identify all Secondary Plans.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume 2 – Text</th>
<th>Current Policies</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.6.7 Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan</strong></td>
<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>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.7.2 Old Town Secondary Plan</strong></td>
<td>7.2 First Sentence “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.”</td>
<td>Amend to read: “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.”</td>
<td>Extent of Secondary Plan area is changing, so description of boundaries needs to be updated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.7.2 Old Town Secondary Plan</strong></td>
<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>Lands currently designated Mixed Use – High Density in Old Town Secondary Plan are being removed and included in Centennial Neighbourhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.7.2 Old Town Secondary Plan</strong></td>
<td>Section E.4.5 – Mixed Use – High Density Designation of Volume 1 shall apply to lands designation Mixed Use – High Density on Map B.7.2-1 – Old Town – Land Use Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Specific Policy – Area C
Policy 7.2.8.3
Those lands located at 33 Cromwell Crescent (St. David School Site) designated Medium Density Residential 3 and identified as Site Specific Policy – Area C on Map B.7.2-1 – Old Town – Land Use Plan are intended to be comprehensively redeveloped for residential purposes in accordance with the following policies:

a) Permitted uses include single-detached dwelling, townhouses and multiple dwelling structures in consultation with the City.

b) In the interim, the use of these lands shall continue for institutional purposes.

c) Any redevelopment will not provide vehicular access to Cromwell Crescent.

d) The height of new buildings adjacent to 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.

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.

Appendix A shows the location of all Secondary Plans in the City.

Add Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan

All Secondary Plans should be shown on map.
| Old Town Secondary Plan – Land Use Map | Old Town Secondary Plan contains lands which are proposed to be part of the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan | Delete lands from Old Town Secondary Plan | Lands cannot be located in two different secondary plans |
| New – Centennial Neighbourhood | N/A | Add four new Schedule Maps and one Appendix (information map) | New maps for the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan |
### Volume 3 – Special Policy Areas, Area Specific Policies and Site Specific Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Policies</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **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. | Delete Policy in its entirety. | 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. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volume 3 – Special Policy Areas, Area Specific Policies and Site Specific</th>
<th>Chapter C, Urban Site Specific Policies, Policies UHN-10, UHC-4, UCW-1C 3.0 and UHE-7</th>
<th>Delete Policies in their entirety</th>
<th>Policies have been relocated to the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan as Special Policy Areas E, D, C, and K.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume 3 – Special Policy Areas, Area Specific Policies and Site Specific</td>
<td>Chapter C, Urban Site Specific Policies UCW-1C Title</td>
<td>Delete words “and 460 Kenora Avenue” and change comma to the word “and”</td>
<td>Reflects that Policy 3.0 of UCW-1C, for 460 Kenora Avenue, has been deleted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume 3 – Mapping</strong></td>
<td><strong>Current Map</strong></td>
<td><strong>Proposed Amendment</strong></td>
<td><strong>Rationale</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Volume 3</strong></td>
<td><strong>Map 1 – Area Specific Policies Key Map</strong></td>
<td>Revise Map to delete “UH-1”</td>
<td>Policy is being deleted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Map H-4 – Area Specific Policies Map

Delete map.

Site specific policies for lands identified on map are from Volume 3 so should be removed from map.
Appendix "H" to Report PED18007
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Volume 3 – Special Policy Areas, Area Specific Policies and Site Specific Policies

Map 2 – Urban Site Specifics Key Map

Amend map by deleting UHC-4, UCW-1C at 460 Kenora Avenue, UHE-7 and UHN-10. Site specific policies are being deleted from Volume 3 so should be removed from map.
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 existingTOC1,TOC2, and TOC3 Zoneto 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>Mixed Use (TOC1) Zone</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.
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>Local Commercial (TOC2) Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhoods Designation</td>
<td>Local Commercial Designation</td>
<td>Mixed Use(TOC1) Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use – Medium Density Designation</td>
<td>Mixed Use – Medium Density Designation</td>
<td>Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use High Density (TOC4) Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use – High Density Designation</td>
<td>Mixed Use – High Density Designation</td>
<td></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 PolicyUH-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:
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- 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 Revisionsto 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 Commercial Uses 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 Zonet 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
MAYOR

Rose Caterini
CITY CLERK
Schedule “1”
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:

1.1. That Section 2.1.g) be deleted and replaced as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“g)”</th>
<th>Transit Oriented Corridor Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use Medium Density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Oriented Corridor Local Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Oriented Corridor Multiple Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transit Oriented Corridor Mixed Use High Density</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Authority: Item , Report (PED18012)
CM: Wards: 3, 4, 5 and 9

Bill No.
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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:"

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."

3.4. That Subsection 5.6 c) iv. be amended by adding the following new regulation for “Shopping Centre” so that it reads as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shopping Centre (Transit Oriented Corridor Zones)</th>
<th>i) 0 for less than 450.0 square metres of gross floor area;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) 1 for each 17.0 square metres of gross floor area between 450.0 square metres and 4,000.0 square metres; and,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iii) 1 for each 50.0 square metres of gross floor area greater than 4,000.0 square metres.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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 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
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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.

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:
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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.

4.10. 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”
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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”
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."
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4.36 That SECTION 11: TRANSIT ORIENTED CORRIDOR ZONES is amended by including the following new subsections:

“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
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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
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Requirement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Minimum Rear Yard</td>
<td>7.5 metres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Minimum Interior Side Yard</td>
<td>7.5 metres abutting a Residential Zone or Institutional Zone.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Building Height</td>
<td>i) Minimum 11.0 metres;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ii) Maximum 40.0 metres;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. The wholly enclosed or partially</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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.

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
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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.

h) Minimum Amenity On a lot containing more than 10 dwelling units, the
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Area for Dwelling Units in Conjunction with a Commercial Use

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 be permitted in a front yard or flankage yard.
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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 shall apply:
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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>
<tr>
<td>727 Queenston Road</td>
<td>Map 1142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>732 Queenston Road</td>
<td>Map 1142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

735 Queenston Road  Map 1142
736 Queenston Road  Map 1142
744 Queenston Road  Map 1142 and Map 1193
750 Queenston Road  Map 1142 and Map 1193
754 Queenston Road  Map 1142 and Map 1193
771 Queenston Road  Map 1142
816 Queenston Road  Map 1194
822 Queenston Road  Map 1194
16 Clapham Road  Map 1142

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

b) Notwithstanding Subsections 11.1.3 g).iii).1., 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
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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
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.

iii) Screening

Rooftop mechanical equipment shall be located and/or screened from view of any
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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” – 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:
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a) For the purposes of this By-law, the front lot line is deemed to be Centennial Parkway North.

b) 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

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 b) B) of Special Exception No. 633 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.

c) 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:
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i) Maximum building height shall be 62.0 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 streetline abutting Kenora Avenue and Delawana Drive within the extent of the boundaries of Area A.

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) Notwithstanding Subsection 4.20 c) i), an outdoor commercial patio shall be permitted to provide commercial entertainment consisting of recorded music only, on a lot where any lot line abuts a Residential Zone or where such lot is separated from a Residential Zone by a laneway or street.

D) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 g) ii) and iii), the following regulations apply:

i) The minimum width of the ground floor façade facing Queenston Road within Area B shall:

1. Be greater than or equal to 75% of the measurement of that portion of the streetline abutting Queenston Road located within Area B;

2. Comply with Subsection 11.4.3 a).

ii) The minimum width of the ground floor façade facing Centennial Parkway North within Area B shall:

1. Be greater than or equal to 75% of the measurement of that portion of the streetline abutting Centennial Parkway North located within Area B; and,

2. Comply with Subsection 11.4.3 a).

iii) In addition to Subsection 11.4.3 g) iv) and clauses c) D) i) and ii) of Special Exception No. 633, the calculation of the measurement of the streetline shall not include any portion of the lot width occupied by a public transit facility.

E) Notwithstanding Subsection 4.12 e) ii) for the existing principal shopping centre building, expansions to the existing principal
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shopping centre building legally existing on the date of passing of the by-law may be permitted provided the total expansion of the gross floor area does not exceed 64,053 square metres.

F) 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 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 described as 165 Queenston Road, the following special provision applies:

a) In addition to Subsection 11.1.1 Permitted Uses, and notwithstanding Subsection 11.1.2 Prohibited Uses, the existing Motor Vehicle Service Station shall also be permitted.

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).

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:

A) 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
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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.

B) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 d) i), a minimum height of 6.0 metres shall be permitted for any addition to any building existing on the date of the passing of this By-law.

b) For the purposes of Special Exception No. 637, the following special regulations shall apply to Area A as shown on Figure 12 of Schedule “F” – Special Figures:

A) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 g) ii) and iii), the following regulations apply:

i) The minimum width of the ground floor façade facing Queenston Road within Area A shall:

1. Be greater than or equal to 75% of the measurement of that portion of the streetline abutting Queenston Road located within Area A;

2. Comply with Subsection 11.4.3 a).

ii) The minimum width of the ground floor façade facing Nash Road within Area A shall:

1. Be greater than or equal to 75% of the measurement of that portion of the streetline abutting Nash Road located within Area A; and,

2. Comply with Subsection 11.4.3 a).

iii) In addition to Subsection 11.4.3 g) iv) and clauses b) A) i) and ii) of Special Exception No. 637, the calculation of the measurement of the streetline shall not include any portion of the lot width occupied by the existing motor vehicle gas bar.

c) 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:

A) In addition to Section 3, for the purpose of Special Exception No. 637, the following definition shall apply:
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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:

- Conference or Convention Centre
- Dwelling Unit(s)
- Educational Establishment
- Emergency Shelter
- Lodging House
- Long Term Care Facility
- Multiple Dwelling
- Residential Care Facility
- Retirement Home

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, residential uses contained in Subsection 11.4.1 and Clause c) B) shall be permitted on the ground floor.

E) In addition to Subsection 11.4.1.1, the following restriction of uses shall apply:

i) Residential Care Facility
   1. Maximum capacity for a Residential Care Facility is 20 residents.

ii) Emergency Shelter
   2. Maximum capacity for an Emergency Shelter is 50 residents.

iii) Emergency Shelter and Residential Care Facility:
   1. Except as provided in Clause c) E) iii) 2., every
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Emergency Shelter or 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; and,

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, 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.

F) Notwithstanding Subsection 11.4.3 a), d) ii), iii) and iv), g) iii), the following regulations shall apply:

i) Building Setback from a Street

1. Minimum 3.0 metres for a building with residential units on the ground floor facing a street;

2. Maximum 4.5 metres, except where a visibility triangle is required for a driveway access;

3. Notwithstanding Clause c) F) i) 2., a minimum setback of 6.0 metres is required for that portion of a building providing access to a driveway or garage; and,

4. 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 Clauses c) F) i) 1. and 2.

ii) Building Height

1. Maximum 22.0 metres;

2. In addition to Subsection 11.4.3 d) i) and notwithstanding Clause c) F) ii) 1., the minimum building height may
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be equivalently increased as the yard increases beyond the minimum yard requirement established in Subsections 11.4.3 b) and c), when abutting a Residential or Institutional Zone, to a maximum of 22.0 metres.

iii) Built Form for New Development

1. The minimum width of the ground floor façade facing Nash Road within Area B shall be greater than or equal to 40% of the measurement of that portion of the streetline abutting Nash Road located within Area B.

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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**RECOMMENDATION**

That the City Solicitor and the General Manager of Planning and Economic Development, be authorized to make submissions to the Province, Ontario Municipal Board and/or the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal with respect to any rules or regulations that may be proposed relating to Bill 139, *Building Better Communities and Conserving Watersheds Act, 2017*, provided the submissions are consistent with previous submissions by the City on Bill 139.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The purpose of this Report is to provide an update on Bill 139 and the impact of proposed potential transition regulations as it relates to the reform of the Ontario Municipal Board and its replacement with the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal. In addition, it is recommended that the City Solicitor and General Manager of Planning and Economic Development be provided with the authority to make submissions with respect to the implementation of Bill 139, including any proposed regulations, provided such submissions are not inconsistent with City Council’s previously identified position(s) on Bill 139.


_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._
Royal Assent and is now an act (the Building Better Communities and Conserving Watersheds Act, 2017, S.O. 2017, c.23, henceforth the “Act”). However, many of the Act’s provisions will come into force on a date to be named by proclamation of the Lieutenant Governor. The provisions of the Act not yet in force include all amendments to the Planning Act and provisions relating to the new Local Planning Appeal Tribunal (the “Tribunal”) and the Local Planning Appeal Support Centre (the “Centre”).

The Province has indicated that it is seeking to have the new system implemented in Spring 2018.

The transition from the Board to the Tribunal will be determined by upcoming regulations accompanying the Act. No draft regulations have been put forward yet by the Province. However, three draft summaries have been released indicating the potential content and direction of transition regulations.

The proposed transition regulations propose that existing proceedings before the Board as of December 12, 2017 will not be affected and any appeal made after Bill 139 is proclaimed by the Lieutenant Governor would be subject to the new rules therein. For appeals filed between December 12, 2017 and the date of proclamation, the appeal would be heard by the Board if the subject application was complete prior to December 12, 2017, and would be heard by the Tribunal if the application was complete after that date.

Other matters addressed by the proposed regulations include set timelines for completing different types of appeals before the Tribunal, restrictions on examination of witnesses before the Tribunal, time limits on submissions by parties at an oral hearing, and technical matters of implementation.

Comments are due on the draft transition regulation summaries by January 21st, 2018. Legal Services and Planning staff do not have any significant concerns at this time with the content of the draft transition regulation summaries and as a result, have not made any submissions.

Alternatives for Consideration – N/A

FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Financial: For further consideration, please see Report LS16027(c)/PED16237(b).
Staffing: For further consideration, please see Report LS16027(c)/PED16237(b).
Legal: Legal Services and Planning staff will continue to monitor the status of Bill 139 and its proposed regulations and will make any submissions that
are determined to be appropriate, provided that such submissions are not inconsistent with City Council's previously identified position(s) on Bill 139. City staff will provide updates to Committee and Council regarding any submissions made. For further consideration, please see Report LS16027(c)/PED16237(b).

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In report LS16027(a)/PED16237(a), Legal Services and Planning Staff provided an update on the introduction of Bill 139, *Building Better Communities and Conserving Watersheds Act, 2017* in the Legislature and recommended submissions be made to the Ministry.

On December 7, 2017, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (the “Ministry”) and the Ministry of the Attorney General (“MAG”) released summaries of the proposed regulations in respect of Bill 139, as well as a background paper providing information and guidance respecting the new regulations. Comments on the proposed Regulations were being received until January 21, 2018. As noted previously, Legal Services and Planning staff do not have any significant concerns at this time with the content of the draft transition regulation summaries and as a result, have not made any submissions. Legal Services notes that the content of the draft regulations may not reflect the summaries described below and remain subject to change.

On December 12, 2017, Bill 139 received Royal Assent and the Act came into force. The majority of the provisions under the Act, including all *Planning Act* amendments and matters related to the Tribunal and the Centre, are not yet in force until they are proclaimed at a future date by the Lieutenant Governor. There has been no confirmation from the Province of what the proclamation date will be, however the Province has made public announcements indicating that proclamation may take place in Spring 2018.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION

Planning and Economic and Development Department, including Planning Division and Growth Management Division.

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.
ANALYSIS

Changes to the Final Version of the Act

The City made submissions to the Ministry in respect of Bill 139 (which can be found in Reports LS16027/PED16237 and LS16027(a)/PED16237(a)). To the extent that the City’s submissions could be incorporated at this time, the final version of Bill 139 included some of the City’s recommendations.

Prior to Royal Assent, Bill 139 was reviewed clause-by-clause by the Standing Committee on Social Policy and amendments were made. The final text of Bill 139 which received Royal Assent was substantively the same as the version that was previously summarized by staff in Report LS16027(a)/PED16237(a). The following are some notable changes from the prior version:

- a requirement that an official plan shall contain such policies and measures as are practicable to ensure the adequate provision of affordable housing. No changes are required to the City’s Official Plans as they already contain policies and measures relating to the adequate provision of affordable housing.

- subsection 70.8(2.1) to the Planning Act was introduced which gives the Minister additional power to make regulations providing for transitional matters respecting matters commenced before or after Royal Assent of Bill 139, and the date of proclamation of Schedules 1, 2, 3, and 5.

With the provisions of the Act now finalized, as part of the Places to Grow Plan and Greenbelt Plan conformity exercises, the City’s Official Plan will need to incorporate changes made to the Planning Act as a result of the Act, including to reflect the new policy statements identified by the Act. In addition, the Zoning By-law will need to be reviewed to ensure conformity.

Bill 139 also contains amendments to the Conservation Authorities Act, which will not be summarized in this Report.

Summary of Proposed Regulations

On December 7, 2017, three summaries of proposed regulations under the Act were released by the Province. One was completed by the MAG (the “MAG Summary”), and concerns the proposed regulations under the new Local Planning Appeal Tribunal Act, 2017 (the “LPAT Act”).
A summary of the proposed regulations in the MAG Summary is outlined below.

**Transition**

The new process under the LPAT Act for appeals of a municipality or an approval authority’s decision in respect of an official plan or zoning by-law amendment would apply to:

- Appeals made during appeals periods that begin *after* the LPAT Act comes into force (being the eventual date of proclamation); and

- Appeals made *before* the LPAT Act comes into force in respect of:
  - complete applications made to a municipality or an approval authority after December 12, 2017; and
  - municipally-initiated official plan and zoning by-law amendments that are adopted/passed after December 12, 2017.

The new process set out in the LPAT Act for appeals of a municipality’s failure to make a decision in respect of an official plan or zoning by-law would apply to:

- appeals made *after* the LPAT Act comes into force; and

- appeals made *before* the LPAT Act comes into force in respect of complete applications made to a municipality or an approval authority after December 12, 2017.

The new process set out in the LPAT Act for appeals of an approval authority’s failure to make a decision in respect of an official plan or plan of subdivision would apply to appeals made after the LPAT Act comes into force.

**Timelines**

The following overall timelines for proceedings before the Tribunal in relation to appeals under the *Planning Act* are proposed, calculated from the date the appeal is received and validated by the Tribunal, excepting extensions for matters such as adjournments:

- Ten months for appeals of a municipality or approval authority’s decision or a municipality’s failure to make a decision in respect of an official plan or zoning by-law under the LPAT Act.
- Six months for appeals of a new decision of a municipality or approval authority (or failure to make a decision), where the Tribunal previously determined that the municipality or approval authority’s original decision failed the new test under the Act and sent the matter back to the municipality or approval authority to make a new decision.

- Twelve months for appeals of an approval authority’s failure to make a decision in respect of an official plan or plan of subdivision under the LPAT Act.

- Six months for any other proceeding before the Tribunal under the Planning Act (e.g. minor variances, consent, etc.).

It is unclear what the impact of exceeding these timelines will be or what resources the Province and the Tribunal will provide in order to meet these timelines.

**Time Limits for Submissions at Oral Hearings**

At an oral hearing of an appeal of a municipality or approval authority’s decision or a municipality’s failure to make a decision in respect of an official plan or zoning by-law under the LPAT Act, it is proposed that each party would have a maximum of 75 minutes to make a submission (i.e. presentation) to the Tribunal. There is no time provided for participant submissions, as under the LPAT Act these would take place as written submissions and no participants would appear at the oral hearing. However, the Tribunal has the power under the LPAT Act to declare a participant an additional party in the appeal, in which case the time limit above may apply.

At an oral hearing of an appeal of an approval authority’s failure to make a decision in respect of an official plan or plan of subdivision under the LPAT Act, it is proposed that each party would have a maximum of 75 minutes to make a submission to the Tribunal and other persons identified by the Tribunal as participants would each have 25 minutes to make a submission to the Tribunal.

It is proposed that the Tribunal would have discretion to increase the time limits where, in the opinion of the Tribunal, it is necessary for a fair and just determination of the appeal.

There are no such legislated time limits imposed on hearings before the Board at present, and there is no indication that this new time limit will affect existing or forthcoming appeals before the Board. Further, there is no indication whether such time limits will apply to any reply submissions at an oral hearing before the Tribunal or to other matters before the Tribunal, including minor variance or consent application appeals.
**Practices and Procedures**

It is proposed that the examination of a party or any other person, other than by the Tribunal, would be prohibited for certain matters. This restriction would apply to appeals of a municipality or approval authority’s decision in respect of an official plan or zoning by-law, a municipality or approval authority's failure to make a decision in respect of an official plan or zoning by-law, or the failure of an approval authority to make a decision in respect of an official plan or plan of subdivision. This means that the parties may not be able to call witnesses at an oral hearing event, as they are presently permitted to do before the Board.

The proposed regulations are silent on whether other planning application appeals would be subject to this restriction, such as minor variances or consents.

**Ministry Summaries**

The Ministry has also released two summaries of proposed regulations under the Act. The first summary released by the Ministry deals with transitional provisions (the “Ministry Summary”), similar to the MAG Summary. There are some internal consistency issues with the terminology used within the Ministry Summary, and the content remains subject to change. The following transition provisions are proposed:

- Restricting the grounds of appeal of a decision on an official plan/amendment or zoning by-law/amendment to consistency and/or conformity with provincial and/or local plans would apply to:
  - appeals made during appeal periods that begin after the Bill comes into force; and
  - appeals of decisions made before proclamation in respect of:
    - complete applications made after Royal Assent;
    - municipally-initiated official plan amendments that are adopted after Royal Assent; and
    - municipally-initiated zoning by-law amendments that are passed after Royal Assent.

- Restricting the grounds of a non-decision appeal on an application for an official plan/amendment or zoning by-law/amendment to consistency and/or conformity with provincial and/or local plans would apply to:
  - appeals of non-decisions made after the Bill comes into force; and
  - appeals of non-decisions made before proclamation in respect of complete applications made after Royal Assent.
The Ministry Summary suggests the following additional proposals on transition Regulations under the Act:

- Removing appeals of provincial approvals of official plans and official plan updates, including for conformity exercises to provincial plans. These provisions would apply to provincial decisions in respect of which notice is given after the Bill comes into force.

- The removal of mandatory referrals of Minister’s zoning orders would apply to requests to refer made after the Bill comes into force.

- The removal of appeals (other than by the Province) of interim control by-laws when first passed (for a period of up to 1 year) would apply to decisions made after the Bill comes into force.

- The restriction on the ability to amend secondary plans for two years following their approval, unless allowed by council, would apply to applications for amendments to secondary plans that come into effect after the Bill comes into force.

- The extension for decision timelines on applications for official plan amendments and zoning by-law amendments would apply to complete applications submitted after Royal Assent, and the extension for decision timelines for approval authorities on adopted official plans/amendments would apply to official plans/amendments adopted after Royal Assent.

The Ministry has also posted a second summary of proposed regulations that appears to be largely technical in nature and will update existing regulations under the Planning Act to reflect the changes being made under the Act. These changes include revisions to what information or materials is to be included in the giving of notice or in a complete application and revisions to what material is required to be forwarded to the Tribunal on an appeal.

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.

Our People and Performance
Hamiltonians have a high level of trust and confidence in their City government.
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Committee Date: February 6, 2018

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR PARTRIDGE…………………………………….

Applicant’s Appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board respecting Minor Variance Application FL/A-17:442 for lands located at 374 5th Concession Road East

WHEREAS, on January 25, 2018 the Committee of Adjustment denied Minor Variance Application FL/A-17:442 to permit the construction of a permanent farm labour residence consisting of three dwelling units contained within one building, a proposed front addition, a barn and two proposed rear greenhouse additions to the existing nursery operation;

WHEREAS, the applicant has appealed the decision of the Committee of Adjustment to the Ontario Municipal Board; and

WHEREAS, Planning staff were in support of Minor Variance Application FL/A-17:442;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That Legal staff be directed to take no action with respect to the appeal to the Ontario Municipal Board respecting Minor Variance Application FL/A-17:442 for lands located at 374 5th Concession Road East, either in support of the Committee of Adjustment’s decision or against the decision, but instead be directed to enter into settlement discussions with the applicant.