



City of Hamilton
GENERAL ISSUES COMMITTEE
ADDENDUM

Meeting #: 21-008
Date: April 20, 2022
Time: 9:30 a.m.
Location: Due to the COVID-19 and the Closure of City Hall (CC)

All electronic meetings can be viewed at:

City's Website:

<https://www.hamilton.ca/council-committee/council-committee-meetings/meetings-and-agendas>

City's YouTube Channel:

<https://www.youtube.com/user/InsideCityofHamilton> or Cable 14

Stephanie Paparella, Legislative Coordinator (905) 546-2424 ext. 3993

5. COMMUNICATIONS

- *5.1. Correspondence respecting Item 8.2 - Report PED17010(p), GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review – Deferred Employment Land Conversion Requests

Recommendation: Be received and referred to the consideration of Item 8.2.

- *a. David Aston, Vice President and Partner, MHBC Planning, Urban Design and Landscape Architecture
- *b. Joyce van Dop
- *c. Mary Thompson

- *5.2. Correspondence respecting Item 8.3 - Report PED17010)(q), Evaluation of Urban Boundary Expansion Requests - Waterdown

Recommendation: Be received and referred to the consideration of Item 8.3.

- *a. Connor Harris, Rayman Beitchman LLP

6. DELEGATION REQUESTS

- *6.1. Bianca Caramento, Bay Area Climate Change Council, to present the BACCC's 'Options for Travel: Giving Residents a Real Choice Report

(For the May 4, 2022 GIC)
- *6.2. John Corbett and/or Nick Wood, Corbett Land Strategies Inc., respecting Item 8.2 - Report PED17010(p), GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review – Deferred Employment Land Conversion Requests
- *6.3. Frances Grabowski, McMaster Innovation Park, respecting Item 8.2 - Report PED17010(p), GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review – Deferred Employment Land Conversion Requests
- *6.4. Nancy Frieday, GSP Group Inc., respecting Item 8.3 - Report PED17010)(q), Evaluation of Urban Boundary Expansion Requests - Waterdown
- *6.5. Mike Crough, IBI Group Inc., respecting Item 8.3 - Report PED17010)(q), Evaluation of Urban Boundary Expansion Requests - Waterdown
- *6.6. Louis Frapporti and P.J. Mercanti, Hamilton100 Commonwealth Games Committee, respecting an update on the 2030 Commonwealth Games Bid initiative

(For a future GIC)
- *6.7. Dr. Lynda Lukasik, Environment Hamilton, respecting Item 8.3 - Report PED17010)(q), Evaluation of Urban Boundary Expansion Requests - Waterdown
- *6.8. Nancy Smith, Turstra Mazza Associates, respecting Item 8.3 - Report PED17010)(q), Evaluation of Urban Boundary Expansion Requests - Waterdown

12. NOTICES OF MOTION

- *12.1. Climate Change Action – Bay Area Climate Change Council Options for Travel Recommendations



KITCHENER
WOODBRIDGE
LONDON
KINGSTON
BARRIE
BURLINGTON

April 19, 2022

Stephanie Paparella
Legislative Coordinator
Office of the City Clerk
71 Main Street, West, First Floor
Hamilton, ON
L8P 4Y5

Dear Ms. Paparella:

**RE: Comments on Municipal Comprehensive Review and Land Needs Assessment –
1400 South Service Road, Flying J
OUR FILE: 14196R**

On behalf of our client, Losani Homes, we have been involved with discussions with City staff and made several submissions as part of the Municipal Comprehensive Review and GRIDS 2 process for the 'Flying J' lands located at 1400 South Service Road, Stoney Creek, hereinafter referred to as the subject lands. The purpose of the request and submissions has been to request the conversion of 7.33 ha of land for a proposed mixed use development, including both employment (office and commercial) and residential uses.

We have made a number of submissions to City staff and submission to the General Issues Committee on August 4, 2021 and November 18, 2021. The subject lands were part of the Council motion on August 13, 2021 and deferred from consideration of GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review.

A formal Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment application was submitted for the lands in August, 2021 for a mixed use redevelopment and is currently under review by staff and agencies. The proposed application provides for a density of 276 people and jobs per hectare and will contribute to the 80% intensification target within the Built-Up Area.

In the Fall of 2021, Council made the decision to implement a no boundary expansion option. At the November 9, 2021 GIC meeting, the Final Land Needs Assessment was presented and City Council made the decision in November 9, 2021 to. This Report noted that a final decision on the lands deferred for employment land conversion consideration was outstanding.

Given the no urban boundary expansion option, which was adopted by Council, it is our understanding that additional opportunities for intensification and residential development within the City's existing urban boundary are required. The conversion of the subject lands for development of a mixed use community will support the 'no urban boundary expansion' option as it will provide new housing to

accommodate forecasted population within the existing Urban Area, and maintain jobs at a similar density to the target of the employment lands designation.

Proposed Revised Site Specific Policy Modification

We have reviewed the Staff Report (PED17010) and City staff's analysis regarding the proposed conversion and the proposed special policy language, and propose the following as a revised special policy:

"For the lands located on at 1400 South Service Road, designated Business Park, shown as Site Specific Policy – Area X on Map B.7.4-1 – Fruitland Winona Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan, the policy recognizes the transition of lands from employment area to a range of other non-employment uses is proposed during the planning horizon of this Plan. For the purposes of this Plan and consideration of a future site specific amendment to redesignate the lands for other uses on the lands, the subject lands shall not be considered as employment area. The justification for conversion of the lands as part of the City's municipal comprehensive review is based on the lands providing a mixed use development with a minimum number of jobs on the lands and intensification of residential uses to assist in achieving the City's intensification targets and housing needs. A site specific Official Plan amendment to redesignate the lands to expand the range of uses, shall consider the following factors:

- a) A minimum of 417 jobs along the QEW frontage to support the City-wide employment targets;*
- b) A mixed use development based on transit-supportive design objectives;*
- c) There is sufficient infrastructure capacity in the area, specifically with regard to sanitary servicing and transportation; and;*
- d) The development area considers the potential development of adjacent lands on the block, from Fifty Road to Fifty Creek, and is developed as part of a complete community in a manner that is transit supportive."*

The proposed special policy will allow for a site specific application on the subject lands outside of the Municipal Comprehensive Review process, while ensuring the City's concerns related to employment, the development of the adjacent lands, and infrastructure capacity are addressed.

The following provides a summary of key points to consider for the proposed modified special policy request:


- The subject lands are not identified as a Provincially Significant employment Zone (PSEZ).
- The proposed special policy language recognizes the lands as an area in transition from traditional employment to mixed use. Existing land use permissions already include a range of commercial and population related uses and prohibit intensive industrial uses.
- The mixed use proposal maintains a significant number of jobs (over 400 jobs). The City's Land Needs Assessment Report completed in November, 2021 (PED 17010 Appendix N) and The Watson & Associate's Land Needs Assessment Peer Review (PED 17010 Appendix B) identifies that the employment area density assumes a density of 39.5 jobs per hectare, and currently the UHOP targets 37 jobs per hectare. The proposed development would provide for an employment density of approximately 37 jobs per hectare for the employment portion of the lands.

- Proposes additional residential units (986) in existing Urban Area to assist with addressing the forecasted housing and population requirements in a comprehensively planned with a transit supportive density that will assist in meeting the City's residential intensification targets.
- The MTO lands to the west are unlikely to be developed by MTO for employment uses, and could be considered as part of the overall comprehensive development of these lands
- Provides opportunity for housing choice in the form of apartment units in the Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan Area that is not currently planned within the area and introduces potential for attainable and rental housing.
- Provides a transit supportive density for any future transit investments in the area.
- The Land Needs Assessment identified a surplus of employment lands, therefore conversion of the subject lands does not impact the long term supply of employment land.
- Details associated with the development of adjacent land, land use compatibility and infrastructure can be addressed through a site specific Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment application.

We request that the General Issues Committee consider the revised special policy wording for input into the draft Official Plan Amendment.

Yours truly,

MHBC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'DAA', followed by a long horizontal line extending to the right.

David Aston, M.Sc., MCIP, RPP
Vice President, Partner

cc. Fred Losani, William Liske, Heather Travis

From: Joyce Van Dop
Sent: Tuesday, April 19, 2022 10:19 AM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Cc: Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>; Travis, Heather <Heather.Travis@hamilton.ca>; Robert Dawson Reynolds <>; rbrez rbrez <>; Danielle Sferrazza <>
Subject: General Issues Committee Meeting #21-008

Hello:

We understand that written material may be submitted for The General Issues Committee Meeting slated for 9:30am tomorrow, Wednesday, April 20, 2022, provided that it is received before 12 noon today.

Would you kindly include this document with the Staff Presentations 8.3 Evaluation of Urban Boundary Expansion Requests Waterdown (PED17010(q)) (Ward 15) at tomorrow's meeting. A staff report about Urban Boundary Expansion indicated that the lands at 329 & 345 Parkside Drive were the only lands, out of requests received, to pass the screening criteria. We the citizens Waterdown fully support the staff recommendations noted on page 146 of the report. We wish to register our support that no other Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside, in the Town of Waterdown be considered for further development. Kindly let me know if you have any questions or if you require further information.

Joyce van Dop

The information below is copied from the top of the petition page. 108 signatures were included on this petition:

For the Hamilton General Issues Committee Meeting to be held on April 20, 2022 at 9:30am

We the residents of Hamilton, Ontario support the City Staff recommendation with respect to a minor boundary expansion for 329 & 345 Parkside Drive (Alexander Place Long Term Care Facility). Hamilton City Council directed staff to screen requests for permit to expand land use in Greenbelt Plan. Only one request passed the screening requirements. See Appendix C, to Report PED170110(q). That request was for the above noted property only.

We the undersigned:

- 1. Wish to register our support of the City Staff recommendation to permit expanded land use for Alexander Place ONLY**
- 2. Wish to register our support that NO other Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside, in the Town of Waterdown be considered for further development**

From: Mary Thompson
Sent: April 18, 2022 1:17 PM
To: Travis, Heather <Heather.Travis@hamilton.ca>; Robichaud, Steve <Steve.Robichaud@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>
Cc: Carl Thomson >
Subject: Evaluation of Urban Boundary Expansion Requests - Waterdown (PED17010(q)) (Ward 15)

Dear Ms. Travis, Mr. Robichaud and Ms. Partridge and to Whom it may concern:

Re: Evaluation of Urban Boundary Expansion Requests - Waterdown (PED17010(q)) (Ward 15).

I am writing to register my opposition to the change in designation of the property at 309-311 Parkside Drive in Waterdown.

I have reviewed Ms. Travis' report and I agree with the findings that 309-311 Parkside Drive should not be re-defined as Urban. While I understand the value of redefining the longterm care home lands as urban given that existing use, I do not want that decision to be precedent setting for the other properties that were screened through this process.

I have lived in Waterdown since 1984. In that time, I have witnessed the development of much of the surrounding farm land. This is a short-term solution which creates long-term problems. Through the years this urban sprawl has not improved Waterdown it has just created new expensive problems. Once the natural lands are gone they are not coming back. This is a finite commodity.

309-311 Parkside Drive used to be rented to a farmer who grew corn and it was a productive piece of land. It has never had any other use than agriculture and has served a valuable role as part of both Waterdown's ecosystem and food supply.

Through the years, this property has had an increasing ecological value as habitat for displaced wildlife while more and more habitat has been destroyed. The field is currently home to many displaced animals. There are deer, fox, coyotes, and rabbits living there. Where do you think they should go next?

The field also plays an important role in protecting our property from climate change. The water table is very high here. When we have a large intense rain storm our ditches fill with water but overland flooding is prevented because the field can absorb the excess water. If this property was considered Urban, that would be the first step towards development which would take away this property's valuable function in the water cycle. All in an era where we need to be increasingly concerned with flooding.

This property has been designated as greenbelt and that designation is more important than ever today.

Please send me a copy of the decision made regarding this matter to me at. Additionally, I would like to be circulated to for any planning matters related to the property currently known as 309-311 Parkside Drive (or whatever these lands may be referred to in the future), including any parcels which may be severed from it.

Please take into consideration my concerns.

Mrs. Mary Thomson



**RAYMAN
BEITCHMAN LLP**

April 18, 2022

Conner Harris
Direct Line: (416) 597-5422
conner@rbllp.com

VIA EMAIL

General Issues Committee
City of Hamilton
Hamilton City Hall
711 Main Street West, 4th Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

To Whom It May Concern:

**Re: City of Hamilton GRIDS 2/MCR
Staff Report PED 17010(q) – Evaluation of Urban Boundary Expansion Requests
Waterdown
Urban Boundary Expansion Request – 347 Parkside Drive, Waterdown, ON
Our File No.: 1556**

We are counsel to 2441066 Ontario Inc. (“244”) – the owner of lands known municipally as 347 Parkside Drive, Waterdown, ON (the “Property”). That Property is located on the edge of, but slightly outside, the City of Hamilton urban boundary.

In December 2021 our client submitted a request to the City for consideration of an urban boundary expansion to incorporate a portion of its Property into the urban boundary as part of the ongoing GRIDS 2/MCR process. A detailed planning justification report and rationale for the request was included with it. Those documents are included with this letter for consideration by the Committee.

244 was disappointed to learn that City staff has recommended approval only of an urban boundary expansion request at 329 and 345 Parkside Drive, and not on our client’s Property. We encourage the Committee to reconsider that recommendation and approve an urban boundary expansion request in accordance with the planning justification report included with this correspondence.

The lands at 329 and 345 Parkside Drive abut 244’s Property immediately to the south. Including our client’s lands within an urban boundary expansion will result in logical synergies with the neighbouring property for which approval has already been recommended. This is further compounded by the northern boundary of 244’s urban boundary expansion request representing the right of way for the proposed By-Pass Corridor. If 244’s lands are not included within the urban boundary they will be an orphan parcel of rural, vacant lands surrounded on two immediate sides by an urban boundary, and on the other side by a busy highway.

This is not good land use planning and makes little practical sense. Even the staff report recommending approval of the expansion at 329 and 345 Parkside Drive recognizes the impracticality of our client’s parcel remaining outside the urban boundary.

Our client disputes several of the assertions in the staff report about its request. The first is that staff identified the request at 329 and 345 Parkside Drive as being the only request which satisfies the 5ha maximum as directed by the City in November 2021. This is not technically accurate – that request actually seeks an expansion of 5.2ha. It therefore slightly exceeds the 5ha maximum directed by Council.

244's expansion request similarly exceeds the 5ha direction only slightly – being a total of 6.6ha in size. But if the stormwater facility and natural heritage features delineated on the Property are backed out from the size calculations then the request seeks an expansion of only 4.4ha in size. This more appropriate sizing brings the request well below the 5ha limit directed by Council.

Even if the larger sizing of 6.6ha is considered, this still falls well below the maximum 10ha contemplated by the Growth Plan. We encourage the Committee to demonstrate flexibility and practicality in its consideration of these requests in a manner that encourages good land use planning.

At page 1 of Appendix E to Staff Report PED17010(q), it is noted that 244's boundary expansion request appears to propose residential uses for the entirety of the expansion area. This is not, strictly speaking, accurate. As noted at page 16 of the planning justification report in support of our client's request, it specifies that "when specific land uses within the proposed UBE are refined in future planning exercises (ie. zoning), the delineations of uses can be further refined and designed to conform to the maximum 50% residential requirement".

As you can see from the excerpt above, our client has been – and remains – willing to work with the City to ensure that any expansion request approved for its Property complies with the governing approvals and guidance from Council. We would welcome an opportunity to work with staff to ensure that the request meets that guidance and can be recommended for approval.

244 urges the Committee to approve its request for an urban boundary expansion on its Property. A representative of our client will be attending the Committee's meeting on April 20th to speak to this matter and would be pleased to address any questions that the Committee may have.

Sincerely,

RAYMAN BEITCHMAN LLP



Conner Harris
CH/rf
Encls.



Parkside Drive, Waterdown

Urban Boundary Expansion Request



Prepared for 2441066 Ontario Inc.
by IBI Group
November 19, 2021

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Description and Location of Subject Lands	1
2.1	Location and Description	1
2.2	Surrounding Context.....	3
3	Proposed Urban Boundary Expansion	4
4	Current Planning Status	5
4.1	Provincial Policy Statement, 2020	5
4.2	Greenbelt Plan, 2017	7
4.3	A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019	9
4.4	Rural Hamilton Official Plan, 2012.....	11
5	GRIDS 2/ MCR	14
5.1	Draft Land Needs Assessment	14
5.2	Waterdown and Binbrook Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool	15
5.2.1	Phase 1 - Initial Screening Criteria	15
5.2.2	Phase 2 Evaluation Criteria	18
6	Conclusions and Recommendations	21

Table of Figures

Figure 2-1: Aerial Capture of Subject Lands (outlined in red, orange and green boundaries)	3
Figure 2-2: Aerial Image of Surrounding Context	4
Figure 3-1: Proposed Boundary Expansion Area	5
Figure 4-1: Water/Wastewater Map (City of Hamilton Water & Wastewater GIS)	7
Figure 4-2: Greenbelt Plan Interactive Mapping	9
Figure 4-3: Schedule D- Rural Land Use Designation.....	12
Figure 4-4: Schedule B- Natural Heritage System.....	13
Figure 4-5: Schedule C- Rural Functional Road Classification	14

List of Tables

Table 1: Preliminary Phase 2 Analysis.....	18
---	-----------

1 Introduction

IBI Group has been retained by 2441066 Ontario Inc., the Owner of 347 Parkside Drive, Waterdown to provide a professional planning opinion regarding a potential expansion of the City of Hamilton Urban Boundary (“UBE”) to incorporate its lands. The City of Hamilton is in the process of updating its Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (“GRIDS”) in order to plan for the City’s population and employment growth up to 2051. This new strategy is known as GRIDS 2. In addition, the City is conducting a Municipal Comprehensive Review (“MCR”) to bring its Urban Official Plan into conformity with updated policies from the various governing Provincial planning documents (the PPS, the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, the Niagara Escarpment Plan, and the Greenbelt Plan). The GRIDS 2 and MCR processes are being carried out concurrently. These coordinated processes provide an opportunity for the City to consider and adopt the proposed UBE within the overarching planning framework.

As part of the GRIDS 2/MCR process the City has completed a draft Lands Needs Assessment (“LNA”) which determined, based on three density scenarios, that additional urban land is necessary in order to accommodate growth up to 2051. As will be further outlined in the subsequent report, this assessment demonstrates a need for additional lands to be added to the City of Hamilton Urban Boundary to accommodate future growth. Within the specific context of the subject lands, screening and evaluation tools for considering a potential UBE within the Waterdown/Binbrook area have been created and approved by the City. This report, and the UBE request it presents, is informed by the framework set out within the GRIDS 2/MCR process to permit a UBE for Waterdown.

The purpose of this report is to provide the City with an understanding of the subject lands, their surrounding context, and the relevant planning controls in order to justify the inclusion of a portion of the subject lands into the City of Hamilton Urban Boundary through a settlement area expansion as a part of the City’s GRIDS 2/MCR processes.

While IBI is retained by the Owner of 347 Parkside Drive, this report includes planning analysis and opinion related to adjacent lands. In order to achieve a more viable potential UBE, the proposed expansion includes the adjacent lands of 329 and 345 Parkside Drive. For the purposes of this report, and specifically for the review and discussion of the proposed UBE, 329, 345, and 347 shall be collectively referred to as the subject lands (“subject lands”). Reference to the “expansion lands” pertains to the portions of the subject lands which are included in the UBE (meaning only a portion of the total area of the subject lands can be, and is recommended for, inclusion in the UBE).

2 Description and Location of Subject Lands

2.1 Location and Description

The subject lands are located along the north side of Parkside Drive between the intersections of Victoria Street and Boulding Avenue. The nearest major intersection is Parkside Drive and Centre Road/Hamilton Street North.

329 Parkside Drive is legally described as Part Lot 6, Concession 4 East Flamborough, firstly as in VM220156, subject to EF23947 and secondly being Part 1, 2, and 3 on Plan 62R-15317 except Part 2 on Plan 62R-15829, subject to easement over Part 2 on Plan 62R-15317 as in EF21375, subject to easement over Part 1 and 2 on Plan 62R-15829 as in WE34586, and subject to easement EF21698, City of Hamilton.

345 Parkside Drive is legally described as Part Lot 6, Concession 4 East Flamborough, as in VM216492m subject to easement EF23946 Flamborough in the City of Hamilton.

347 Parkside Drive is legally described as Part Lot 6, Concession 4 East Flamborough, as in CD260033 save and except Part 1 on Plan 62R20823, save and except Part 1 on Expropriation Plan WE1440621, subject to and together with Easement CD260033, and subject to Easement EF23444 Flamborough in the City of Hamilton.

For the purposes of this report, the planning analysis will be directed to the southern portion of the subject lands, south of the Right of Way (“ROW”) of a proposed By-Pass Corridor. This is where the proposed expansion lands are located (“expansion lands”). The expansion lands represent a smaller area of the southern portion of the subject lands and are further outlined in **Section 3**. The subject lands have a lot frontage of approximately 80 metres along Parkside Drive, made up of approximately 20 metres on the west side, 20 metres in the centre, and 40 metres on the east side of the lot. The southern portion of the subject lands have a depth at their deepest point of approximately 444 metres (from the Parkside Dr. ROW to the proposed By-Pass Corridor) and a total area of approximately 12.1 hectares. The total area of the subject lands is approximately 37 ha.

The proposed By-Pass Corridor is an established public ROW which bisects the subject lands and can be seen as the gap in 347 Parkside Drive in **Figure 2-1** below. This ROW will connect Parkside Drive to Centre Road, and ultimately to Highway 8. Based on the Waterdown Construction Staging Plan, construction of this By-Pass Corridor was to occur in 2021.

A majority of the subject lands currently exist as agricultural or Natural Heritage lands. The institutional use of the Alexander Place long term care home exists on the western portion. A hedgerow strip bisects the eastern and central portion of the subject lands with additional hedgerows running along the northwestern and northeastern boundary. A hydro corridor diagonally bisects the southern portion of the subject lands, with a transmission tower situated in the south-eastern portion. A driveway, connecting to Parkside Drive and to the dwelling located at 349 Parkside Drive, is situated in the south-eastern portion of the subject lands. A second driveway access to Parkside Drive is located along the western portion of the subject lands and provides access to the long-term care home. Adjacent to the driveway is the Waterdown Wetland Trail which progresses north along the western boundary of the subject lands. Finally, Grindstone Creek runs through the northern half of the subject lands. It is predominantly surrounded by Natural Heritage features (i.e. woodland).



Figure 2-1: Aerial Capture of Subject Lands (outlined in red, orange and green boundaries)

2.2 Surrounding Context

To the immediate south of the subject lands is a low-density residential neighbourhood consisting of predominantly 1 and 2 storey single-detached homes. A portion of this residential area is located within the Greenbelt Plan Towns/Villages designation, illustrated in **Figure 3-1**. To the west are Natural Heritage features, along with a few single-detached residential buildings along a private road. The transmission corridor that bisects the subject lands also locates a tower to the west of the lands. To the north of the subject lands is agriculture and Natural Heritage lands including a large woodland and Grindstone Creek. To the east is a large nursery, Grindstone Creek, and related ponds.

In the broader context, additional residential neighbourhoods with some institutional uses exist further south, in addition to Grindstone Creek. Further west of the subject lands exists a provincially significant wetland, and more residential neighbourhoods including single-detached and townhouse developments. A commercial plaza containing a grocery store, medical centre, and retail units along with the Waterdown Memorial Park exist to the southwest along Hamilton Street North. The large woodland Natural Heritage feature mentioned above progresses further north and incorporates a Provincially Significant Wetland along Grindstone Creek. Beyond the Natural Heritage feature is a large recreational park which contains sports fields and baseball diamonds. Finally, further to the east of the subject lands is a rail line beyond which an industrial use, agricultural lands, and Natural Heritage lands including the Arrowhorn Natural Area are located. In addition, to the northeast is a second large scale greenhouse/nursery.




Figure 2-2: Aerial Image of Surrounding Context

3 Proposed Urban Boundary Expansion

This report provides a planning analysis of a request to include a portion of the subject lands, referred to as the expansion lands, in the City's Urban Boundary via incorporation into the Urban Hamilton Official Plan ("UHOP") through the ongoing MCR and GRIDS 2 process. The proposed expansion lands comprise approximately 9.63 ha of the subject lands, as delineated by the red dashed line in **Figure 3-1** below. Of that ± 9.63 ha, ± 4.44 ha is vacant land conceptually identified for residential development (tan), ± 1.41 ha is vacant (light brown) conceptually identified to remain vacant, and ± 2.51 ha is comprised of the existing long-term care home (dark brown), conceptually identified as institutional. Other existing land uses are also integrated into the proposed expansion including ± 0.53 ha of the hydro easement (pink), and ± 0.74 ha of buffered Natural Heritage lands to preserve an existing hedgerow feature that bisects the expansion lands (green), which is conceptually identified as Natural Heritage and Stormwater Management ("SWM"). The purpose of this conceptual delineation of land uses is to illustrate conformity with the applicable policies that guide both the total size of the proposed expansion area and the maximum amount of residential lands, while also recognizing the existing land uses and leaving some lands available for future use determination (i.e. the vacant lands). The proposed northerly boundary limit follows a delineation that combines the parcel fabric, air photo delineation of the Natural Heritage features, and the current ROW of the proposed By-Pass Corridor.



Figure 3-1: Proposed Boundary Expansion Area

4 Current Planning Status

A proposed UBE must be consistent with, conform to, or otherwise not conflict with, applicable planning legislation and policies in effect at time of the proposal. The following subsections provide a review and analysis of the applicable requirements in order to situate the proposed UBE request within this required context and to connect it to the City's MCR/GRIDS 2 process.

4.1 Provincial Policy Statement, 2020

The PPS 2020 provides policy direction on matters of provincial interest regarding land use planning and development, and it sets the policy foundation for regulating land use and development of land in the Province of Ontario.

The PPS was issued under Section 3 of the Planning Act and the current (2020) PPS came into effect on May 1, 2020. Section 3 of the Planning Act requires that land use planning decisions be consistent with the PPS.

The PPS focuses growth within Settlement Areas and away from significant or sensitive resources and areas which may pose a risk to public health and safety. It recognizes that the wise management of development may involve directing, promoting or sustaining growth. Land use must be carefully managed to accommodate appropriate development to meet the full range of current and future needs, while achieving efficient development patterns. Applicable policy excerpts from the PPS are italicized and assessed against the proposed expansion through a planning comment below.

Section 1 of the PPS focuses on building strong, healthy Communities.

Policy 1.1.1 *Healthy, liveable and safe communities are sustained by:*

- a) *promoting efficient development and land use patterns which sustain the financial well-being of the Province and municipalities over the long term;*
- b) *accommodating an appropriate affordable and market-based range and mix of residential types (including single-detached, additional residential units, multi-unit housing, affordable*

housing and housing for older persons), employment (including industrial and commercial), institutional (including places of worship, cemeteries and long-term care homes), recreation, park and open space, and other uses to meet long-term needs;

- d) *avoiding development and land use patterns that would prevent the efficient expansion of settlement areas in those areas which are adjacent or close to settlement areas;*
- e) *promoting the integration of land use planning, growth management, transit-supportive development, intensification and infrastructure planning to achieve cost-effective development patterns, optimization of transit investments, and standards to minimize land consumption and servicing costs;*

Subsection 1.1.3 provides development and growth direction for settlement areas.

Policy 1.1.3.8 *A planning authority may identify a settlement area or allow the expansion of a settlement area boundary only at the time of a comprehensive review and only where it has been demonstrated that:*

- a) *sufficient opportunities to accommodate growth and to satisfy market demand are not available through intensification, redevelopment and designated growth areas to accommodate the projected needs over the identified planning horizon;*
- b) *the infrastructure and public service facilities which are planned or available are suitable for the development over the long term, are financially viable over their life cycle, and protect public health and safety and the natural environment;*
- c) *in prime agricultural areas:*
 - 1. *the lands do not comprise specialty crop areas;*
 - 2. *alternative locations have been evaluated, and*
 - i. *there are no reasonable alternatives which avoid prime agricultural areas; and*
 - ii. *there are no reasonable alternatives on lower priority agricultural lands in prime agricultural areas;*
- d) *the new or expanding settlement area is in compliance with the minimum distance separation formulae; and*
- e) *impacts from new or expanding settlement areas on agricultural operations which are adjacent or close to the settlement area are mitigated to the extent feasible. In undertaking a comprehensive review, the level of detail of the assessment should correspond with the complexity and scale of the settlement boundary expansion or development proposal.*

Planning Comment: The proposed UBE will result in an efficient land use pattern while contributing to accommodating projected land and housing needs. The boundary of the proposed UBE has been established based on the surrounding constraints, including the Natural Heritage features and the ROW of the proposed By-Pass corridor, in conjunction with the guiding overall size policy for the UBE. As set out above, developed urban areas exist to the west and the south of the expansion lands. Introducing urban development through a UBE will fill a pocket of constrained lands, which is surrounded by urban development, and will round out the urban boundary. Within this new boundary, urban development can occur without negatively impacting the surrounding existing urban and rural character, nor infringing on hazard lands. The proposed UBE therefore contributes towards achieving a healthy, liveable and safe community as outlined in Policy 1.1.1 of the PPS.

As will be further outlined in **Section 5.1**, an LNA was conducted as part of the GRIDS 2/ MCR process in order to determine the amount of land required to accommodate the City's projected

growth up to the year 2051. In all intensification scenarios explored, it was determined that additional urban land would be necessary to accommodate projected growth. This includes the staff recommended Ambitious Density scenario, which currently estimates that 1,310 gross hectares of additional urban land will be necessary. The LNA provides a basis for evaluating whether growth can be accommodated within the existing urban boundary or whether expansion is required. While Council has not adopted the LNA to date, the work and staff recommendation provide the basis for considering whether an expansion of the urban boundary is needed. For the purposes of this submission, the analysis accepts the LNA and the recommended Ambitious Density scenario. This technical analysis demonstrates that there are not sufficient opportunities to accommodate all of the forecasted growth within the existing Settlement Area as required in Policy 1.1.3.8.a) of the PPS. The LNA provides the technical basis through which the proposed UBE can be requested.

Figure 4-1 shows that urban servicing, including water and wastewater, exists adjacent to the subject lands within the Parkside Drive ROW. Given the size of the proposed UBE, the lands would not represent a significant increase in demand to the existing services and therefore existing servicing is considered suitable as required in Policy 1.1.3.8.b) of the PPS.

The expansion lands are not designated Prime Agricultural and no livestock facilities exist nearby. In terms of impact on nearby agricultural operations, the subject lands exist as a generally isolated parcel of non-prime agricultural land which is divided from adjacent agricultural lands by Natural Heritage features. Therefore, the urban expansion would not have any major impact on agricultural operations as outlined in Policy 1.1.3.8.c), d) & e).




Figure 4-1: Water/Wastewater Map (City of Hamilton Water & Wastewater GIS)

4.2 Greenbelt Plan, 2017

The Greenbelt Plan was prepared and approved under the Greenbelt Act, 2005. It took effect on July 1, 2017 and is applicable to the subject lands. The Greenbelt Plan provides policies for the

protection of agricultural lands, water resources, and natural areas in Ontario's Greater Golden Horseshoe Region.

Section 3.1.4 provides policies for lands falling within Rural Lands of the Protected Countryside.

Policy 3.1.4.3. *Settlement area expansions may be permitted into rural lands, subject to the policies of section 3.4.*

Section 3.4.2 provides the General Settlement Area policies.

Policy 3.4.2.1. *Settlement areas outside the Greenbelt are not permitted to expand into the Greenbelt.*

Section 3.4.3 provides policies pertaining to lands within Towns/Villages within the Protected Countryside.

Policy 3.4.3.1. *Towns/Villages are subject to the policies of the Growth Plan and continue to be governed by official plans and related programs or initiatives and are not subject to the policies of this Plan, save for the policies of sections 3.1.5, 3.2.3, 3.2.6, 3.3 and 3.4.2.*

Policy 3.4.3.2. *Extensions or expansions of services to settlement areas within the Protected Countryside shall be subject to the infrastructure policies of section 4.2 of this Plan, including the requirements regarding environmental assessments and agricultural impact assessments.*

Policy 3.4.3.3. *As part of a municipal comprehensive review under the Growth Plan, an upper- or single-tier planning authority may allow expansions of settlement area boundaries in accordance with the policies 2.2.8.2 and 2.2.8.3 of the Growth Plan.*

Planning Comment: As can be seen in **Figure 4-2**, the expansion lands are designated Protected Countryside and the residential lands directly abutting to the south and further to the west are designated Towns and Villages within the Greenbelt Plan. The proposed UBE represents an expansion of a Settlement Area into the Protected Countryside from abutting Settlement Area lands to the south, which are within the Greenbelt and designated Towns and Villages. As per policies 3.4.2.1 and 3.4.3.3, the Towns/Villages designation can be expanded. The criteria for considering this expansion is provided by Growth Plan policies 2.2.8.2 and 2.2.8.3. These criteria are examined in **Sections 4.3** and **5.2** of this report.



Figure 4-2: Greenbelt Plan Interactive Mapping

4.3 A Place to Grow: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2019

The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (“Growth Plan”) 2019 was prepared and approved under the Places to Grow Act, 2005. The Growth Plan took effect on May 16, 2019. Amendment 1 to the Growth Plan took effect on August 28, 2020, which amended its policies to better align with PPS 2020. This included providing land use direction for a planning horizon up to 2051 and establishing a new Land Needs Assessment Methodology (LNA).

The Growth Plan provides policies to guide future growth and development, where the major goals are to provide a sufficient housing supply, improving transportation options, encourage a high quality of life and a strong economy, while ensuring a healthy natural environment. The Growth Plan guides development in the Greater Golden Horseshoe (“GGH”) to a time horizon to the year 2051. Overall, the Growth Plan has projected a 2051 population of 820,000 for the City of Hamilton

Section 2 of the Growth Plan provides direction on how and where development should occur. **Subsection 2.2** provides policies for Where and How to Grow.

Subsection 2.2.8 provides policies relating to the expansion of Settlement Areas.

Policy 2.2.8.2 A settlement area boundary expansion may only occur through a municipal comprehensive review where it is demonstrated that:

- a) based on the minimum intensification and density targets in this Plan and a land needs assessment undertaken in accordance with policy 2.2.1.5, sufficient opportunities to accommodate forecasted growth to the horizon of this Plan are not available through intensification and in the designated greenfield area:
 - i. within the upper- or single-tier municipality, and

- ii. *within the applicable lower-tier municipality;*
- b) *the proposed expansion will make available sufficient lands not exceeding the horizon of this Plan, based on the analysis provided for in policy 2.2.8.2 a), while minimizing land consumption; and*
- c) *the timing of the proposed expansion and the phasing of development within the designated greenfield area will not adversely affect the achievement of the minimum intensification and density targets in this Plan, as well as the other policies of this Plan.*

Policy 2.2.8.3 *Where the need for a settlement area boundary expansion has been justified in accordance with policy 2.2.8.2, the feasibility of the proposed expansion will be determined and the most appropriate location for the proposed expansion will be identified based on the comprehensive application of all of the policies in this Plan, including the following:*

- a) *there is sufficient capacity in existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities;*
- b) *the infrastructure and public service facilities needed would be financially viable over the full life cycle of these assets;*
- c) *the proposed expansion would be informed by applicable water and wastewater master plans or equivalent and stormwater master plans or equivalent, as appropriate;*
- d) *the proposed expansion, including the associated water, wastewater and stormwater servicing, would be planned and demonstrated to avoid, or if avoidance is not possible, minimize and mitigate any potential negative impacts on watershed conditions and the water resource system, including the quality and quantity of water;*
- e) *key hydrologic areas and the Natural Heritage System for the Growth Plan should be avoided where possible;*
- f) *prime agricultural areas should be avoided where possible. To support the Agricultural System, alternative locations across the upper- or single-tier municipality will be evaluated, prioritized and determined based on avoiding, minimizing and mitigating the impact on the Agricultural System and in accordance with the following:*
 - i. *expansion into specialty crop areas is prohibited;*
 - ii. *reasonable alternatives that avoid prime agricultural areas are evaluated; and*
 - iii. *where prime agricultural areas cannot be avoided, lower priority agricultural lands are used;*
- g) *the settlement area to be expanded is in compliance with the minimum distance separation formulae;*
- h) *any adverse impacts on the agri-food network, including agricultural operations, from expanding settlement areas would be avoided, or if avoidance is not possible, minimized and mitigated as determined through an agricultural impact assessment;*
- i) *the policies of Sections 2 (Wise Use and Management of Resources) and 3 (Protecting Public Health and Safety) of the PPS are applied;*
- j) *the proposed expansion would meet any applicable requirements of the Greenbelt, Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation, Niagara Escarpment, and Lake Simcoe Protection Plans and any applicable source protection plan; and*
- k) *within the Protected Countryside in the Greenbelt Area:*
 - i. *the settlement area to be expanded is identified in the Greenbelt Plan as a Town/Village;*

- ii. *the proposed expansion would be modest in size, representing no more than a 5 per cent increase in the geographic size of the settlement area based on the settlement area boundary delineated in the applicable official plan as of July 1, 2017, up to a maximum size of 10 hectares, and residential development would not be permitted on more than 50 per cent of the lands that would be added to the settlement area;*
- iii. *the proposed expansion would support the achievement of complete communities or the local agricultural economy;*
- iv. *the proposed uses cannot be reasonably accommodated within the existing settlement area boundary;*
- v. *the proposed expansion would be serviced by existing municipal water and wastewater systems without impacting future intensification opportunities in the existing settlement area; and*
- vi. *expansion into the Natural Heritage System that has been identified in the Greenbelt Plan is prohibited.*

Planning Comment: The Growth Plan permits settlement boundary expansions through an MCR. The City's GRIDS 2/ MCR process provides the opportunity to expand the settlement boundary to include the proposed UBE. Based on the LNA (**Section 5.1**), City staff have recommended the Ambitious Density scenario which estimates the need for 1,310 ha of additional urban land through settlement boundary expansions. This report accepts the findings and recommendations of the LNA as the technical basis for accommodating forecast growth to the year 2051.

The LNA demonstrates the need for additional urban land despite density and intensification targets in the Ambitious Density scenario that are above the minimum required by the Growth Plan. The proposed expansion lands, being a modest size of approximately +/- 9.63 ha, will not impede the achievement of the minimum density and intensification targets and instead supports the accommodation of projected growth up to 2051.

A key consideration is phasing, which will continue through the GRIDS 2/MCR process and be reflected in the final adoption of an OPA to specify phasing areas and policies. This will unfold through the remainder of the GRIDS 2/MCR process. The UBE proposed in this report can and should be incorporated into the first phase of adopted expansion.

Based on existing and future conditions of the subject lands, including the surrounding Natural Heritage features and the proposed ROW, the proposed expansion lands represent an underdeveloped pocket of land adjacent to existing urban development to the west and south. The LNA has demonstrated that growth cannot be reasonably accommodated within the existing settlement area. The expansion lands therefore represent an appropriate location for future growth and development as they will contribute towards creating a more complete community in association with the adjacent existing urban residential areas and will make more efficient use of existing and planned services, notably along Parkside Drive.

Policy 2.2.8.3 sets out feasibility criteria by which proposed expansions are evaluated. This includes expansion into lands within the Protected Countryside in the Greenbelt Area. Based on these policies, the City has established screening and evaluation criteria for the Waterdown and Binbrook areas that are to be analyzed and applied in two phases. Those criteria are outlined and discussed below in **Section 5.2**.

4.4 Rural Hamilton Official Plan, 2012

The Rural Hamilton Official Plan ("RHOP") was approved by the Ministry in 2006 and took effect in March 2012. It applies to lands in the rural area of the City of Hamilton. The RHOP contains

goals, objectives and policies that ensure that the City has a strong rural community, protects ecological systems, and makes wise use of its infrastructure services.

As illustrated in **Figure 4-3**, the subject lands directly abut the urban boundary and are designated Rural. Although portions of the expansion lands are currently utilized for agricultural purposes, they are not designated as Agricultural, and thus are not limited in future use by the protection of prime agricultural areas for agricultural uses.




Figure 4-3: Schedule D- Rural Land Use Designation

In terms of Natural Heritage, **Figure 4-4** demonstrates the expansion lands are situated in a small pocket outside of Natural Heritage features such as Core Areas, Linkages, and the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System ("GBNHS"). The expansion lands therefore are located within the Greenbelt Protected Countryside designation but are surrounded by the GBNHS.




Figure 4-4: Schedule B- Natural Heritage System

A By-Pass Corridor is proposed to the north of the expansion lands, as described in greater detail earlier in this report. **Figure 4-5** identifies the proposed By-Pass Corridor as an Arterial Road. Policy 4.5.2 b) i) recognizes that Rural Arterial Roads will carry high volumes of intra-municipal and inter-regional traffic through the rural area. This proposed By-Pass Corridor therefore provides opportunity for further site access, but it also represents a limitation on the size of the UBE request. Given the guiding size criteria on expansion requests in the Waterdown/Binbrook area (i.e. 10 ha), expansion onto the subject lands north of the By-Pass Corridor would result in a small, orphaned area of potentially developable land less than 1 ha in size separated from the balance of the UBE by an arterial road. Including this orphaned land within the UBE makes little sense from a planning perspective, and so the By-Pass is a functional limitation that sets the upper limit of the boundary for the UBE. The By-Pass Corridor will also create a smaller and less functional pocket of rural/agricultural land cut off from the rest of the subject lands that, should it not be included in the urban boundary, would be of limited agricultural use potential on its own.




Figure 4-5: Schedule C- Rural Functional Road Classification

5 GRIDS 2/ MCR

At the time of writing this report, the GRIDS 2/MCR process remained ongoing. The City has not yet formally adopted the LNA. This report accepts the LNA and proposes a UBE to be included in the consideration and adoption of a preferred growth scenario through the MCR.

5.1 Draft Land Needs Assessment

The LNA was conducted by Lorus and Associates, with a Technical Working Paper completed in March 2021. It examined the urban land needs of the City of Hamilton over the period to 2051 and was completed based on the Provincial Land Needs Assessment Methodology, as required by the Growth Plan. A July 2021 technical update included Secondary Dwelling Units (“SDUs”) in Designated Greenfield Areas (“DGA”) and Rural Areas within the land needs assessment. The LNA is required to support the GRIDS2/MCR process, which are being updated in accordance with the Growth Plan.

The LNA analyzes urban land needs based on three scenarios which vary dependent on the applicable intensification target and dwelling unit densities. City of Hamilton staff have formally recommended the adoption of the Ambitious Density scenario which targets 50% intensification to 2031, 60% intensification to 2041, and 70% intensification to 2051. It also targets a density in new greenfield areas of 77 residents and jobs combined per hectare. This scenario was acknowledged to have strong growth management principles by the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

The updated LNA determined that the Ambitious Density scenario would, despite its intensification targets, require an additional 1,310 gross hectares of land in order to adequately accommodate

the projected growth. Therefore, in accepting this analysis, there is a demonstrable need for urban boundary expansions in order to ensure that there is adequate land to accommodate projected 2051 growth. The proposed UBE would contribute ±9.63 ha of land towards achieving the demonstrated land need.

It should be noted that this justification only becomes more pronounced if one of the other growth scenarios presented is ultimately selected, given their less ambitious intensification targets. In those scenarios, even more additional land will be required to meet the anticipated population growth.

5.2 Waterdown and Binbrook Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool

Staff report (PED17010(I)) was submitted to the General Issues Committee on August 4, 2021. Appendix B of that report sets out Screening Criteria and an Evaluation Tool to examine a potential UBE from each of the Waterdown and Binbrook areas respectively. These tools form a subcomponent of the broader GRIDS2/ MCR process. They were formulated based on a scaled down version of the *GRIDS2/ MCR Planning to Growth to 2051: Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria*, as staff noted that the broader criteria may not be appropriate for small expansion requests for Waterdown and Binbrook areas in light of the constraints on size and composition imposed by the Growth Plan. The creation of this screening criteria and evaluation tool points to a specific municipal consideration for growth accommodation to occur within the Waterdown and Binbrook area.

In order to determine the suitability of a proposed expansion area, each must first be assessed against the initial Screening Criteria (i.e. Phase 1), which analyzes their suitability based on the Growth Plan criteria identified in Policy 2.2.8.3(k). The lands must satisfy all of the criteria in order to continue to the more detailed evaluation phase. This phase (i.e. Phase 2) evaluates and identifies an expansion option based on a series of criteria that represent local and provincial planning priorities.

The following subsections evaluate the proposed UBE against the Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool, respectively, to the extent possible at this stage of the planning process

5.2.1 Phase 1 - Initial Screening Criteria

The proposed UBE must satisfy all of the Phase 1 Screening Criteria in order to be considered as a candidate area through the Phase 2 Evaluation Tool and the subsequent selection of a preferred growth option.

Size/ Use

Is the proposed expansion area less than 10 ha in size? (Growth Plan Policy 2.2.8.3 k) ii.)

Yes. The area of the proposed expansion lands is a total of ± 9.63 ha.

Is residential development restricted to a maximum of 50% of the expansion area? (Growth Plan Policy 2.2.8.3 k) ii.)

Yes. The conceptual UBE maps illustrate a breakdown of uses within the expansion lands, showing that only 46% or ±4.44 ha has been identified for potential residential development. The proposed expansion area also includes the existing institutional use (long-term care home) and ±1.41 ha of vacant lands directly abutting the institutional use, which conceptually provides a vacant land buffer for determination of future land use. The concept also incorporates an existing utility easement and a hedgerow which is separated from adjacent Natural Heritage features, but which would nonetheless provide natural and potential SWM benefits within the urban boundary.

Given these parameters, when specific land uses within the proposed UBE are refined in future planning exercises (i.e. zoning), the delineations of uses can be further refined and designed to conform to the maximum 50% residential requirement.

Is there a demonstrated use / need for the non-residential portion of the expansion area? (Growth Plan Policy 2.2.8.3 k) ii.)

Yes. The proposed UBE concept includes the existing institutional use in the western portion along with adjacent vacant lands. This use is currently outside of the urban boundary and has site-specific rural zoning permissions. Incorporating the institutional use into the urban boundary therefore represents good land use planning. There is a general need for such uses to provide services to an ageing population. Bringing the institutional use into the urban boundary will provide future opportunities for expansion and development to meet the needs of existing and future residents and has the potential for expansion in the future onto the abutting vacant lands. As set out in **Section 2.2**, the nearby urban uses are predominantly residential with minimal commercial and institutional uses. There is a demonstrated need to ensure the viability and potential expansion of this institutional use, in order to contribute to creating a more complete community.

5.2.1.2 Complete Communities

Does the proposed expansion support the creation of a complete community or the local agricultural economy? (Growth Plan Policy 2.2.8.3 k) iii.)

Yes. In its current state the agricultural portion of the expansion lands are not designated Prime Agricultural and are restricted and slightly fragmented by Natural Heritage features. With the proposed addition of the By-Pass Corridor bisecting the existing agricultural lands, the farmable area will become even more fragmented. As established by the Ministry of Agriculture, Food, and Rural Affairs ("OMAFRA") Land Evaluation and Area Review ("LEAR") tool, agricultural land becomes less viable as the farmable area is fragmented. With the existing Natural Heritage features and the addition of the proposed By-Pass Corridor, the ability of the subject lands to support the agricultural economy in its current rural/agricultural form is already diminished. Their addition to the urban boundary will not represent a measurable loss to the local agricultural economy.

Conversely, the expansion lands are located adjacent to existing urban residential neighbourhoods to the west and the south. The introduction of the expansion lands into the urban boundary will provide an opportunity for increased synergy with the existing urban areas and support the creation of a more complete community. By coming as close as possible to achieving the 50% maximum permitted residential proportion, the proposed UBE will support the opportunity to achieve a complete community by increasing the residential population in the area and contributing to spatially balanced residential growth in Waterdown, while also providing a viable location for non-residential uses such as the institutional use (long-term care home). Public or private open space and recreational opportunities can be integrated to service both proposed and existing residents, and those potential uses will be able to serve both existing and conceptual communities.

Has it been demonstrated that the proposed uses cannot be reasonably accommodated within the existing urban boundary? (Growth Plan Policy 2.2.8.3 k) iv.)

Yes. As set out in **Section 5.1** the LNA demonstrates that in order to adequately accommodate the projected growth within the City of Hamilton to 2051, a UBE will be required. This was demonstrated for all three growth scenarios, including the staff recommended Ambitious Density scenario. The Ambitious Density scenario is projected to require 1,310 gross ha of land. This demonstrates that the City of Hamilton cannot reasonably accommodate projected growth within the existing boundary. Further, in the context of Waterdown, there are limited opportunities for new Designated Greenfield Areas ("DGA"), and while relatively small, the proposed UBE would

provide for future DGA growth in Waterdown. This is important to meeting other relevant policy objectives, such as providing housing to meet market-based choice.

5.2.1.3 Servicing Infrastructure

Can the proposed expansion area be serviced by existing water / wastewater systems without impacting future intensification opportunities in the existing urban area? (Growth Plan Policy 2.2.8.3 k) v.)

Yes. Municipal servicing exists adjacent to the expansion lands within the urban boundary, along the Parkside Drive ROW as seen in **Figure 4-1**. This includes a 400 mm watermain and 200 mm sanitary line. The existing institutional use is also currently serviced by a 100 mm sewer main. The inclusion of the conceptual uses on the expansion lands within the urban area would not represent a significant addition to the existing water/wastewater systems and are therefore not expected to negatively impact the system capacities nor future intensification opportunities in the existing urban area (i.e. only approximately 4.44 ha of new residential uses). With the Waterdown Village Built Heritage Inventory evaluations recommending that many of the buildings to the south of the subject lands be added to the Municipal Heritage Register, the area may not experience much potential for intensification. Further, modelling of potential servicing impacts can be carried out through the Phase 2 analysis, should this be required. Alternatively, the proposed UBE can be considered as part of the Preferred Growth Scenario, which is to be coordinated through the MCR process with updates to the Water and Wastewater Master Plan.

5.2.1.4 Natural Heritage

Does the proposed expansion area avoid the Natural Heritage system? (Growth Plan Policy 2.2.8.3 k) vi.)

Yes. As illustrated in the UBE concept, the subject lands contain and are abutted by multiple Natural Heritage features. A hedgerow strip bisects the centre of the subject lands. To protect the Natural Heritage features and systems, the proposed boundary in the UBE concept was delineated in a manner that creates a buffer around the Natural Heritage features and ensures that they are properly separated from any form of urban development. The hedgerow feature that bisects the expansion lands is currently physically separated from the other Natural Heritage features by the existing farm field, which provides a natural breakpoint for delineating the boundary line, and hence the reason the boundary moves through the gap. This ensures that features in and outside of the proposed boundary are protected and maintained, and that the feature within the boundary is adequately buffered and will be maintained, possibly with stormwater retention capabilities.

5.2.1.5 Phase 1 Conclusion

In order to be considered as a candidate for UBE within the Waterdown and Binbrook area, the proposed expansion lands have been screened against the Phase 1 criteria based on Growth Plan Policy 2.2.8.3 k).

The proposed expansion lands have a total size of ±9.63 ha and conceptually identifies 46% of the expansion lands as residential development. There is a demonstrated need for the non-residential existing institutional use and its inclusion within the urban boundary, which will support its ability to expand and provide services to the community. The proposed expansion lands do not represent a significant potential for supporting the agricultural economy and instead present an opportunity to contribute towards achieving a more complete community. The lands represent a potential extension of the existing urban communities to the west and south which would add further conceptualized residential units, non-residential uses, and recreational/open space opportunities to support a more compact and complete community in the surrounding

neighbourhoods and broader Waterdown community. This includes the limited opportunity for new Designated Greenfield Areas within the Waterdown area.

The aforementioned LNA provides a technical basis for the UBE, demonstrating that the projected urban land needs based on 2051 population and employment growth cannot reasonably be accommodated within the existing urban boundary. A full complement of services exist within the Parkside Drive ROW, and the proposed ±4.44 ha of new residential use will not represent a significant new burden on existing services. This can be further explored during a subsequent full Phase 2 analysis. Finally, conceptual design of the proposed expansion lands avoids and/or buffers Natural Heritage features.

Based on the above analysis of the Phase 1 screening criteria, we are of the opinion that the expansion lands satisfy those criteria and represent an appropriate candidate for further UBE consideration as a part of the GRIDS 2/MCR process.

5.2.2 Phase 2 Evaluation Criteria

This report also looks ahead to the Phase 2 Evaluation Criteria in order to provide consideration as to how the proposed UBE meets those additional criteria. The review of the Phase 2 Evaluation Criteria further supports the proposal as a viable expansion area based on local and provincial planning priorities. Given the stage of the planning process with respect to this request, should additional information or justification be required through the Phase 2 process it can be provided at the appropriate time. This includes a recognition that further studies may be required, as the discussion of the Phase 2 criteria only outlines preliminary planning comments. Table 1 below provides a simple matrix with preliminary planning commentary for each criterion.

Table 1: Preliminary Phase 2 Analysis

THEME/CRITERIA	PRELIMINARY JUSTIFICATION
<p>Efficient Servicing</p> <p><i>Can the expansion area be efficiently serviced based on existing water / wastewater and stormwater infrastructure?</i></p>	<p>Urban services exist adjacent to the expansion lands. The existing institutional use is already serviced, and the addition of ±4.44 ha of residential lands is not anticipated to have a significant impact on existing services. As noted, the area and potential uses could be included in the Water and Wastewater Master Plan updates coordinated through the MCR and selection of a preferred growth option. The necessary studies demonstrating capacity within servicing systems for specific land uses could also be completed at a later date, as part of the appropriate planning applications.</p>
<p>Transportation</p> <p><i>Does the expansion area align well with existing and planned road and active transportation networks?</i></p>	<p>The proposed expansion area fronts onto Parkside Drive, which is a Minor Arterial Road, and provides three site access points. It also aligns with the southerly edge of the proposed By-Pass Corridor to the north.</p> <p>The proposed expansion includes the existing institutional use, some vacant lands, and only ±4.44 ha of residential lands, which would not result in a significant increase in traffic on the capacity of the road network.</p> <p>A Transportation/Traffic Impact study has not been prepared at this time, but traffic flows and impacts could be conceptually modelled if required. The area and its potential uses could be included in the Transportation Master Plan updates coordinated</p>

<p><i>What is the impact of the expansion area on the capacity of the road network?</i></p>	<p>through the MCR and selection of a preferred growth option. The necessary studies demonstrating capacity within traffic systems for specific land uses could also be completed at a later date, as part of the appropriate planning applications.</p>
<p>Complete Communities</p> <p><i>Does the expansion area contribute to the surrounding area's completeness?</i></p> <p><i>Does the expansion area have access to community facilities or address gaps in currently available facilities?</i></p> <p><i>Would the expansion area impact the scenic resources of the Niagara Escarpment?</i></p>	<p>The proposed expansion area includes a conceptually delineated additional ±4.44 ha of residential land and ±1.41 ha of vacant lands. This provides the opportunity to refine land uses in the future and/or provide lands for expansion of the existing institutional uses, which will contribute to creating a more complete community.</p> <p>The proposed UBE is a natural expansion area due to its location within a pocket of minimally developed land that is defined by the adjacent urban neighbourhoods to the west and south. The introduction of the lands into the urban boundary creates the opportunity to establish a more complete community in a logical and efficient manner through the addition of the institutional use, new residential uses, and natural features, to support the adjacent community.</p> <p>The proposed expansion area introduces the institutional use of the long-term care home into the urban area, complementing multiple community facilities in close proximity to the subject lands including Mary Hopkins Public School (±550 m), Waterdown Memorial Park (±1 km), and Waterdown District Highschool (±1.4 km). Furthermore, the proposed expansion lands can include public or private amenity areas.</p> <p>The proposed expansion area is located north of the Niagara Escarpment Plan Urban Area. This area does not provide any scenic resources.</p>
<p>Climate Change</p> <p><i>Does the expansion area present any significant opportunities or risks associated with climate change?</i></p>	<p>As established throughout this report, the proposed boundary expansion represents an opportunity to create a more complete community through the introduction of urban uses adjacent to built-up urban area to the west and south. This will achieve a more compact urban form which will build off of existing infrastructure and services. It represents a controlled and measured expansion which will contribute towards reducing emissions related to infrastructure/service expansions and their broader efficiency.</p>
<p>Natural Heritage and Water Resources</p> <p><i>Does the expansion area demonstrate avoidance and / or mitigation of potential</i></p>	<p>The small size of the proposed expansion area is not anticipated to create any negative impacts on watershed conditions, particularly given that part of the lands are already</p>

<p><i>negative impacts on watershed conditions?</i></p> <p><i>Does the expansion area avoid key hydrologic areas?</i></p> <p><i>Does the expansion area maintain, restore or improve the functions and features of the area including diversity and connectivity of natural features and the long term ecological function of Natural Heritage systems?</i></p>	<p>developed for institutional uses. Further, the proposed UBE provides buffers around existing Natural Heritage features.</p> <p>No key hydrological areas have been identified on RHOP mapping within the proposed expansion area. Preliminary screening of Conservation Halton mapping indicates the expansion lands may be within a Highly Vulnerable Aquifer (HVA), and subject to the Source Protection Plan. This HVA appears to cover almost the entire northern boundary of the Waterdown Urban Area and much of the existing developed area within. The proposed UBE is of minor scale and includes existing development (i.e. long term care home) and thus is not expected to have any negative impacts on water quality or quantity. Measures to address these matters can be implemented through potential future development, including appropriate SWM and construction techniques and practices.</p> <p>The proposed expansion area concept was designed with buffers surrounding the Natural Heritage features. This is intended to maintain the existing functions and features while also providing a stable environment for long term ecological function that can be coordinated with future development, including landscape areas and planting, SWM design and controls (i.e. potential Low Impact Development), and other contemporary approaches to sustainable development.</p>
<p>Natural Hazards</p> <p><i>Does the Candidate Expansion Area contain any natural hazards?</i></p> <p><i>Does the Candidate Expansion Area contain a significant amount of hazardous lands that would make the area unfeasible for future development?</i></p>	<p>Preliminary screening of Conservation Halton mapping indicates a minor amount of floodplain area exists in the north-west corner of the proposed expansion lands (i.e. +/- 0.14 ha). This condition does not affect the development feasibility of the expansion lands.</p>
<p>Agriculture</p> <p><i>Does the expansion area minimize / mitigate impacts on the agricultural system, including the agri-food network, to support local food security?</i></p>	<p>The subject lands currently exist as a component of an isolated non-prime agricultural land with ±8.15 ha of cultivated land. The addition of the proposed By-Pass Corridor will remove part of this cultivated land. With the Natural Heritage features bounding the subject lands and the addition of the proposed By-Pass Corridor, the viability of the agricultural parcel will be significantly diminished. Therefore, the proposed UBE would not represent a significant removal or impact on the agricultural system.</p>

<p><i>Does the proposed expansion minimize land fragmentation?</i></p> <p><i>Is the proposed expansion in compliance with MDS guidelines?</i></p>	<p>With the addition of the proposed By-Pass Corridor, the subject lands will exist as an isolated and fragmented parcel of agricultural land. Therefore, its removal will not result in any significant additional fragmentation.</p> <p>A preliminary review shows that no livestock facilities exist near the subject lands.</p>
<p>Finance</p> <p><i>Does the proposed expansion have an unreasonable or unexpected financial impact on the City?</i></p>	<p>The proposed expansion is not expected to have an unreasonable financial impact on the City due to the limited size of the expansion and the adjacent existing urban services and infrastructure.</p>
<p>Cultural Heritage</p> <p><i>Does the Candidate Expansion Area contain significant cultural heritage resources including designated heritage properties and can they be conserved?</i></p> <p><i>Does the Candidate Expansion Area contain significant archaeological resources and can they be conserved?</i></p>	<p>A preliminary review indicates that the proposed expansion area does not contain any significant cultural heritage resources.</p> <p>The subject lands are located within the Archaeological Potential area as identified in the RHOP. This is typically addressed in the development stage through a site-specific archaeological assessment.</p>

6 Conclusions and Recommendations

As part of the GRIDS2/ MCR, we submit that the proposed UBE be included within the City's Urban Boundary. The purpose of this report has been to provide planning analysis and justification for the proposed UBE based on relevant provincial and municipal policy, including the specific evaluation criteria outlined by the City for the Binbrook and Waterdown areas.

The proposed UBE is consistent with the policies of the PPS. This includes its contribution to creating a liveable, healthy, and safe community as outlined in Policy 1.1.1 and its consistency with Policy 1.1.3.8 related to settlement area expansion criteria.

Conformity was also demonstrated with the Greenbelt Plan as the proposed UBE expands the Towns/Villages designation into the Protected Countryside during an MCR as defined in Policy 3.4.3.

Furthermore, the proposed UBE conforms with the Growth Plan in terms of settlement area expansion. Based on the results of the current LNA, a UBE is justified in conformity with Policy 2.2.8.2, as the LNA provides a need for 1,310 ha of additional urban land. With the justification established, the proposed expansion lands have been demonstrated to be feasible based on

conformity with Policy 2.2.8.3. Growth Plan conformity was further analysed using the Waterdown and Binbrook Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool.

Phase 1 of this evaluation criteria outlined the ways the UBE satisfied the applicable criteria, including size (+/- 9.63 ha), avoidance or buffering and retention of Natural Heritage features, and the limited potential for agricultural use.

This report has also outlined how the proposal would satisfy the Phase 2 criteria based on a preliminary analysis. Should the proposal be considered further, additional work in Phase 2 could be completed if requested. Alternatively, the expansion area can be considered in the coordinated master plan reviews and updates alongside the GRIDS 2/MCR process.

In summary, the proposed UBE represents a logical extension of the existing boundary, as it would expand urban land use onto lands pocketed by adjacent urban areas to the west and south, with access to a range of infrastructure and services. The UBE would thus permit more efficient utilization of existing services on what would otherwise be increasingly isolated, fragmented and increasingly less viable agricultural land. This will also contribute to achieving identified land needs in order to accommodate forecasted growth, while providing a complete community.

We trust the information and plans contained herein are sufficient. If you require any additional information, or have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours Truly,

IBI Group



Mike Crough RPP MCIP
Associate Director – Planning Lead



Dean Todd
Planning Student

Submitted on Wednesday, April 13, 2022 - 1:13pm Submitted by anonymous user: 172.70.175.200
Submitted values are:

==Committee Requested==

Committee: General Issues Committee
Will you be delegating in person or virtually? Virtually
Will you be delegating via a pre-recorded video? No

==Requestor Information==

Name of Organization (if applicable): Bay Area Climate Change
Council (BACCC)
Name of Individual: Bianca Caramento
Preferred Pronoun: She/her
Contact Number:
Email Address: b.caramento@bayareaclimate.ca
Mailing Address:
Reason(s) for delegation request: Present BACCC's 'Options for
Travel: Giving Residents a Real Choice report, in respect to
Councilor Danko's motion on May 4th.
Will you be requesting funds from the City? No
Will you be submitting a formal presentation? Yes



April 18, 2022

City of Hamilton,
General Issues Committee
Hamilton City Hall
71 Main Street West, 4th Floor
Hamilton ON L8R 2K3

ATTENTION: Stephanie Paparella, Legislative Co-Ordinator
Jason Thorne, General Manager, Planning & Economic Development
Steve Robichaud, Director of Planning and Chief Planner

Attention:	Chair and Members of the General Issues Committee
Re:	GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review – Item PED 17010 (P) GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review- Deferred Employment Lands Conversion Requests UPPER WEST LANDOWNER GRUP (Twenty Road West)

Corbett Land Strategies (CLS) represents the Upper West Side Group (formerly known as Twenty Road West) and has participated comprehensively in the GRIDS2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review process.

We received notice, and a detailed staff report related to the above noted item late last week, just ahead of the 4 day Holiday Easter weekend, which left stakeholders with interest in this very substantive issue with no insufficient time to review and respond to the recommendations in a comprehensive manner.

We suggest that now that the report has been issued to the public on the April 20th agenda the matter be deferred to the May 7th, General Issues Committee. This would allow sufficient time to allow a proper review and prepare a response to Committee.

Thank-you in advance for your co-operation and assistance.

Sincerely,

John Corbett

John B. Corbett, M.C.I.P., R.P.P.

Corbett Land Strategies Inc.

President

john@corbettlandstrategies.ca

cc. General Issues Committee
clients
Legal Counsel (Joel Farber)

Submitted on Thursday, April 14, 2022 - 12:02pm Submitted by anonymous user: 162.158.126.165
Submitted values are:

==Committee Requested==

Committee: General Issues Committee

Will you be delegating in person or virtually? Virtually

Will you be delegating via a pre-recorded video? No

==Requestor Information==

Name of Organization (if applicable): Corbett Land Strategies
Inc.

Name of Individual: John Corbett and Nick Wood

Preferred Pronoun:

Contact Number: 416-806-5164

Email Address: john@corbettlandstrategies.ca; and nick@corbettlandstrategies.ca

Mailing Address:

5045 South Service Road, Suite 301

Burlington ON L7L 5Y7

Reason(s) for delegation request: Item 8.2 - Deferred Employment

Land Conversion Request

Will you be requesting funds from the City? No

Will you be submitting a formal presentation? No

Submitted on Thursday, April 14, 2022 - 4:54pm Submitted by anonymous user: 162.158.126.185
Submitted values are:

==Committee Requested==

Committee: General Issues Committee

Will you be delegating in person or virtually? Virtually

Will you be delegating via a pre-recorded video? No

==Requestor Information==

Name of Organization (if applicable): McMaster Innovation Park

Name of Individual: Frances Grabowski

Preferred Pronoun:

Contact Number: 289-237-8869

Email Address: fgrabowski@mcmasterinnovationpark.ca

Mailing Address: 175 Longwood South, Suite 101A, Hamilton, ON

Reason(s) for delegation request: While we appreciate the increase to the allowable 15% of Residential uses of GFA without a conversion, the requirement to restrict this to specific areas and number of buildings is too prohibitive for future options in an Innovation Park. We will have NBLC/McCallum Sather and MIP speak to these issues. This is also supported by the Land Use Compatibility Study with our Master Plan vision deemed appropriate.

Will you be requesting funds from the City? No

Will you be submitting a formal presentation? No

Submitted on Thursday, April 14, 2022 - 5:09pm Submitted by anonymous user: 162.158.126.207
Submitted values are:

==Committee Requested==

Committee: General Issues Committee

Will you be delegating in person or virtually? Virtually

Will you be delegating via a pre-recorded video? No

==Requestor Information==

Name of Organization (if applicable): GSP Group Inc.

Name of Individual: Nancy Frieday

Preferred Pronoun: she/her

Contact Number: 365-336-3300

Email Address: nfrieday@gspgroup.ca

Mailing Address:

162 Locke Street South

Suite 200

Hamilton, ON L8P 4A9

Reason(s) for delegation request:

Representing landowners who requested an Evaluation of an Urban
Boundary Expansion

PED17010(q) (Ward 15) - April 20, 2022

513, 531 and 537 Dundas Street East

Will you be requesting funds from the City? No

Will you be submitting a formal presentation? No



SHAPING GREAT COMMUNITIES

April 19, 2022

File No. 19070


Chair and Members
 General Issues Committee (GIC)
 71 Main Street West, 4th Floor
 Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Email Only: Stephanie Paparella, Legislative Coordinator

Dear Chair and Members of the General Issues Committee:

Re: **Evaluation of Urban Boundary Expansion Requests – Waterdown
 PED17010(q) (Ward 15)
 513, 531 and 537 Dundas Street East**

GSP Group represents the landowners (“Owners”) of 513, 531 and 537 Dundas Street East located on the north side of Dundas Street East immediately east of Avonsyde Blvd. (Subject Lands). The three (3) properties total 16.3 hectares in size. The west property line of 513 Dundas Street East is adjacent to the Waterdown Urban Area boundary (see extract below from Appendix “D” to Report PED17010(q)).



In this latest exercise, the Owners requested that their lands, or a portion thereof, be added to the Urban Area. This request followed over 30 years of navigating City of Hamilton, Provincial and Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) land-use planning procedures that ignored or side-stepped the inevitable land-use conflict, while the Owners tried to find a workable solution.

As in the past, these lands were not selected for the 5-hectare expansion to the Waterdown Urban Area boundary and were excluded from the Phase One process based on existing property size (rather than intention), and other assumptions that the City of Hamilton chose not to verify with the Owners.

PLANNING | URBAN DESIGN | LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE

72 Victoria St. S., Suite 201, Kitchener, ON, N2G 4Y9
 162 Locke St. S., Suite 200, Hamilton, ON, L8P 4A9
 gspgroup.ca

Owners Request to the GIC

There is a basic land use conflict between the existing and planned urban residential development, widened roads and new roads being constructed in Waterdown, and the continued ability to efficiently farm the Subject Lands. The existing poultry operation has already faced legal challenges for legitimate agricultural construction activities (manure sheds) as well as urban development proposals that failed to factor in Minimum Distance Separation requirements. To provide other examples of direct impact, the poultry operation lost access to groundwater (well water) in 2015 resulting in a dependence on trucked-in city water ever since. The farm at 513 Dundas Street has had access to its driveway impeded by the traffic light island created on Dundas Street East at the intersection with Avonsyde Boulevard making manoeuvrability dangerous.

The Owners have worked in good faith with all land-use decision-makers to try and overcome the ambiguous nature of Provincial Plan reviews, their relationship to Municipal Plan reviews and to try and address the fact that these processes do not align.

During the 2015 Co-ordinated Provincial Plan Review, the Owners made a request to remove their lands from the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP) such that they could become part of the Waterdown Urban Area. This request was met with refusal, but Provincial staff advised the Owners that the City should consider the Subject Lands as part of their Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR). The City has done so, however, the City cannot add these lands to the Urban Area until a decision is made during a subsequent Provincial Plan Review. There does not appear to be clear direction on these types of requests and the two types of reviews do not align.

The Owners support the City staff's opinion that this circular process should be addressed.

The Owners respectfully request that the GIC pass a motion to direct City of Hamilton staff to support the Owners in finding a workable solution (in coordination with the Province) to affect the necessary change regarding the Subject Lands to address the land-use conflict that is now before them.

Concerns Regarding the Process

In May 2021 the Owners submitted written comments on the draft Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool. The Owners also asked to be included in any future consideration of a minor expansion. At that time the proposed maximum area for consideration was ten (10) hectares.

In November 2021, City Council decided to proceed with no major expansions to the Urban Area. Council did retain the ability to consider requests for a minor expansion to the Waterdown Urban Area, to a maximum of five (5) hectares. No communication or correspondence was received by the Owners to explain why the maximum area was changed and the Owners were neither

informed about how the evaluation would be completed nor offered the opportunity to contribute any additional information based on the new criteria.

The staff report states that five properties did not pass the initial screening test and only one (1) request passed both the Phase One and Phase Two evaluation criteria. The properties selected to be added to the Urban Area are 329 and 345 Parkside Drive, which contain an existing long-term care facility (institutional use).

The Owners identified the following concerns with the City's evaluation process which they wish to outline for the Committee.

Phase One of the review included the Growth Plan policies "with an added screening criteria requiring an expansion to address a need for a non-residential use." Phase Two criteria are said to represent local priorities. The staff report states: "an expansion will only be recommended if there is a need for a logical rounding out of the boundary or a recognition of existing uses."

The recognition of an existing use in the Rural Area became the key criterion for evaluating a minor urban expansion. The Growth Plan does not refer to existing uses but rather proposed uses.

Of further concern to the Owners is the statement in the staff report that the reduction in the size from ten (10) hectares to five (5) hectares resulted in all but two of the areas being eliminated for consideration in Phase One.

The Owners land area totals 16.3 hectares. There would be certain natural features that would be netted out of that total. When the total area to be brought into the Urban Area changed from 10 hectares to 5 hectares, the Owners were not given the opportunity to propose a reduced area on the Subject Lands.

The results of the City's evaluation suggests that the Owners should have identified a non-residential use in their request. The Owners contend that City staff should have clarified this criterion with them rather than using it against them. The Owners did not identify a specific use knowing that need etc. would be evaluated during a separate land use planning process.

The staff report states that only the selected site could meet the criteria because there was an existing non-residential use on the lands (long term care facility). The staff report also states that support for the selected lands "does not imply support for a specific future development proposal as no details of the future development have been provided." This was the case for the other sites as well.

The staff report states that three (3) of the requests are for lands immediately adjacent to the existing urban area, and are being impacted by the east-west corridor (planned by-pass). Yet the

report could also have mentioned that the Subject Lands have been impacted by road works and are also immediately adjacent to the existing urban area.

Minimum Distance Separation (MDS) between urban uses and the existing poultry livestock operation have not been met in recent development applications which is a unique situation. Also, the farm located at 513 Dundas Street East and its viability have been impacted by urban growth and new / widened transportation facilities.

As mentioned above, the staff report is sympathetic to the Owners' dilemma of being part of the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP) Greenbelt Area. We agree with City staff that the process should be addressed with the Province and decisions made to co-ordinate the reviews. Surely, after thirty years of constructive dialogue, the Owners have earned the right to a better outcome.

Conclusion

In our opinion, other policies in the Growth Plan support the inclusion of the Subject Lands in the Urban Area, or a portion thereof, over the other sites. This is primarily due to the incompatibility of land uses caused by past decisions to expand the Waterdown Urban Area near existing farms, including a poultry farm, jeopardizing their continued viability.

We appreciate the opportunity to express our concerns, and we count on the support of the City of Hamilton and Provincial staff to resolve the land use conflict that now exists between agricultural and urban uses.

Yours truly,
GSP GROUP INC.



Nancy Frieday, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner

Copy: Mayor Fred Eisenberger
Councillor Judi Partridge, Ward 15
S. Robichaud, Director of Planning and Chief Planner

Submitted on Monday, April 18, 2022 - 6:43am Submitted by anonymous user: 172.70.130.149
Submitted values are:

==Committee Requested==

Committee: General Issues Committee

Will you be delegating in person or virtually? Virtually

Will you be delegating via a pre-recorded video? No

==Requestor Information==

Name of Organization (if applicable): IBI Group Hamilton

Name of Individual: Mike Crough

Preferred Pronoun: Mr

Contact Number: 9055461010

Email Address: mike.crough@ibigroup.com

Mailing Address: 360 James Street North, East Wing, Suite200

Reason(s) for delegation request: Speaking on behalf of my client, the Owner of 347 Parkside Drive, at the April 20, GIC meeting regarding item 8.3 - PED 17010 (q) - Evaluation of Urban Boundary Requests - Waterdown, and our submission to request an expansion onto these lands. I will be providing a brief presentation to highlight the lands and our request.

Will you be requesting funds from the City? No

Will you be submitting a formal presentation? Yes

Evaluation of Urban Boundary Expansion Requests – Waterdown

347 Parkside Drive



IBI GROUP
2441066 Ontario Inc.
347 Parkside Dr
April 20, 2022

We have submitted a request for expansion for 347 Parkside through the Waterdown-specific process

We have read the staff report and all appendices

347 Parkside meets most criteria and is a prime candidate for expansion

We respectfully request that Committee and Council direct staff to include 347 Parkside in the total Waterdown expansion area

Subject Lands



City Air Photo

Expansion Request



Conceptual Mapping


Request is small scale and within intent of minor expansions permitted by Growth Plan and Greenbelt Plan

Would provide lands for future development in Waterdown with uses of some lands to be determined later

Outside of mapped Natural Heritage System

Impacted by planned Transportation corridor; remnant lands would not be viable for farming and would be best suited for urban use

Adjacent to Urban Boundary and Impacted by Planned Transportation Corridor




Corridor Impacts

Expansion Lands and NHS Boundary



Outside Established NHS Boundary

Impacted by Planned Transportation Corridor



Remnant Lands South of Corridor

Staff analysis re: 329-345 Parkside Phase 1 and 2 Criteria compliance also generally applies to 347 Parkside

Our submission illustrates consistency with this analysis

A combined expansion to include 347 Parkside is logical and represents good planning

- **Can be efficiently serviced**
- **No significant transportation impacts**
- **Can incorporate range of uses (i.e. retain natural feature, long term-care, etc.)**
- **Will contribute to a complete community**
- **Generally free of hazards**
- **Outside of current NHS boundary**
- **Are not Prime Agricultural lands**
- **Contain no built heritage resources**
- **Future development can be conditioned, etc.**

Inclusion of 347 Parkside in boundary expansion through MCR/GRIDS 2 is good planning – expansion can only happen through the MCR

Thank you!

Submitted on Monday, April 18, 2022 - 6:55am Submitted by anonymous user: 172.70.126.223
Submitted values are:

==Committee Requested==

Committee: General Issues Committee

Will you be delegating in person or virtually? In person

Will you be delegating via a pre-recorded video? No

==Requestor Information==

Name of Organization (if applicable): Hamilton100 Commonwealth Games Bid Committee

Name of Individual: Louis Frapporti and PJ Mercanti

Preferred Pronoun:

Contact Number: 905 512 0763

Email Address: Louis.Frapporti@Gowlingwlg.com

Mailing Address: 54 Forest Street, Guelph, Ontario n1g 1h9

Reason(s) for delegation request: To provide an an update on the 2030 Commonwealth Games Bid initiative, to answer any questions and to secure a further amended MOU between Hamilton100 and the City of Hamilton governing their collaboration through the submission of a final hosting proposal to government and beyond.

Will you be requesting funds from the City? No

Will you be submitting a formal presentation? Yes

Submitted on Monday, April 18, 2022 - 7:16am Submitted by anonymous user: 162.158.126.185
Submitted values are:

==Committee Requested==

Committee: General Issues Committee

Will you be delegating in person or virtually? Virtually

Will you be delegating via a pre-recorded video? No

==Requestor Information==

Name of Organization (if applicable): Environment Hamilton

Name of Individual: Lynda Lukasik

Preferred Pronoun: She/Her

Contact Number: 9055490900

Email Address: llukasik@environmenthamilton.org

Mailing Address:

51 Stuart Street

Stuart Street

Reason(s) for delegation request: I am requesting to speak to

Item 8.3 Evaluation of Urban Boundary Expansion Requests -

Waterdown (PED17010(q)) (Ward 15) - on the April 20th GIC agenda.

Will you be requesting funds from the City? No

Will you be submitting a formal presentation? No

Submitted on Tuesday, April 19, 2022 - 10:15am Submitted by anonymous user: 162.158.126.207
Submitted values are:

==Committee Requested==

Committee: General Issues Committee
Will you be delegating in person or virtually? Virtually
Will you be delegating via a pre-recorded video? No

==Requestor Information==

Name of Organization (if applicable): Turkstra Mazza Associates
Name of Individual: Nancy Smith
Preferred Pronoun: She/Her
Contact Number: 9055293476
Email Address: nsmith@tmalaw.ca
Mailing Address:
15 Bold Street
Hamilton
ON L8P 1T3
Reason(s) for delegation request: To speak to the Committee concerning Staff Report PED17010(q) recommending approval of a minor urban boundary adjustment in Waterdown. We will request that the City use the unused portion of Growth Plan policy 2.2.8.3k) (5 ha) to approve a minor boundary adjustment for 309-311 Parkside Drive.
Will you be requesting funds from the City? No
Will you be submitting a formal presentation? Yes

Turkstra Mazza

Hamilton London Toronto

Nancy Smith

15 Bold Street

Hamilton Ontario Canada L8P 1T3

Receptionist 905 529 3476 (905 LAW-FIRM)

Facsimile 905 529 3663

nsmith@tmalaw.ca

VIA EMAIL

April 19, 2022

Attn: Chair and Members
General Issues Committee
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West
Hamilton ON L8P 4Y5

Dear Members of the General Issues Committee

Re: Staff Report PED17010(q) – Alexander Place Boundary Adjustment

We represent Sidana Holdings and 2474314 Ontario Inc. (“**Consoli**”), part owners of 309-311 Parkside Drive, Waterdown (“**Property**”). We write in relation to Staff Report PED17010(q) recommending approval of a minor urban boundary adjustment (5.0 ha) for Alexander Place Long Term Care Facility (“**Alexander Place Boundary Adjustment**”). We support the staff recommendation. It represents a sound boundary adjustment for a portion of policy 2.2.8.3k) of the Growth Plan Boundary Adjustment Process. We write to request that you consider using the unused portion of policy 2.2.8.3k) (5 ha) to approve a minor boundary adjustment for the Property as well.

THE PROPERTY

For the last 40 years, the Property has undergone modest and incremental development: Summit South (1963), Summit North/Northlawn (1965) and Summit Extension (1979). In 2019, Consoli sold the By- Pass portion of the Property to the City with no conditions. What remains is approximately 11 ha south of the By-Pass and 14 ha north of the By-Pass. With the Alexander Place Boundary Adjustment, the 11 ha south of the By-Pass is boxed in by the By-Pass to the north and the urban boundary on all other sides. It essentially becomes a residential infill parcel but for the fact that it remains outside the urban boundary. It is this anomaly that we respectfully request you fix.

NANCY SMITH PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
TURKSTRA MAZZA ASSOCIATES, LAWYERS



GREENBELT PLAN ADJUSTMENT PROCESS

In 2005, the Greenbelt Plan was approved and applied to the Property. In 2015, Consoli participated in the provincial Greenbelt Plan Review. What a process! Consoli met repeatedly with municipal staff, provincial staff and the Minister of Housing. All direction given culminated in a game plan led by the City's Real Estate Department for the acquisition of the By-Pass lands. Essentially, the City asked Consoli to sell the By-Pass unconditionally and prepare a Justification Package to remove the Property south of the By-Pass from the Greenbelt Plan. He did both. The By-Pass lands were sold to the City unconditionally. He submitted a comprehensive (and expensive!) Justification Package complete with numerous studies.

The City, with the full support of staff, accepted the Justification Package and supported the Greenbelt Plan Adjustment Request. Regrettably, the Province refused all Greenbelt Plan adjustment requests province wide, including the modest adjustment proposed by Consoli. The Province told Consoli that because the Property was next to the settlement boundary, he should engage the Growth Plan Boundary Adjustment Process during the next City municipal comprehensive review.


NANCY SMITH PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
 TURKSTRA MAZZA ASSOCIATES, LAWYERS

GROWTH PLAN BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT PROCESS

Policy 2.2.8.3k) of the Growth Plan envisions settlement area boundary adjustments for Greenbelt Plan lands like the Property. Up to 10 hectares can be added to the urban boundary with residential permissions on no more than 50% of the lands to be added. The Alexander Place Boundary Adjustment is 5 ha. We request that you use the remaining 5 ha available to implement the Greenbelt Plan Adjustment you supported in 2015.

CAPPING THE BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT

The Property is not farmland nor are there any natural features on it. Consoli fully supports the City's commitment to Farmland for Future Generations. To assist the City with achieving this objective, Consoli will cap the boundary adjustment at 5.0 ha ("**Consoli Boundary Adjustment**") and gift the remaining 20 ha ("**Gift to the City**"). With ownership, the City will control this boundary.



NANCY SMITH PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION
TURKSTRA MAZZA ASSOCIATES, LAWYERS

Please note that in the 2015 discussions with the City regarding the By-Pass lands, the City sought to buy the lands north of the By-Pass. Consoli and the City could not agree on price at that time. It is these very lands that comprise a significant portion of the Gift to the City.

Consoli has had ongoing discussions with the neighbouring community regarding the Gift to the City. The feedback has been very positive.

FIX THE ANOMALY

The unique history of the Property coupled with the Alexander Place Boundary Adjustment creates an anomaly. The Consoli Boundary Adjustment represents lands that are boxed in by urban lands and the new By-Pass. This is an infill site absent the underlying official plan designation. This boundary adjustment was supported by the City in 2015 as part of the Greenbelt Plan review. It achieves provincial policy while in no way offending the City's objectives to preserve farmland. To be blunt, the Consoli Boundary Adjustment makes good planning sense.

In addition to fixing the anomaly, your approval of the Consoli Boundary Adjustment will secure ownership of 20 ha of land for free. This gift will cap the boundary adjustment and offer potential open space opportunities for the residents of Waterdown. So, in addition to making good planning sense, the Consoli Boundary Adjustment is in the public interest.


OUR ASK

We respectfully request that you use the unused portion of Growth Plan policy 2.2.8.3k) (5.0 ha) to approve a minor boundary adjustment for the Property as outlined in this letter.

Yours truly,



Nancy Smith
ns/l



Deferred Employment Land Conversion Requests (City Wide)

Report PED17010(p)
General Issues Committee
April 20, 2022


Background

- Employment Land Review Report PED17010(k) brought forward to GIC on August 4, 2021
 - City has an approximate surplus of 60 hectares of Employment Area designated lands to the year 2051 (as determined by the City's LNA)
 - 53.5 hectares of Employment Area designated lands were supported by GIC for conversion to non-employment designations
 - 6 requests for conversion from private landowners were deferred for consideration at a later date

Deferred Employment Land Conversion Requests (Report PED17010(p))


- Staff Report presents final recommendation to GIC for the 6 deferred employment land conversion requests
 - Support for one additional site for conversion (1725 Stone Church Rd E)
 - Refinement to a previous recommendation for conversion in Flamborough
 - Discussion of one additional request for conversion submitted in Feb. 2022
- Appendix “A” provides details on the proposed developments for the 6 deferred sites, analysis based on the Provincial and Local Conversion Criteria, and staff recommendations
- Appendix “B” provides an explanation for the proposed refinement to the previously supported minor refinement in the Flamborough Business Park

1. McMaster Innovation Park (MIP) – West Hamilton Innovation District




- Revised Master Plan for MIP
- Existing permissions allow for limited residential use (max 8% of Employment Use GFA, max. GFA 11,500m², 2 res. buildings)
- No conversion requested
- Request to increase permitted GFA for residential uses to allow development of 3 residential buildings
 - GFA 41,341m²
 - 17.5% of Employment Use GFA (proposed/existing)
 - 3 buildings (E1- 26 storeys, E6 – 22 storeys, E5, 14 storeys)
- Recommendation: permit increased residential GFA to a max. 15%, limited to 2 buildings (E1 & E6), revised SSP in WHID Secondary Plan

2. 70 – 100 Frid Street – West Hamilton Innovation District




- Area of requested conversion: 2.24 ha
- Proposed development of mixed use buildings ranging from 4 – 24 storeys to support redevelopment of this section of WHID
- No existing residential permissions for this area of WHID
- Interior to the business park area
- Some remaining intensive industrial uses (asphalt plant) that compromise introduction of sensitive land uses
- Recommendation: No conversion
- Potential for City to conduct a fulsome review of WHID secondary plan in the future to consider the unique context of the Employment Area

3. Twenty Road West Area – Airport Employment Growth District



- Area 55.2 ha (areas shown in yellow boundary)
- Proposed Mixed Use (MU) development along Garth St. extension and Compact Residential (CR)
- Adjacent to rural lands not approved for inclusion in Urban Boundary
- Context with residential is not consistent with adjacent lands
- Area of land could result in Employment Area land supply deficit to 2051
- Recommendation: No conversion

4. 700 Garner Road East – Airport Employment Growth District





- Area: 26.6 ha
- Proposed development of mixed uses including residential, institutional, office, and commercial
- Designated Institutional in AEGD, but defaults to Airport Prestige Business if not developed for institutional purposes related to Redeemer College
- Adjacent to rural lands not approved for inclusion in Urban Boundary
- Context with residential is not consistent with adjacent lands
- Area of land could result in Employment Area land supply deficit to 2051
- Recommendation: No conversion
- Staff support revision to Policy B.8.7 of AEGD to remove reference to lands developing exclusively for Redeemer College

5. 1725 Stone Church Road East – Red Hill North Business Park



- Area: 7.4 ha
- Proposed development of commercial and retail uses similar to those in Heritage Green (located east of RHVP)
- No residential or major office uses are proposed
- Need for additional commercial space in the area demonstrated by assessment submitted, and existing sites are fully developed
- Existing mixed context
- Recommendation: Conversion to District Commercial is supported
- Site Specific Policy proposed to prohibit development of sensitive land uses, and to require submission of architectural and urban design guidelines for the site, to ensure consistency with Heritage Green development

6. 1400 South Service Road – Stoney Creek Business Park



- Area: 7.2 ha
- Proposed development of 4 multiple dwellings (two 16 storey and two 8 storey) with 986 units, 1 office building (3 storeys), and two 1-storey commercial buildings
- Lands to east and west of site not proposed for conversion
- Active application for OPA / ZBA
- Sanitary servicing and transportation capacity constraints have been identified
- Recommendation: No conversion
- Site Specific Policy proposed - lands may be considered for conversion in future provided servicing capacity can be demonstrated, and lands from Fifty Road to the creek are included (comprehensive development area)

Refinement to Flamborough Business Park Conversion



- Area 2.0 ha
- Lands are part of utility corridor adjacent to plan of subdivision for business park development
- Lands were mistakenly identified through OPA 107 (Housekeeping) as part of UFE-2
- No conversion is required for this linear area of land as utility designation already applies, and lands inside the employment area are not intended to be converted
- Recommendation: No conversion required

Additional Request for Conversion - 54 Dundas St. E, Flamborough




- Area 1.4 ha
- Request for conversion to District Commercial designation submitted on February 10, 2022
- Proposed development of Long Term Care
- Adjacent to Niagara Escarpment
- Insufficient time to review proposal in coordination with other agencies within MCR deadline
- Recommendation: No conversion

Summary of Recommended Employment Land Conversions

Conversions Analysis	Area (hectares)
ELR Conversions (Staff Identified)	35.1
Residential Enclaves	5
Request for Conversion (including deferrals)	9.5
Confederation GO Station	4.0
Council Directed Conversion (1280 Rymal Rd. E / 385 Nebo Rd)	5.3
Total Recommended Conversions	58.9

Next Steps

- Implementation of Employment Land Conversions through final MCR Official Plan Amendment
 - Municipal Comprehensive Review Public Meeting during Planning Committee on May 17, 2022
 - Submission of final MCR OPA to the Province following Public Meeting



THANK YOU

CITY OF HAMILTON NOTICE OF MOTION

General Issues Committee: April 20, 2022

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR J. P. DANKO.....

Climate Change Action – Bay Area Climate Change Council Options for Travel Recommendations

WHEREAS, the City of Hamilton recognizes that Climate Change is an emergency and a threat to municipalities across the world and urgent climate action is needed;

WHEREAS, Hamilton City Council declared a climate emergency on March 27, 2019, and directed staff to form a Corporate Climate Change Task Force;

WHEREAS, over 12% of Hamilton emissions come from the transportation sector and low carbon forms of transportation facilitate our collective efforts to decarbonize; and,

WHEREAS, transportation connectivity and the safety of residents are priorities for the City of Hamilton, as reflected in the Ten-Year Local Transit Strategy, Vision Zero, and the Cycling Master Plan;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

That the General Manager of the Planning and Economic Development Department be directed to work with staff to review how each recommendation in the Bay Area Climate Change Council’s Options for Travel report could be actioned, and report back to the General Issues Committee by September 21, 2022.