



City of Hamilton

CITY COUNCIL ADDENDUM

22-012

Wednesday, May 25, 2022, 9:30 A.M.

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

4. COMMUNICATIONS

4.6. Correspondence respecting the Municipal Comprehensive Review / Official Plan Review – Phase 1 Amendments to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Rural Hamilton Official Plan (PED21067(b)) (City Wide):

*4.6.s. Summer Thomas

*4.6.t. James S. Quinn

*4.6.u. Lilly Noble

*4.6.v. MaryAnn Hudecki Thompson

*4.6.w. Connie Kidd

*4.6.x. Maryanne Lemieux

- *4.6.y. Mary Love
- *4.6.z. Jill Tonini
- *4.6.aa. Michelle Tom
- *4.6.ab. Akira Ourique
- *4.6.ac. Craig Cassar
- *4.6.ad. Lyn Folkes & family
- *4.6.ae. Margot Olivieri
- *4.6.af. Howard Cole
- *4.6.ag. Chris Ritsma
- *4.6.ah. Colin Chung, Managing Partner, Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc.

Recommendation: Be received and referred to the consideration of Item 4 of Planning Committee Report 22-008.

- *4.12. Correspondence from Kevin Gonci, respecting the Toronto 2015 Pan and Parapan American Games, Backgrounder on Auditor General of Ontario Special Report, June 2016.

Recommendation: Be received and referred to the consideration of Item 7 of the General Issues Committee Report 22-010.

- *4.13. Correspondence from Dr. Sarah Sheehan objecting to the proposed 17-year lease to the current bidder, as part of the sole-sourced, unsolicited bid for Chedoke Estates (1 Balfour Dr.).

Recommendation: Be received and referred to the consideration of Item 6 of General Issues Committee Report 22-010.

7. NOTICES OF MOTIONS

- *7.1. Budget Increase for the Housing for Hamilton Community Improvement Plan (CIP) for the Roxborough Mixed Income/Tenure Demonstration Project
- *7.2. Amendment to Item 3.1 of Council Minutes 22-001 respecting the Amendment to the Mandatory COVID-19 Vaccination Verification Policy (HUR21008(a)) (City Wide)

11. BY-LAWS AND CONFIRMING BY-LAW

*11.7. 124

To Repeal and Replace By-law No. 22-110, Removal of Part Lot Control, Block 1, Registered Plan No. 62M-1283, municipally known as 1288 Baseline Road, Stoney Creek

PLC-22-004

Ward: 10

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Council meeting, may 25 GRIDS-2

From: Summer Thomas

Sent: May 23, 2022 12:28 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca; Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Powers, Russ <Russ.Powers@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Council meeting, may 25 GRIDS-2

Hello councillors and staff,

I am writing to express my support for staff's recommendation for intensification in Hamilton, such as fourplexes, including in Ancaster where I live. Ancaster residents can afford to include denser housing options such as laneway housing, garden suites, etc. in our sparsely-populated neighborhoods. As a YIMBY, I can assure you that for all the NIMBYs there are in Ancaster, there are other residents who fully support the recommendation of inclusive zoning.

Thank you,

Summer

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Protecting green spaces and farmland

From: Quinn, James S

Sent: May 23, 2022 11:11 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca; Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Powers, Russ <Russ.Powers@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Protecting green spaces and farmland

Dear Councillors:

Thankyou for your decision to hold fast on the urban boundary. That decision is important and has far reaching benefits and future generations will appreciate.

Please follow through with this work. It is essential that appropriate densification is encouraged so that we can protect our farmlands and green space. We know that inflation, particularly with regard to our food, is increasing. Despite supply chain and war issues, climate change is playing an important role. We need to preserve our farm land. We know now how important green spaces are for mental health. Therefore we must protect our watersheds and forests and other natural green spaces, both for our own and for many other species.

It achieve this necessary densification within our existing urban boundary, please support your staff's proposals for changing official plans, both urban and rural. Please support inclusionary zoning to low density residential neighbourhoods and suitable types of housing that will increase density, while maintaining good livable neighbourhoods. Please make parks public. They do not belong only to those living beside them. They should not be transformed into sports fields, which limit other uses. Please support the protection of farmlands, watersheds, and natural areas.

As we have come to know the harms reflected in the term Anthropocene, please recognise that people are watching, and expecting that you will be vigilant and protective of our critical green spaces.

Take Care, Jim

James S. Quinn, PhD

Pilon, Janet

Subject: GRIDS 2/MCR

From: Lilly N

Sent: May 21, 2022 4:31 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Powers, Russ <Russ.Powers@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>

Subject: GRIDS 2/MCR

Dear Mayor and Council,

I write today in reference to GRIDS2/MCR.

The plan is to hold the urban boundary firm so we can preserve farmland and build more affordable homes within the urban boundary making use of under-utilized areas but also allowing middle density, multifamily homes like 4-plexes to be built. See attached for an example of a Hamilton 4-plex.

These types of homes allow seniors to downsize and live in their current neighborhoods as well as allow first-time home owners the chance to be able to buy a home in areas they grew up in and close to family.

This increase in density will also create more areas of the city which would warrant more frequent transit. Better transit service creates even more affordable neighborhoods.

Thank you for moving forward to create a more affordable city for all residents and preserving vital Hamilton farmland. It's the only way forward and not backwards.

Sincerely,

Lilly Noble

P.S.

Make Main St safer and two ways.

I'm sure us Ancasterites can deal with it.



26

1
2

3
4

Pilon, Janet

Subject: City Council Meeting May 25, 2022

From: MaryAnn Thompson

Sent: May 23, 2022 12:47 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca; Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Powers, Russ <Russ.Powers@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>

Subject: City Council Meeting May 25, 2022

Dear City Council and staff

I have lived in Hamilton for almost all of my 72 years with time out for university and have followed city government throughout those years. My father, Dr. Stan Hudecki was elected as Member of Parliament in 1980, serving the citizens of Hamilton. We were raised on the belief of taking care of those less fortunate and working for the good of all. I have always been proud to be a Hamiltonian.

I believe in City Council's support staff's recommendations and proposed changes to the rural and urban official plans. They have worked tirelessly to create a proposal that is strong and in keeping with provincial planning policy requirements.

In order to maintain the city's current and wise boundary decision it is necessary to have inclusionary zoning in Hamilton's broad urban residential neighbourhoods as has been proposed. This is simply obvious to all.

As well I strongly support the creation of four plexes in our low density urban neighbourhoods. High rises do not foster the community that is found in walkable family oriented urban neighbourhoods nor does expansion.

Please know that what you decide today and in the future impacts the lives of hundreds of thousands who have elected you to steward their city And thank you for your efforts to make Hamilton an example to other cities on how to maintain a family centred community that can grow within its boundaries using existing space for the good of all.

Sincerely

MaryAnn Hudecki Thompson

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Urban and rural official plan

From: C Kidd

Sent: May 23, 2022 9:37 AM

To: Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Powers, Russ <Russ.Powers@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; clerk@hamilton.ca; Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Urban and rural official plan

- I support staff's overall proposed changes to the urban and rural official plans
- The staff proposal is sound and conforms with provincial planning policy requirements.
- I support inclusionary zoning to Hamilton's low density urban residential neighbourhoods as proposed
- I support fourplexes in low density neighbourhoods

Connie Kidd

Ward 2

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Municipal comprehensive review/official plan review, amendments to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Rural Hamilton Official Plan

From: Maryanne Lemieux

Sent: May 23, 2022 1:02 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca; Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Powers, Russ <Russ.Powers@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Municipal comprehensive review/official plan review, amendments to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Rural Hamilton Official Plan

Good morning,

I thank city staff for the hard work they have done to carefully plan a sustainable future for Hamilton and I support their overall proposed changes to the urban and rural plans. I believe their proposal is sound and conforms with provincial planning requirements while ensuring the intensification will happen in accordance with the No Urban Boundary Expansion Growth Option that was selected by Council.

The commitment to conserve the rich soil for farming and protect these lands from being paved and destroyed preserves food security for generations to come.

The proposed residential zoning changes are crucial to the plan and I support them as presented. These zoning bylaw amendments to low density residential zones to expand uses to include a greater diversification of building forms will bring about the gentle density required to accommodate a variety of housing needs while implementing more sustainable opportunities for small scale intensification. These include 3-4 unit dwellings, secondary dwelling units, semi-detached, townhouses, converted dwellings, as well as single detached dwellings.

Council, I support inclusionary zoning to Hamilton's low density urban residential neighbourhoods as proposed. I support four plexes as of right in low density neighbourhoods.

Please ratify this well conceived plan for Hamilton's future.

Yours sincerely,

Maryanne Lemieux
A proud Hamiltonian

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Message for Agenda Wednesday May 25 Council Meeting

From: Mary Love

Sent: May 23, 2022 1:27 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca; Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Powers, Russ <Russ.Powers@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Message for Agenda Wednesday May 25 Council Meeting

Hello, City Clerk and City Council.

I am writing in support of City Council ratifying the Official Plan for No Boundary Expansion this coming Wednesday May 25. Please enter my email in the agenda for that meeting.

I think the plan as it has developed is an excellent example of how the various parts of civic democracy work.

I find the staff proposal to be sound and the proposed changes to the rural and urban plans in conformity with provincial planning policy requirements.

I fully support inclusionary zoning for Hamilton's low density urban residential neighbourhoods as proposed. As well as the intriguing possibilities for secondary dwelling units and laneway dwellings, some of which I have toured, this inclusionary zoning will allow the addition of fourplexes in low density neighbourhoods. Whether new or redesigned, these structures will also allow our City to practice carbon neutral construction techniques that will conserve resources and keep people in all income brackets comfortable despite the challenges of Climate Change.

These changes may seem unsettling, but they are necessary and in a generation, will seem natural.

The Hamilton plan abides by the provincial regulations by creating the density we need in a way that is inclusive, just, democratic, and respects the land and its First Nations who have cared for it for millennia. Neighbourhoods that are walkable, safer for pedestrians, and much more interesting and community-based than the huge car-centred streets such as Upper James that lead out to sprawl, are the best way to ensure a liveable future for all Hamiltonians.

I urge you all, as my City Council, to ratify the Official Plan for No Boundary Expansion!

Thank you very much for the opportunity to address you.

Sincerely,

Mary Love

Ward 7 homeowner

Pilon, Janet

Subject: May 25 agenda - Hamilton's Official Plan

From: Jill

Sent: May 23, 2022 1:55 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca; Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Powers, Russ <Russ.Powers@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>

Subject: May 25 agenda - Hamilton's Official Plan

To members of council and the clerk,

Please include my comments in the May 25 agenda:

I would like to express my complete support of all proposed changes to the urban and rural Official Plans, as it is sound, responsible planning, and conforms with provincial planning policy requirements.

I would also like to express my support for inclusionary zoning to Hamilton's low density urban residential neighbourhoods as proposed. This is incredibly important in order to help allow our youth to buy property in desirable areas, and to allow elderly to downsize in desirable areas.

I support triplexes and fourplexes in low density neighbourhoods, and a smart and progressive means of gentle densification. As our population grows, we need to think of future generations, their food security (by not increasing the urban boundary) and also their right to affordable housing options in the urban core and along public transit corridors. Densification is the best way forward.

You're all doing an excellent job in supporting this.

Sincerely, a concerned citizen,
Jill Tonini
Ward 13

Pilon, Janet

Subject: GRIDS2/MCR: Council Wed. May 25th

From: **Michelle Tom**

Date: Mon, May 23, 2022 at 2:17 PM

Subject: GRIDS2/MCR: Council Wed. May 25th

To: <clerk@hamilton.ca>, <mayor@hamilton.ca>, <maureen.wilson@hamilton.ca>, Farr, Jason <jason.farr@hamilton.ca>, Nann, Nrinder <nrinder.nann@hamilton.ca>, <sam.merulla@hamilton.ca>, <russ.powers@hamilton.ca>, <tom.jackson@hamilton.ca>, <esther.pauls@hamilton.ca>, <john-paul.danko@hamilton.ca>, <brad.clark@hamilton.ca>, <maria.pearson@hamilton.ca>, <brenda.johnson@hamilton.ca>, <loyd.ferguson@hamilton.ca>, <arlene.vanderbeek@hamilton.ca>, <terry.whitehead@hamilton.ca>, <judi.partridge@hamilton.ca>

Dear Councillors and Staff,

Hamilton is on the cusp of making a fantastic investment in our collective future. We can save 3300 acres of prime farmland and create more affordable, walkable neighbourhoods.

18,000 residents weighed in and were individually vetted by staff for 3 weeks, we were all so excited to find out that a staggering 90% of those who voted wanted to save farmland.

The engagement in this issue has been unprecedented and the council voted in November 16-3 showing their commitment to the wishes of regular citizens.

Now, one councillor is trying to undermine this effort.

We need to eliminate exclusionary zoning now!

Increased gentle density in our neighbourhoods means transit will be more effective and we will have a better chance of lowering our emissions.

Residents learned that [taxes will increase](#) if we expand urban boundaries.

We must create gentle density (including fourplexes) within our neighbourhoods.

The country is watching, let's do this right and finish strong.

Let's eliminate exclusionary zoning.

Thank you,
Michelle Tom
Ward 2

Pilon, Janet

Subject: No Urban Boundary Expansion

From: Akira Ourique

Sent: May 23, 2022 7:04 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca; Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Powers, Russ <Russ.Powers@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>

Subject: No Urban Boundary Expansion

Hello,

My name is Akira Ourique, and I live in ward 3. I ask that this email be included in the May 25 agenda.

I support the council's overall proposed changes to the urban and rural official plans. I believe the proposal is realistic, and conforms with provincial planning policy requirements. I strongly support inclusionary zoning to Hamilton's low density urban residential neighbourhoods as proposed. I additionally support the construction of fourplexes in low density neighbourhoods.

Keeping a firm urban boundary is crucial to climate action and housing justice. As a resident, taxpayer, student, and environmentalist I want to see development and city resources within my own community— not outside of it. Thank you for your time.

Akira

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Ratification of GRDIS2/MCR

From: Craig Cassar

Sent: May 23, 2022 7:52 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca; Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Powers, Russ <Russ.Powers@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Ratification of GRDIS2/MCR

To Hamilton City Council,

I believe there is a sentiment among some members of Council that those of us supporting the frozen urban boundary don't understand what it means. As a resident of Ancaster, I can assure you that the community is very much engaged and educated on this topic and anyone making the accusation that we are ignorant is misguided.

Like so many other people in Ancaster and across the City, I support staff's overall proposed changes to the urban and rural official plans. Their proposal is sound and conforms with provincial planning policy requirements. Those of you that are familiar with both the recommendations and the official plans will already understand this as a fact.

Further, I fully support the staff proposal to establish inclusionary zoning for Hamilton's low-density urban residential neighbourhoods (including fourplexes).

Finally, as I understand the process, there is still public consultation to come regarding the detailed zoning changes that will enable more inclusionary zoning. So the council decision to be made on May 25 is for high-level approval of this approach; you're just setting the general direction with this vote - the detailed policy is yet to be developed, consulted on, and implemented.

Sincerely,

Craig Cassar

Resident of Ancaster - Ward 12

Pilon, Janet

From: Lyn Folkes

Sent: May 24, 2022 12:43 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca; Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Powers, Russ <Russ.Powers@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>

Subject:

Dear City Clerk and Council Members,

I am writing today to say that I support the Council's plan to intensify development within boundaries.

I agree with the staff's proposed changes to the urban & rural official plans. I support four residential neighbourhoods in the city and inclusionary zoning for these neighbourhoods as proposed.

Again, I am very concerned that Councillor Ferguson continues to work against the majority trying to thwart your plans for the intensification of urban development within our current support the Council or the people's voice in Hamilton, then I wonder where his loyalties really lay? As a taxpayer in this city, Councillor Ferguson's actions do not represent me. He certainly does not speak for my family!

Please include this letter as public input for your May 25th meeting.

Sincerely,

Lyn Folkes & family

Ward 8 Hamilton

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Ferguson Motion

From: margot olivieri

Sent: May 24, 2022 8:41 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca; Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Powers, Russ <Russ.Powers@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>

Subject: Ferguson Motion

Good Morning.

Please include this email in the May 25th agenda. I am a resident of Dundas who supports the proposed Official Plan for NO URBAN BOUNDARY EXPANSION.

I believe the staff proposal conforms with provincial planning policy requirements. I support fourplex construction in low density neighbourhoods. Please do not support Ferguson in his most recent attempt to expand our boundaries into valuable agricultural and environmentally sensitive areas. It's all we have. Thank you for your attention to this letter.

Margot Olivieri

Pilon, Janet

Subject: support for official plan — no urban boundary expansion

From: Howard Cole

Sent: May 24, 2022 11:04 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca; Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Powers, Russ <Russ.Powers@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>

Subject: support for official plan — no urban boundary expansion

I am a resident of Ancaster (ward 12), and would like to express my support for the changes that have been proposed by city staff to Hamilton's official urban and rural plans. Staff have submitted a sound plan that meets all of the province's planning policy requirements and merits the support of city council.

The best way forward for Hamilton — economically, socially, and environmentally — is a development framework that encourages smart and sustainable redevelopment of the city's large inventory of unused and underused real estate for a gentle intensification in preference over yet more costly sprawl.

Specifically, I am in favour of the proposed inclusionary zoning for low-density urban residential neighbourhoods, and the building of fourplexes in these neighbourhoods. Hamilton needs to plan for a sustainable future in order to succeed.

Sincerely,
Howard Cole

4.6 (ag)

Pilon, Janet

Subject: In support of Density and stopping sprawl

From: Chris Ritsma

Sent: May 24, 2022 11:33 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Cc: Farr, Jason <Jason.Farr@hamilton.ca>; Wilson, Maureen <Maureen.Wilson@hamilton.ca>; Nann, Nrinder <Nrinder.Nann@hamilton.ca>; Merulla, Sam <Sam.Merulla@hamilton.ca>; Jackson, Tom <Tom.Jackson@hamilton.ca>; Pauls, Esther <Esther.Pauls@hamilton.ca>; Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>; Clark, Brad <Brad.Clark@hamilton.ca>; Pearson, Maria <Maria.Pearson@hamilton.ca>; Johnson, Brenda <Brenda.Johnson@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; VanderBeek, Arlene <Arlene.VanderBeek@hamilton.ca>; Whitehead, Terry <Terry.Whitehead@hamilton.ca>; Partridge, Judi <Judi.Partridge@hamilton.ca>; Office of the Mayor <Officeofthe.Mayor@hamilton.ca>; Powers, Russ <Russ.Powers@hamilton.ca>

Subject: In support of Density and stopping sprawl

Hello Council,

I am reaching out because I want you to know that I support farmers, and avoiding paving our most precious resources with more sprawl. This is related to the upcoming vote to ratify the no urban boundary expansion proposal.

I also want to make it clear that duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes do not ruin neighbourhoods. I live in a duplex, and lived in a triplex prior to this. I live on a street of single family homes, small 2 and 3 storey apartment buildings, and many multi-unit buildings.

These alternate living options mean that my neighbourhood has families, singles, young couples, seniors, and people who are blue collar, white collar, and a broad range of income levels. I have spoken to, and made friends with my neighbours from all kinds of lives. It makes my neighbourhood rich with culture and experience. Multi-plexes allow people to enter a neighbourhood that is otherwise exclusive to certain types of people.

I love living downtown, but have many friends who want to live further out but have no smaller options. They don't want a full sized house, but with few apartment, duplex or townhome options they are only able to find housing in limited areas of the city.

For this reason, and reasons related to a climate emergency, stopping sprawl, tax efficiency, I support allowing 4-plexes on all properties in the city of Hamilton, I support staff recommendations, and that their proposal conforms to provincial expectations, and I support inclusionary zoning, and by-laws that encourage affordable homes.

Regards,

Chris Ritsma
Ward 2 Resident.



4.6 (ah)

May 16, 2022

GSAI File No. 1137-002

City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, ON
L8P 4Y5

Attention: Lisa Kelsey, Legislative Coordinator

RE: **GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review**
City of Hamilton

Dear Chair and Members:

Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. (GSAI) are the planning consultants for Castandgrey 5 Corp and Castandgrey 7 Corp, who own lands within the Elfrida Whitebelt area which are municipally known as 407 Fletcher Road and 406 – 526 Fletcher Road. Our client has been actively participating the City’s GRIDS 2 and MCR Process and has submitted correspondences dated December 9, 2020 and October 7, 2021.

GSAI has been participating in the City’s ongoing MCR process. We understand that this process will culminate in a comprehensive Official Plan Amendment (‘OPA’) that will modify policy permissions for lands across the City of Hamilton, including the Subject Property. We understand the City of Hamilton is completing the MCR process to update the Urban and Rural Hamilton Official Plans to conform with Provincial planning documents and to implement City Council’s direction for the “No Urban Boundary Expansion” growth scenario.

In our opinion, City Council’s decision to maintain a firm urban boundary to the year 2051 does not conform to the MCR policy requirements outlined in A Place to Growth: Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe, 2020 (the ‘Growth Plan’) and is inconsistent with the Province of Ontario’s Land Needs Assessment Methodology. Our opinion herein is consistent with the technical opinion provided by City staff and its consultants through the Land Needs Assessment, in that additional urban boundary expansion is required to meet projected population and employment growth to the year 2051.

We support a growth management strategy across the City of Hamilton that conforms with the policies of the Growth Plan and is consistent with the Provincial Land Needs Assessment Methodology. We believe that it is good planning to allocate future growth through intensification in the existing urban area supported by sufficient community services, infrastructure, and amenities and new growth that achieves compact, walkable, and sustainable communities in the new urban expansion areas. We do not believe the City’s “No Urban Boundary Expansion” growth scenario and corresponding OPAs achieve this balance of growth.

10 KINGSBRIDGE GARDEN CIRCLE
SUITE 700
MISSISSAUGA, ONTARIO
L5R 3K6
TEL (905) 568-8888
FAX (905) 568-8894
www.gsai.ca



We continue to support City staff's recommendation that an urban boundary expansion into the City's existing Community Area Whitebelt lands, including the Elfrida, Twenty Road East, and Twenty Road West lands, are required to accommodate population and employment growth to the year 2051. We maintain the position that Elfrida lands, in its entirety, remain a logical, appropriate, and needed expansion to the City's urban boundary. Through the previous GRIDS 1 and subsequently the Elfrida Secondary Plan process, a Nodes and Corridors land use structure was endorsed. Following GRIDS 1, significant resources were spent to implement the City's growth management strategy, which includes a subwatershed study for the Elfrida lands, and the extension of services. An urban boundary expansion into the City's Community Area Whitebelt lands, including the Elfrida lands, provides a balanced growth strategy to accommodate a market-based approach for housing supply, while prioritizing key growth management objectives such as climate change, complete communities, preserving and enhancing the natural heritage system and effectively planning around existing and planned infrastructure.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. Our Client wishes to be informed of updates and future meetings. Please feel free to contact the undersigned if there are any questions.

Yours very truly,

GLEN SCHNARR & ASSOCIATES INC.

Colin Chung, MCIP, RPP
Managing Partner

cc. Mr. Steve Robichaud, City of Hamilton
Mr. Heather Travis, City of Hamilton
Castandgrey 5 Corp and Castandgrey 7 Corp
Mr. Chris Barnett, Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt LLP

Pilon, Janet

Subject: WRITTEN SUBMISSION - CITY COUNCIL MEETING MAY 25, 2022

From: Kevin Gonci

Sent: May 22, 2022 1:45 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: WRITTEN SUBMISSION - CITY COUNCIL MEETING MAY 25, 2022

Please accept the attached correspondence for submission to the Agenda of the May 25th City Council meeting.

Kevin Gonci

**Toronto 2015 Pan and Parapan American Games
Backgrounder on Auditor General of Ontario Special Report, June 2016**

The Toronto 2015 Pan American and Parapan American Games (Games) were held as scheduled in July and August 2015. About 10,000 athletes, coaches and officials from 41 countries participated in the Games at 44 training and competition venues spread over 16 municipalities in the Greater Toronto and Greater Golden Horseshoe areas.

On September 30, 2015, the Legislature's Standing Committee on Public Accounts (Committee) unanimously passed a motion requesting that the Auditor General conduct a value-for-money audit of the 2015 Toronto Pan Am/Parapan Am Games (Games).

Detailed Audit Observations

The Games were primarily funded by the three levels of government. Our audit shows that the total cost of the Games (including organizing and hosting the Games, and the Athletes' Village) was about \$2.529 billion, and when compared to our adjusted bid budget of \$2.187 billion, the Games came in at \$342 million or 15.6% over budget. Ontario committed to cover most of the budget overruns and additional costs associated with organizing and hosting the Games, which ended up being about **\$304 million.**

- It's worth noting that the original bid cost estimate (2009) was \$1.429 billion dollars.
- A variety of sources made a commitment towards the \$1.429 billion dollars including:
 - \$500 million from the Federal government.
 - \$500 million from the Provincial government.
 - \$198 million from the Municipal government.
 - \$84 million from universities.
 - \$147 million from Games hosting (ticket sales/broadcast rights/sponsorships).
- The Athlete's Village (housing athletes, coaches and officials) was budgeted separately at \$1 billion.
- By March 2016 the bid cost estimate had increased to \$1.717 billion and the cost for the Athlete's Village had decreased to \$687 million after reducing the size and scope of the housing plan and reallocating these funds to the Games operating costs.
- Between 2009 to 2014, the municipal contribution increased incrementally from 1.429 – 1.505 – 1.766 – 1.867 million dollars.

- Major Categories of Expenses for the 2015 Toronto Pan Am/Parapan Am Games

EXPENSE	ORIGINAL ESTIMATE (2009)	ESTIMATED ACTUAL (2016)
Capital/Venues	\$638 million	\$708 million
Transportation	\$19 million	\$95 million
Essential Services	\$48 million	\$108 million
Sport, Venues, Overlay	\$99 million	\$144 million
Marketing and Communications	\$113 million	\$130 million
Operations and Village	\$68 million	\$77 million

- Comparison of Revenue Projections to Actual

SOURCE OF REVENUE	ORIGINAL ESTIMATE (2009)	ESTIMATED ACTUAL (2016)
Sponsorships (Cash)	\$61.310 million	\$35.828 million
*Ticket Sales	\$38.25 million	\$36.94 million
Licensing	\$3.65 million	\$2.08 million
Broadcast Rights	\$2.61 million	\$0.30 million

*Calculation includes deduction of \$2.3M paid to ticket vendor.

Completion and Performance Bonuses

TO2015 offered all of its staff an annual performance bonus. The annual performance incentive plans provided for a payout range of up to 5% of base salary for general staff and up to 30% for senior management based on weighted individual and collective performance.

Despite there being performance deficiencies, the total annual performance and completion bonuses paid was \$15.8 million (between 2011 and 2016). Salary disclosures on Ontario's 2015 "sunshine list" indicated that four of the 10 highest-paid provincial and broader-public-sector employees were Games executives, who each received an average of \$815,000, including annual salary, annual performance bonuses for the fiscal years 2015 and 2016, and completion bonuses, all paid out in the 2015 calendar year.

Security

The Games took place in Toronto and 15 municipalities in the surrounding area, a broad geographical footprint for a major international sporting event of this kind. This required complex security coverage from several partners at all venues, plus the Athletes' Village and satellite villages for athletes competing at more distant sites, and training facilities.

The Ontario Provincial Police (OPP) established the Integrated Security Unit (ISU) with representation from the RCMP and the eight regional and municipal police forces to lead overall security planning, integrate security prior to the start of the Games, and lead security during the Games.

2015 Pan Am/Parapan Am Games Security – Special Report (November 2014)

The total security budget for the Games being funded by Ontario, including both OPP/ISU and TO2015 budget allocations, has increased from \$121.9 million in the 2009 Bid budget to \$247.4 million as of September 2014. Key cost components of this budget include: \$57 million for the OPP, **\$101.5 million for municipal police services** and \$81 million for contract private security services.

- Comparison of Security Costs and Event Size at Recent International Sport Events

EVENT	ORIGINAL SECURITY BUDGET	PROJECT FINAL SECURITY BUDGET
Toronto 2015 Pan Am Games	\$121.9 million	\$247.4 million
Vancouver 2010 Winter Olympics	\$175 million	\$869 million
London 2012 Summer Olympics	\$362.9 million	\$1.508 Billion
Glasgow 2014 Commonwealth Games	\$47 million	\$156.6 million

Other Costs

We reviewed the budgets and costing of various venues to assess if all significant components were included to reflect the true cost of the facilities. **We believe the following items should have been included in the capital cost of the projects in relation to site preparation and remediation.**

- Toronto Pan Am Sports Centre at the University of Toronto Scarborough Campus: The site was formerly a waste landfill site operated by the City of Toronto. The City and the University together incurred remediation costs of **\$30.1** million to prepare the site for construction (The City paid about 42% and the University about 58%).
- Markham Pan Am Centre: The Town of Markham paid **\$9.4** million to remediate the site, which was once an industrial area with a road-maintenance depot and car-repair shops.
- Tim Hortons Field: The City of Hamilton spent about **\$2.3** million to demolish the old Ivor Wynne Stadium and to remediate the site.

These costs, totalling about \$42 million, should be considered part of the total Games capital costs as they were directly related to venue-selection decisions and to construction of the facilities.

Athlete's Village

As part of the commitment to host the Games, TO2015 was required to provide the Pan American Village to accommodate at least 8,400 athletes, coaches and officials.

In its 2009 bid, the province said the Village would be built on 80 acres of the 200-acre provincially-owned West Don Lands, a vacant property earmarked by Toronto City Council in 2005 for redevelopment as a mixed-use community and **in September 2011, the development and construction costs of the Athletes' Village was estimated at \$871 million and did not include the site remediation cost of \$140 million.**

Athlete's Village – Reduction of Scope

When the project went to the Ontario Treasury Board for approval in 2010, the planned capacity for the Village was reduced to 8,000 and eventually 7,200 beds from 8,500, and the number of future residential units was cut to 1,853 from 2,067 followed by a further reduction of capacity in 2011.

The training venues were also dropped because the land on which they would have been built was heavily contaminated and would be too costly to clean up. As well, the planned green initiative to use lake water to cool and heat the buildings was determined to be costly and technically unfeasible and was also eliminated. Offsetting costs included the sale of condos to the public following the Games (\$324M) and sale of the buildings to two non-profit organizations (\$71M).

Transfer of Land to Developer

The West Don Lands site for the Village development consists of eight blocks. Of these, only five were required for permanent buildings for the Games, and these were collectively called Stage 1 lands. In addition, land on the site valued at \$49 million was included in the Request for Proposals process and was transferred to the successful bidder as part of the final contract at a nominal cost of \$10.

The Stage 2 lands consist of a gross area of 788,886 sq. ft., and can be developed into 970 condo units. The value of the Stage 2 lands is estimated to be **\$48.9 million**. The developer is expected to develop these blocks after the Games at its own cost, and is entitled to all the revenues from them.

The development cost of the Village did not include the value of the land provided to the developer and the other third parties (the YMCA, George Brown College, and two other not-for-profit organizations) for a token fee of \$10 each. **The \$118.6-million fair value of all this land should have been included in the development cost to reflect the real economic cost to the province.**

Municipal Considerations

- Responsibility for mandatory hosting fee of **\$43.7 million** paid to the Commonwealth Games Federation?
- Responsibility for cost overruns (Birmingham contingency cost **\$280 million**)?
- Responsibility for Private sector contribution shortfalls (Birmingham **\$47.6 million**)?
- Responsibility for revenue shortfalls (ticket sales/sponsorships/licensing/broadcasting rights)?
- Responsibility for Security/Policing costs (Birmingham currently **\$353 million**)?
- Funding of Games-specific capital projects (permits, site plan exemptions)?
- Consideration of land value and site remediation?
- Potential delays/impact to current list of municipal capital projects?
- City of Hamilton Staff Report (2019) Municipal contribution estimated between **\$200 and \$300 million**.
- Municipal services to support Games hosting (Birmingham **\$58 million**) including:
 - EMS
 - Fire rescue
 - street cleaning
 - parks maintenance
 - parking operations & enforcement
 - garbage and recycling collection
 - traffic signal maintenance & operations
 - graffiti removal
 - water & sewer maintenance
 - street lighting
 - by-law enforcement
 - municipal staffing

Pilon, Janet

Subject: Chedoke Estate (1 Balfour Dr.) – Council May 25th

From: Sarah Sheehan

Sent: May 24, 2022 11:59 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: Chedoke Estate (1 Balfour Dr.) – Council May 25th

Mr. Mayor, respected Councillors:

I'm writing to you to strenuously object to the proposed 17-year lease to the current bidder, as part of the sole-sourced, unsolicited bid.

This is a poor deal for the citizens of Hamilton and for Ontarians, for a number of reasons:

1. The bidder would get Chedoke rent-free. This is not customary for commercial leases, where tenants make capital investments and pay commercial rent.
2. Public access would be restricted to weekdays before 4 p.m., until 2039 — severely limiting access to a building that is publicly owned, and was generously given to the public by the donor. It's just too important to be put in private hands.
3. With Chedoke, transparency and timing of meetings (during COVID and Grey Cup Week) have presented serious difficulties for public engagement. The ward councillor was on leave for much of the process.
4. Since the unsolicited, sole-sourced bid in 2019, the city has been reactive — rather than developing its own, proactive vision for Chedoke. There are plenty of lovely, privately owned properties in the area. The proposed use, which would close the property for 17 years, isn't a good fit for a publicly owned venue.
5. For such an incredible potential visitors' attraction, privatizing Chedoke would be a missed opportunity.
6. Forgone revenue is another unknown. Some quick calculations suggest this property could generate significantly more revenue via events. Compare the Enoch Turner Schoolhouse, a heritage property that generates substantial revenue as an event space. Enoch Turner is a much smaller property, but can earn up to about approx. \$1.5 M per year in event revenue, from weddings alone — the same in a single year as the entire 17-year investment by the current bidder.

Chedoke is an inspiring place that all Hamiltonians and Ontarians deserve access to. Let's keep Chedoke public.

Regards,

—Dr. Sarah Sheehan

References:

Star print edition: "Access for all to heritage properties" (May 23, 2022, A13) | online: "[Everyone deserves access to our Ontario Heritage Trust properties. Let's keep Chedoke public](https://www.thestar.com/opinion/contributors/2022/05/23/everyone-deserves-access-to-our-ontario-heritage-trust-properties-lets-keep-chedoke-public.html)"
<https://www.thestar.com/opinion/contributors/2022/05/23/everyone-deserves-access-to-our-ontario-heritage-trust-properties-lets-keep-chedoke-public.html>



Everyone deserves access to our Ontario Heritage Trust properties. Let's keep Chedoke public | The Star

Chedoke is Hamilton's last great escarpment estate. This week, councillors are set to ratify a proposal to lease it for private use.

www.thestar.com

Sincerely,
Dr. Sarah Sheehan

CITY OF HAMILTON

NOTICE OF MOTION

Council: May 25, 2022

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR S. MERULLA.....

Budget Increase for the Housing for Hamilton Community Improvement Plan (CIP) for the Roxborough Mixed Income/Tenure Demonstration Project

WHEREAS, in 2019 the City of Hamilton approved the Housing for Hamilton Community Improvement Plan (CIP) for the Roxborough Mixed Income/Tenure Demonstration Project;

WHEREAS, the intent of the CIP is to establish an innovative demonstration project for a joint public-private housing redevelopment which will deliver a mix of market and below market homeownership and rental housing options through the redevelopment of approximately 12.5 acres of land within the McQueston neighbourhood in East Hamilton;

WHEREAS, the City's financial contribution under the CIP is primarily in the form of waivers of Development Charges and Parkland Dedication Fees;

WHEREAS, the Roxborough Demonstration Project was envisioned to deliver approximately 650-750 mixed income and mixed tenure residential units including 103 family-oriented Rent-Geared-to-Income and affordable rental units to be owned and operated by City Housing Hamilton, over 200 multi-residential rental units with capped rents, approximately 200 - 250 below market homeownership townhouse units; and approximately 100 -150 maisonettes and condominium units geared towards seniors and smaller households;

WHEREAS, the 103 unit City Housing Hamilton building is nearly complete and the first 126 below market home ownership townhouse units are under construction;

WHEREAS, the Roxborough Development Group has now secured Preliminary Approval with CMHC for participation in the Rental Construction Financing Initiative (RCFI) program designed to facilitate the construction of new rental housing that is attainable and affordable, which would allow the Roxborough Demonstration Project to construct 352 affordable rental units, far surpassing the minimum 200 rental units required by the City's CIP;

WHEREAS, the affordability benchmark for the rental units would exceed the affordability threshold established by the City's CIP, such that rents for new tenancies would be capped at not more than 90% of existing market rents for comparable product (10% below market, at minimum) and rents on 20% of the units (70 suites) must be set at rents not to exceed 30% of Household income for the Hamilton CMA;

WHEREAS, a pre-condition of the federal RCFI program funding is that the municipality also make a contribution toward the project, which would be satisfied by the City's Development Charge contribution under the CIP;

WHEREAS, expanding the scope of the City's CIP to provide for significantly more rental units as well as enhanced affordability for all rental units will require an expansion to the CIP's current budget of approximately \$10.5 million; and

WHEREAS, there is a significant time sensitivity to confirming the City's support in order to leverage the federal support.

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED

- (a) That the budget for the Housing for Hamilton Community Improvement Plan (CIP) for the Roxborough Mixed Income/Tenure Demonstration Project be increased by an amount up to \$4.4 million in order to support the expansion of the project to include approximately 352 affordable rental units and to secure an enhanced level of rental affordability, to be funded first from any 2022 favourable Housing Services Division surplus and second from the Unallocated Capital Reserve (Reserve # 108020); and
- (b) That the General Manager of Healthy and Safe Communities and the General Manager of Corporate Services be authorized and directed to enter into any necessary agreements for the provision of the enhanced funding under the CIP, in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor.

CITY OF HAMILTON

NOTICE OF MOTION

Council: May 25, 2022

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR E. PAULS.....

Amendment to Item 3.1 of Council Minutes 22-001 respecting the Amendment to the Mandatory COVID-19 Vaccination Verification Policy (HUR21008(a)) (City Wide)

WHEREAS, Council on January 12, 2022 approved the amendment to the Mandatory COVID-19 Vaccination Verification Policy (HUR21008(a)), requiring those unvaccinated staff or those who have not disclosed their vaccination status will have until May 31, 2022 to provide proof of full vaccination, or an approved medical exemption, at which time any failure to do so will result in their termination of employment with the City; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary to provide those unvaccinated staff or those who have not disclosed their vaccination status with more time to provide proof of full vaccination, or an approved medical exemption;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

That Item 3.1 of the January 12, 2022 Council Minutes be **amended** to change the date of May 31, 2022 to **September 30, 2022**, to read as follows:

3.1 Amendment to the Mandatory COVID-19 Vaccination Verification Policy (HUR21008(a)) (City Wide)

- (a) That the recommended amendments to the Mandatory COVID-19 Vaccination Verification Policy (attached as Appendix "A" to Report HUR21008(a)), requiring proof of full vaccination in the workplace, and that, those unvaccinated staff, or those staff choosing not to disclose their vaccination status, without an approved medical exemption, be subject to discipline up to and including termination of employment, be approved;
- (b) That those unvaccinated staff or those who have not disclosed their vaccination status will have until **September 30, 2022** to provide proof of full vaccination, or an approved medical exemption, at which time any failure to do so will result in their termination of employment with the City;
- (c) That unvaccinated employees or those who do not disclose their vaccination status, and those employees who are subject to an approved exemption, will be required to continue to participate in the rapid testing program until **September 30, 2022**;

- (d) That, in the event the City is unable to secure an adequate and appropriate supply of rapid tests between the date of the amended policy and **September 30, 2022**, any employee who would otherwise be restricted from attendance at work will be placed on a paid leave of absence, pending the continuation of the program at the earliest available opportunity;
- (e) That the amended Mandatory COVID-19 Vaccination Verification Policy (attached as Appendix "A" to Report HUR21008(a)), continues to apply to all City employees, including permanent, temporary, full-time, part-time, casual, volunteers, students, members of Council and members of Council appointed committees, as appropriate and except where excluded otherwise, subject to the terms and conditions of applicable collective agreements; and,
- (f) That the City Clerk be directed to report to the Governance Review Sub-Committee with recommendations for amendments to the Council Code of Conduct and the Code of Conduct for local Boards and Council mandated Committees to ensure Member compliance with the Corporate Vaccination Policy and how sanctions may be applied to members of Council who do not comply.

Authority: Item 12, Committee of the Whole
Report 01-033 (PD01184)
CM: October 16, 2001
Ward: 10

Bill No. 124

CITY OF HAMILTON

BY-LAW NO. 22-

To Repeal and Replace By-Law No. 22-110 Removal of Part Lot Control, Block 1, Registered Plan No. 62M-1283, municipally known as 1288 Baseline Road, Stoney Creek

WHEREAS the sub-section 50(5) of the *Planning Act*, (R.S.O. 1990, Chapter P.13, as amended, establishes part-lot control on land within registered plans of subdivision;

AND WHEREAS sub-section 50(7) of the *Planning Act*, provides as follows:

“(7) **Designation of lands not subject to part lot control.** -- Despite Subsection (5), the council of a local municipality may by by-law provide that Subsection (5) does not apply to land that is within such registered plan or plans of subdivision or parts of them as are designated in the by-law.”

AND WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton is desirous of enacting such a by-law with respect to the lands hereinafter described;

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

1. Sub-section 5 of Section 50 of the *Planning Act*, for the purpose of creating 60 Parcels of Tied Land (POTL's) for street townhouse dwellings and back to back townhouse dwellings, shown as Parts 1 to 60 inclusive, Parts 62 to 77 inclusive, and Parts 79 to 84 inclusive, access and maintenance easements (Parts 62 to 77 inclusive, and Parts 79 to 84 inclusive) and condominium common elements including a private road network, visitor parking, sidewalks, amenities, and an amenity area (Parts 61 and 78) as shown on Deposited Reference Plan 62R-21862, shall not apply to the portion of the registered plan of subdivision that is designated as follows, namely:

Block 1, Registered Plan No. 62M-1283, in the City of Hamilton.

2. City of Hamilton By-law No. 22-110 is hereby repealed in its entirety.
3. This by-law shall be registered on title to the said designated land and shall come into force and effect on the date of such registration.

To Repeal and Replace By-Law No. 22-110
Removal of Part Lot Control, Block 1, Registered Plan No. 62M-1283,
municipally known as 1288 Baseline Road, Stoney Creek

Page 2 of 2

4. This by-law shall expire and cease to be of any force or effect on the 25th day of May, 2024.
5. **PASSED** this 25th day of May 2022.

M. Wilson
Acting Mayor

A. Holland
City Clerk

PLC-22-004