



City of Hamilton

CITY COUNCIL ADDENDUM

24-012

Wednesday, June 12, 2024, 9:30 A.M.

Council Chambers

Hamilton City Hall

71 Main Street West

5. COMMUNICATIONS

*5.9 Correspondence from Watson & Associates Economists Ltd. respecting an Assessment of Bill 185, Cutting Red Tape to Build More Homes Act, 2024.

Recommendation: Be received.

*5.10 Correspondence from Nicholas Charitsis, Chair, Justice of the Peace Appointments Advisory Committee respecting a notice of Justice of the Peace Vacancies.

Recommendation: Be received.

*5.11 Correspondence from Pride Hamilton respecting the motion which proposes prohibiting the closure of pathways at Pier 4 Park during the Pride Hamilton event and replacing the planned fencing with additional security and signage:

*a. Stephanie Adams, Co-Director of Fund Development

*b. Michael Harper, Director of Finance

*c. Bonnie Barlow, Board Administrator

*d. Matt Sbrissa, Co-Director of Fund Development

*e. Kiel Hughes, Chair, Director of Events

*f. Adrian DiPietro, Director of Outreach/Vendors

Recommendation: Be received and referred to the June 20, 2024
Emergency and Community Services Committee meeting.

*5.12 Correspondence from Durmalouk Kesibi and Tarek Malouhi in opposition to the development and rezoning under ZAC-24-006 and UHOP 24-002.

Recommendation: Be received and referred to the consideration of Item 1 of Planning Committee Report 24-008.

*5.13 Correspondence from Tim Potocic, President, Sonic Unyon Records respecting use of Pier 4 Park during the upcoming Because Beer Craft Beer Festival (July 12-14, 2024).

Recommendation: Be received and referred to the June 20, 2024, Emergency and Community Services Committee meeting.

*5.14 Correspondence from Alia Karim, Senior Research Officer, CUPE National Office urging the City of Hamilton to declare Hamilton as a "No Paid Plasma Zone".

Recommendation: Be received and referred to the consideration of Item 10 of Public Health Committee Report 24-005.

*5.15 Correspondence from Greg Dunnett, President & CEO, Hamilton Chamber of Commerce respecting the Stormwater Fee Financial Incentive Program.

Recommendation: Be received and referred to the consideration of Item 1 of General Issues Committee Report 24-010.

7. MOTIONS

*7.10 Amendment to By-law 16-290, Council Code of Conduct

8. NOTICES OF MOTIONS

*8.1 Amendment to Item 7 of the Emergency and Community Services Report 24-004, respecting Ward 2 Community Grants - Food Insecurity Programming Q1 and Q2 2024 (Ward 2), which was approved by Council on May 22, 2024

(A request to waive the rules will be introduced)

11. PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

Members of the public can contact the Clerk's Office to acquire the documents considered at this meeting, in an alternate format.

April 11, 2024

To Our Municipal Clients:

Re: Assessment of Bill 185, *Cutting Red Tape to Build More Homes Act, 2024*

On behalf of our many municipal clients, we are writing to inform you of the Ontario Legislature's proposed changes to the *Development Charges Act* (D.C.A.) under Bill 185 (*Cutting Red Tape to Build More Homes Act*) and to Ontario Regulation 82/98 under the D.C.A. These proposed changes are with respect to:

- The definition of eligible capital costs (to include certain studies);
- The removal of the mandatory phase-in of charges;
- The process for minor amendments to development charge (D.C.) by-laws;
- A reduction of time for the D.C. rate freeze related to site plan and zoning by-law amendment planning applications;
- Modernizing public notice requirements; and
- Implementation of the Affordable Residential Unit exemptions.

Further details with respect to these proposed changes are provided below.

With respect to changes to the *Planning Act* arising from Bill 185, Watson will be preparing a subsequent letter summarizing the changes.

1. Revised Definition of Capital Costs

On November 28, 2022, the Province enacted Bill 23, *More Homes Built Faster Act*, which included a number of discounts, exemptions, and reductions to D.C.s. As part of this legislation, the definition of capital costs (subsection 5 (3) of the D.C.A.) was amended to remove studies, including D.C. background studies.

Bill 185 proposes to reverse the capital cost amendments of the *More Homes Built Faster Act* (Bill 23) by reinstating studies as an eligible capital cost. The following paragraphs are proposed to be added to subsection 5 (3) of the D.C.A.:

5. *Costs to undertake studies in connection with any of the matters referred to in paragraphs 1 to 4.*
6. *Costs of the development charge background study required under section 10.*



The proposed amendment will allow municipalities to fund studies, consistent with by-laws passed prior to the *More Homes Built Faster Act* (Bill 23). This will allow for the funding of master plans, D.C. background studies, and similar studies that inform the capital costs of the D.C. background study.

2. Removal of the Mandatory Phase-in

The *More Homes Built Faster Act* (Bill 23) required the phase-in of charges imposed in a D.C. by-law over a five-year term. D.C. by-laws passed after January 1, 2022, were required to phase-in the calculated charges as follows:

- Year 1 of the by-law – 80% of the charges could be imposed;
- Year 2 of the by-law – 85% of the charges could be imposed;
- Year 3 of the by-law – 90% of the charges could be imposed;
- Year 4 of the by-law – 95% of the charges could be imposed; and
- Years 5 to 10 of the by-law – 100% of the charges could be imposed.

Bill 185 proposes to remove the mandatory phase-in of the charges. It is proposed that this change would be effective for D.C. by-laws passed after Bill 185 comes into effect.

For site plan and zoning by-law amendment applications that were made prior to Bill 185 receiving Royal Assent, the charges payable will be the charges that were in place on the day the planning application was made (i.e., including the applicable mandatory phase-in).

Note, the Bill also proposes to allow minor amendments to D.C. by-laws that include these phase-in provisions. As provided in further detail below, these amendments would not require the preparation of a D.C. background study or undertake the statutory public process, and the amendments would not be subject to Ontario Land Tribunal appeal. This provision will only be available for a period of six months after Bill 185 takes effect.

3. Process for Minor Amendments to D.C. By-laws

Section 19 of the D.C.A. requires that a municipality must follow sections 10 through 18 of the D.C.A. (with necessary modifications) when amending D.C. by-laws. Sections 10 through 18 of the D.C.A. generally require the following:

- Completion of a D.C. background study, including the requirement to post the background study 60 days prior to passage of the D.C. by-law;
- Passage of a D.C. by-law within one year of the completion of the D.C. background study;
- A public meeting, including notice requirements; and
- The ability to appeal the by-law to the Ontario Land Tribunal.



Bill 185 proposes to allow municipalities to undertake minor amendments to D.C. by-laws for the following purposes without adherence to the requirements noted above (with the exception of the notice requirements):

1. To repeal a provision of the D.C. by-law specifying the date the by-law expires or to amend the provision to extend the expiry date (subject to the 10-year limitations provided in the D.C.A.);
2. To impose D.C.s for studies, including the D.C. background study; and
3. To remove the provisions related to the mandatory phase-in of D.C.s as discussed in section 2 of this letter.

Minor amendments related to items 2 and 3 noted above may be undertaken only if the D.C. by-law being amended was passed after November 28, 2022, and before Bill 185 takes effect. Moreover, the amending by-law must be passed within six months of Bill 185 taking effect.

Notice requirements for these minor amending by-laws are similar to the typical notice requirements, with the exception of the requirement to identify the last day for appealing the by-law (as these provisions do not apply).

4. Reduction of D.C. Rate Freeze Timeframe

Bill 108, *More Homes, More Choices Act, 2019*, which received Royal Assent on June 6, 2019, provided several changes to the D.C.A. including the requirement to freeze the D.C.s imposed on certain developments. This applied to developments that were subject to a site plan and/or a zoning by-law amendment application. The D.C. rate for these developments is “frozen” at the rates that were in effect at the time the site plan and/or a zoning by-law amendment application was submitted (subject to applicable interest). Once the application is approved by the municipality, if the date the D.C. is payable^[1] is more than two years from the approval date, the D.C. rate freeze would no longer apply.

Bill 185 proposes to reduce the two-year timeframe to 18 months and move this timeframe from being identified in O. Reg. 82/98 to being identified in the D.C.A. Transition provisions are included that require the two-year D.C. “freeze” for site plan and zoning by-law amendment applications that were approved prior to Bill 185 receiving Royal Assent to remain in effect.

^[1] In the case of Rental Housing and Institutional development, once the application is approved by the municipality, if the date the first building permit is issued is more than two years after the date of approval, the D.C. rate freeze would no longer apply.



Note that the streamlined process for minor amending by-laws does not appear to include the ability to amend D.C. by-laws to meet this legislative change.

5. Other Proposed Changes

Along with the proposed legislative changes outlined in Bill 185, the Province has identified related proposed regulatory changes regarding modernization of the public notice requirements. In addition, the Province has noted that implementation of the Affordable Residential Unit exemption will occur on June 1, 2024.

5.1 Modernizing Public Notice Requirements

The D.C.A. sets out the requirements for municipalities to give notice of public meetings and of by-law passage. These requirements are prescribed in sections 9 and 10 of O. Reg. 82/98 and include giving notice in a newspaper of sufficiently general circulation in the area to which the by-law would apply. The proposed regulatory changes would modernize public notice requirements by allowing municipalities to provide notice on a municipal website if a local newspaper is not available.

5.2 Implementing the Affordable Residential Unit Exemption

The More Homes Built Faster Act (Bill 23) identified an exemption for Affordable Residential Units. This exemption was subsequently revised through Bill 134, *Affordable Homes and Good Jobs Act, 2023*, which received Royal Assent on December 4, 2023. The exemption is summarized as follows:

- Affordable Rental: Where the rent is no greater than the lesser of the income based affordable rent^[1] set out in the Affordable Residential Units Bulletin and the average market rent identified in the Affordable Residential Units Bulletin.
- Affordable Owned Unit: Where the price of the residential unit is no greater than the lesser of the income-based affordable purchase price^[2] set out in the Affordable Residential Units Bulletin and 90% of the average purchase price identified in the Affordable Residential Units Bulletin.

^[1] Based on the 60th percentile of gross annual incomes for renter households in the applicable local municipality and where the rent is equal to 30% of the income of the household.

^[2] Based on the 60th percentile of gross annual incomes for households in the applicable local municipality and where the purchase price would result in annual accommodation costs equal to 30 per cent of the income of the household.



The Provincial Backgrounder has indicated that this exemption will come into force on June 1, 2024, and that the Affordable Residential Units Bulletin will be posted on Ontario.ca.

Note, no commentary has been provided on the Attainable Unit exemption at this time.

6. Summary Comments on the Proposed Amendments

Many of these changes to the D.C.A. appear positive for municipalities by assisting in ensuring that growth pays for growth to the extent possible. This is achieved by allowing for the inclusion of growth-related studies that will allow municipalities to appropriately plan for additional development. Furthermore, the removal of the mandatory phase-in provisions ensures discounts to D.C.s are not provided to development and redevelopment that municipalities do not aim to incentivize. The reduction in the D.C. rate freeze timeline helps to ensure development that is not proceeding quickly does not receive D.C. discounts. Additionally, the ability to make minor amendments to D.C. by-laws to align with the legislative changes without onerous administrative requirements will assist municipalities in aligning policies with the amended legislation quickly. Modernizing the public notice requirements further assists municipalities in areas where there is no local newspaper.

With respect to the implementation of the Affordable Residential Unit exemption on June 1, 2024, as stated in previous correspondence, while it is an admirable goal to create additional affordable housing units, further D.C., community benefits charge, and parkland exemptions will continue to provide further financial burdens on municipalities to fund these exemptions.

Watson will be providing a submission through the Environmental Registry of Ontario on these legislative changes. Watson will also be seeking an opportunity to speak as a delegation to the Standing Committee, if possible, to provide our comments on behalf of our municipal clients. We will continue to monitor the progress of Bill 185 through the legislature and will continue to keep our clients informed of any changes. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours very truly,

WATSON & ASSOCIATES ECONOMISTS LTD.

Daryl Abbs, MBE, PLE, Managing Partner
Andrew Grunda, MBA, CPA, CMA, Principal
Jamie Cook, MCIP, RPP, PLE, Managing Partner
Peter Simcisko, BA (Hons), MBE, Managing Partner
Sean-Michael Stephen, MBA, Managing Partner
Jack Ammendolia, BES, PLE, Managing Partner

**Justices of the Peace Appointments
Advisory Committee**

720 Bay Street, 3rd Floor
Toronto ON M7A 2S9
Telephone : 437 233-6900
Fax : 416 326-4065
Email : jpaac.info@ontario.ca

**Comité consultatif sur la nomination
des juges de paix**

720, rue Bay, 3^e étage
Toronto ON M7A 2S9
Téléphone : 437 233-6900
Télécopieur : 416 326-4065
Courriel : jpaac.info@ontario.ca



June 6, 2024

I am writing you in my capacity as Chair of the Justices of the Peace Appointments Advisory Committee.

The Committee is mandated by the Attorney General of Ontario to provide a list of recommended candidates that exhibit the traits and characteristics of a Justice of the Peace to fill the vacancies that arise on the Justice of the Peace Bench. As you know, these important judicial officers are critical to the efficient functioning of our courts, with jurisdiction over the majority of provincial regulatory offences, municipal by-law prosecutions and most bail hearings, among other duties.

Justices of the peace are recruited from the communities they serve with a focus on recruiting individuals who have strong connections to the community. It is critical that all Ontarians see themselves reflected on the Bench, so the Committee is especially committed to connecting with prospective candidates from diverse communities, with particular emphasis on Indigenous and bi-lingual communities. Justices of the Peace do not need to have prior legal training as a lawyer or paralegal. All Justices of the Peace that are appointed go through an extensive education process and are mentored throughout their careers on the bench.

As leaders in your community, your knowledge and guidance would be most appreciated in identifying potential candidates for this important role. We are asking for your support in distributing our notice of vacancies.

For more information on the vacancies, the JPAAC process and the role of justices of the peace in Ontario, please visit our website at <https://www.ontariocourts.ca/ocj/jpaac/>.

Attached to this e-mail is our current advertisement, which can be used in any community newsletters, e-mails to constituents, social media or other communications with your constituents. Please feel free to forward this and to use the advertisement in any communication that you wish.

The Committee is accepting applications for vacancies until **Wednesday, July 31, 2024**.

On behalf of my colleagues on the Justices of the Peace Appointments Advisory Committee, thank you for taking the time to consider this request and for your help in recruiting outstanding candidates for this important role in Ontario's justice system.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Charitsis, B.B.A., LL.B
Chair, Justices of the Peace Appointments Advisory Committee

Attach. – JPAAC Advertisement

<https://www.ontariocourts.ca/oci/jpaac/advertisements/>

Advertisements for Justice of the Peace Vacancies

JUSTICE OF THE PEACE VACANCIES

Ontario Court of Justice

At the request of the Attorney General and in accordance with the *Justices of the Peace Act*, the Justices of the Peace Appointments Advisory Committee (JPAAC) invites applications for vacant justice of the peace positions in the province of Ontario in the following court locations:

| | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Barrie (Bilingual-1) | Newmarket (2) | Sudbury (1) |
| Brampton (5) | Oshawa (3) | Sudbury (Bilingual-1) |
| Brampton (Bilingual-1) | Oshawa (Bilingual-1) | Timmins (Bilingual-1) |
| Dryden (Indigenous-1) | Ottawa (2) | Thunder Bay (1) |
| Haileybury (1) | Ottawa (Bilingual-2) | Toronto (8) |
| Hamilton (2) | Ottawa (Indigenous-1) | Toronto (Bilingual-1) |
| Kenora (2) | Owen Sound | Toronto (Indigenous-1) |
| Kingston (2) | (Indigenous-1) | Welland (1) |
| Kitchener (1) | Sault Ste. Marie (1) | |
| Kitchener (Bilingual-1) | Sioux Lookout | |
| London (Bilingual-1) | (Indigenous-1) | |
| | St. Catharines (1) | |
| | St. Catharines | |
| | (Indigenous-2) | |

A justice of the peace is an independent judicial officer who presides in court over various proceedings under federal and provincial statutes. This is a full-time appointment that requires travel within the province.

Qualifications:

Applicants must meet minimum qualifications as set out in the *Justices of the Peace Act*. Candidates must have at least 10 years of paid or volunteer experience, and:

- have a university degree;
- have a diploma or advanced diploma granted by a college of applied arts and technology or a community college following completion of a program that is the equivalent in class hours of a full-time program or of at least four academic semesters;
- have a degree from an institution, other than a university, that is authorized to grant the degree; or meet the educational equivalency requirement set out in s.2(1.3) of the *Justices of the Peace Act*.

More information about the qualifications to become a justice of the peace can be found [here](#).

Selection Criteria:

In addition to reflecting the diversity of the population in Ontario, applicants should also display the fundamental skills and abilities, personal characteristics and community awareness attributes set out in the JPAAC [General Selection Criteria](#), including:

1. Skills and/or education that are clearly relevant and transferable to the work of a justice of the peace.
2. Work, volunteer or other experience that is clearly relevant and transferable to the duties and responsibilities of a justice of the peace.
3. An understanding of, and the skills, abilities, and personal characteristics applicable to, the [vacancy](#), including the pace of court, geographic and community needs.
4. Awareness and understanding of the breadth and depth of the [role](#) of a justice of the peace.
5. Keen interest in people and humanity, including cross-cultural experience and community engagement.
6. An ability to apply superior [interpersonal skills](#) in the courtroom and maintain decorum in adversarial circumstances.
7. A high level of achievement in the area(s) of employment and/or community service.
8. Experience providing functional advice, guidance and assistance to/at multiple levels of authority.
9. Ability and willingness to learn, substantiated through the candidate's record of life-long learning.
10. Demonstrated good judgment in the face of real or perceived conflict of interest.
11. Proven ability and experience in making sound, practical and timely decisions with complex factors.
12. Proven reputation for punctuality, reliability, organization skills and preparedness.
13. Highly developed intellectual and analytical skills.
14. Demonstrated flexibility and adaptability to change.
15. Ability to work both co-operatively and independently.
16. Ability to manage people, time, and resources.
17. Ability to present a clear, concise, and well-written application that is reflective of the candidate's interest and ability.

18. Bilingual ability (if applicable).

For vacancies that serve large Indigenous communities (one vacancy in each of Dryden, Ottawa, Owen Sound, Sioux Lookout, and Toronto and two in St. Catharines), candidates that are Indigenous people and/or people with an in-depth understanding of Indigenous languages, history, law and communities and the issues affecting those communities are encouraged to apply.

To apply for an appointment as a justice of the peace, refer to the current application form and instructions for completion and submission [here](#).

This website also provides information about the advertised [vacancies](#), the JPAAC [process](#) and the [role](#) of the justice of the peace in Ontario. Reviewing the JPAAC [Frequently Asked Questions](#) may also be helpful. **Applications must be received by 11:59 P.M. EST on Wednesday July 31, 2024.** Late applications will NOT be accepted.

To be informed about future vacancies, please register at: [Subscribe to Vacancy Notifications \(via e-mail\)](#).

Maps: [Northern Ontario](#) & [Southern Ontario](#) (PNG)

*Please be advised that these maps may be outdated and should be used for reference purposes only.

UHFHLYHG D VLJQLILFDQW DPRXQW RISRVLWLYH IHHGEDFM
LQGLYLGXDOV DQG IDPLOLHV ZKR VKDUHG WKH\ ZHUH WKU
FRPH WR WKH HYHQW DQG QRW EH IHDXO IRU WKHLU VDIH

:H DUH DVNLQJ IRU GD\ RIEORFNLOJ WKH SDWKV DW 3LHU
WKDW WKRVH ZKR DWWHQGRXU HYHQW DUH VDIH 7KH SDV
H[DP SOHV RI WKH LPSRUWDQFH RIEDUULHUV DQG DSHULPH
VDIH VSDFH , XQGHUVWDQG WKDW WKDW RQH RI WKH DUJX
EHLQJ EURXJKW IRUZDUG LV WKDW SDUNV DUH D SODFH IRU
UHFUHDWH WRJHWKHU VDIHO\ DQG ZDONLQJ FDQLPSURYH
PHQWDO ZHOOEHLQJ LV RQH GD\ UHDOO\ QHJDWLYHO\ L
KHDOWK DQG PHQWDO ZHOOEHLQJ RI WKRVH WKDW UHVLGH
ODLQWDLQLQJ RXU FXUUHQW IRRWSULQW ZLWK WKH SDWK
XV WR SURWHFW DQG VDIHJXDUG WKH KHDOWK DQG PHQWDO

SHRSOH WKDW DWWHQGRXU HYHQW HDFK\H DU
2XU FKDLU .LHO +XJKHV SRLQWHGRXW LQKLV OHWWHU W
QRW KROGDV PXFVWUHQJWK DQG SRZHU LQ &DQGD ,IV
WR 3LHU ZLWK QHJDWLYH LQWHQWLRQ DVHFXULW\ JXD
VLJQLILFDQW FKDOOHQJH WR VHHLOJ WKRVH QHJDWLYH LQ
SRVHV D VLJQLILFDQW ULVN WR ERWK VHFXULW\ JXDUGV DQ
FRPPXQLW\ DW ULVN ,VWKLVPRLRQZRUKDUHSHDW R
ZDQW WR VKRZR XU\RXQJHU JHQHUDWLRQ WKDW WKH FLW\
QRW FDUH DERXW WKHLU ZHOOEHLQJ" ,IWKDW VWKH FDVH
SUHSDUHGI RU SHRSOH WR VWDUW WDNLQJ WKLQJVLQWR W
RIWHQ

, ZRXOG OLNH WR PDNH QRWH RIVRPHWKLOJ WKDW PD\ SUR
WRP\ VWDWHPHQWV DQG WKRVH RIP\FROOHDJXHV &DPH
:DUG &RXQFLOORU LVDIRXQGLQJPHPEHURIWKH 3ULGH
ZDV WKH WUHDVXUHU LQ DQG WKH FKDLURIWKH FLW\
&DPHURQKDVH[SUHVHVGKLVGLIIHULQJYLHZV RQZKDW W
HYHQW VKRXOG ORRN OLNH DORQJZLWKKLV SHUVRQDOEH
WKH +36DW 3ULGH(YHQWV 7KURXJKRXW WKH WLPHWKDV
SUHSDULQJIRU WKLVPRLRQKHKDV QHYHUFQWDFWHGX
SRVVLEOH DOWHUQDWLYH WR RXUSODQQRUKDV KHVKRZQ
RUJDQL]DWLRQ HYHQWE\ DWWHQGLQJRU VKDULQJ VXSSR
VRFLDOPHGLD

, FRXOG JR RQ DQGRQ DERXW PRUH UHVRQV ZK\ WKH IHQFL
SHULPHWHURIWKH SDUNLVHVHQLDOLQSURYLGLOJWK
FRPPXQLW\ D VDIH DQG KDSS\ 3ULGH DW WKH 3LHU EXW , W

KDYH WRXFKHG RQ WKH RWKHU DVSHFWV RIZK\ WKLVLVVR
FRPPXQLW\

7KDQN\RXIRU WDNLQJ WKH WLPH WRUHDG DOORIRXU OHV
3ULGH +DPLOWRQ VVLGH :HKRSH WKDW\RX WDNH WKLVLV
ORRNDW WKHELJJHUSLFWXUHRIKRZ WKLVLVGHFLVLRQZLO
IRURXUHYHQWVDQG WKH 6/*%74 FRPPXQLW\LQ+DPLO

6LQFHUHO\

Stephanie Adams

6WHSKDQLH \$GDPV
Co-Directors of Fund Development



June 9th, 2024

Dear Mayor Horwath and City Council,

By way of introduction, my name is Michael, and I am the Director of Finance with Pride Hamilton. I have been a member of the Board of Directors of Pride Hamilton since November of 2021. I would like to start off by saying thank you for the opportunity to share my thoughts on behalf of Pride Hamilton regarding my own concerns about the safety and security of our Strength with Pride Event at Pier 4 Park on August 10th, 2024.

It has come to our attention that a motion will be put forward to City Council this week that will prohibit the closure of the pathways at Pier 4 Park for the duration of our event and replace the fencing that we are currently planning to use with additional security and signage. This motion is extremely concerning for me as a member of the 2SLGBTQIA community and as an organizer of the festival this year.

As we all know from the Annual Report on Hate/Bias Occurrences by the Hamilton Police Service, the number of hate/bias incidents and criminal offences have been increasing. 2022 saw a 61% increase in the number while 2023 saw a further 26% increase. For the past two years, the 2SLGBTQIA community has been the second most-frequently targeted group within the city. In addition, according to the HPS breakdown by type and category, 2023 saw the highest number of crimes committed because of sexual orientation. These alarming statistics show the dire state of safety for the 2SLGBTQIA community within Hamilton. As a result of this, Pride Hamilton has been working tirelessly to ensure that our event is safe for all Hamiltonians to attend and enjoy. During our 2023 Event, Pride at the Pier, we established a perimeter around the edges of Pier 4 Park such that there was only one entrance point to the event. This singular entry point also contained a bag check area, to ensure that no weapons or dangerous items were brought into the park. This allowed us to ensure that our event was protected and that any groups who may want to protest Pride or harm the community could not enter our event space. I am pleased to confirm that as a result of this, our 2023 Event had no security or safety incidents occur. All members of the Hamilton community were able to enjoy the entire day without any threat to their safety or well-being. They were able to be present and enjoy the festivities to the fullest. We had countless individuals share with us how grateful they were for the steps we had taken and that they were very happy with the security measures in place.

If this motion were to pass, it would be impossible for us to replicate this safe space. First, we would not have enough space to conduct our event. If we were only allowed to fence in the grassy area at Pier 4 Park, the space would be too small to safely and comfortably host all aspects of our event, leaving us no choice but to have no fencing at all. Our fencing last year created a perimeter by using the front and natural features of the park so that the entire lakefront portion of the park was open. This allowed us to create an enclosed space that didn't feel that



way. In addition, if we were unable to fence in an area, it would create an endless amount of entry points to the event space. Even with additional security (as mentioned in the motion), it would be difficult to ensure that any threatening groups would not be able to sneak into the event. Furthermore, due to the events of 2019, it is very difficult for members of the community to trust law enforcement and security to protect them. Our previous layout, which blocked the pathways, helped us to work with the police and security to safeguard the event. The perimeter we created allowed us to put the HPS dispatch tent in a location that was less obvious, enabling us to protect people who may be triggered by seeing a police presence at the event.

To close, I would like to implore the members of City Council to consider the negative impact this motion could have on the 2SLGBTQIA community in Hamilton, who continue to feel that they are not welcome in the city they call home. We, as an organization, are asking for path closures for one day out of 365. We want to make Hamilton a place where every person, regardless of race, gender, gender identity, religion, and sexual orientation, feels welcome and at home. Help us to take this step with our event and create that space for them.

Thank you for your consideration,

Michael Harper

Michael Harper

Director of Finance, Pride Hamilton



June 9, 2024

Mayor Horwath and City Council

Thank you for taking the time to consider our perspective regarding the proposed motion on the floor, regarding events. I am the Administrator for Pride Hamilton and the board member who is championing the safety planning of the event. I have volunteered with a few organizations that have had to create security barriers and boundaries either for licensing or for other safety measures. I write this letter as a cis-white-female, a parent to a bisexual person whose partner is transgender, and as a family and friend to many more within the 2SLGBTQIA+ community. As an ally, I am not ignorant to the struggles that are faced by the many communities that are represented within the queer community. I will be using family interchangeably between family that is related by blood and family that is chosen because to me family is family no matter how they came to be family, because they're all auntie's cousins or other members of a family.

I understand that above all else, the PRIDE movement is a protest, and to lose sight of that means we would be denying the struggles of every single person in the 2SLGBTQIA+ That have come before us. I recognize that the actions of the protest have turned more towards a celebration, the struggles of Marsha P Johnson and the Stonewall riots and the movement that they created are absolutely at the forefront of everything that I do as it pertains to the 2SLGBTQIA+ community. I grew up in the early 80s with the AIDS epidemic being a forefront conversation, and having friends of one of my parents being a same sex couple, learning about the need for representation, inclusion and acceptance was brought into my awareness right from the beginning. I was never ignorant to the hate and bigotry that was prevalent not just in Hamilton but in the world in general. I am also very much aware that we currently live in a police state and that, in itself, poses many issues.

As a parent my primary role is ensuring the safety of my children and that is a role that I take very seriously. That would include promoting events where I feel that they are safety is the forefront of the event planners, and teaching them how to assess the events that they choose to be a part of. This is the reason why I became a part of the board for Pride Hamilton and why I am focusing on the safety plan for our events. I wish for the city to be the safe-haven so that my child does not have to go back into the closet.

The reality for this community is that their very existence is under attack every single day. From extreme fundamental religious movements to the legislation being proposed from both New Brunswick and Alberta regarding gender affirming care. Now more than ever do I feel called to be a part of the safety framework for the family members that I have within the community. To me this can be sitting on a board of an organization that represents my family or being part of a "human wall" protecting the very community that is accepting of my family.



The few rallies that I have attended in the past years have relied on “human walls” to keep the members safe. And while I feel I am in a position where I can take the various slurs and other hateful rhetoric and protect the members of the community, I feel that having the physical barrier adds another layer of protection for the community, rather than simply having private security, members of the police force, and members of the community adjacent and other allies alone. My other concerns around not having a physical barrier around events are also about the liability should anyone be harmed in any way. The physical barriers provide a level of security that reduces the risk of injury, and reduces the chance for neither the city nor the organizations to be liable for reparations and restitution.

While I believe that breaking down fences and other barriers is a movement towards true acceptance and inclusion, I do not believe that we are in a position to have that as a reality at this time. We're still very much dealing with hate groups and their online presence and sharing images from other pride organizations as well as misgendering and otherwise denying the basic human rights and dignity's that the charter of rights and freedoms allow us. Our event may not be as large scale as other events in the city, the impact on the city is still large, with personal connections being made by many in our city. We, as humans, are naturally drawn to be included and part of a community, and Pride At The Pier is one way that we can create community.

Again I thank you for your consideration in the opinions that are presented by the board of Pride Hamilton

Regards,

Bonnie Barlow (She/They)

Pride Hamilton | Board Administrator



June 9th, 2024

Dear Mayor Horwath and City Council,

My name is Matt Sbrissa, one of Pride Hamilton's Co-Directors of Fund Development. As a Hamilton-born and raised queer individual and an advocate for at-risk youth, I appreciate the opportunity to express my concerns on behalf of Pride Hamilton regarding the safety and security of our upcoming Strength with Pride Event at Pier 4 Park on August 10th, 2024.

It has come to our attention that a motion will be presented to City Council this week, which proposes prohibiting the closure of pathways at Pier 4 Park during our event and replacing the planned fencing with additional security and signage. This proposal deeply concerns me as a member of the 2SLGBTQIA community and an organizer of this festival. During our 2023 Pride at the Pier event, we established a perimeter around Pier 4 Park with a single controlled entry point and a bag check area. This setup effectively prevented weapons or harmful items from entering and kept potential protestors or threats at bay. The result was a secure, incident-free event where all attendees felt safe and enjoyed the day without fear. Many participants expressed their gratitude for these safety measures, reinforcing the importance of maintaining such protocols.

If the proposed motion is approved, replicating this safe space would become impossible. Limiting our fencing to only the grassy areas would drastically reduce the space needed to comfortably and safely host all aspects of our event. Last year's layout allowed us to create an open yet secure environment by utilizing the park's natural features to form a boundary, enabling us to manage entry points effectively.

Additionally, not having a fenced perimeter would result in multiple uncontrolled entry points, even with additional security. This would make it challenging to prevent potentially threatening groups from infiltrating the event. The traumatic events of 2019 have already eroded trust in law enforcement and security among community members. Our previous arrangement, which blocked pathways, facilitated cooperation with the police and security while discreetly placing the HPS dispatch tent to minimize distress for attendees sensitive to police presence.

The Pride Hamilton Festival serves as a vital lifeline for queer youth in Hamilton, providing not just a celebratory space but also a crucial sanctuary where they can feel seen, supported, and safe. In a world where queer youth often face significant challenges, including higher rates of bullying, discrimination, and mental health issues, events like this festival offer a rare opportunity for them to connect with their community, access supportive resources, and



reinforce their sense of identity and belonging. The festival's importance extends beyond mere celebration; it is a beacon of hope and safety in an otherwise uncertain landscape. By providing a secure environment where queer youth can express themselves freely and without fear of harassment, we empower them to thrive and build resilience. Neglecting to ensure their safety during such critical gatherings not only undermines the inclusive values we strive to uphold but also borders on negligence. Ignoring the security needs of these young individuals and failing to protect their right to a safe, affirming space is not just shortsighted; it is fundamentally irresponsible. As leaders and protectors of our community, we have a duty to support and safeguard all our members, especially the most vulnerable. Denying the necessary safety measures for events like Strength with Pride would be a profound failure in our commitment to fostering a nurturing and inclusive city for everyone.

In conclusion, I urge the members of City Council to consider this motion's potential negative impact on the 2SLGBTQIA community in Hamilton. We request pathway closures for just one day out of the year to ensure that our event remains a safe, inclusive space where everyone, regardless of their identity, feels welcome and at home. Let us take this vital step together to create a supportive environment for all Hamiltonians.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "M. Sbrissa". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letter of the first name being a large, stylized "M".

Matt Sbrissa (he/him)
Co-Director of Fund Development, Pride Hamilton

5.11 (e)

June 7, 2024



To Mayor Horwath & Hamilton City Councillors,

I thank you for taking the time to read letters from myself and various members of the board; I do wish it was under different circumstances.

It has come to our attention that a motion is being put forward to block event organizers from putting up perimeter fences around their event spaces that blocks the path. If you have read my colleague's letter, the statistics from the Hate Crime Report are briefly shared. I ask that you read that and digest the issues at hand.

I am writing this to you all with the hopes that you would see that this motion is illogical. I also ask that you look at the *gross abuse of power* to push this motion without consulting the people it would directly impact if the changes are approved. We were not consulted by the Ward 2 Office, not even contacted to discuss any issues that may have arisen.

From my perspective, Pier 4 is not the only park in the area. Pier 8 and Bayfront are both within very close walking, transit, driving, biking and even assistive device proximity. Pier 4 also does not have access to swimmable water. I could understand great push back *if* this park was the *only* park for multiple kilometers and/or this park had water folks could access; neither point is a reality.

In lightly touching on the past, 2019 was a bad year for the Hamilton 2SLGBTQ+ Community and the reputation of this city on an international level. What happened, should not have happened. It was a failure at the hands of HPS, the City and Pride Hamilton. Our event in 2023 was a stark contrast. I am not asking you to create special permissions for this organization but I am asking that you look from a lens that allows you to see a larger image. Where is the logic in moving this progress backwards? Where is the logic in having an event for a targeted group that has no perimeter and is accessible by all without any security screening to ensure there are no concealed weapons or illegal substances that could be sold to children or used to harm others? We saw the lack of due diligence and the repercussions it had. Our event had a single point of entry and exit, this allowed security guards to check bags and loose clothing to ensure the safety of those inside the perimeter. Why should that be taken away? We are not looking to block the path for countless days, weeks or months. We are also not blocking the community splash pad or the tugboat, both of which were still accessible as they are not a part of our event.

We should not be interested in reliving that event and the harm it caused. The suggested money should be used to better things in Ward 2. By approving this motion what will that show the local community and the ones abroad? Approving it will show the local community, communities abroad, businesses and investors that this current Mayor and City Council does not support the 2SLGBTQ+ community. The ironic part, there are community members on the Council, the greater irony is the person behind the motion is the one who was a member of the Pride Hamilton board during the ordeal.

The layout of last year's event was not an instant approval, it was checked multiple times by the SEAT committee and was discussed multiple times both amongst them and with us before approval was given. Those at SEAT expressed that they, too, did not want a repeat of the past.

For those of you who did attend, our event had no acts of violence, no protests and no incidents. This was in part due to the perimeter. Part of the protection that it offers is trespassing by agitators would be handled by police. Without a perimeter, how does one determine where that boundary would start? What powers would police have at that moment if it were to occur?

Previously, folks were asked to be a “human wall” and plans were made to have community members defend others rather than have paid-duty officers do their job. The current Pride Hamilton board will never ask the community to do so on our behalf. Should we do otherwise, I understand the possible consequences of those actions, which includes legal ones. The Criminal Code of Canada discusses what counts as “self defense” in the eyes of the law. However, systemic oppression is prevalent in the judicial system and the decolonization of that is going to be a generational task. In saying that, members of the 2SLGBTQ+ community, racialized folks and other equity-deserving groups face harsher punishments and injustices when compared to cisgender, white folks. Our reactions are looked at and taken into account before the actions we are reacting to. Why would we fail to do our part to ensure a safe event where folks feel they need to defend themselves? The last time we saw that happen, folks were arrested and incarcerated.

Please allow me to be frank. Respectfully, are security guards really a deterrent? This is not the United States where security guards often carry arms. If you will, look at it from the perspective of, if there is a perimeter with police presence, what is the likelihood of an incident? If there is no perimeter and just security guards, how likely is there to be an incident. Based on the outcome of 2019, the latter is very high. There was no perimeter, no police presence, just security guards and community members and look what transpired. Trauma, assault, arrests and scandal. People will think twice doing illegal things in front of law enforcement in comparison to a security guard in Canada.

We have been warned by CSIS via Hamilton Police regarding possible threats and the need to up security measures. Taking away one of the most important safety measures is ludicrous. *This motion seems targeted and I question the integrity of it.*

As Michael stated in his letter, trying to have a perimeter inside the path is not realistic when it has to house staging, vendors, food trucks, equipment and people. We plan to continue the growth of Pride Hamilton both as an organization and events as well as increase the impact on the local economy. This means occupying space in Pier 4 is temporary.

We ask that you look at the implications of leaving a targeted group open to hate in a city that has the highest national reported hate crimes per capita. Members of the community reside in every one of your respective wards, show your residents you care about their well-being. Help us to continue to change the negative perception that people have of this city.

I am grateful to live with intersectional identities that allow me to look at this world from an intersectional lens. It allows me to see the harm that this change will create. In no way is my letter stating that I am, “pro-police” in any way. It states that I am, “pro-safety”. I respect that HPS has a job to do, I am cognizant of the damage the institution has caused for QTBIPOC and 2SLGBTQ+ folks. Because of systemic oppression, I am also very much aware that our reactions are questioned, judged and even punished before the actions we are reacting to are taken into account; as previously stated. Community members and supporters felt safer attending our 2023 event. Don’t take that away from them. Don’t allow our progress to regress. Events of 2019 should be looked at as a lesson on what not to do, and that is to not forgo a perimeter and expect security guards to prevent violence.

Respectfully,

Kiel Hughes

Pride Hamilton

Chair | Director of Events



5.11 (f)

June 9th 2024

Dear Mayor Horwath and City Council,

Thank you for giving Pride Hamilton the opportunity to voice our concerns pertaining to the motion to restrict or prohibit fencing at outdoor events. I have been on the board of directors for Pride Hamilton for about a year and a half now, but I have lived in Hamilton my whole life. As a gay man, it is quite apparent to me that the 2SLGBTQ+ community is a point of contention among Hamilton citizens. This is a far cry from the situation in Toronto, for example, where two-foot-high barricades are considered adequate security for the parade.

We don't even have to look that far back to see what happens when we forego adequate security measures at Pride Hamilton events. In 2019, when Councillor Kroetsch was on the board, he was witness to a significant protest at the Pride event in Gage Park. I can't speak for others, but I feel that this sends a clear message as to whether Pride Hamilton needs a controlled perimeter at our events. Especially considering the recent political climate surrounding drag queens, transgender youth, and gender-diverse individuals.

Recently, it has become even more apparent that these measures were taken in good conscience and for good reason. Protest groups aim to disrupt Pride events across the country – not just in Hamilton. As a member of the board, I feel it is our duty to the community and to Hamilton to provide a safe and secure environment to enjoy the Pride festivities.

This motion feels quite short-sighted, all things considered. Is it really appropriate to ask our community to sacrifice their safety in the name of furthering someone else's political agenda?

Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion. I appreciate your consideration.

Adrian DiPietro

Director of Outreach | Vendors

Pride Hamilton



Pilon, Janet

Subject: To be included in the June 12th council agenda

From: durra kesibi

Sent: June 10, 2024 10:27 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Cc: TAREK MALOUHI

Subject: To be included in the June 12th council agenda

Hello,

I am submitting this email to oppose the development and rezoning under the file(s): ZAC-24-006 & UHOP-24-002.

Please find attached 2 reports for the opposition

I would like all my personal information to be private (to remove my personal information) when discussing this report especially from the applicant and general public.

I would also like to receive updates on the city's decisions for these files.

Best regards,

Durmalouk Kesibi & Tarek Malouhi

I would like to provide below points to oppose to the Construction of the 8-Story Retirement building in the zoning and plan amendments (Files No. ZAC-24-006 & UHOP-24-002):

1. **Loss of Natural Light:** The construction of an eight-story building will cast significant shadows on our properties, reducing natural sunlight which can affect both quality of life and health. Sunlight has psychological benefits and is important for well-being; reduced exposure could negatively impact mood and energy levels.
2. **Blocked Views:** The new building will obstruct the previously unobstructed view, which is a significant aesthetic and emotional asset to your home. One of the main reasons we bought our house was for the open view in the back and construction of an 8-story building in this proximity will hinder this very much. It will be difficult to see the sky even.
3. **Reduced Value of Home:** the construction of this building will significantly affect the value of the home putting us at a significant loss. Given all the negative affects it will cause on views, sunlight, privacy, noise, reduced safety, and others. Unless the house's value is much lower than the market no one will want to buy. This can be confirmed by asking any real-estate agent.
4. **Privacy Concerns:** The proximity of a much taller building will lead to loss of privacy, with potentially hundreds of windows looking down into your backyard and home. We have little children and privacy is very important to us.
5. **Increased Traffic:**
 - a. An eight-story retirement home will likely lead to increased traffic in the area, which can mean longer delays on nearby roads. Roads are already tight especially from having a high school very close by, and the street on Rymal 1890 and Dakota are already narrow streets with congestion in the morning and afternoon hours.
 - b. There will be increased traffic from visitors, healthcare workers, and social service personnel.
 - c. There is already limited parking space in the area.
6. **Safety Concern:**
 - a. From the additional traffic which raises safety concerns for pedestrians and cyclists. Our area is predominantly children who play outside and walk to school and bus stops. The increased traffic from the retirement home raises safety concerns.
 - b. Also, the safety concern is heightened given that the building will operate for 24/7 with many visitors and change of staff at midnight.
7. **Increased Noise:**
 - a. There will be more noise in the area from having visitors, health care staff, and ambulances.
 - b. Increased noise from operating 24 hours.
 - c. Staff shift change at night.
 - d. Retirement homes require frequent visits from emergency medical services. This can happen during night hours.

8. Light Pollution: Increased lighting around the facility for security and safety at night can lead to light pollution. This can disrupt sleep patterns.
9. Environmental Impact: It is important to maintain some urban greenery for environmental and community health.
10. Noise pollution- given the proximity of the building to the townhouse complex. Construction work can cause significant disruption of the residence and the construction will be over several years given that it is an 8-story building. Construction will block the entrance to drop off kids to the high school (Bishop Ryan) may cause noises that will disrupt residence and classes. Also, several daycares walk young kids between the ages of 1.5- 4 years on the sidewalk just where this building will be and this will have to cause the staff to reroute.
11. Air pollution- again given the proximity of the construction to the townhouse complex. This will cause daily significant dust build-up which is very harmful for those with dust allergies.
12. High-density residential buildings can significantly affect urban ventilation leading to reduced wind velocity due to obstructed airflow which can leads to urban heat accumulation in the summer.
13. Community Character: The construction of a large, incongruent building will alter the character and harmony of the neighborhood. Maintaining the architectural and community aesthetic is important for residents' satisfaction. This neighborhood is predominantly of young families with children and high schoolers, and it is often oriented towards children's activities and needs, including parks, playgrounds, and family-friendly services. Introducing a large retirement home might shift the local government and businesses to reallocate resources and reorient services towards the elderly population, potentially at the expense of amenities for young families.
14. Infrastructure Strain: infrastructure like sewer systems, roads, and public services may not be equipped to handle the increased load from a large retirement home. This can lead to longer-term degradation of service quality for existing residents. Retirement homes add additional strain on local utilities (water, electricity, sewer systems). Given the high demands of such facilities, which operate 24/7, this may overload the existing infrastructure.

It was argued in the meeting on June 4th that the addition of a daycare in the retirement building has many benefits based on research. However, I do not understand how the elderly will benefit from the daycare. The daycare is a very private and secure place and residence from the building will not be able to access the daycare for safety reasons. As such, I do not believe there are any benefits to that. Also, although there are similar buildings that are being built in the area, but there are differences from this plan. First the houses are much further back from the building being built and the building is of shorter height.

I ask the city to take all these points into careful consideration in their decision on the plan and zone amendment.

Report to the office of the city governor: Opposition to the re-zoning and plan amendment of File(s) No. ZAC-24-006 & UHOP-24-002

I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed construction of an 8-story retirement building on 1866 Rymal Rd E which is directly in front of my house. This report outlines several critical concerns, supported by recent research findings, emphasizing the potential negative impacts on mental health, privacy, environmental conditions, and overall quality of life for existing residents.

Research by Wang et al. (2023) highlights the essential role of sunlight in maintaining mental health. The construction of a tall building in this proximity would significantly reduce natural light exposure for nearby homes, potentially leading to negative mental health outcomes.

Dzhambov et al. (2021) demonstrated that exposure to greenery, even indoors, positively affects mental health. Similarly, Zhang et al. (2023) found that indoor greenery is associated with fewer depressive symptoms. The proposed building would obstruct views of existing green spaces, reducing the mental health benefits currently enjoyed by residents. According to Dreyer et al. (2018), having a view of the outside is positively correlated with well-being. An 8-story structure would significantly obstruct such views, diminishing residents' quality of life and overall well-being.

The prolonged construction phase and the subsequent increase in population density will elevate noise levels in the neighborhood. Specifically, having a retirement home which may require the need for ambulances at any time during the day or night, as well as the increased traffic from visitors and the medical team will cause high noise levels. Ma et al. (2020) found that annoyance from neighborhood noise is linked to a higher risk of poor mental health, with those affected reporting 2.34 times higher odds of experiencing mental health issues. Hammersen et al. (2016) also linked noise annoyance to poor mental health.

Privacy is a fundamental aspect of human socio-spatial behavior, essential for mental and emotional well-being (de Macedo et al., 2022). The height and proximity of the proposed building would severely compromise the privacy of existing homes, leading to increased stress, anxiety, and dissatisfaction among residents.

Amiryar and Asano (2022) examined the impact of high-rise buildings in residential areas, noting issues such as overcrowding, transportation congestion, and changes in housing typology. These factors lead to several environmental and societal challenges, including poor ventilation, shadowing, air and noise pollution, and loss of privacy.

High-density residential buildings significantly affect urban ventilation. Reduced wind velocity due to obstructed airflow leads to urban heat accumulation and pollution, all of which impede the urban environment and disrupt neighbours in close proximity (Amiryar & Asano, 2022).

The proposed retirement building would likely exacerbate these conditions, negatively affecting the health and comfort of residents. Considering the compelling evidence presented,

it is clear that constructing an 8-story retirement building on 1866 Rymal Rd E will significantly disrupt neighbours of the townhouse on Rymal Street and other neighbours in close proximity as well. It would have severe negative impacts on the mental health, privacy, and overall well-being of existing residents. The potential for increased noise, reduced sunlight and greenery exposure, compromised privacy, and environmental degradation poses significant risks that must be considered. I urge you to reconsider the approval of this project File(s) No. ZAC-24-006 & UHOP-24-002. Your consideration of these points is greatly appreciated. Thank you for your attention to this matter.

References

- Amiryar, M. R., & Asano, J. (2022). A Study on Transformation of Housing Typology and Its Environmental and Social Effects on the Living Conditions of Residents in Planned Residential Neighborhoods of Kabul City. *Urban Science*, 6(3), 45-. <https://doi.org/10.3390/urbansci6030045>
- de Macedo, P. F., Ornstein, S. W., & Elali, G. A. (2022). Privacy and housing: Research perspectives based on a systematic literature review. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment*, 37(2), 653–683. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10901-022-09939-z>
- Dreyer, B. C., Coulombe, S., Whitney, S., Riemer, M., & Labbé, D. (2018). Beyond Exposure to Outdoor Nature: Exploration of the Benefits of a Green Building's Indoor Environment on Wellbeing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 1583-. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01583>
- Dzhambov, A. M., Lercher, P., Browning, M. H., Stoyanov, D., Petrova, N., Novakov, S., & Dimitrova, D. D. (2021). Does greenery experienced indoors and outdoors provide an escape and support mental health during the COVID-19 quarantine? *Environmental Research*, 196, 110420–110420. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2020.110420>
- Hammersen, F., Niemann, H., & Hoebel, J. (2016). Environmental Noise Annoyance and Mental Health in Adults: Findings from the Cross-Sectional German Health Update (GEDA) Study 2012. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 13(10), 1–1. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph13100954>
- Ma, J., Li, C., Kwan, M.-P., Kou, L., & Chai, Y. (2020). Assessing personal noise exposure and its relationship with mental health in Beijing based on individuals' space-time behavior. *Environment International*, 139, 105737–105737. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2020.105737>
- Wang, J., Wei, Z., Yao, N., Li, C., & Sun, L. (2023). Association Between Sunlight Exposure and Mental Health: Evidence from a Special Population Without Sunlight in Work. *Risk Management and Healthcare Policy*, 16, 1049–1057. <https://doi.org/10.2147/RMHP.S420018>
- Zhang, J., Browning, M. H., Liu, J., Cheng, Y., Zhao, B., & Dadvand, P. (2023). Is indoor and outdoor greenery associated with fewer depressive symptoms during COVID-19 lockdowns? A mechanistic study in Shanghai, China. *Building and Environment*, 227, 109799–109799. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.buildenv.2022.109799>



June 10, 2024

By E-Mail Only clerk@hamilton.ca

Mayor and Members of Council
City of Hamilton
Hamilton City Hall
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario L8P 4Y5

Attention: City Clerk

Dear Madam Mayor and Members of Council:

Re: Agenda Item 7.8 - Access to the Waterfront Pathway through Pier 4 Park During Special Events (Ward 2)

We are writing on behalf of Sonic Unyon Records regarding the use of Pier 4 Park for the upcoming Because Beer Craft Beer Festival (July 12-14, 2024). This letter is in written in response to the motion being brought forward by our ward councillor Cameron Kroetsch. We are providing written input as delegations are not permitted in response to a motion brought before Council, a choice by the motion's author that stifles public debate. The facts are as follows:

- Heading into its 11th year with the same layout and location it has offered since 2014, Because Beer has seen no official complaints filed with the City of Hamilton. We understand that the councillor's office has received some complaints, though these concerns were never communicated through any official channels where we would have been notified in writing.
- This year's Because Beer will be the most robust tourist draw to date, with an estimated attendance of 10,000 to 12,000 over three days, delivering significant positive economic impact.
- Because Beer's event application has, as always, been extensively scrutinized and thoroughly vetted by the Special Events Advisory Team (SEAT).
- As detailed in our SEAT application, we require the entire area of Pier 4 Park to meet the needs of festival infrastructure, the requirements of our liquor license, to ensure attendee safety, and enable successful execution of the event.
- Because Beer's event layout and square footage has also been reviewed and approved by the Alcohol & Gaming Commission of Ontario (AGCO). Reductions to said event layout would directly and negatively impact the event's liquor license.
- It is unreasonable to unilaterally alter the perimeter of the festival just four weeks from an event that has been planned for most of the last year, and which has been on sale for months.
- There is considerable risk to both residents and attendees in opening a narrow perimeter around the festival that will effectively be a dark alleyway, as fencing will necessarily be blackout to eliminate the view into the ticketed festival. This creates a danger to residents: there cannot be enough security and staff hired to police the perimeter in an effective manner to manage risk around the water, and emergency services similarly have no easy means to protect the public. It is our understanding that the City's Risk Management Office has similar feelings on this matter.



- As we have done every year since 2014, we will ensure that Pier 4 Playground north of the Leander Boat Club will also remain open to the public during the festival weekend, as will access to the 350-meter trail loop to Pier 4 Park Point, directly beside the Pier 5 marina.

- Throughout the weekend of Because Beer, Harbour Front Drive and Leander Drive will always remain open to pedestrians, cyclists, and the trolley, allowing easy east-west travel across the waterfront, connecting to Bayfront Park and Princess Point to the west and Pier 8 to the west.

Our ongoing commitment is to maintain a positive relationship with the Hamilton community, and we will always address any concerns that arise promptly and respectfully.

Yours sincerely,

Tim Potocic

Tim Potocic
President, Sonic Unyon Records

1375, boul. St. Laurent Blvd., Ottawa, ON K1G 0Z7
Tel./Tél. : (613) 237-1590 Fax/Télé. : (613) 237-5508 Toll free/Sans frais : (844) 237-1590
cupemail@cupe.ca/courriel@scfp.ca – cupe.ca/scfp.ca

June 11, 2024

BY E-MAIL

Hamilton City Hall
71 Main Street West, Second Floor,
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Dear Hamilton City Council:

The Canadian Union of Public Employees (CUPE) believes that treating human plasma as something to buy and sell on the market is fundamentally wrong. We urge the Hamilton City Council to declare Hamilton as a “No Paid Plasma Zone” and send a clear message to Canadian Blood Services that we do not support cash-for-plasma in Ontario.

In 2022 Canadian Blood Services signed an exclusive 15-year deal with Grifols to run paid plasma centres in Ontario. This deal was negotiated and signed behind closed doors—**there was absolutely no transparency to the public in this deal**. The secrecy surrounding this decision severely limits public debate regarding its potential risks and dangers, and it neglects consideration of alternatives to paid plasma collection.

Now Canadian Blood Services and Grifols are trying to convince the public to trust for-profit corporations to collect plasma; yet, neither side will reveal the full details of their contract. It is a sign that Canadian Blood Services and Grifols have something to hide.

Our members work on the frontlines of public health care, including Canadian Blood Services. They are deeply concerned that paid plasma collection will pose serious harms to our current blood and plasma supply by opening the door to unaccountable corporations.

We have had this debate before when Canadian Plasma Resources tried to open a collection site in Hamilton next to a methadone clinic. Knowing the consequences of paid plasma collection, the Ontario government passed the *Voluntary Blood Donations Act* in 2014 to protect the integrity of our blood and plasma system.

We are urging you as leaders to stop this scheme again.

Paid plasma is about profit

Canadian Blood Services argue that the products from paid plasma clinics will be used exclusively for patients in Canada. But now, where paid plasma is collected, it does not stay in Canada. Canadian Plasma Resources, who operates paid plasma centres in New Brunswick, ships their plasma to

MARK HANCOCK
National President/Président national

CANDACE RENNICK
National Secretary-Treasurer/Secrétaire-trésorière nationale

PATRICK GLOUTNEY, FRED HAHN, JUDY HENLEY, SHERRY HILLIER, KAREN RANALLETTA
General Vice-Presidents/Vice-présidences générales

markets mostly in Europe. Their CEO said that Canadian plasma is potentially distributed to over 100 countries.¹

Hamilton should not trust Grifols, who will acquire Canadian Plasma Resources by 2025, that they are going to change anything. If that were the case, they would have an open and transparent deal with input from the public. In fact, this month *The Breach* revealed that Grifols will be able to export plasma products for sale in other countries.²

The goal of corporations like Grifols is to sell plasma protein products for profit—full stop.

They sell their products on the global market to the highest bidder to make as much money as possible. They are driven by profits, not by the interest in protecting our plasma supply.

Even though some people in favour of paid plasma collection argue that it benefits low-income populations, the reality is that the donors are paid a mere fraction of what their plasma is worth. In the U.S. a donor could be paid \$50 for therapies worth at least \$300 per product.³

We know Grifols tends to locate their paid plasma centres in impoverished communities where they know they can find people looking for extra sources of income. This is simply unacceptable. As Mayor Andrea Horwath said, “anything that preys upon the most vulnerable is hideous and doesn’t belong in Hamilton.”⁴

Research shows that frequent plasma donations are not safe for donors. [A research study published this year](#) by SUPPLY, a project co-funded by the European Union’s EU4Health programme, found that frequent plasma donation negatively impacts donor health.⁵ The donors they analyzed showed a reduction in immunoglobulin G and ferritin levels. The study concluded that European countries should increase the number of low-frequent plasma donors, rather than have an existing donor pool give their plasma frequently.

Paid plasma is not guaranteed to be safe

In the 1980s, over 30,000 Canadians were infected with HIV and Hepatitis C from contaminated blood products—this disaster is known as the “tainted blood scandal.” **It resulted in more than 8,000 innocent deaths and it is recognized as the worst preventable public health disaster in Canada’s history.**

¹ Weldon, T. (2018, Jul 19). After 1 year, pay-for-plasma clinic in Moncton sees almost 300 visits weekly. *CBC News*. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/new-brunswick/moncton-blood-plasma-pay-donation-1.4752005#:~:text=Plasma%20collected%20in%20Moncton%20does,is%20no%20facility%20in%20Canada.&text=Despite%20the%20need%20in%20Canada,in%20Europe%2C%22%20Barhardoust%20said>

² Lukacs, M. (2024, Jun 3). Canadian blood plasma products can be sold abroad for profit by pharma giant. *The Breach*. <https://breachmedia.ca/canadian-blood-plasma-products-for-profit-pharma-giant/>

³ Darrah, D., & Lukacs, M. (2022, Aug 2). Canada’s blood plasma collection to be sold off to foreign pharma giant. *The Breach*. <https://breachmedia.ca/canadas-blood-plasma-collection-to-be-sold-off-to-foreign-pharma-giant/#:~:text=Despite%20a%20lack%20of%20research,products%20worth%20at%20least%20%24300>

⁴ Frketich, J. (2024, Apr 5). Mayor looks to declare Hamilton a ‘paid-plasma-free zone’ to stop private Spanish clinic from opening. *Hamilton Spectator*. https://www.thespec.com/news/hamilton-region/mayor-looks-to-declare-hamilton-a-paid-plasma-free-zone-to-stop-private-spanish-clinic/article_b7c32f26-aeec-56bf-b08e-ab04defeb4e1.html

⁵ Centre for Evidence-Based Practice. (2024, Apr 8). What is the impact of repeated plasma donation on donor health? <https://www.cebp.org/news/what-is-the-impact-of-repeated-plasma-donation-on-donor-health/>

This happened in part because inadequately screened blood, often coming from “high-risk” populations like American prisoners and impoverished communities, entered the system through blood transfusions.⁶ Those responsible for this disaster failed to properly screen blood donors, failed to test blood properly, and failed to warn the public that there were risks with paid plasma collection. Justice Krever, who led a full investigation of the disaster, said that the donors may have had an incentive to donate even when they knew they should not have.

We are aware that screening technology has advanced since the tainted blood scandal. **But even though technology has improved, we are not convinced that paying for plasma is 100% safe today and we cannot have another tainted blood disaster.**

We must remember the lessons from the Krever Commission. Justice Krever said that the tainted blood scandal was driven in part by the profit motive. He recommended that we stop paid blood and plasma collection, and he made it clear that means having a fully voluntary, non-paid blood and plasma donation system. Paid collection should only happen in very specific circumstances.

Today, unlike the 1980s and '90s, we can test for HIV and Hepatitis C; however, **we cannot test for what is unknown.** A new blood-borne pathogen could impact the blood and plasma supply in ways we cannot anticipate right now.

The World Health Organization agrees that voluntary donation is the safest option. Last year the organization called for all countries to move to unpaid donation systems given research that found volunteers have the lowest prevalence of blood-borne infections.⁷

We need to ensure that our national blood authority—Canadian Blood Services—is the only gatekeeper of our system, not a corporation whose lobbying and involvement has been kept secret.

Fundamentally, CUPE believes that blood products are a **public resource**. This means no one should be collecting, influencing the supply of, or profiting from it except our public system.

Paid plasma will weaken our donor base

Our members on the frontlines of Canadian Blood Services have also expressed deep concerns that paid plasma collection will weaken our voluntary blood donor program, which would jeopardize our national blood supply.

This happens because long-time donors start to lose motivation and stop giving. Other donors opt for payment from paid centres instead. One paid “donor” out of our system is one volunteer donor taken from our supply chain—over time this will dwindle the base of volunteer donors.

For example, in December 2016, Canadian Blood Services announced that volunteer blood donation in Saskatoon declined due to the arrival of paid plasma centres. Canadian Blood Services insist that they are going to put a limit to the amount of paid plasma centres, but we believe as soon as Grifols opens a centre in Hamilton it will be difficult to stop them from lobbying for more.

⁶ DePalma, A. (1999, Jan 29). Suit says Canada imported tainted blood from U.S. inmates. *New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/1999/01/29/world/suit-says-canada-imported-tainted-blood-from-us-inmates.html#:~:text=According%20to%20the%20panel's%20final,to%20accept%20prison%20blood%20products>.

⁷ World Health Organization. (2023, Jun 2). Blood safety and availability. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/blood-safety-and-availability>

The deal with Grifols is also based on the false pretense that the only way to increase our plasma supply is to do business with corporations. But other provinces have shown that there are alternatives.

Hema-Quebec increased their plasma supply from 15%-30% and they are on track to reach 50% plasma self-sufficiency by voluntary donations alone.⁸ They did this by successfully starting a public education campaign and established several new donation centres. Their efforts increased voluntary plasma donation, nearly doubling the amount of plasma they received. They have shown we can do it too, we just need to have the political will to stand up to rich, multinational corporations.

Conclusion

We urge Hamilton City Council to continue supporting a public, not-for-profit, voluntary blood and plasma donation system. **Please declare Hamilton as a “No Paid Plasma Zone”** and send a strong message that paid plasma collection should not be allowed here, and in the rest of the province.

Sincerely,

Alia Karim

Alia Karim, Senior Research Officer

:ic/cope 491

⁸ Dowson, A. L. (Sep 8, 2022). Canadian Blood Services is betraying the public trust. *Canadian Health Coalition*. <https://www.healthcoalition.ca/canadian-blood-services-is-betraying-the-public-trust/#:~:text=In%20the%20same%20time%20frame,sufficiency%20by%20voluntary%20donations%20alone>

Tuesday, June 11, 2024

Dear Mayor Horwath and Councillors,

Stormwater Fee Financial Incentives Program

The Hamilton Chamber of Commerce is Hamilton's oldest institution, and it is incumbent on our organization to raise concerns when Hamilton's business community is not properly consulted on decisions that will impact our members financial viability.

In our letter from last June 2023, the Hamilton Chamber of Commerce sought formal consultations and engagement with the business community to understand the impact of the Stormwater Rate Structure. The Hamilton Chamber of Commerce is again sounding the alarm that outreach to the business community has been inadequate.

Phase 2 of the Stormwater Fee implementation, consultation with business was minimal and engagement next to non-existent. A clear metric that highlights this deficiency is the mere 34 survey responses from the over 12,000 commercial, industrial, institutional and mixed-use properties impacted. Council would never accept such a low response rate, if so, few homeowners had been reached to provide input.

It is critical that businesses have information and an ability to plan for the stormwater fee structure change. Given the weak economy, high interest rates, lower households spending, businesses in Hamilton are struggling to maintain their financial health. Additional unplanned expenses at this time, could further impact our member's viability.

To address this omission, we request that part of the \$100,000 communication budget approved at GIC and before Council on Wednesday, be allocated to outreach and education efforts to the business community to help prepare our small and medium size businesses adjust to the new rate system.

Furthermore, we ask Council to reconsider the proposed credit program on greenhouse operations. Greenhouse operators are important food producers, who also make significant capital investments in their operations. Greenhouse producers who can demonstrate a stormwater management system redirecting water to their operations, should also be eligible for a 90% credit similar to that provided to properties who fully discharge to Lake Ontario.

.../2

Additionally, we urge Council to explore zero-interest or low-interest property-assessed loans to help small and medium size businesses in our city in making stormwater-efficient upgrades to their properties. This kind of program would allow commercial and property owners to borrow to cover the upgrade and repay the loan over time as a surcharge on their property tax bills. The loan is secured as a tax lien attached to the property and can be transferred if the property is sold.

A variety of small and mid-size businesses, including automobile services, car dealerships to strip malls and quick service restaurants, would benefit from an impact analysis of this significant shift. We strongly encourage Council to consider these recommendations during your deliberation on Wednesday.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'G.D.', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Greg Dunnett
President & CEO
Hamilton Chamber of Commerce

CITY OF HAMILTON

MOTION

Council Date: June 12, 2024

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR C. KROETSCH.....

SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR.....

Amendment to By-law 16-290, Council Code of Conduct

That staff be directed to prepare an amendment to By-law 16-290, Council Code of Conduct, to include the following and renumbering the remaining sub-sections accordingly:

SECTION 14: STANDARDS RELATING TO COMMUNICATION

- 14.1 Members are responsible for making honest statements. No member shall make a statement, including through social media, when they know that statement is false or are reckless as to whether it is true. No member shall make a statement with the intent of misleading Council or members of the public.

- 14.2 Members will conduct their communications with each other and members of the public, including by means of social media, in ways that maintain public confidence in the office to which they have been elected or appointed, are open and honest, focus on issues rather than personalities, and avoid threatening, intimidating, offensive or abusive conduct.

CITY OF HAMILTON

NOTICE OF MOTION

Council Date: June 12, 2024

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR C. KROETSCH.....

Amendment to Item 7 of the Emergency and Community Services Report 24-004, respecting Ward 2 Community Grants - Food Insecurity Programming Q1 and Q2 2024 (Ward 2), which was approved by Council on May 22, 2024

WHEREAS, Tastebuds Hamilton was initially named as the recipient of program funding for breakfast programming at Hess Street School; and

WHEREAS, program funding for Food Insecurity Programming must be provided to the umbrella organization (Social Planning and Research Council of Hamilton), which was not named in the original motion.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That Item 7 of the Emergency and Community Services Report 24-004, respecting Ward 2 Community Grants - Food Insecurity Programming Q1 and Q2 2024 (Ward 2), be **amended** by deleting "Tastebuds Hamilton" from sub-section (c), and inserting "Social Planning and Research Council of Hamilton", to read as follows:

7. **Ward 2 Community Grants - Food Insecurity Programming Q1 and Q2 2024 (Ward 2)**
 - (a) That free school-wide pizza lunch to the Dr. J. E. Davey School Council be funded from the Ward 2 Non-Property Tax Revenue Account 3301609602 at an upset limit, including contingency, not to exceed \$750;
 - (b) That purchase of supplies for a breakfast program to the Hamilton Downtown Mosque be funded from the Ward 2 Non-Property Tax Revenue Account 3301609602 at an upset limit, including contingency, not to exceed \$5,000;
 - (c) That breakfast programming at Hess Street School to ~~Tastebuds Hamilton~~ **Social Planning and Research Council of Hamilton** be funded from the Ward 2 Non-Property Tax Revenue Account 3301609602 at an upset limit, including contingency, not to exceed \$5,000;
 - (d) That purchase of supplies for their foodbank to Living Rock Ministries be funded from the Ward 2 Non-Property Tax Revenue Account 3301609602 at an upset limit, including contingency, not to exceed \$5,000; and
 - (e) That the Mayor and City Clerk be authorized and directed to execute any required agreement(s) and ancillary documents, with such terms and conditions in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor.