



**CITY OF HAMILTON**  
**PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT**  
**Planning Division**

<b>TO:</b>	Chair and Members Planning Committee
<b>COMMITTEE DATE:</b>	December 3, 2015
<b>SUBJECT/REPORT NO:</b>	Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide)
<b>WARD(S) AFFECTED:</b>	City Wide
<b>PREPARED BY:</b>	Joanne Hickey-Evans Manager, Policy Planning and Zoning By-law Reform (905) 546-2424 Ext. 1282  Sarah Cellini Planner, Policy Planning (905) 546-2424 Ext. 2634  Steve Robichaud Director of Planning and Chief Planner
<b>SUBMITTED BY:</b>	Jason Thorne General Manager Planning and Economic Development Department
<b>SIGNATURE:</b>	

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- (a) That the Public Consultation Summary Report, prepared by Dillon Consulting, summarizing the comments received from the City-hosted consultation events on the Greenbelt Boundary Review and attached as Appendix “A”, be received and forwarded to the Province to be considered as additional citizen input on the Coordinated Provincial Plan Review;
- (b) That the City of Hamilton requests the Province:
  - (i) to revise the applicable Greenbelt Plan policies in order to allow municipalities to request changes to Greenbelt Plan designations and boundaries at the conclusion of a municipal comprehensive review, provided the review is completed in accordance with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014), the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and meets the goals and objectives of the Provincial Policy Statement and all other applicable Provincial Plans;

**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 2 of 25**

---

- (ii) to defer any decisions on potential changes to the Greenbelt Plan boundaries in the City of Hamilton to allow the City to complete a municipal comprehensive review which will include a full assessment of the opportunities and constraints:
  - (1) to determine the amount and location of land (both non-employment and employment) required to meet the 2031 to 2041 Growth Plan forecasts;
  - (2) to identify appropriate lands to add to the Whitebelt area, in the event that additional land is required for an urban boundary expansion to meet targets and based on the principles of cost effective, complete and healthy communities; and,
  - (3) to identify appropriate lands to be added to the Greenbelt Plan area;
- (c) That upon completion of the municipal comprehensive review, City Council request the Province to revise the Greenbelt Plan boundaries prior to the City adopting the Official Plan Amendment relating to Growth Plan conformity and implementation of the Municipal Comprehensive Review.
- (d) That notwithstanding Recommendations (b) and (c), as part of the current Coordinated Provincial Plan Review, the City of Hamilton requests the Province to give consideration to the following modifications to Greenbelt Plan Protected Countryside area as follows:
  - (i) remove the Lower Stoney Creek lands (104 ha) and the lands north of Parkside Drive, east of Centre Road in Waterdown (28 ha) from the Greenbelt Plan, as shown on Appendix “B”, identified in *Greenbelt Plan Boundary Review Report* prepared by Dillon Consulting, and attached as Appendix “C”; and,
  - (ii) add the lands between Twenty Mile Creek and Airport Road, west and east of Nebo Road (231 ha) to the Greenbelt Plan, as shown on Appendix “B”, identified in *Greenbelt Plan Boundary Review Report* prepared by Dillon Consulting, and attached as Appendix “C”;
- (e) That City Council reconfirms Recommendation 22 from Report PED15078, Item 8 of Planning Committee Report 15-010 approved by Council on June 23, 2015, that requests the Province to work with Hamilton staff to further revise the Natural Heritage System map to reflect the core areas and natural heritage system of the City;
- (f) That the City of Hamilton requests the Province to consider amendments to the Niagara Escarpment Plan as follows:

**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 3 of 25**

---

- (i) to redesignate the lands located on Jerseyville Road East, south of Robert E. Wade Park from “Rural Escarpment” to “Urban Area”, as shown on the attached map marked as Appendix “D”;
  - (ii) to redesignate the lands located at 294 and 296 York Road from “Rural Escarpment” to “Urban Area”, as shown on the attached map marked as Appendix “E”; and,
  - (iii) to add the lands located on the Mountain Brow into the Niagara Escarpment Plan Open Space System (NEPOSS), as shown on the attached map marked as Appendix “F”, which would allow the City to undertake a Management Strategy / Plan for the lands to address maintenance, views from the Brow among other matters;
- (g) That the City Clerk be directed to forward Report PED15078(a) to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing and that the recommendations of this Report are to be considered the City of Hamilton’s formal supplementary comments on the Coordinated Provincial Plan Review.

Note: Due to the bulk of the appendices associated with this Report, the appendices have not been included as part of this staff Report (PED15078(a)). The Report and Appendices “A” to “I” will be available for viewing in the Office of the City Clerk at 71 Main Street West (City Hall) 1st floor or on-line at [www.hamilton.ca/planreview](http://www.hamilton.ca/planreview).

## **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

City Council at its meeting of June 24, 2015 directed that staff consult with the Province, stakeholders and the public to identify potential options for changes to the Greenbelt Plan boundaries.

Dillon consulting was hired to assist staff with developing and documenting the public consultation process and secondly to assist with the identification and assessment of the potential areas to be added to or removed from the Greenbelt Plan.

Consultations occurred in July, 2015 and December, 2015 with stakeholders and the public.

A stakeholder workshop was held in July, 2015, prior to the public consultation open houses. The purpose of the July, 2015 workshop was to test and review the criteria with the stakeholder group. The results of that consultation are contained in Appendix “C”.

The public consultation events were held during the month of September and the results of that consultation are contained in Appendix “C”. The public were asked to provide comment on a set of criteria for the lands to be added and / or removed as well as

**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 4 of 25**

---

potential areas that had been identified for consideration for addition to / removal from the Greenbelt Plan. Over 500 comments were recorded. They ranged from specific comments on the areas to be removed or added, to general comments on supporting the Greenbelt Plan. Other comments noted that lands outside the Greenbelt Plan have a different long term financial value which may be affected by adding lands into the Greenbelt Plan, while many participants indicated the boundaries should not be touched as all.

This report sets out five options for Council's consideration regarding the Greenbelt Plan boundaries:

- Option 1: Status Quo, No Change to the Greenbelt Plan Boundary;
- Option 2: Minor Revisions to the Greenbelt Plan Boundary;
- Option 3: Major Revisions to the Greenbelt Plan Boundary;
- Option 4: Defer Greenbelt Plan Boundary Revision until Completion Municipal Comprehensive Review; and,
- Option 5: Grow the Greenbelt.

The recommended option is a combination of Options 2 and 4: that the City request some minor modifications to the Greenbelt boundaries now (Option 2); and, that any further potential revisions be deferred until the completion of a municipal comprehensive review (Option 4).

An additional recommendation outlined in the report includes reaffirming a recommendation from the June Report (PED15078) requesting the Province to work with staff to refine the Natural Heritage System boundaries since there are some lands that should be excluded and other lands included in the Natural Heritage Designation of the Greenbelt Plan.

This report also recommends three revisions to the Niagara Escarpment Plan:

- 1) redesignate the lands located on Jerseyville Road East, south of Robert E. Wade Park from the Rural Escarpment designation to Urban, as shown on the attached map marked as Appendix "D";
- 2) redesignate the lands located at 294 and 296 York Road from the Rural Escarpment designation to Urban, as shown on the attached map marked as Appendix "E"; and,
- 3) add the lands located on the Mountain Brow into the Niagara Escarpment Plan Open Space System (NEPOSS), as shown on the attached map marked as Appendix "F", which would allow the City to undertake a Management Strategy / Plan for the lands to address maintenance, views from the Brow amongst other matters.

***Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 24***

**FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

**Financial:** None

**Staffing:** None

**Legal:** In accordance with Sections 11, 12 and 14 of the *Greenbelt Plan Act*, the Minister may propose amendments to the Greenbelt Plan and recommend amendments to the Lieutenant Governor in Council, but provided those recommendations do not reduce the total land area within the Greenbelt Plan. Therefore, if Council recommends removal of lands from the Greenbelt Plan without adding equal amount of lands into the Greenbelt Plan, a request to amend the *Greenbelt Plan Act* will be required in the event that no other lands have been identified for inclusion in the Greenbelt Plan as a result of the Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (CPPR).

**HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

**1.0 History of the Greenbelt Plan**

The draft Greenbelt Plan was released in 2004. The City provided comments on the draft. In March 2005, the final Plan was released and incorporated the following changes from the draft Greenbelt Plan:

- The addition of three natural heritage fingers in the southern part of the City;
- The removal of lands in the Book Road area; and,
- The removal of certain lands within the Lower Stoney Creek Area that were included in the Stoney Creek Urban Boundary Expansion (SCUBE) Official Plan Amendments.

The Greenbelt Plan, unlike the Niagara Escarpment Plan, has no right of appeal. Section 5.7 of the Greenbelt Plan outlines the formal mechanism to initiate amendments to the Plan, outside the 10-year review, in the following circumstances:

- 1) There are major unforeseen circumstances, or major new Provincial policy, legislation or regulation that creates the need for an amendment;
- 2) The overall effectiveness and integrity of the Plan would be threatened if the amendment were deferred to the next 10-year review; or,
- 3) The effectiveness and / or relevance of the Plan's policies would be improved through an amendment.

The Urban River Valley designation is an amendment to the Greenbelt Plan that can be considered outside the 10-year review using the Growing the Greenbelt Criteria (refer to Appendix “I”).

Section 5.6 of the Greenbelt Plan outlines the requirement for a 10-year review of the Plan. The purpose of the review is “...to assess the effectiveness of the policies contained in the Plan...and make amendments...to update or include new information or improve the effectiveness and relevance of the policies. The review can only consider modifications to the urban boundaries within the Greenbelt if the upper or single-tier municipality provides a comprehensive justification or growth management study.”

The City of Hamilton has not commenced or completed the update of the growth management study (i.e. GRIDS 2.0) to assess and incorporate the 2031-2041 growth forecasts. As such, staff request the Province revise the applicable Greenbelt Plan policies to allow municipalities to request changes to Greenbelt Plan designation boundaries, outside of the 10-year review, at the conclusion of a municipal comprehensive review (MCR) provided that the MCR is completed in accordance with the Provincial Policy Statement (2014) and the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe and meets the goals and objectives of the Provincial Policy Statement and applicable Provincial Plans.

## **2.0 Coordinated Provincial Plan Review - Phase 1**

The Province has several different Provincial Plans and the Provincial Policy Statement (PPS) that have been developed over different time periods, geographic areas and for different land use planning purposes. On February 27, 2015, the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing announced the coordinated review of the following four Provincial Plans:

- The Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe;
- The Greenbelt Plan;
- The Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan; and,
- The Niagara Escarpment Plan.

In April 2015, the City of Hamilton hosted four consultation sessions in advance of the Province’s Regional Town Hall Meeting in Hamilton on April 16, 2015. The purpose of the City-hosted consultation sessions was to obtain feedback on the policies of each plan, relevant to Hamilton (i.e. Growth Plan, Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan) by topic area: Niagara Escarpment; natural environment; agriculture and the rural economy; economic growth and jobs; and, accommodating population growth. The comments on each topic were gathered and included as an appendix to the staff report and was presented to Planning Committee on June 16, 2015.

**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 7 of 25**

---

The deadline to provide comments to the Province on the first phase of the CPPR was May 28, 2015. City staff submitted preliminary comments to the Province before the deadline, followed by the Council endorsed comments submitted at the end of June 2015.

## 2.1 Planning Committee / Council Directions

On June 16, 2015, City staff presented recommendations to Planning Committee regarding the CPPR. The staff recommendations were approved, as amended, by Planning Committee and endorsed by Council on June 24, 2015. The Council endorsed recommendations (as amended), and comments were forwarded to the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing (MMAH).

In accordance with the June 24, 2015 Council recommendation, City staff were directed to consult:

“... with the Province, the public, and the development community on options for any changes to the Greenbelt boundaries that are necessary to ensure Hamilton has sufficient land to accommodate future growth, while at the same time ensuring there is no net decrease in the size of the Greenbelt in Hamilton, and ensuring that the Greenbelt’s goals related to protecting agricultural lands and natural heritage are achieved; and that these options be brought forward for Council’s approval, prior to submitting them to the Province for its consideration.”

Council directed staff to bring forward options for Council to deliberate and make a decision on changes to the Greenbelt Plan boundaries, prior to submitting comments to the Province. The Council direction was in response to ad hoc requests by individual landowners and/or stakeholders on changes to the Greenbelt Plan boundaries.

Staff retained Dillon Consulting to assist in the development and implementation of a consultation plan for the Greenbelt Boundary Review project.

## 2.2 Establishing a Set of Criteria for Removals and Additions

To determine potential areas for addition or removal, a set of draft criteria were initially developed to identify and evaluate which Whitebelt lands could be considered for addition to the Greenbelt Plan and what lands could be considered for removal from the Greenbelt Plan. An explanation of what was used in the development and drafting of the criteria and a list of the criteria are contained in page 24 of Appendix “C”. The draft criteria were used to generate discussion and comments from the Stakeholder Workshop held on July 28, 2015 and to form the basis of discussion and consultation for the four Open House Sessions held in September 2015.

## **POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS**

The review of the Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan boundaries is part of the City's on-going participation in the Coordinated Provincial Plan Review.

### **RELEVANT CONSULTATION**

#### **1.0 Public Consultation Events on Greenbelt Plan Boundary Review**

##### *1.1 Stakeholder Event*

As noted in Section 2.2 of the Historical Background Section of this Report, staff established a set of criteria to be used as part of the evaluation to add and remove lands from the Greenbelt Plan. Prior to the public consultation open houses, staff reviewed the draft criteria with the stakeholder group at a workshop in July, 2015.

An invitation for this workshop was sent to stakeholders from a variety of agencies including: conservation authorities; chambers of commerce; homebuilders association; environmental groups; and, agriculture associations. The stakeholder workshop was held on July 28, 2015. The stakeholders provided the following comments:

- Ensure that the big picture of the Greenbelt Plan is not lost (especially when looking at individual parcels of land);
- Define the Greenbelt and its vision – should not evaluate the Greenbelt by what it is not;
- Nothing should be removed from the Greenbelt;
- Greenbelt policy issues negatively impact the efficacy of the Greenbelt;
- Evaluation criteria should not be used as a weighted criteria for scoring; and,
- The criteria must be measurable but it is recognized that this is very challenging to make the criteria measurable, especially rural economy.

The criteria were revised based on the input received from the stakeholders. The stakeholder workshop information is provided on pages 2 and 27 of Appendices “A” and “C”, respectively.

##### *1.2 Open Houses*

Four Open House Sessions were held on September 10, 14, 17 and 28, 2015, in Ancaster, Flamborough, Stoney Creek and Downtown Hamilton. The sessions were



**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 9 of 25**

---

advertised in the Spectator and the Hamilton Community Newspapers (e.g. Glanbrook Gazette, Flamborough Review, Stoney Creek News, etc.). The purpose of the open house sessions was to facilitate a discussion about the opportunities to refine the Greenbelt Plan boundaries and to obtain feedback about the potential areas for addition and / or deletion based on the draft criteria. The sessions utilized a “drop in” format.

The open house session format was the same at every location: an orientation session and a self-guided, interactive panel display. The panels were colour coordinated by type of revision: proposed additions to the Greenbelt were labelled blue and proposed removals from the Greenbelt were labelled in orange. Participants were asked to visit the panels; panels prompted participants to provide their comments on the criteria and areas proposed either via “sticky note” directly onto the panel itself. In addition, participants were provided with a workbook to provide additional comments. Workbooks could be either completed at the session or returned to the City at a later date. Participants were required to provide comments by September 30, 2015 for inclusion in the Dillon Consultation Report. The panels and workbooks were also available online for those who were unable to attend the sessions.

A total of 415 people attended the four open houses. Some individuals attended more than one open house event; and for reporting purposes, the number of attendees has been revised to reflect the net number of attendees. Approximately 500 submissions were received through “sticky notes”, work books, emails and letters.

Key messages resulting from the discussions at the open house events and submissions received at (and after) the open house sessions included, but were not limited to:

- A significant number of comments on Greenbelt Plan boundary changes suggested additions to the Greenbelt Plan as well as a significant number of comments suggesting the removal of lands from the Greenbelt Plan;
- The principle of changing the Greenbelt Plan boundary was questioned and many participants suggested that the Plan should remain as is;
- Agricultural land was recognized as an important resource worth protecting;
- The Greenbelt Plan was identified as having an important function in protecting lands and containing urban sprawl; albeit concern was raised about restrictive Greenbelt Plan policies; and,
- The principles of fairness and equity were raised as being important and changing the Greenbelt Plan boundary. In particular, the consideration and identification of lands for potential addition was not perceived as fair from the perspective of many landowners.

**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 10 of 25**

---

For more details regarding the open house format and/or submissions received, please refer to Appendix “A” and page 31 of Appendix “C”.

## **ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION**

### **1.0 Purpose of the Review**

The City’s response to the Coordinated Provincial Plan Review has been undertaken in two parts: Part 1 was the review of the Provincial Plan policies; and, Part 2 has focussed on a review of the Greenbelt Plan boundaries.

The review of the boundaries was undertaken for several reasons:

#### **1.1 Council Direction**

At its meeting June 24, 2015, Council directed:

“That City staff consult with the Province, the public, and the development community on options for any changes to the Greenbelt boundaries that are necessary to ensure Hamilton has sufficient land to accommodate future growth, while at the same time ensuring there is no net decrease in the size of the Greenbelt in Hamilton, and ensuring that the Greenbelt’s goals related to protecting agricultural lands and natural heritage are achieved; and that these options be brought forward for Council’s approval, prior to submitting them to the Province for its consideration.”

Council received submissions from property owners to remove individual areas / parcels of land from the Greenbelt Plan. The intent of the Review was to ensure that the public, not just specific property owners, had a voice in potential changes to the Greenbelt Plan boundaries and any changes could be assessed based on pre-determined criteria.

#### **1.2 Review of certain lands that could be added or removed**

The Province initiated the CPPR in recognition of the inter-relationships between the Growth Plan and the Greenbelt Plan which establishes the Planning framework for how and where municipalities grow.

There are lands within the Greenbelt Plan that may not be suitable for agricultural and / or rural uses due to the proximity of future urban uses and municipal investments in infrastructure. Alternatively, there are isolated small parcels of land that do not align with the principles of healthy, complete and sustainable communities and are therefore more suitable for non-urban uses and merit consideration for inclusion in the Greenbelt Plan.

### 1.3 Long Term Growth

In 2013, Amendment No. 2 to the Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe came into effect. The amendment provided for updated population and employment forecasts for the 2031-2041 period. Hamilton is forecasted to grow by an additional 120,000 people and 50,000 jobs between 2031 and 2041.

These forecasts were supported by a report titled *Greater Golden Horseshoe 2041 Forecasts: Technical Report 2012* by Hemson Consulting. The report notes that:

“The Regions of the GTAH are assumed to be able to continue to accommodate some growth in greenfield areas through the forecast period (i.e. 2041). No GTAH Region is expected to build out the entire area “inside” the Greenbelt Plan through 2041.”

“No land supply constraints have been identified that would prevent any municipality from achieving the density and intensification targets established by the Growth Plan.”

The City needs to test and assess the *Technical Report 2012* statements to ensure the City has an adequate supply of land to meet Growth Plan policies and PPS objectives. More specifically, if the lands that are proposed for potential addition or removal from the Greenbelt Plan contribute to a complete and healthy community. The City commissioned Dillon consulting to begin this process. They applied a set of assumptions with respect to land supply and demand and arrived at an initial estimate of 200-700 ha of additional land that will potentially be required to accommodate the 2031-2041 population forecasts. In addition, a review of the lands outside the urban area and not within the Greenbelt Plan area (i.e. lands located within the Whitebelt) identified that a significant amount of land (63%) is covered by the 28 Noise Exposure Forecasts (NEF). No sensitive land uses are permitted within the 28 NEF contour.

## **2.0 Approaches to the Review**

Dillon consulting was retained to assist staff with developing and documenting the public consultation process and to assist with the identification and assessment of the options for areas to be added or removed from the Greenbelt Plan.

The approach to this exercise included the following steps:

- 1) identify a set of criteria that would be used to evaluate lands to be added and removed;
- 2) consult the public on the criteria used and the specific areas identified;

**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 12 of 25**

---

- 3) identify the areas that were not part of the review (e.g. lands within the urban area, lands where commitments were made for long term growth (i.e. Elfrida Special Policy Area) and lands that were surrounded by the Greenbelt);
- 4) summarize the public comments (refer to Appendix “A”); and,
- 5) prepare a summary report with options for the potential addition and / or removal of lands from the Greenbelt Plan. The summary report reviewed these areas in the context of a land use planning lens, public input received and identifies the relative pros / cons of each option (refer to Appendix “C”).

The purpose of the consultation was to engage the community in the discussion of the Greenbelt Plan boundary review.

### **3.0 Greenbelt Plan Boundary Options for Adding and Removing Lands**

Based on the analysis by Dillon and the input received from the public, five options have been developed for the City’s request to the Province with respect to the Greenbelt boundaries. The options are:

- Option 1: Status Quo, No Change to the Greenbelt Plan Boundary;
- Option 2: Minor Revisions to the Greenbelt Plan Boundary;
- Option 3: Major Revisions to the Greenbelt Plan Boundary;
- Option 4: Defer Greenbelt Boundary Revision until Completion of a Municipal Comprehensive Review; and,
- Option 5: Grow the Greenbelt.

The options are detailed in Chapter 5 of Appendix “C” *Greenbelt Boundary Review Report* by Dillon Consulting. A summary of the pros and cons of the five options identified, with the focus on a land use planning lens based on the principles of complete communities, is discussed below.

Each option received comments in favour of or opposition to, the option. The majority of land owners whose lands were not in the Greenbelt Plan wished to remain out of the Greenbelt Plan. Alternatively, many people wished to grow the Greenbelt area (i.e. add all the lands identified for possible inclusion) while not correspondingly removing any area from the Greenbelt.

Some individuals suggested that the NEF contours were outdated and they should not be used as the basis for adding or removing lands to/from the Plan. Staff notes that the 2015 contours are not significantly different than the 2010 contours. Contours are applied for the 2015 time period, not what the potential NEF contours would be in the future (i.e. 2025).

**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 13 of 25**

---

**3.1 Option 1 – Status Quo, No Changes to the Greenbelt Plan Boundary**

This option includes no revisions to the Greenbelt Plan boundaries.

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
Certainty of outcome. The status quo represents the current situation and would not affect the current land use designation.	The City may not meet the population growth forecasts given the NEF constraints on a large portion (63%) of the Whitebelt lands.
	Some isolated parcels would remain either in the Greenbelt Plan or outside the Greenbelt Plan.

**3.2 Option 2 – Minor Revisions to the Greenbelt Plan Boundary**

This option involves: 1) up to three small areas to be removed from; and, 2) one small area that could be added to the Greenbelt (as shown on Appendix “B”). Any combination of these areas could be removed/added.

**3.2.1 *Remove Lower Stoney Creek Area (104 ha)***

The areas identified as Area 1 are a combination of two distinct blocks of land: Block A (Glover Road / Lewis Road) and Block B (lands east and west of Fifty Road, north of Highway 8).

In 2003, the City of Hamilton adopted official plan amendments (OPAs) to expand the urban boundary between Fruitland Road and the Hamilton / Grimsby border. However, the Greenbelt Plan was enacted prior to the finalization of the OPAs, resulting in Blocks A and B being included within the Greenbelt Plan.

In 2014, the Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan was adopted and the lands surrounding Blocks A and B were designated for a variety of urban uses. Blocks A and B lands are surrounded on three sides by urban area.

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
Connects residential development to the east, west and north and industrial development to the north of Block B.	Identified as Tender Fruit and Grape (Specialty Crop) by the Province.
Removes isolated parcels of agriculture lands.	Some productive agricultural land will be lost.
Urban uses can take advantage of existing and planned transportation and infrastructure (hard and soft) in close proximity.	

**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 14 of 25**

---

<p>Future uses would be complementary to the existing and proposed urban development within the Fruitland-Winona Community and Secondary Plan.</p>	
--	--

Planning Committee approved the removal of part of the lands in Block B, but Council deferred the request until such time as staff had completed a review of the Greenbelt Plan boundaries and reported back to Council on said review.

*3.2.2 Remove Lands east of Centre Road north of Parkside (North / east of Waterdown) (28 ha)*

The lands around the north / east / west side of the Waterdown urban area are located within the Protected Countryside designation of the Greenbelt Plan.

In April 2015, the Environmental Assessment, including the alignment, for the East-West Transportation Corridor around Waterdown was approved by the Ministry of the Environment. The approved road alignment is shown on Appendix “H”. The eastern end of the future roadway is located in the rural area. When the roadway is ultimately constructed, several properties will be bisected, leaving 28 ha of disjointed and isolated rural and Natural Heritage lands, adjacent to the urban boundary and fronting onto Highway 5.

In addition, the City is exploring a land exchange with private land owners to protect some environmentally significant portions of the lands north of the approved road.

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
Contiguous to urban area and existing and future residential, commercial and institutional uses.	Some productive agricultural land will be lost.
Urban uses can capitalize and contribute to existing and planned transportation and infrastructure systems.	
Future uses would be complementary to the existing and proposed urban development in the Waterdown.	
These lands are located adjacent to and near a major arterial road.	

**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 15 of 25**

---

*3.2.3 Remove Upper Stoney Creek (195 ha)*

This area was broken down into four quadrants originally (see page C-1, panel 18 of Appendix “A”). However, during the consultation period, the Hamilton Conservation Authority advised that they had completed the purchase of lands in this area (within the quadrant bounded by the Escarpment, Second Road, Green Mountain Road and Third Road East). The lands were acquired as part of a watershed restoration and enhancement strategy. As such, three quadrants remain for consideration. The lands are located on the east side of Upper Centennial Parkway from the Escarpment to Mud Street and from Upper Centennial Parkway to First Road West in the Escarpment / Mud Street block and to Second Road East from Green Mountain Road / Mud Street Block (Appendix “B”).

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
These lands are located adjacent to and near a major arterial road.	Identified as Tender Fruit and Grape (Specialty Crop) by the Province.
The lands would be an extension of the future Elfrida area.	Some productive agricultural land will be lost.
Transportation and infrastructure exists adjacent to the lands to accommodate future growth.	
The area is large enough to accommodate a mixture of land uses that can contribute to Elfrida as a complete community.	
Lands are located adjacent to a Secondary Corridor as identified in the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.	

*3.2.4 Add lands south of Twenty Mile Creek, east and west of Nebo Road (231 ha)*

This area is identified on Appendix “B”. The lands are located between Trinity Church Road to the east and west of Nebo Road, and between Airport Road East to the south and the concession line between the third and fourth concessions to the north.

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
Lands are located at the most south eastern part of the Whitebelt area next to the Greenbelt.	
Most land is used for agricultural purposes and inclusion in the Greenbelt will ensure long term protection.	
There are large natural heritage features within one quadrant that creates	

**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 16 of 25**

---

challenges to service or develop.	
-----------------------------------	--

**3.3 Option 3: Major Revisions to the Greenbelt Plan Boundary**

This option involves: 1) up to two large areas that could be removed from; and, 2) one large area that could be added to the Greenbelt (as shown on Appendix “B”). As with Option 2, any combination of these areas could be removed/added.

**3.3.1 Remove Stoneybrook lands (243 ha)**

The lands are located between Mud Street and Golf Club Road and Second Road / Hendershot Road and Third Road East / Concession Line. The area is identified on Appendix “B”. The lands were identified as a potential extension to the Elfrida area on the east.

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
These lands are located adjacent to the future Elfrida area.	Some productive agricultural lands will be lost.
There are limited natural heritage features within the area.	Servicing for this area has not been evaluated.

**3.3.2 Remove the lands North of Twenty Mile Creek (323 ha)**

The lands are located between Twenty Road and Twenty Mile Creek, and Highway 56 and Hendershot Road. The area is identified on Appendix “B”. The lands were identified as a potential southerly extension of the Elfrida area.

<b>Advantages</b>	<b>Disadvantages</b>
These lands are located adjacent to the future Elfrida area.	Some productive agricultural lands will be lost.
There are limited natural heritage features within the area.	Servicing for this area has not been evaluated.
	This area acts as a buffer between Twenty Mile Creek and the future urban area.

**3.3.3 Add the lands in the Book Road Area (450 ha)**

Within the Book Road Area there were three separate Blocks for consideration as lands that could be added to the Greenbelt Plan. The blocks of land are as follows: Block A lands south of Garner Road; Block B lands north of Book Road West; and, Block C lands south of Book Road West.



**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 17 of 25**

---

Advantages	Disadvantages
Block A has limited development potential given the presence of the Greenbelt Plan natural heritage finger and the large cemetery. Addition of these lands will further support the long term production of the natural heritage system.	Only a portion of Block A is designated Agriculture in the RHOP; the remainder of the lands are designated Open Space. Small and isolated parcels of agricultural land tend to be constrained for agriculture uses.
Blocks B and C are suitable for farming. The majority of the lands are designated Agriculture in the RHOP.	Proximity to existing and future employment lands.
Blocks B and C are largely constrained by the 28 NEF noise contour.	

**3.4 Option 4: Defer Greenbelt Boundary Revision until Completion of a Municipal Comprehensive Review**

As part of the review undertaken for this report, public input was sought on potential lands to be added or removed from the Greenbelt Plan. There was no clear consensus on whether lands should be removed or added, or which lands should be removed or added, due to the diversity of interests.

As identified in the *Greenbelt Boundary Review Report*, there are more than sufficient lands within the Whitebelt to accommodate future employment land needs. This is because there is a large percentage of the Whitebelt lands that are constrained by the 28 NEF Contour which would not allow sensitive lands uses (i.e. residential, institutional). On this basis, the City is able to choose the most appropriate areas for future employment growth.

The same circumstance does not exist for future residential growth. The high level analysis of the 2014 forecast and the application of the assumptions outlined in the Dillon report suggest the City may be short approximately 200 to 700 ha to meet the population and associated household growth within the 2031-2041 timeframe. If a more detailed analysis as part of a municipal comprehensive review confirms these findings, and no changes are made to the Greenbelt boundaries, the City would have limited infrastructure, transportation and land use planning options to consider for meeting these land needs. The options available to the City may therefore result in a less than ideal growth scenario.

The City is undertaking the 2031-2041 municipal comprehensive review which will include a land budget, and updates to the water / wastewater, transportation and storm water management plans. This review will provide greater clarity and certainty with respect to the City's future land needs. As such, Option 4 would be to request that the

**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 18 of 25**

---

Province defer any revisions to the Greenbelt boundaries until the municipal comprehensive review is completed.

After completing the review and supporting studies, the City will be in a better position to determine how much land is needed and where the most appropriate location would be for these lands to meet the policies of the Growth Plan and the PPS.

### 3.5 Option 5: Grow the Greenbelt

The last option is to add all areas identified for potential addition to the Greenbelt Plan into the Greenbelt Plan Boundary (i.e. Book Road, Nebo Road and Urban River Valley Areas). During the open house events, many participants expressed that all areas identified for potential addition into the Greenbelt Plan should be included due to the significant agricultural lands within the Nebo Road and Book Road areas that would benefit from protection and enhancement through Greenbelt policy. Many other participants expressed opposition to the addition of the Book Road and Nebo Road areas due to financial investment and development interests.

Option 5 would include the addition of urban river valleys. City staff identified the potential addition of the Red Hill Creek Valley as part of the consultation process. Additional suggestions provided by the public at the open house sessions included adding the following areas:

- Lower Spencer Creek / Spencer Gorge;
- Chedoke Creek;
- Ancaster Crescent Valley;
- Stoney Creek and Battlefield Creek;
- Grindstone Creek Valley; and,
- Tributaries through Dundas and Ancaster.

In 2011, the Province added a new policy framework called urban river valleys:

*“Key river valleys in urban areas adjacent to the Greenbelt provide opportunities for additional connections to help expand and integrate the Greenbelt and its systems into the broader Southern Ontario landscape. The Urban River Valley designation provides direction to those areas where the Greenbelt occupies river valleys in an urban context. These urban river valleys may be the setting for a network of uses and facilities including recreational, cultural and tourist amenities and infrastructure, which are needed to support urban areas.*

*The Urban River Valley designation as shown on Schedule 1 applies to publicly owned lands within the main corridors of river valleys connecting the rest of the Greenbelt to the Great Lakes and inland lakes. The lands*

**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 19 of 25**

---

*in this designation comprise river valleys and associated lands and are generally characterized by being:*

- *Lands containing natural and hydrologic features; and/or,*
- *Lands designated in municipal official plans for uses such as parks, open space, recreation, conservation and environmental protection.*

*The lands are governed by the applicable municipal official plan policies provided they have regard to the objectives of the Greenbelt Plan.*

*All existing, expanded or new infrastructure which is subject to and approved under the Environmental Assessment Act, or which receives a similar approval, is permitted provided it supports the needs of adjacent urban areas or serves the significant growth and economic development expected in southern Ontario and supports the goals and objectives of the Greenbelt Plan.”*

When considering this option, it should be noted that adding lands to the Greenbelt Plan can be undertaken outside of the ten year review provided the six criteria are met as described in the Province’s *Growing the Greenbelt* document (page 4, Appendix “I”).

Adding the Red Hill Valley and other creeks / streams to the Greenbelt Plan at this point in time is not being recommended for the following reasons:

*Red Hill Valley*

- 1) Any revision to policy within the Red Hill Valley requires consultation with Joint Stewardship Board. In 2002, the City of Hamilton and the Six Nations community signed a number of agreements intended to preserve the Haudenosaunee interest in the Red Hill Valley with the onset of the construction for the Red Hill Valley parkway. The intent of the agreements was to foster long-term relationships and to create a plan for the Valley. The Joint Stewardship Board, comprised of equal representation from the City of Hamilton and the Haudenosaunee, has a responsibility to ensure cooperation and successful continuation of the environmental management plans for the Red Hill Valley. Therefore any consideration of adding the Red Hill Valley to the Greenbelt Plan will require consultation with the Board prior to any decisions made.
- 2) Any potential revisions to the approved Environmental Assessment would require an evaluation as to how the infrastructure ‘supports the needs of adjacent urban areas or serves the significant growth and economic development expected in Southern Ontario’ according to the policies contained within the Greenbelt Plan, specifically Section 6.0 Urban River Valley Policies.

**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 20 of 25**

---

- 3) The City owns most of the Red Hill Valley lands in the Greenbelt Plan, but some lands are privately owned which may impact the application of the Urban River Valley designation to the Valley lands (i.e. only publicly owned lands can be designated “Urban River Valley” in the Greenbelt Plan).
- 4) The lands are designated Open Space on Schedule ‘E-1’ – Urban Land Use Designations and identified as a core are of the Natural Heritage System within the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. Additional provincial policy does not create a greater level of environmental protection. Additional planning policy layers undermine the goals of the Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (i.e. remove policy layers).

*Other Creeks / Streams*

- 5) Some of the creeks are already within the NEP Area and protected through regulations of the governing Conservation Authorities (e.g. Grindstone Creek Valley, tributaries through Dundas, etc.) and additional provincial direction is unnecessary.
- 6) The City has protected all these areas through the Official Plan, the Zoning By-law and public acquisition (where applicable). Additional planning layers do not increase the protection for these areas.

3.6 Other Lands (requested by the Public) to be removed from or added to the Greenbelt Plan Boundary.

Appendix “G” identifies the site specific land requests to:

- 1) Remove lands from the Greenbelt Plan (lands not part of the identified areas); and,
- 2) Add lands to the Greenbelt Plan (lands not part of the identified areas).

The rationale as to why (or why not) lands should (or should not) be removed and / or added is described in Appendix “G”. Staff do not support these options.

**4.0 Changes to the Greenbelt Plan Natural Heritage System boundaries**

During the open house sessions, many people commented that the Natural Heritage System boundary is inaccurate on their lands and they wished for the designation to be removed.

Amendments to the Natural Heritage System boundaries were addressed in Report PED15078. Recommendation 22 specifically stated “that the Province work with Hamilton staff to revise the Natural Heritage System map to reflect the core areas and natural heritage systems of the City”. The rationale for this recommendation was that

there are some lands have been included in the Natural Heritage System that do not have features, whereas other lands have features but such features were not designated.

Staff reaffirm the position that a more detailed review of the Natural Heritage System boundary should be undertaken by the Province in conjunction with City staff to ensure the accuracy of these boundaries and to add and delete lands from the Greenbelt Plan based on this review. A particular focus on the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System fingers is required since there is some discrepancy that some fingers do not contain natural heritage features.

A specific recommendation to reaffirm this request has been added (Recommendation (e)).

## **5.0 Niagara Escarpment Plan**

Part of the Greenbelt Plan boundary review included any potential changes to the Niagara Escarpment Plan designations. Lands within the Niagara Escarpment Plan are considered to be part of the 'Greenbelt'; however, they have their own legislation under the Ontario Planning and Development Act and Niagara Escarpment Plan / Development Control Act. Changes to the Plan are being considered as part of the Coordinated Provincial Plan Review.

### 5.1 Council Requests for Changes – Robert E. Wade and Olympic Parks

Council supported Recommendation 26 in Report PED15078 which recommended that the Robert E. Wade Park, Hydro One site and Olympic Park be redesignated from Escarpment Rural to Urban since these designations do not reflect the current function of the site.

At its meeting of October 15, 2015, the Niagara Escarpment Commission recommended to the Province that these two designation changes are appropriate.

Since the completion of this report, three additional changes to the Niagara Escarpment Plan have been identified and are listed below.

### 5.2 345 and 363 Jerseyville Road (adjacent to Robert E. Wade Park)

As a result of the recent recommendation from the NEC to redesignate Robert E. Wade Park from "Escarpment Rural Area" and "Escarpment Natural Area" to "Urban Area", two small parcels of land (1.4 ha for both parcels) are isolated between urban designations to the south and west (see Appendix "D"). Both sites contain an existing single detached dwelling. It would be appropriate to also include these parcels within the urban area designation.

**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 22 of 25**

---

Changes to the Niagara Escarpment Plan designations do not affect the overall quantum of lands within the Greenbelt Plan: the Greenbelt Plan includes all of the Niagara Escarpment Plan regardless of designation.

5.3 294 and 296 York Road

There are two sites (as shown on Appendix “E”): an existing house serviced by water and a garden centre serviced by both water and sewers. They are directly across from the urban area of Dundas and the lands to the north are designed Urban in the NEP and the lands to the south have been recommended for a redesignation from Rural to Urban as a result of the NEC’s recent report on the Coordinated Provincial Plan Review. The garden centre is a commercial use that serves much of the urban area and it is more appropriate to be located outside the rural area. The existing house should also be included as Urban, as it would leave a remnant parcel of land designated Rural in the NEP. Neither of the subject lands supports the objectives of the NEP rural area designation.

The property owner at 296 York Road sent a request to the NEC to have their lands included within the urban designation. However, the NEC gave them a site specific exemption to allow them to connect to municipal services. Staff are unsure as to why a site specific exception is necessary since it is the City’s determination as to the owner’s ability to connect to municipal services. Furthermore, at this time an amendment to the Rural Hamilton Official Plan would be required to connect to municipal services.

5.4 Add City of Hamilton owned lands to the Niagara Escarpment Plan Open Space System (NEPOSS)

*5.4.1 Issue*

The City wishes to establish regularly maintained viewing areas along the Mountain Brow from Mohawk Road to the Sherman Cut. Staff are not authorized to proceed with selective tree removals to improve views under the NEC development control area; the City is restricted to good forestry practices. Good forestry includes removal of dead, diseased or hazard trees. Staff recommend that a long term strategy be developed to identify significant view locations and a corresponding management strategy for the Mountain Brow.

*5.4.2 Proposed Solution*

To achieve this goal, it would be beneficial to amend the Niagara Escarpment Plan to include these lands within the Niagara Escarpment Plan Open Space System (NEPOSS) for the Natural Area, identified in Appendix “F”, as a means to facilitate a Management Plan approval by NEC. The management plan would establish the appropriate maintenance zones and view locations as well as management practices according to the Niagara Escarpment Parks and Open Space Planning Manual. Staff from

**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 23 of 25**

---

Environmental Services met with the NEC staff and they agree that this approach is an appropriate course of action.

The natural area of the mountain brow under consideration for NEPOSS includes the Bruce Trail, the Escarpment Rail Trail, the Chedoke Radial Trail and the multiuse trail at the top of the escarpment within the road allowance. By including this area, the City will achieve several of the NEPOSS objectives, including but not limited to:

- Provide opportunities for outdoor education and recreation;
- Provide public access to the Niagara Escarpment;
- Complete a public system of major parks and open space through additional land acquisition and park and open space planning;
- Secure a route for the Bruce Trail;
- Maintain and enhance the natural environment of the Niagara Escarpment;
- Support tourism by providing opportunities on public land for discovery and enjoyment by Ontario's residents and visitors;
- Educate visitors and community members on the Niagara Escarpment; and,
- Show leadership in supporting and promoting the principles of the Niagara Escarpment's UNESCO World Biosphere Reserve Designation through sustainable park planning, ecological management, community involvement, environmental monitoring, research and education.

### 5.5 Recommendations

That the City of Hamilton requests the Province to consider amendments to the Niagara Escarpment Plan as follows:

- (i) to redesignate the lands located on Jerseyville Road East, south of Robert E. Wade Park from the Rural Escarpment designation to Urban, as shown on the attached map marked as Appendix "D";
- (ii) To redesignate the lands located at 294 York Road and 296 York Road from the Rural Escarpment designation to Urban, as shown on the attached map marked as Appendix "E";
- (iii) To add the lands located on the Mountain Brow into the Niagara Escarpment Plan Open Space System (NEPOSS) which would allow the City to undertake a

**SUBJECT: Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (Greenbelt Plan and Niagara Escarpment Plan Boundary Review) - City of Hamilton Comments (PED15078(a)) (City Wide) – Page 24 of 25**

---

Management Strategy / Plan to address maintenance, views from the Brow among other matters.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION**

Staff are recommending a combination of Option 2 and 4. The alternative for consideration is that Council can adopt one or a combination of the other options outlined in the report.

**ALIGNMENT TO THE 2012 – 2015 STRATEGIC PLAN**

**Strategic Priority #1**

A Prosperous & Healthy Community

*WE enhance our image, economy and well-being by demonstrating that Hamilton is a great place to live, work, play and learn.*

**Strategic Objective**

- 1.1 Continue to grow the non-residential tax base.
- 1.3 Promote economic opportunities with a focus on Hamilton's downtown core, all downtown areas and waterfronts.
- 1.4 Improve the City's transportation system to support multi-modal mobility and encourage inter-regional connections.
- 1.6 Enhance overall sustainability (financial, economic, social and environmental).

**Strategic Priority #3**

Leadership & Governance

*WE work together to ensure we are a government that is respectful towards each other and that the community has confidence and trust in.*

**Strategic Objective**

- 3.1 Engage in a range of inter-governmental relations (IGR) work that will advance partnerships and projects that benefit the City of Hamilton.



**APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED**

- Appendix “A” Greenbelt Boundary Review Public Consultation Summary Report (Dillon Consulting)
- Appendix “B” Areas to be Added and/or Removed from the Greenbelt Plan Map (Dillon Consulting)
- Appendix “C” Greenbelt Boundary Review Report (Dillon Consulting)
- Appendix “D” Revision to the NEP – Jerseyville Road
- Appendix “E” Revision to the NEP – York Road Properties
- Appendix “F” Revision to the NEP – Mountain Brow
- Appendix “G” Site Specific Boundary Revisions Proposed for Addition to or Removal from the Greenbelt Plan
- Appendix “H” Waterdown East-West Bypass Road Alignment Map
- Appendix “I” Growing the Greenbelt (Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing)

/th