

From: Lakewood Beach Community Council

Sent: December-04-15 10:18 AM

To: Caterini, Rose

Cc: Office of the Mayor; Johnson, Aidan; Farr, Jason; Green, Matthew; Merulla, Sam; Collins, Chad; Jackson, Tom; Whitehead, Terry; Conley, Doug; Pearson, Maria; Johnson, Brenda; Ferguson, Lloyd; VanderBeek, Arlene; Pasuta, Robert; Partridge, Judi

Subject: Greenbelt Plan Review

Rose, please add this to Council Agenda. We don't know which item # at this time because the Agenda isn't public as yet but we believe it will be on next week's. We've copied all of Council in at this time since it includes a link. Hope that is okay.

Dear Honourable Mayor & Council:

<http://www.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/media/browser/2015-09-10%2008%3A56/greenbelt-boundary-pic-panels.pdf>

Please refer to slide 15 on the above link. We would attach it to this email, but you will need to zoom in to the Lower Stoney Creek Area to appreciate our comments. Please look at the area that is supposedly **in** the Greenbelt **Protected** Area (light green slashed area) and it becomes quite obvious how much development has and is occurring within this protected? area in lower Stoney Creek.

Following the "urban boundary" terminology is a little confusing, but our understanding is that within our *Growth* Plan urban boundary, we have:

- (a) built-up areas (designation in our OP but shown as *urban* in the Greenbelt Plan) and,
- (b) greenfield development areas (designation in our OP but shown as *whitebelt* areas in the Greenbelt Plan)

There appears to be some confusion between *Greenbelt* (protected for significant reasons) and the *Greenfield* areas (developable, but with mandated targets to curb sprawl)

We are mandated, under our *Growth* Plan, to have a *minimum* of 40% of our units built within the built-up areas; leaving the whitebelt area to accommodate 60% of our residential housing units. According to our Planning Dept, our 4 year result as of 2014 is 30% of our residential units have been built in the "built-up" area due to 70% of our units being built in our greenfield areas. We're falling short of our **minimum** target.

Approving removals from our Greenbelt may free up those lands for development, but they will still be located outside of the built-up area, designated "greenfield", and have a negative impact on our mandated intensification targets (which is mandated to occur by 2015).

Considering we:

(a) are no where near our residential intensification target under the Growth Plan,
(b) the forecasted developments (based on building permits) will have us falling even further behind, and,
(c) we already have sufficient lands within the whitebelt of the Greenbelt Plan, we are requesting that Council endorses **no removal** of any lands from the Greenbelt in lower Stoney Creek.

It appears, the focus needs to be on finding a better balance on intensifying the lands we have in our urban boundary; not expanding the boundary even further.

During the deliberations and Public meeting, the focus seemed to be on "agricultural" lands which is extremely important, but it is just one of the 3 visions of the Greenbelt. All 3 are key and should be taken into consideration before any removals are recommended.

We have historical and major flooding issues in lower Stoney Creek, we already have extensive development within the "protected" area", (as per the panel #15), we do *not* have any detailed floodplain maps, and the recommendations to remove have not provided anyone (Council & Public) with details on the impact to our natural heritage and water resources systems. (Vision #2 under the Greenbelt Plan)

Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,

Lakewood Beach Community Council