

Summary of Comments on Final Draft

Name	Comments	Response
Azher Siddiqui	<p>Expand the Red Hill Public Library and connect it to Sam Manson Park. At the moment, there is no back entrance to the Red Hill Public Library from Sam Manson Park and in fact there is a metal fence preventing flow of movement. There should be some entrance way made where the back parking lot currently exists.</p> <p>It would be nice if the City could install lights at Sam Manson Park to allow for evening soccer games, etc.</p>	<p>Comments refer to detailed design of a particular site and do not impact the proposed Secondary Plan.</p> <p>Comments have been provided to Recreation Planning regarding lighting for soccer fields and to Parks and Hamilton Public Library staff regarding access between the library and the park. Access would require the existing property owner's permission as the library leases its site from a private property owner.</p>
Mike Pawlowski	<p>Include the railroad tracks and the Go Station in all of the maps.</p> <p>To reduce heavy east-west traffic on Barton and Queenston:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approach provincial government for access to QEW at Millen Road, • Explore use of hydro-right-of-way east of Lake Avenue, • Expand width of North Service road, • Provide LRT to Eastgate, • Limit bike lanes on major roads that will inhibit traffic. <p>Explore all possibilities to address the volume of north-south traffic on Centennial Pkwy</p>	<p>The station site and the railroad tracks have been identified on the first 4 of the maps.</p> <p>The Transportation Management Plan (TMP) provides transportation system recommendations. There are no plans to allow additional access to the QEW. The use of the hydro right-of-way is restricted.</p> <p>The review done by the TMP did not identify a road widening to North Service Road as part of the preferred solution.</p> <p>The LRT is now proposed to be built to Eastgate. The TMP proposes bike lanes on Nash Road and Lake Avenue instead of major arterial roads. "Neighbourhood Greenways" are also proposed on several local/collector roads which will also be designed to support cyclists.</p> <p>The Transportation Management Plan addresses this.</p>

	<p>The purpose of the Go Station should be to bring people to Hamilton and not to take them to jobs away from Hamilton.</p> <p>Stop the establishment of further auto business or retail-car-lots on Centennial that have inherent limits on the number they employ.</p> <p>Consider relocating the low-income-housing projects at Kenora and Barton. Most likely none of these residents will have any interest in the Go Station. Housing should be established for those who will utilize the facility.</p> <p>Approach Universities and Colleges to promote the establishment of an academic institution near the GO Station. Attract people to Hamilton, especially students that most likely would make Hamilton their home after completing their internships here.</p> <p>Move the Drivers Examination Centre to make the area available for high rise dwellings or office towers</p> <p>Move recycling plant on Kenora to make the area available for high rise dwellings or office towers.</p>	<p>The station will provide better transportation options to and from the area, both of which are beneficial for the area.</p> <p>The policies will not permit new auto oriented uses such as drive-throughs, gas stations, vehicle dealerships and car washes on Centennial Parkway.</p> <p>The Secondary Plan only directs the form of housing and cannot determine who lives in what dwelling unit. The proposed Mixed Use – High Density Designation on Centennial near the GO Station will permit high density residential uses, which supports the GO station.</p> <p>The Mixed Use – High Density Designation permits a wide variety of uses, and would permit the type of use suggested. Initiatives to attract businesses or institutions to different sites happen outside of the land use planning process, and are a function of the City’s Economic Development group.</p> <p>The Secondary Plan cannot force a legally existing use to relocate.</p> <p>The Secondary Plan includes policies that direct the City to consider moving this City facility, to address potential compatibility issues between this operation and residential uses which may be proposed on Centennial Parkway. The TMP also</p>
--	--	--

		<p>recommends the relocation of this site to allow Goderich Road to be extended to Kenora Avenue, to provide better access to the GO Station.</p>
<p>GSP Group (on behalf of 860 Queenston Road)</p>	<p>Client has filed an appeal to the OMB respecting its application for a 19 storey residential building on the subject site. The application was supported by Planning staff but was not approved by Council. Our client continues to request that the Secondary Plan provide a designation and policies that implement our client's application as the most appropriate designation for the subject site.</p> <p>The current designations do not implement the staff recommended development proposal for our client's lands. This is despite the fact that a number of properties in the Secondary Plan area have densities that are proposed to increase from medium to high density within the draft Plan when compared to the current UHOP permissions. City should acknowledge that the subject site should be designated for high density.</p> <p>The alternative that was brought forward in the May 2017 draft was to apply a site specific policy to recognize that the entire site is subject to an ongoing OMB appeal. This has been removed. At a minimum, our client requests that the site specific policy be reinstated for the entire site. The site specific policy recognizes that pending the OMB's</p>	<p>Through the Secondary Plan process, staff developed an overall vision for the area, identified the level of intensification needed to meet City targets, and developed a concept which shows a variety of levels of intensification in different areas. Key locations were identified for the highest densities based on a number of different factors. Additional density beyond what is proposed by the plan is not necessary to meet density targets.</p> <p>Staff have applied a site specific policy area noting that the site is subject to an ongoing OMB process. However, staff note that identifying a property in a Secondary Plan as subject to an OMB decision, where a decision has not yet been made, cannot effectively place a "hold" on the designation and allow it to be changed when a decision is made. If the owner wishes to prevent</p>

	<p>disposition on the appeals, the site remains subject to the existing Official Plan designations.</p> <p>The Secondary Plan relies upon redevelopment of the Eastgate Mall lands to achieve the minimum density target of 150 persons and jobs per hectare by 2031. However, the Eastgate Mall lands are recognized as transitioning over the long term, which does not ensure that the minimum targets will occur. Recently the City staff report reviewing the Existing Conditions and Development Trend Between 2006 and 2016 – GRIDS2 Background Report PED17010(a) indicated that “residential intensification to date in the Downtown and the other Nodes and Corridors has been underperforming.” The Report indicates the Centennial Node is currently at 64 persons and jobs per hectare. Significantly more development than what is proposed in the draft Secondary Plan is required in the immediate term, to support the minimum targets identified. Proposed intensification should be focused on the lands in and around the Major Transit Station Areas. Numerous properties in this area that are proposed to be designated Medium Density should instead be High Density, in recognition of the investment in transportation and to achieve Provincial policy direction.</p>	<p>the proposed land use designation from coming into effect, the owner will need to appeal the Secondary Plan as it relates to their lands. The appeal could be consolidated with the development application appeal so that the decision of the OMB, when it occurs, is reflected in the final Secondary Plan.</p> <p>The minimum density that the area must achieve by 2031 is 100 persons and units per hectare, not 150. A 20% intensification rate was applied equally across the Node to establish a growth estimate. This represents a Node density of 106 persons and jobs per hectare. Staff note that the significant difference between the Mixed Use - Medium Density and the Mixed Use – High Density designations is the height limitations. Due to the fact that permitted uses include both commercial and residential, the designations do not prescribe residential density ranges. Significant densities can still be achieved at a moderate height, depending on the type and design of development. The Mixed Use – High Density designation recognizes key areas where the highest heights are appropriate based on a variety of factors.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>The High Density Residential policies allow an increase in density, but restrict the overall height in a manner which may not practically permit increased density to be utilized (i.e. restriction to existing heights).</p> <p>With respect to sites proposed as Mixed Use – High Density increases in density and height are permitted without amendment to the Plan, however height is capped at five additional storeys. No rationale is provided in support of this cap. We continue to question the ability of the land within the Secondary Plan area to achieve the necessary intensification to support the significant transit initiatives in this area.</p>	<p>The height restrictions for High Density Residential sites are intended to protect existing housing stock, which is important to the area. The limitations also serve to protect the stability of existing residential neighbourhoods. The additional densities will allow for additions to existing buildings, renovations to existing buildings that increase the number of units, and for new infill buildings.</p> <p>Recommendations from Dillon Consulting noted that marginal increases to height permissions may be appropriate for Mixed Use – High Density areas, to allow for flexibility in building design. A number of sites were tested generally with regards to sun shadow impacts at proposed maximum heights, and although the heights are appropriate, it is recognized that some sites may be able to achieve a small amount of additional height depending on the design of a building. Limitations are needed to ensure that the area remains secondary in focus and level of development to the downtown, and that the spirit of the plan that was publicly endorsed is maintained. Limitations also ensure that heights do not exceed those permitted for the focal point of the Node, Eastgate Square Mall.</p>
Fred Pizzoferrato	<p>The designation of the property located at 103 Centennial Parkway South should be changed from “Low Density Residential 2” to “Medium Density Residential 3” for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lots directly to the south are 	<p>The designation for these lots has been changed to Low Density Residential 3 as requested.</p> <p>To properly consider these comments, staff did a detailed review of lands surrounding this property, and of the lot sizes and depths for the properties</p>

	<p>designated “Medium Density Residential 3” and this lot is the same depth.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The property is only 200 feet from a High Density designation. • The property is 90 feet from the Low Density Residential 2 lands (across the street). • Centennial Parkway south is a major road • If designation is left as is, there is a concern with overshadowing on this property. 	<p>fronting Centennial Parkway South in this block (between Neil Ave and Meadowvale Ave). Based on the densities and type of development permitted in the Medium Density Residential 3 designation, lot consolidation of properties on this stretch of road would be appropriate to allow for future development. Although the property fronts onto Neil Avenue, which is a low density residential street, the design of a medium density development can achieve an appropriate interface with housing across the street. Therefore the proposed designation of this site has been amended to “Medium Density Residential 3” as requested.</p> <p>In addition to this change, staff also identified that the Medium Density Residential 3 designation applied to two small properties at the southernmost part of this block located at 67 and 69 Centennial Parkway South is too restrictive in terms of density requirements. A development meeting the required densities would be very difficult to achieve, even with consolidation of these lots. Therefore, the designation of these properties was changed to Low Density Residential 3.</p>
<p>Zelinka Priamo Limited (on behalf of Canadian Tire Real Estate Limited, for 686 Queenston Road and 106 Centennial</p>	<p>The lands at 686 Queenston Road are proposed to be split designed Mixed Use – Medium Density and Mixed Use – High Density with a Pedestrian Focus Street overlay. The proposed designation remains unchanged from the April 2017 draft Secondary Plan, whereby the boundary of the proposed split designation bisects the existing</p>	<p>A higher density/intensity of use, greater building heights and a pedestrian focus is appropriate for the front portion of this site, as it is located directly adjacent to Queenston Road, a major arterial road, and abuts a proposed LRT stop. As the site is very large, the southern half (approx.) of the site is positioned more in the interior of a low density neighbourhood and the same amount of</p>

<p>Parkway North)</p>	<p>parking lot and other buildings on site. In our submission the implementation of a split designation is difficult, whereby there would be differing land use permissions and tests under the Official Plan and Secondary Plan.</p> <p>We request confirmation that the existing gas bar will continue to be permitted under the proposed Mixed-Use – High Density designation notwithstanding Section 4.5.6 and the Pedestrian Focus Street overlay.</p> <p>Policy 6.7.5.1 j) should also reference Policy 6.7.7.5 b) in order to notwithstanding the required minimum building height of 3 storeys for properties located on Queenston Road.</p>	<p>density and height is not appropriate in this area. To address these concerns, staff have extended the Mixed Use – High Density designation across the whole site, but have applied a site specific policy to the lands which maintains the original policy intent to have a lower density and height on the southern half of the site. Staff notes that both designations are similar and generally permit the same range of uses.</p> <p>The existing gas bar will continue to be permitted as a Legal Non-Complying use. New gas bars will not be permitted on the LRT route or within Pedestrian Focus Street areas.</p> <p>Correction made.</p>
<p>Fotenn (for 50 Violet Drive, 11 and 40 Grandville Ave. and 77 Delawana Drive)</p>	<p>Current policies will permit intensification of High Density Residential properties up to 300 units per hectare. Satisfied with the policies.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Webb Planning Consultants (for Effort Trust, 697, 686 and 706 Queenston Road)</p>	<p>Generally satisfied that the policies are appropriate. Should further explore maximum building heights and Policy 6.7.5.1 j) that provides specific relief from minimum building heights and maximum setback requirements. Suggest that a site specific policy area be developed for the Queenston Mall site (686 Queenston) to reflect context of site and provide guidance for any major</p>	<p>Staff are satisfied that the maximum building heights and Policy 6.7.5.1 j) appropriately address the site.</p> <p>Staff have amended the land use designation for the southerly half of the site from Mixed Use – Medium Density to Mixed Use – High Density, as noted in the response to Zelinka Priamo’s comments for this same site, on page 7 of Appendix H above. To maintain the intent of the</p>

	redevelopment of the site, similar to Eastgate Square site specific policy area.	Plan, staff have developed a site specific policy area for the site to provide guidance for future development.
Richard Herlick, Laurier Group (for 826-840 Queenston)	The site is within the Major Transit Station Area boundary and essentially right on the LRT line and across the street from higher density. Our site should be designated with a density of greater than 12 storeys.	No changes are recommended. Through the Secondary Plan process, staff developed an overall vision for the area, identified what level of intensification is needed to meet City targets, and developed a concept which shows a variety of levels of intensification in different areas. Key locations were identified for the highest densities based on a number of different factors. Mixed Use sites along Queenston Road on the edges of the Node have lower heights to provide a gradual transition out of the Node and to maintain heights similar to existing residential uses along these road segments. Additional density beyond what is proposed by the plan is not necessary to meet density targets.
Parkway Nissan (191 Centennial Parkway North)	Business is planning on doubling in size to approx. 25,000 square feet with a construction cost of \$2-3 million which will allow them to hire 6 more people. The proposed land use change is unfair to us and our neighbourhood and is not in keeping with the spirit of the current use of the properties along Centennial Pkwy.	Staff acknowledge that the direction of the plan represents a shift from historical development along Centennial Parkway. However, it is important to ensure that the area is appropriately planned for the long term, to ensure that development meets the requirements of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. Transit-supportive development within the Node and along higher order transit corridors is important to support transit investments occurring in the area. To address the concerns, staff have added policies to the plan allowing legal non-complying car dealerships to be recognized as existing uses in the Zoning By-law. Changes to the built form of these uses will require them to be brought into

		greater conformity with the Pedestrian Focus Streets and Urban Design policies of the Secondary Plan.
Urban Solutions (for 71, 83 and 85 Centennial Parkway South)	<p>There are concerns with draft policies i) and ii) of the site specific for the lands (Policy 6.7.18.2c)), as they prescribe building step-backs to the built form without an opportunity for an informed determination if such step-backs are necessary to establish compatibility. These prescriptive policies are onerous.</p> <p>There is a need to clarify the permitted density of units per hectare for both traditional multiple dwelling units and retirement home suites. It is our understanding that two retirement dwelling suites are typically interpreted to equate to one residential unit for the purpose of calculation of density and this should be reflected in the site specific policy.</p>	<p>Policies noted have been removed. General urban design policies are sufficient to deal with transitions and appropriate design.</p> <p>Policy has been added that clarifies density calculations for retirement home dwelling units which do not have full kitchens.</p>
GSP Group (for SmartREIT, 210 Centennial Parkway North and 502-560 Centennial Parkway North)	<p>Request confirmation that Policy 6.7.5.1 K) would apply to a phased approach of redevelopment.</p> <p>Policy 6.7.7.4 c) states that the minimum building height shall be 3 storeys. Three storey buildings are not typically financially feasible. We suggest a minimum height of 2 storeys for the site at 210 Centennial Parkway North.</p>	<p>Policy noted has been removed. Policy j) permits minor one storey development to be added to existing development or to be part of a new major redevelopment, and would apply to a phased approach.</p> <p>Policy quoted is not in the September draft policies. Policy requires a minimum 2 storey height along Centennial Parkway, and 3 storeys along Queenston Road, which addresses this concern.</p>

	Suggest that Policy 6.7.5.1 k) permit limited 1 and 2 storey development.	Change is not necessary as 2 storey development is permitted across site. This policy is removed in final version as policy 6.7.5.1 j) adequately addresses transitional development.
Urban Solutions (for 140 Centennial Parkway North)	A height of greater than 20 storeys should be considered for the site. Only Eastgate Mall permits 20 storeys.	No change recommended. Heights are based on a number of factors. Eastgate Mall is intended to be the focal point for the Secondary Plan, and is the largest and most prominent site. Node must also be secondary to downtown in terms of heights and densities. Eastgate Mall is also much larger than other Mixed Use – High Density sites within the Secondary Plan, allowing for greater separation distances between tall buildings and existing residential and sensitive land uses.
Spears and Associates Inc. Planning Consultants (for Eastgate Mall)	<p>Policy 6.7.5.1 b)</p> <p>It is not clear what is intended by this Policy. It is not clear where the 5,000 square metres of commercial floor space comes from. Eastgate Mall is substantially larger, over 9 times this amount. One would think, that as part of any redevelopment proposal, the City could request various supporting studies. In other words, I don't see the need for this policy and I do not understand the rationale or significance of the 5,000 square metres. The 5,000 square metres and the 30% reduction seem arbitrary and there is no reference to these thresholds in Volume 1. As an alternative, it would be much simpler to require a market study as part of a redevelopment proposal on a site by site basis. As the changing retail commercial</p>	<p>Policy revised to eliminate numerical values. Requires that where a proposal on a large site will be reducing the amount of retail floor space, the City may require a retail impact study. The City to request on a case-by-case basis depending on a specific proposal.</p>

	<p>market evolves the amount of commercial floor space may change.</p> <p>The word “development” and “redevelopment” are defined terms in Chapter G – Volume 1 Glossary. However the words “redeveloped” and “major redevelopment” are not defined terms in Volume 1. Section 6.7.7.2 h) appears to introduce a new definition referred to as “major redevelopment” however “major” is not italicized. This is very confusing and a suggestion would be to include a definition. Are “major development” and “major redevelopment” the same? Is there a maximum lot area? How does the 5,000 square metres and/or the 30% threshold into it?</p> <p>Section 6.7.7.2 h) i) and ii) are also very confusing. Policy refers to sites on 2.5 hectares or more and appears to now define “major redevelopment” as 30% of the land area of the property existing at the date of approval of the plan. This policy is problematic for Eastgate Square. If the owner wanted to partially demolish and reconstruct the shopping centre, would this be considered “major redevelopment” even if no new gross floor area was proposed? Similarly, if the “redevelopment” of the shopping centre were to progress in phases, would a residential component be required when the combined area of the redevelopment of the proposals is greater</p>	<p>As most sites in the Secondary Plan are currently developed, major redevelopment has the same meaning as major development. Major redevelopment is not defined in Volume 1 as the reference to this term in the Secondary Plan policies is specific to the Secondary Plan. Policies describing what is considered to be major redevelopment have been amended to provide general guidance and allow determination of major redevelopment through the Zoning By-law and development applications.</p> <p>Policy referred to has been rewritten to provide clearer direction, and reconstructions of portions of the mall have been exempted from having to provide a mix of uses.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>than 30%? This policy does not work for Eastgate Mall. A suggestion would be to include a site specific policy in Areas F to exclude Eastgate Square from the 30% residential trigger.</p> <p>Policy 6.7.7.4 c) Mixed Use – High Density is also confusing. Chapter E Section 2.3.2.14 Design refers to sites greater than 2.5 ha for redevelopment for mixed uses. Chapter E Policy 2.3.2.7 states that “Sub Regional Service Nodes shall generally have some higher densities with a target density of 100 to 150 persons and jobs per hectare across each node.” Volume 1 does not require a minimum density of 100 units per hectare for every site, it is a blended density across the entire Eastgate Node.</p> <p>Policy 6.7.18.6 – Site Specific Policy – Area F Wording is confusing. What is meant by “Major redevelopment”? What is meant by the “majority of the site”? Also, it is not realistic to expect a major redevelopment of the majority of the site would be initiated by a single developer.</p> <p>Draft 2 contains a lot of numbers related to percentages of commercial floor area (30%) and lot areas (2.5 hectares in some places, 2</p>	<p>Secondary Plans are intended to provide more detailed land use direction than Volume 1, and can implement more detailed policies. Where residential is proposed, the minimum density requirement ensures that the density is a high density, as intended by the Plan. In order to achieve the needed density across the node, a minimum density of development needs to be achieved on a site by site basis. The Secondary Plan establishes this density framework. Policy wording has been revised for additional clarification on intent.</p> <p>Policy wording has been amended to provide more clarity and remove the term “Major Redevelopment”.</p> <p>Policies 6.7.7.2 h) and i) reference sites 2.5 ha or larger, and are based on Volume 1 policies already established in the UHOP. Policies 6.7.5.1</p>
--	---	---

	<p>in others). Volume 1 E.2.3.2.10 states “The Sub-Regional Service Nodes shall be planned and encouraged to accommodate in excess of 100,000 square metres of retail floor space each. The words “planned” and “encourage” do not require each site to achieve this target. Eastgate Square is close to 50,000 square metres or half of the entire Eastgate Node’s requirements. The numbers and percentages appear arbitrary and there is no explanation for them or illustrations as to how to apply them if they are intended as a guideline. There is no explanation of the rationale behind these numbers. Upon closer review of the policies in Volume 1, there seems to be a disconnect between the Draft 2 policies and the Volume 1 policies in terms of planning and encouraging retail floor space. The draft 2 secondary plan also refers to commercial floor space, which does not necessarily mean retail floor space.</p> <p>As a suggestion, as far as Eastgate Square is concerned the Site Specific Policy – Area F needs to include language that is appropriate to the continued commercial development and redevelopment of the shopping centre over the long term. The planned function should include the ability of the shopping centre to be subdivided into smaller parcels and at the time of development application, apply the policies in the plan to guide new</p>	<p>b) and j)i) reference sites larger than 2 ha. This lot size has been applied specifically in the Centennial Neighbourhoods Secondary Plan in recognition of the size of existing large commercial plaza sites in the Sub – Regional Service Node.</p> <p>Volume 1, Policy E.2.3.2.10 requires the City to plan to accommodate in excess of 100,000 square metres of retail floor space within the Node. The policies in the Plan apply this direction. Revisions to Policy 6.7.5.1 b) have been amended to consistently use the term “retail floor space.”</p> <p>Policies clearly support the continued function and operation of the Mall in its current format. A policy has been added clarifying that nothing in the Plan is intended to prevent severances of portions of the existing mall site in the future.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>development. Trying to come up with an arbitrary formula for redevelopment or development of each and every site in the Node does not work.</p> <p>This draft is a significant improvement over the previous draft released in April 2017. Many of our concerns expressed previously have been addressed.</p>	
<p>MHBC Planning (for 640 Queenston Road)</p>	<p>We are concerned with the lack of policy respecting short to medium term development and redevelopment potential of the subject land. Policies 6.7.5.1 j) and k) attempt to address these concerns by providing some allowances for reduced building heights for smaller commercial buildings and expansions to existing buildings on larger sites. We appreciate the flexibility that these policies offer with respect to built form but we believe that the subject lands, as well as other larger commercial sites in the proposed secondary plan area will be unduly constrained by the restriction imposed by Policies 6.7.7.2 j) and 6.7.7.3 e) which restrict the development of drive through facilities, gas bars and car washes.</p> <p>The redevelopment of large format commercial shopping centres requires flexibility in the policy framework to allow for incremental change to occur on site while minimizing disruption to the existing commercial operations which support the</p>	<p>The restriction on certain uses, including drive through facilities, gas bars and car washes, is applicable to all Pedestrian Focus Street areas and all properties on the proposed Light Rail Transit (LRT) route. These uses are auto oriented uses which are not consistent with the intent to establish uses along the LRT route (and on Pedestrian Focus Streets) that support higher order transit and provide a comfortable pedestrian environment.</p> <p>These uses also have the potential to interfere with the operation of the Light Rail Transit system and the associated traffic movements in the Light Rail Transit corridor, as they typically require full movement access.</p> <p>Staff do not recommend the creation of a site specific policy area that permits drive through facilities, gas bars and car washes on the site. No justification has been provided as to why this restriction is not appropriate. The same requirements have been applied in conjunction</p>

	Sub-Regional Node. As such, we require that the subject lands be placed in a Special Policy Area which addresses these issues.	with updated commercial zoning along the entire LRT corridor throughout Hamilton.
--	--	---