

Department / Agency	Comments	Staff Response
Development Engineering	<p><i>Infrastructure Planning:</i></p> <p>The water, wastewater servicing and stormwater management strategies for the area have been included in the Upper West Side Master Drainage Plan &amp; Servicing Study by the landowners group. However, the Upper West Side Master Drainage Plan &amp; Servicing Study is not completed yet. Therefore, the contents of the water, wastewater servicing and stormwater management overview report are premature.</p> <p>Information that has not been provided includes: a concept plan including local road networks with land use; standalone SWM plans &amp; strategies for residential development on these lands; phasing and implementation plans; servicing capacities and allocation policies for projected growth in the existing urban boundary and urban boundary expansion; road improvement works; and Front Ending Cost policies and agreement.</p> <p>The section recommends not to consider urban boundary expansion for these white belt areas until the Upper West Side Master Drainage Plan &amp; Servicing Study initiated by landowners group is complete and approved by all agencies.</p> <p><i>Public Works – Water Servicing:</i></p> <p>If approved, the OPA should be modified to read: “Delivery of necessary road, <b>water, sanitary, and stormwater</b> infrastructure...”</p> <p>A comprehensive water servicing study will be required to demonstrate adequate supply for the proposed development(s), including the following: district-wide watermain hydraulic analysis demonstrating the modelled system pressures for the whole of Pressure District 6; functional design of watermains; Block Servicing Strategy; fire flow calculations; conclusions establishing that the existing water infrastructure (including watermains, pump stations and storage) has sufficient spare capacity for</p>	<p>The comments are noted and the studies and information being requested will be required and evaluated as part of any future application for expansion of the urban boundary.</p> <p>As part of the GRIDS 2 / MCR process, an integrated update to the Water / Wastewater and Stormwater Master Plans is being undertaken. Through this integrated process, a review of capacity of existing infrastructure and phasing and financial viability of any necessary infrastructure upgrades to support future growth will be undertaken. The integrated approach of GRIDS 2 / MCR addresses the comments / concerns regarding prematurity noted in the comments.</p>

Department / Agency	Comments	Staff Response
	<p>the subject lands in addition to capacity for anticipated development within the existing urban lands in the Pressure Zone 6 boundary (up to 2041).</p> <p><i>Development Engineering:</i></p> <p>The City’s existing strategy for future servicing of the subject lands requires completion of major new infrastructure, including the planned Dickenson Road trunk sewer, Battlefield trunk sewer, and Woodward WWTP capacity expansion before the subject lands can be developed. It will be 7 to 10 years before this infrastructure is all completed and in service.</p> <p>A new update of the Water and Wastewater Servicing Master Plan may be required upon completion of the studies and projects identified in this document to support the Urban Boundary expansion.</p> <p>Our office recommends that the proposed urban boundary expansion is <u>premature</u> based on the above noted comments from the servicing point of view.</p>	
Growth Management – Legislative Approvals	Appropriate separation and transitioning of land uses (employment lands and sensitive land uses) should be included per Provincial Policy Statement 2020.	Comments will be addressed at future stages of the planning process.
Transportation Planning	<p>The general expansion of the Urban Boundary contradicts sustainability initiatives within the Transportation Planning department. The difficulty of providing sustainable modes of transportation within areas currently outside of the Urban Boundary promotes reliance on passenger vehicles and is unfavorable when considering climate change initiatives.</p> <p>Transportation Planning does not support the proposed amendment without the inclusion of additional provisions related to transportation concerns, such as: inclusion of complete community design incorporating mixed-use neighbourhoods, meeting minimum density requirements; inclusion of a higher degree of active transportation facilities and connectivity between communities; evaluation of</p>	<p>Comments are noted and the applicant has been made aware of the inconsistencies regarding the proposed road network.</p> <p>Transportation capacity, complete community design and density of development are important considerations that will be included as part of the evaluation framework which will be established through the</p>

Department / Agency	Comments	Staff Response
	<p>infrastructure capacity from a Transportation perspective relating to roadway capacity and the need for future improvements through a Transportation Impact Study; feasibility review for connectivity and opportunities considering public transit as well as Light Rail Transit (LRT) BLAST corridors.</p> <p>Transportation Planning recommends the application not proceed to formal application until the road network shown on the concept plan submitted with formal consultation applications is revised to the satisfaction of the Manager of Transportation Planning.</p> <p>City of Hamilton staff is actively reviewing the Airport Employment Growth District (AEGD) Road Network which has been previously revised in the AEGD Transportation Master Plan (AEGD-TMP) Implementation Update, dated December 2017. As part of this review, the City of Hamilton is exploring potential reconfiguration, designation and alignment of the previously recommended road network within the AEGD lands. The applicant shall coordinate amendments made to the AEGD road network as a result of the ongoing AEGD-TMP update process, with Transportation Planning, before proceeding to formal application.</p> <p>The proposed road network with the Formal Consultation does not conform to the AEGD TMP Implementation Update and the approved road network for the AEGD, as shown in Figure 26 of the AEGD TMP. To ensure adequate access and traffic circulation is provided, that the local network is efficiently and safely connected to the arterial system, and that consistency is maintained for all development parcels throughout the subject block, it is recommended that the applicant complies with the UHOP and AEGD Secondary Plan and adopt the approved road network. Discrepancies include: location of Street B (Collector 6N) has been shifted northerly; Street F cannot be constructed as proposed; need for the north-south collector (collector 6E) at mid-point between Garth Street and Upper</p>	<p>GRIDS 2 / MCR process</p> <p>The studies and information being requested will be required and evaluated as part of any future application for expansion of the urban boundary.</p>

Department / Agency	Comments	Staff Response
	<p>James St., which extends from Dickenson Road to Twenty Road West.</p> <p>A Transportation Impact Study (TIS) will be required to support the proposed Official Plan Amendment application, however Transportation Planning will not accept a TIS or TIS terms of reference prior to road network revisions for the subject lands and adjacent central and western lands.</p> <p>A Transportation Demand Management (TDM) report will be required.</p>	
HSR	<p>At the present time there are no plans to introduce the conventional fixed route transit network as outlined in earlier TMP's. In order to improve transit operational productivity, thereby reducing net operating costs, the full development of lands within a corridor (400m on either side of Upper James Street) between the Glanbrook boundary and Twenty Road should take place, prior to development of the subject lands.</p> <p>The possibility of implementing developer cost-sharing agreements should be investigated further, to assess suitability related to public transit operations.</p>	<p>Transit availability is an important consideration when evaluating future urban boundary expansion and will be included as part of the evaluation framework which will be established through the GRIDS 2 / MCR process and any future site-specific urban boundary OPA requests.</p>
Forestry and Horticulture Section	<p>There are no municipal tree assets on site; therefore no Tree Management Plan is required.</p> <p>A Landscape Planting Plan will be required as part of future applications.</p>	<p>Comments will be addressed at future stages of the planning process.</p>
Landscape Architectural Services	<p>Cash-in-lieu is not requested at this point in the planning process.</p> <p>LAS staff should be consulted on any future park and open space development matters, including adding these lands to the Recreational Trails Master Plan update in 2021 and to the upcoming Parks Master Plan for park planning / development, particularly the land allocated for residential development.</p>	<p>Comments will be addressed at future stages of the planning process.</p>
Cultural Heritage	<p>While cultural heritage and archaeological interests can be addressed at later stages of the planning process, staff prefer to retain the ability to request</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p>

Department / Agency	Comments	Staff Response
	<p>these studies during the review of urban boundary expansion requests if deemed necessary. Should there be significant built heritage or archaeological interest in lands subject to an urban boundary expansion request, the ability to require these assessments at the request review phase ensures that the lands are comprehensively assessed prior to any future development. Rather than requiring multiple piecemeal studies as individual parcels are developed, individual assessments at the initial review phase could clear large portions of an expansion area for development and clearly identify areas requiring additional study. Further, in situations such as the subject application where a boundary expansion request is submitted by a consortium of land owners, there is opportunity to assess a site within a broader geographic context, rather than at the individual lot level. This is significant because cultural heritage resources, particularly archaeological resources, are not necessarily aligned to contemporary lot fabric and may exist beyond the boundaries of an individual lot.</p> <p>As part of work associated with the Airport Employment Growth District Secondary Plan, a Stage 1 archaeological assessment (P058-1642-2018) which includes the subject property within its study area has been submitted to the Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport and the City of Hamilton. The report recommends that further archaeological work be conducted to address the archaeological potential of the subject property.</p> <p>As part of the forthcoming Urban Area Amendment application for the subject lands, staff require that a Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment for the entire subject property be completed and submitted as a condition of approval.</p> <p>All of the properties subject to this application are included in the City’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest.</p> <p>Heritage staff is in receipt of a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for the properties located at 9511</p>	<p>Requested studies will be required with future Urban Boundary Expansion Applications.</p>

Department / Agency	Comments	Staff Response
	<p>and 9445 Twenty Road West, Glanbrook, dated June 27, 2018 and completed by Golder. The report was submitted in support of subdivision application 25T-201807. The report found that both properties contained farmhouses of cultural heritage value, and recommended modifications to the submitted plan of subdivision to conserve the properties and the creation of conservation plans for each property. The report was reviewed by the Policy and Design Working Group of the Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee at their September 17, 2018 meeting, and both staff and the working group echoed the recommendations of the report.</p> <p>As part of the forthcoming Urban Area Amendment application for the subject lands, staff require the applicant to submit a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment for the remainder of the lands or to submit an addendum to the existing CHIA which incorporates the remaining properties not presently assessed.</p>	
Natural Heritage	<p>Core Areas, including watercourses and woodlands, have been identified on the subject lands.</p> <p>Natural Heritage: The Natural Heritage System (NHS) is an integral component to consider in the development of the subject properties. This is reflected in policies of the Growth Plan 2019 (2.2.8.3 e), Provincial Policy Statement 2020 (2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.13 and 2.2), Rural Hamilton Official Plan (C.2.1.1 to C.2.1.6, C.2.3.3 and C.2.7.1) and Urban Hamilton Official Plan (C.2.1.1 to C.2.1.6, C.2.3 and C.2.7).</p> <p>Since the proposed amendment does not include a mapping change to add the 'candidate' lands (rural lands in the Twenty Road West area (south side of Twenty Road West bounded by Glancaster Road, Upper James Street and Dickenson Road) to the urban area, a review of studies submitted with FC applications has not been provided as part of this application. These studies will be reviewed as part of future Official Plan Amendment Urban Boundary Expansion applications.</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>If Council chooses to approve the application, the requested edits / corrections to the proposed OPA language will be addressed by staff prior to the OPA being presented to Council. (see alternatives for consideration section of Report).</p> <p>Requested studies will be required with future Urban Boundary Expansion Applications.</p>

Department / Agency	Comments	Staff Response
	<p>While the proposed OPA policy recognizes the inclusion of a Natural Heritage System (NHS) within the lands proposed to be added to the urban area, there is concern with the following aspects of this policy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Existing NHS: Within the proposed policy, there is concern that the existing NHS within and adjacent to the expansion area has not been considered (language ‘establish a NHS based on Subwatershed analysis’ has been used). The policy needs to be revised to include recognition of the existing NHS and that development/site alteration will need to consider the impacts on the NHS within the proposed expansion area as well as on adjacent lands.</li> <li>ii. Linkage Assessment: Within the policy it is stated <i>“the lands to be added will include the establishment of a Natural Heritage System based on sub-watershed analysis and linkage assessment”</i>. This statement suggests that a linkage assessment will be undertaken independently of the Subwatershed Study. Since Linkages are part of the NHS, they are to be evaluated through the Subwatershed Study process. Reference to the “linkage assessment” is to be removed from the text.</li> <li>iii. Schedule B of the UHOP: It has been identified within the proposed policy that the NHS will be designated on Schedule “B” of the UHOP. There is concern with regards to the terminology that has been used. The NHS is an overlay (not a designation) and is not confined to only Schedule B. The NHS is identified on Schedules B (Natural Heritage System) and B-1 to B-8 (Detailed Natural Heritage Features). In addition, not all Core Areas are mapped (i.e. significant habitat of endangered species, significant valleylands and significant wildlife habitat). The text is to be revised. It is important to note that through the development of the Secondary Plan process, the</li> </ul>	

Department / Agency	Comments	Staff Response
	<p>NHS may be designated as ‘Natural Open Space’ on Land Use Schedules.</p> <p>iv. NHS Refinement: It has been stated that “<i>the Natural Heritage System will be subject to refinement and detailed implementation policies established in the subsequent secondary plan approval process as set out in policy 2.2.6 (ix) below</i>”. It is unclear why refinement of the NHS would be required at the Secondary Plan stage since the NHS will be ground-truthed as part of the Subwatershed Study and other required background studies. Further clarification is required. In addition, reference has been made to policy 2.2.6 ix. This is to be revised to reflect the appropriate section (2.2.6.1 ix).</p> <p>Proposed Secondary plan policy: With regards to the NHS, these studies need to demonstrate that there are no negative impacts on the features or their functions (either within the expansion area or adjacent to this area). These studies are to be completed as per Council adopted Guidelines (e.g. Environmental Impact Statement Guidelines-revised March 2015; Linkage Assessment Guidelines-March 2015; Tree Protection 5 Guidelines-revised October 2010). Text is to be provided within the policy to reflect the use of Council adopted Guidelines in the preparation of these reports.</p> <p>TOR: In addition, policy F.3.1.6.1 within the UHOP indicates that a Terms of Reference (ToR) is to be developed in consultation with the Conservation Authorities, the City, stakeholders and relevant agencies for subwatershed studies. A similar reference should be provided within this policy. It is important to develop the ToR since it ensures that appropriate inventories/studies are undertaken. The text should be revised to reflect the need to develop ToR where applicable.</p>	
Urban Design	Urban Design staff have reviewed the proposed OPA amendment associated with this application and recommend that section 2.2.6.1 (ix) which is proposed	Comment is noted.

Department / Agency	Comments	Staff Response
	<p>to provide for a Secondary Plan addressing the development of this area should include Urban Design Guidelines for the new community as one of the required studies.</p>	<p>If Council chooses to approve the application, the requested edits / corrections to the proposed OPA language will be addressed by staff prior to the OPA being presented to Council. (see alternatives for consideration section of Report).</p>
Hamilton International Airport (HIA)	<p>Lands fall within the Airport Zoning Regulations (AZR) particularly the Outer Surface and a portion of the land under the Approach Surfaces for Runway 24 (see AZR map attached). Therefore, the lands are subject to building/structure height restrictions, vegetation growth controls and compliance with prohibition of interference with aircraft communications and navigational facilities.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposed residential areas are located within the Airport Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF 25-30) contours which is highly susceptible to aircraft noise. Thus, the Airport is not in favour of the proposed Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment (UHOPA) 20-011 for residential dwellings on these lands.</p> <p>However, should the proposed development proceed, the Airport strongly recommends that noise mitigation measures be implemented including appropriate warning clauses .</p> <p>The proposed development plan should also be submitted to NAV CANADA and Transport Canada for navigational system assessment and obstruction lighting evaluation, respectively.</p>	<p>Proposals for residential development shall be required to comply with UHOP policies which do not allow the development of new sensitive land uses above the 28 NEF contour to protect the operations of the John C Munroe International Airport.</p> <p>This issue will be further evaluated when future applications to amend the urban boundary for lands in the vicinity of the HIA is received, and through the ongoing GRIDS 2 / MCR process.</p>
Hamilton Wentworth Catholic District School	<p>In conformity with the Growth Plan and Policies for Settlement Area Boundary Expansions, the proponents shall include as part of their analysis confirmation of sufficient capacity in existing and</p>	<p>Capacity of existing and planned public service facilities, including schools, will be</p>

Department / Agency	Comments	Staff Response
Board (HWCD SB)	<p>planned public service facilities and infrastructure, specifically, the need and availability for lands to accommodate future school sites.</p> <p>The school board has no objection to the present applications to expand the Urban Boundary provided the required background studies and concept planning are completed to address the need and availability for future school sites.</p> <p>For the information of the City and the proponents, please note that the Board owns a 10 acre parcel of land located on Twenty Road, abutting the lands proposed for development. The Board reserves the right to make submissions on future Planning applications which could potentially affect their land, including the establishment of the internal road pattern for the area and the provision of infrastructure.</p>	evaluated and will be included as part of the emulation framework which will be established through the GRIDS 2 / MCR process and any future site-specific urban boundary OPA requests.
Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA)	The NPCA has no issues with the proposed Policy Amendments. The NPCA will review the required studies mentioned through the Formal Consultation processes in detail and provide more detailed site specific comments when specific applications involving mapping changes are submitted.	No comment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hydro One</li> <li>• Budgets &amp; Finance</li> <li>• Recreation Division</li> <li>• Waste</li> <li>• Hamilton Fire</li> <li>• Union Gas</li> <li>• Bell Canada</li> <li>• Cogeco Cable</li> <li>• Healthy &amp; Safe Communities</li> <li>• Canada Post</li> <li>• HWDSB</li> </ul>	No comment / concern.	No comment.