



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

<b>TO:</b>	Chair and Members General Issues Committee
<b>COMMITTEE DATE:</b>	August 4, 2021
<b>SUBJECT/REPORT NO:</b>	GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review - Consultation Update and Evaluation Framework and Phasing Principles (PED17010(I)) (City Wide)
<b>WARD(S) AFFECTED:</b>	City Wide
<b>PREPARED BY:</b>	Heather Travis (905) 546-2424 Ext. 4168
<b>SUBMITTED BY:</b>	Steve Robichaud Director, Planning and Chief Planner Planning and Economic Development Department
<b>SIGNATURE:</b>	

**RECOMMENDATION**

- (a) That Council approve the GRIDS 2 / MCR: Final Growth Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria, attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED17010(I);
- (b) That Council approve the GRIDS 2 / MCR – Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool (Waterdown and Binbrook), attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED17010(I).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Through the Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (GRIDS) 2 and the Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR), the City is mandated by Provincial policy to determine how and where to plan for forecasted population and employment growth to the year 2051, in accordance with the Provincial population and employment growth forecasts and land needs assessment methodology.

The City completed a draft Land Needs Assessment (LNA), prepared by Lorus & Associates, which examined the capacity of the City’s Urban Area to accommodate the projected growth. The Ambitious Density scenario modelled in the LNA, based on an average intensification rate of 60% over the next 30 years, and a planned density of 77

**SUBJECT: GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review – Consultation Update and Evaluation Framework and Phasing Principles (PED17010(I)) (City Wide) - Page 2 of 27**

---

persons and jobs per hectare (pjh) in new Designated Greenfield Areas (DGA), identified a requirement for an urban boundary expansion of 1,340 ha to accommodate Community Area (population) growth.

At the March 29, 2021 General Issues Committee (GIC) meeting, through Report PED17010(i), staff recommended that Council approve the LNA and endorse the Ambitious Density scenario.

Further, as part of Report PED17010(j) staff provided draft evaluation tools to be used in the evaluation of growth options under the Ambitious Density scenario. Staff requested authorization to consult with the public on the draft evaluation tools.

Following discussions and delegations at the March 29, 2021 meeting, Council deferred approval of the draft LNA and recommended Ambitious Density scenario. Rather, Council directed staff to undertake further consultation on the draft LNA through a mail-out survey to all households, including an option to select a preference for No Urban Boundary Expansion. Further, Council directed staff to model and evaluate growth scenarios under both the No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario and the Ambitious Density scenario and report back to Committee in October 2021. Council authorized staff to engage with the public on the draft evaluation tools.

Furthermore, in June, 2021, Council directed staff to have a peer review of the Land Needs Assessment undertaken and to report back on the results of the peer review in October 2021.

In accordance with Council direction, staff have consulted with the public and stakeholders on the draft evaluation tools and have considered revisions to the draft tools to respond the concerns and comments received. The revised evaluation tools are presented in this Report.

Further, to implement the Council direction to model and evaluate the No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario, and in accordance with comments received from the public and stakeholders, staff have revised the evaluation framework to compare and evaluate the No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario with the Ambitious Density scenario. The new framework is described in this Report.

**Alternatives for Consideration – See Page 26**

**FINANCIAL – STAFFING – LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Financial: N/A

Staffing: N/A

Legal: N/A

## **HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

### **1.0 GRIDS 2 / MCR**

GRIDS 2 will result in a long term growth strategy which allocates forecasted population and employment growth for the 2021 to 2051 time period. The Provincial forecasts for Hamilton project a total 2051 population of 820,000 persons and total employment of 360,000 jobs, a net increase of 236,000 persons and 122,000 jobs.

The MCR is being completed concurrently with GRIDS 2. The MCR is broad and encompasses many inter-related components, and must be completed prior to any expansion of the urban boundary. Many of the studies that are required as part of the MCR are also part of a growth strategy. Like the first GRIDS, GRIDS 2 / MCR is an integrated study which will inform the updates to the Infrastructure Master Plans, transportation network review, and Fiscal Impact Assessment (FIA) that will assist with future updates to the Development Charges By-law. The outcomes of the Growth Strategy and MCR will be implemented through the City's Official Plans.

### **2.0 March 29, 2021 General Issues Committee meeting**

#### *2.1 Report PED17010(i) - GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review – Final Land Needs Assessment*

At the March 29, 2021 meeting of the General Issues Committee, staff presented Report PED17010(i), including the City's Land Needs Assessment to 2051, and recommended the adoption of the Ambitious Density growth scenario.

The Ambitious Density scenario is based on an intensification target of 50% between 2021 and 2031, 60% between 2031 and 2041, and 70% between 2041 and 2051. In addition, the scenario assumes a planned density of 60 persons and jobs per hectare (pjh) in the City's existing Designated Greenfield Area (DGA) and 77 pjh in new DGA (i.e. urban expansion areas). The resulting land need under the Ambitious Density scenario is an urban boundary expansion area of 1,340 ha to accommodate Community Area (population) growth.

Delegations were made at the meeting with concerns being raised about the lack of consideration of a 'no urban boundary expansion' option within the LNA. Further, concerns over the challenges and limitations of virtual public engagement were also cited.

Responding to these concerns, Committee approved the following revised Recommendation to Report PED17010(i):

“That Report PED17010(i), respecting GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review - Final Land Needs Assessment, be amended by deleting sub-sections (a) through (c) in their entirety and replacing them with the following in lieu thereof, and by re-lettering the balance accordingly:

- (a) That staff be directed to conduct a city-wide mail consultation with a survey on the Land Needs Assessment and the Municipal Comprehensive Review that includes the Ambitious Density Scenario, a “no boundary expansion” scenario, and that also allows residents to submit their own alternative scenario, to be funded from the Tax Stabilization Reserve No. 110046 at an estimated cost of \$35,000;**
- (b) That, with respect the mailout survey regarding the Land Needs Assessment and the Municipal Comprehensive Review, staff be directed to:**
  - (i) include a postage prepaid return envelope as part of the mailout; and,**
  - (ii) give residents 30 days to respond to the survey, respecting the Land Needs Assessment and the Municipal Comprehensive Review;**
- (c) That staff be directed to compile the data from the Land Needs Assessment and the Municipal Comprehensive Review survey and provide an Information Report to be presented at a Special General Issues Committee no later than October 2021; and,**
- (d) That staff be directed to prepare scenarios for where and how growth would be accommodated under the Ambitious Density Scenario as well as a “no boundary expansion” scenario, and to present these scenarios as well as staff’s recommended land needs assessment, growth targets, and preferred growth scenario at that same Special General Issues Committee to be held no later than October 2021.**

- (e) That the GRIDS 2 / MCR process and the development and evaluation of scenarios consider phasing options that would ensure that any future urban boundary expansions are controlled and phased, including consideration of options for identifying growth needs beyond 2041 without formally designating the land as urban at this time; and,
- (f) That at the conclusion of GRIDS 2 / MCR and the final approval of the implementing Official Plan Amendments identifying the land need to accommodate growth to 2051, staff prepare a report for Council with respect to the necessary steps for recommending to the Province that any remaining Community Area Whitebelt lands be added to the Greenbelt.”

Approval of the Land Needs Assessment and the Ambitious Density scenario was deferred to October, 2021. Rather, the revised Council recommendation directed staff to undertake additional consultation on the Land Needs Assessment in the form of a City-wide mail-out survey, including an option for respondents to select a preference for ‘no urban boundary expansion’. The recommendation further directed staff to undertake modelling and evaluation of both the Ambitious Density scenario and the no Urban Boundary Expansion scenario, and to report back on the findings of the modelling and evaluation in Fall 2021.

The evaluation tools presented in this report, including the introduction of the GRIDS 2 / MCR “How Should Hamilton Grow?” Framework (see Appendix “A” to Report PED17010(I)) to examine the option of ‘No Urban Boundary Expansion’ are consistent with the Council direction above.

## *2.2 Report PED17010(j) - GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review – Planning for Growth to 2051: Draft Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria*

Report PED17010(j) was also considered at the March 29, 2021 GIC meeting. The Report presented two draft evaluation tools which would be used to assess the location and timing of future urban expansion growth in accordance with the Ambitious Density scenario: the GRIDS 2 / MCR – Planning for Growth to 2051: Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria (Whitebelt Lands) and the GRIDS 2 / MCR – Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool (Waterdown and Binbrook). Staff recommended the draft tools be received by Committee and requested authorization for staff to commence public consultation on the draft frameworks. Committee approved the recommendation, including the request to consult with the general public and stakeholders.

A summary of the draft frameworks presented in Report PED17010(j) is provided below. A full description of the draft frameworks is found in Report PED17010(j).

The Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation Section of this Report provides an overview of the revisions to the draft frameworks to address comments received through public engagement. The revised evaluation tools proposed for Council approval are attached as Appendices “A” and “B” of Report PED17010(I).

- **GRIDS 2 / MCR – Planning for Growth to 2051: Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria (Whitebelt Lands):** the whitebelt evaluation framework will be utilized to evaluate where and when the City will grow if Council approves the requirement for an urban boundary expansion (Ambitious Density scenario). The framework was developed by the City’s consultant team (Dillon Consulting) and is premised on a two-stage whitebelt evaluation approach:

The first stage of the whitebelt evaluation is the Feasibility Evaluation of Candidate Expansion Areas which would include a feasibility analysis of each of the Candidate Expansion Areas against a series of considerations based primarily on the Growth Plan criteria identified in Policy 2.2.8.3. The Growth Plan provides a detailed list of criteria to be satisfied prior to urban boundary expansion occurring, including servicing, financial, natural heritage, and agricultural impacts.

The feasibility evaluation in Stage 1 would identify any Candidate Expansion Areas that do not meet the provincial and local criteria and therefore would not be screened through to the second stage of evaluation. The Stage 1 feasibility evaluation would not prioritize or rank one area against another, rather each Candidate Expansion Area will be assessed individually. Essentially, a pass / fail grade is assigned to determine if a geographic area merits further consideration.

The second stage of the whitebelt evaluation is the Phasing Criteria and Analysis which would be focused on determining the preferred order of phasing of future development based on the Ambitious Density scenario. The phasing analysis would evaluate a series of growth scenarios against each other to ultimately determine the preferred scenario.

As part of Stage 2, modelling of required infrastructure and transportation upgrades, public service facility needs, and financial impacts would be undertaken. Climate change risks / opportunities, agricultural impacts, and complete community consideration assessments also form part of the Stage 2 evaluation.

The phasing evaluation would consider all themes comprehensively, and the scenario that produces the best results overall would be identified as the preferred option. It is possible for a scenario to perform higher in certain components of the evaluation compared to the scenario chosen as preferred, but the preferred scenario would represent the option that performs best across the greatest number of themes.

---

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.

- **GRIDS 2 / MCR – Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool (Waterdown and Binbrook):** the Provincial Growth Plan includes a special provision for a minor expansion of up to 10 ha into the Greenbelt Protected Countryside from lands identified as a Town or Village within the Greenbelt Plan. Within Hamilton, both Binbrook and Waterdown are identified as ‘Towns’ in the Greenbelt Plan. The Waterdown / Binbrook evaluation tool was created to provide a framework against which to evaluate any expansion requests received within these areas. The creation of the framework does not pre-determine that any expansion will occur.

Phase one of this evaluation would include the evaluation of all expansion requests for areas adjacent to Waterdown or Binbrook against a set of pass / fail screening criteria based on Growth Plan Policy 2.2.8.3(k). These criteria are mandatory, and an expansion area would only be screened through to the second phase of evaluation if the mandatory screening criteria are all satisfied.

The second phase would evaluate each remaining proposed expansion area against a series of criteria which represent local and provincial planning priorities. The criteria identified in the GRIDS 2 / MCR – Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool (Waterdown and Binbrook) were selected to ensure that, in addition to the mandatory criteria identified in the Growth Plan, other local priorities are also evaluated and considered in the decision-making process, including logical expansion, agricultural, fiscal and transportation impacts.

In accordance with the Council direction, staff undertook consultation on the draft evaluation tools in May 2021. This report summarizes the results of the consultation and recommends revisions to the evaluation tools to address both comments received from the public and stakeholders as well as the revised Council direction to examine the ‘No Urban Boundary Expansion’ scenario. The revised evaluation tools are attached as Appendices “A” and “B” of Report PED17010(I).

### **3.0 Consultation and Survey**

As noted in Section 2.0 above, in accordance with Council direction, two separate engagement initiatives have been recently undertaken related to the GRIDS 2 / MCR project:

- **Mail-out Survey** – in response to the direction received at the March 29 GIC meeting, a city-wide mail-out survey was launched in June to allow residents to select between a ‘No Urban Boundary Expansion’ scenario and the ‘Ambitious Density’ scenario, or to identify a third preferred option. The survey was mailed to all households in Hamilton. Replies can be provided through the postage paid mail option or through email. The results of this survey will be reported in October 2021 in accordance with the Council direction above.

**SUBJECT: GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review – Consultation Update and Evaluation Framework and Phasing Principles (PED17010(I)) (City Wide) - Page 8 of 27**

---

- Engage Hamilton consultation on Draft Evaluation Tools – this engagement is the subject of this Report and is described in greater detail in the Consultation section of this Report. The engagement responded to the direction received through report PED17010(j) and requested comments and feedback on the GRIDS 2 / MCR – Planning for Growth to 2051: Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria (Whitebelt Lands) and the Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool (Waterdown and Binbrook). The results of this round of engagement are summarized in this Report and in Appendices “C” to “E” to Report PED17010(i).

#### **4.0 MCR deadline**

The GRIDS 2 / MCR study design and workplan is required to move forward at an efficient pace to meet provincial deadlines. The Province requires municipalities to update their Official Plans to conform to the revised Provincial Plans by July 1, 2022. The Province must approve the MCR Official Plan Amendment (OPA) within 120 days of the receipt of the Amendment. If the Province does not give notice of decision within 120 days, the OPA may be subject to appeals. Therefore, the timing of when the City’s OPA is sent to the Province is critical given that there is a Provincial election scheduled for June 2022, meaning that no decisions will be made following the writ anticipated in April 2022. The GRIDS 2/ MCR workplan is attached as Appendix “G” to Report PED17010(l).

Other Provincial requirements include a 90-day review period of the proposed Official Plan Amendment prior to a statutory Open House under Section 26 of the *Planning Act*. Combined, these requirements leave little room for delay in the GRIDS 2 / MCR process if the City is to meet the conformity deadline. Approval of the evaluation tools as part of this Report is critical to meeting the timelines.

Following Council approval of the evaluation tools attached as Appendices “A” and “B” of Report PED17010(l), the following are the next steps in the GRIDS 2 / MCR process:

<b>Time frame</b>	<b>Key Project Milestones</b>	<b>Status</b>
Spring 2017	MCR Commencement, Employment Land Review call for requests	Completed
May 2017	Growth Plan 2017 released	Completed
May 2018	Land Needs Assessment Methodology released by Province	Completed
May / June 2018	First round of public / stakeholder consultation – focus on urban structure (i.e. where should intensification occur?) and major transit station area	Completed

---

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.



**SUBJECT: GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review – Consultation Update and Evaluation Framework and Phasing Principles (PED17010(I)) (City Wide) - Page 9 of 27**

<b>Time frame</b>	<b>Key Project Milestones</b>	<b>Status</b>
	planning	
November 2018	Imagining New Communities – information sessions on greenfield density	Completed
May 2019	Growth Plan 2019 released	Completed
April 2021	Public Consultation on Draft Framework and Phasing Criteria	Completed
August 2021	Approval of Employment Land Review report (GIC)	Pending
August 2021	Approval for Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria (GIC)	Pending
May to October 2021	Growth Options Evaluation / Scenario Modelling	Pending
October 2021	Presentation of Urban Growth Survey Results  Presentation of Land Needs Assessment Peer Review Results  Presentation of Results of “How Should Hamilton Grow?” Evaluation	Pending
December / January 2021	Presentation of Results of Whitebelt Lands Feasibility Evaluation and Phasing Analysis (if required)  Public Consultation on Evaluation Analysis Results, including Preliminary Preferred Growth Option	
April 2022	Approval of Final Preferred Growth Option	Pending

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND LEGISLATED REQUIREMENTS**

Policies at both the Provincial and local level provide direction on managing growth and incorporating the provincial growth forecasts to 2051. Within the Growth Plan, policy 2.2.1 provides high level direction on important growth management considerations including the requirement for municipalities to plan to the provincial forecasts in accordance with the Provincial land needs assessment methodology. Should the City’s

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.

completed land needs assessment identify that settlement area expansion is required to accommodate a portion of forecasted growth, criteria and requirements to be considered in advance of a settlement (urban) area boundary expansion are highlighted in policy 2.2.8.3. A complete policy review is included in Appendix “F” to Report PED17010(I).

Key policy considerations are highlighted below.

### **Growth Plan 2019, as amended**

Section 2.2.1 of the Growth Plan provides policy direction on Managing Growth. The section provides high level policies on growth allocation (prioritizing settlement areas and strategic growth areas), planning for infrastructure, public service facilities and the transportation system in a financially viable manner, environmental and agricultural protection, and supporting the achievement of complete communities including a climate change lens. As addressed in the Analysis / Rationale for Recommendation section, staff propose to use the guiding policies of Section 2.2.1 as a framework for the consideration of the No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario to assist the City with determining how Hamilton will manage its growth to the year 2051 (Appendix “A” to Report PED17010(I)).

Policies 2.2.8.2 and 2.2.8.3 of the Growth Plan identify a series of comprehensive criteria that must be considered prior to expansion of the urban boundary. Policy 2.2.8.2 requires a municipality to demonstrate that sufficient opportunities to accommodate projected growth through intensification and existing designated greenfield area lands are not available, based on minimum intensification and density targets of the Plan. This review has been undertaken through the GRIDS 2 / MCR draft LNA and the Ambitious Density scenario identifies a requirement for urban boundary expansion to accommodate a portion of the City’s forecasted population growth that cannot be accommodated through intensification and / or the City’s existing designated greenfield areas based on Growth Plan requirements. Staff note that Council has not made a decision on the LNA or the Ambitious Density scenario.

Policy 2.2.8.3 outlines that, where the need for a *settlement area* boundary expansion has been justified in accordance with policy 2.2.8.2, the feasibility of the proposed expansion will be determined and the most appropriate location for the proposed expansion will be identified based on the comprehensive application of all of the policies in the Plan, including a list of criteria addressing servicing, financial viability, watershed planning and protection of the natural heritage system, and impacts on the agricultural system, amongst other matters. The GRIDS 2 / MCR – Planning for Growth to 2051: Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria, attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED17010(I), has been designed to ensure compliance with Provincial policy matters

and would be used to evaluate growth areas and phasing options under the Ambitious Density scenario.

Policy 2.2.8.3(k) provides particular direction on potential settlement area boundary expansion within the Protected Countryside of the Greenbelt. Policy 2.2.8.3(k) restricts expansions into the Greenbelt Protected Countryside to a minor expansion of up to 10 ha (of which no more than 50% may be used for residential purposes) from a defined Town / Village only (in Hamilton, both Waterdown and Binbrook are considered 'Towns' in the Greenbelt Plan). Special consideration to policy 2.2.8.3(k) regarding small expansion into the Greenbelt Protected Countryside is also included in this Report, and the GRIDS 2 / MCR – Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool (Waterdown and Binbrook), attached as Appendix "B" to Report PED17010(I) responds to this policy direction.

### **Corporate Goals and Areas of Focus for Climate Change**

The City of Hamilton has declared a climate change emergency and set a target to reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and be carbon neutral by 2050. Land use planning and growth management can play an important role in helping the City achieve that goal.

In the City's Corporate Goals and Areas of Focus for Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation, Goal #4 is related to planning and aims to ensure that a climate change lens is applied to all planning initiatives to encourage the use of best climate mitigation and adaptation practices. In particular, a climate change lens, as part of the GRIDS 2 / MCR evaluation framework, is one area of focus. This direction is also consistent with Direction #1 of the GRIDS 2 10 Directions to Guide Development. Discussion of how the climate change lens can be applied as part of the GRIDS 2 / MCR evaluation process is included in the Analysis / Rationale for Recommendations section below.

### **Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP)**

The Urban Hamilton Official Plan contains policies regarding growth management and urban boundary expansion and, specifically, the studies and criteria that must be considered prior to the City expanding its urban boundary (UHOP polices related to urban boundary expansion cited in Appendix "F" to Report PED17010(I) remain under appeal).

The UHOP criteria identifies the need to address similar matters as those identified in the Growth Plan, to be completed as part of a secondary plan and municipally initiated comprehensive review, including the completion of a land needs assessment, sub-watershed plan and environmental impact study, agricultural impact assessment and financing policy. These matters are addressed in the GRIDS 2 / MCR Final Growth

---

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.

Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria, including the “How Should Hamilton Grow?” Framework to evaluate the No Urban Boundary Expansion option, attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED17010(I).

## **RELEVANT CONSULTATION**

### **Public and Stakeholders**

During the month of May 2021, the Engage Hamilton platform was used to obtain feedback from members of the public and stakeholders on the GRIDS 2 / MCR – Planning for Growth to 2051: Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria (Whitebelt Lands) and the Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool (Waterdown and Binbrook). The Engage Hamilton website included information on the two draft documents and asked respondents to provide comments and suggestions related to the frameworks through an open-ended question:

“Question: What are your thoughts on the draft evaluation framework for potential urban boundary expansions from the Whitebelt lands? Are there any theme areas of evaluation that you think are missing? Are there any criteria that should be added and / or removed? Provide any comments you might have in the box below.”

Similar wording was provided in the questions relating to the Waterdown / Binbrook Screening and Evaluation Tool.

Notification of this consultation opportunity was provided through email to the GRIDS 2 / MCR project mailing list (approximately 400 addresses) and the project stakeholder team and through the City’s social media channels, including the use of social media boosting to reach a wider audience.

In summary, 42 responses were received through Engage Hamilton to the survey question on the GRIDS 2 / MCR – Planning for Growth to 2051: Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria (Whitebelt Lands) and 19 responses were received on the Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool (Waterdown and Binbrook). An additional 26 responses to the request for comments were received directly through the GRIDS 2 / MCR project email. A total of 7 comments were received from the project stakeholder team.

A summary of the key themes and comments received through the consultation is provided in the Analysis and Rationale for Recommendation section below, including the recommended changes to the draft frameworks resulting from the consultation. Further, copies of all comments received through Engage Hamilton are attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED17010(I) and comments received through email

---

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.

(stakeholders and public comments), including staff responses, are attached as Appendices “D” and “E” to Report PED17010(I) and comments.

## **ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION**

### **1.0 Key themes from Consultation**

The following topics represent the most commonly cited questions and areas of concern from the comments received through all forms of engagement.

#### **1.1 Process – why is the City consulting on a framework to evaluate urban boundary expansion?**

Comments received suggested that the City should not be seeking feedback on a framework to evaluate urban boundary expansion options / phasing scenarios when the decision on whether or not an urban boundary expansion is required has yet to be made.

The GRIDS 2 / MCR – Planning for Growth to 2051: Draft Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria (Whitebelt Lands) and the Draft Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool (Waterdown and Binbrook) were drafted based on the staff recommendation for the Ambitious Density scenario in the Land Needs Assessment, which identifies a requirement for 1,340 ha of land to be added to the urban area. The draft tools were presented at the March 29, 2021 GIC meeting and Committee approved the recommendation for staff to commence consultation on the tools prior to reporting back with a final version. The consultation undertaken in May 2021 was consistent with that direction.

However, at the same meeting, Committee also directed staff to consider and model the No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario and to consult on the question of urban boundary expansion through a mail-out survey. The survey has been distributed to all households in Hamilton, and staff are undertaking the modelling of a No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario, also consistent with the direction of the Committee.

Staff note that the consultation on the GRIDS 2 / MCR – Planning for Growth to 2051: Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria (Whitebelt Lands) and the Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool (Waterdown and Binbrook) does not indicate that a decision on the question of urban boundary expansion has been made. That decision will not be made until the Fall of 2021. Rather, the need to consult on the draft evaluation tools is reflective of the need to keep the GRIDS 2 / MCR project moving forward in order to meet the firm Provincial deadline for completion of the MCR of July 2022. By finalizing the draft evaluation tools to reflect

---

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.

the comments received by the public and stakeholders, staff will be able to model and evaluate the various Ambitious Density phasing scenarios using a tool that has been reviewed by the community, and report back to Committee in Fall of this year with a comprehensive evaluation of scenarios. As per the GRIDS 2 / MCR timeline, staff will first be reporting back on the evaluation of the No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario, as described in the next section.

## **1.2 How will the No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario be evaluated?**

Feedback on the applicability of the framework to evaluate the No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario was also received. Many questions were raised as to how, or if, the draft framework would be applied to the new scenario / option.

Both the GRIDS 2 / MCR – Planning for Growth to 2051: Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria (Whitebelt Lands) and the Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool (Waterdown and Binbrook) were created to evaluate urban boundary expansion scenarios. As noted above, the tools were drafted based on the staff recommended Land Needs Assessment Ambitious Density scenario requiring an urban boundary expansion area of 1,340 ha. Both tools use the policies of Section 2.2.8 – Settlement Area Boundary Expansions as a guiding framework for the feasibility evaluation of expansion areas. In particular, policy 2.2.8.3 outlines the list of criteria that must be considered in determining the most appropriate location for proposed expansion following the demonstration of need for the expansion through the completion of a land needs assessment. The criteria are wide-ranging and include consideration of financial impacts of growth, servicing infrastructure and transportation impacts, impacts on the agricultural system, natural heritage system and water resources, amongst other matters. Policy 2.2.8.3(k) specifically identifies criteria for limited expansion into the Greenbelt area from Towns / Villages.

Part 2 of the GRIDS 2 / MCR – Planning for Growth to 2051: Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria (Whitebelt Lands) is the phasing evaluation of whitebelt lands, and, similar to the Part 1 framework, addresses a range of themes including climate change, infrastructure, transportation, agriculture and fiscal impacts of phasing growth. Again, the phasing criteria are premised on the need for urban boundary expansion based on the recommendations of the Ambitious Density scenario.

To implement the Council direction to model and evaluate the No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario, it is necessary to modify the evaluation process that had been envisioned as an evaluation of expansion options. The question of whether or not the City selects the No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario or the Ambitious Density scenario must be addressed first as it represents a fundamental question of how the City will grow into the future. The question of conformity of a No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario with the provincial requirement to plan for a market-

---

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.

based housing forecast in accordance with the lands needs assessment methodology must be considered. In addition, key questions and considerations relating to intensification rates, housing mix, and fiscal and servicing implications need to be addressed.

Staff therefore propose that the modelling and evaluation of the No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario and the Ambitious Density scenario must be undertaken as a separate evaluation, in accordance with the GRIDS 2 / MCR “How Should Hamilton Grow?” Framework proposed below (section 2.1) and attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED17010(I), followed by an examination of phasing options under the Ambitious Density scenario in accordance with the draft tools. If the No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario is ultimately chosen as the City’s preferred growth option, none of the phasing scenarios under the Ambitious Density scenario would be chosen. However, staff will continue with the modelling of phasing options under the Ambitious Density scenario so that a recommendation on a preferred phasing scenario can be presented to Committee.

### **1.3 Weighting / ranking of criteria**

Feedback on how the framework would be applied, particularly in terms of rating / ranking of criteria and themes, was also received.

Staff note the framework is intended to be used as a method for documenting a wide range of information considered in the development of the final recommended growth option. The information in the evaluation framework will include a mix of qualitative and quantitative data. No weighting is assigned to any given dataset. The phasing component will include the results of more detailed technical analysis related to agriculture, municipal finance, transportation, water, wastewater and stormwater management.

Revisions to the framework documents include a more detailed explanation of how the information collected in the evaluation and phasing analysis will be used to inform the development of the planning rationale for a preferred growth scenario.

### **1.4 Agricultural system**

Email submissions were received which dealt with the question of how to apply criteria on the Agricultural system to the question of urban boundary expansion.

The draft tools have been created to implement the Growth Plan policy 2.2.8.3 (f):

“Where the need for a *settlement area* boundary expansion has been justified in accordance with policy 2.2.8.2, the feasibility of the proposed expansion will be

determined and the most appropriate location for the proposed expansion will be identified based on the comprehensive application of all of the policies in this Plan, including the following:

- f) *prime agricultural areas* should be avoided where possible. To support the *Agricultural System*, alternative locations across the upper-or single-tier municipality will be evaluated, prioritized and determined based on avoiding, minimizing and mitigating the impact on the *Agricultural System* and in accordance with the following:
  - i. expansion into *specialty crop areas* is prohibited;
  - ii. reasonable alternatives that avoid *prime agricultural areas* are evaluated; and,
  - iii. where *prime agricultural areas* cannot be avoided, lower priority agricultural lands are used;”

The GRIDS 2 / MCR – Planning for Growth to 2051: Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria (Whitebelt Lands) has been drafted to implement the above policy direction. Part 1 of the Framework, the Feasibility Evaluation of each candidate area, considers the ability of a candidate expansion area to avoid prime agricultural areas and to minimize / mitigate impacts on the agricultural system. Part 2, the Phasing Criteria, ask the questions: “Does the phasing scenario prioritize development of areas that are non-prime agricultural” and “Does the phasing scenario prioritize development of areas that have fewer agricultural operations or active livestock operations?”

The concern raised in the comments primarily focussed on the consideration of prime / non-prime agricultural lands as a phasing criteria. Based on Rural Hamilton Official Plan designations, all phasing options under the Ambitious Density scenario would require the inclusion of whitebelt lands that are designated prime agricultural being added to the urban boundary. The City’s draft Land Needs Assessment has identified that 1,340 ha of land is required under the Ambitious Density scenario, so there is no phasing option that avoids prime agricultural lands.

The wording of the evaluation and phasing criteria with respect to the Agricultural System is consistent with the direction of the PPS and the Growth Plan. The Growth Plan policy 2.2.8.3 requires that settlement area expansions avoid prime agricultural areas where possible. Alternative locations are to be evaluated, prioritized and determined based on avoiding, minimizing and mitigating the impact on the agricultural system. While staff concur that all phasing options under the Ambitious Density scenario result in a requirement to add prime agricultural lands to the urban



boundary, staff do not find that negates the requirement to evaluate and model options that would prioritize the development of non-prime agricultural lands. The phasing criteria have been defined to allow the City to consider not only Growth Plan and provincial policy objectives, but also matters of local interest and concern. There is an interest from both members of the public and staff to understand phasing implications of growth on prime and non-prime agricultural lands.

However, staff note that this consideration is one criteria that will be considered comprehensively with the other criteria in the framework. As discussed previously, all criteria will be evaluated and the phasing option that performs best overall will be recommended as the preferred phasing option. It is possible that the preferred phasing option will not perform best to each criteria, but rather best overall.

### **1.5 Climate change and GHG emissions**

A key theme that emerged from public consultation was the integration of a climate change lens into the evaluation process, for both the evaluation of the No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario and the Ambitious Density scenario.

Staff concur with the importance of this theme. Both of the draft tools address climate change from many perspectives. Within the GRIDS 2 / MCR – Planning for Growth to 2051: Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria (Whitebelt Lands), climate change is a critical part of both the Stage 1 and Stage 2 evaluations. While climate change is identified as its own theme in both stages, it is noted that climate change considerations are embedded within many of the other themes as well. Many of the themes / considerations in both stages are complementary and inter-related to each other. Both mitigation and adaptation considerations are addressed in the evaluation framework and phasing criteria.

Climate change considerations in Stage 1 relate to opportunities to reduce GHGs and private internal combustion engine powered automobile use through built form, district energy opportunities, infrastructure resiliency, tree canopy protection and hazard land planning. Through Stage 2, the phasing analysis will consider opportunities and risks from a climate change lens resulting from the different phasing scenarios.

One of the key concerns noted was the ability to evaluate greenhouse gas emissions resulting from the various growth options / phasing scenarios. The City of Hamilton has set a target of 50% emission reductions by 2030 and net zero by 2050. The primary sources of GHG emissions in Hamilton are industry (of which cement and steel manufacturing are the primary sources), existing buildings, and transportation. The ability of the City to reach these targets requires considerations

of emissions, and potential for reductions in existing and future sources in long term planning decisions.

To address this concern, the City has retained a consultant team to model the impacts of growth on GHG emissions. The evaluation will describe the energy and GHG profiles of the growth options when built out and whether or not a specific sequence of growth or growth option will aid the City’s ability to achieve GHG emissions reductions. The evaluation will be undertaken in relation to both the No Urban Boundary Expansion and the Ambitious Density scenarios as part of the “How Should Hamilton Grow? evaluation. The framework will be modified, as outlined below, to clarify this criteria.

**2. Summary of Recommended Changes to Evaluation Process**

Following review of the comments received (see Appendices “C” to “E” of Report PED17010(I)), including the key concerns noted above, staff are recommending the following revisions to the evaluation process and the draft tools:

**2.1 Analysis of No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario – GRIDS 2 / MCR “How Should Hamilton Grow?” Framework – Step 1 (Appendix “A” to Report PED17010(I))**

A new evaluation framework to evaluate the No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario against the Ambitious Density scenario is proposed.

This evaluation tool, titled the GRIDS 2 / MCR “How Should Hamilton Grow?” Framework, will be utilized as the first step in the evaluation process, as described in Section 1.2 above. The framework, attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED17010(I), is based on the direction of Section 2.2.1 ‘Managing Growth’ of the Growth Plan 2019, as amended. Section 2.2.1 provides overarching direction for growth management and provides a high level and comprehensive set of considerations to assist Council and members of the public with understanding the implications and differences of the two contrasting growth options (“No Urban Boundary Expansion” or “Ambitious Density”). The considerations identified in Section 2.2.1 of the Growth Plan align with the GRIDS 2 10 Directions to Guide Development, the decision making tool approved by Council in December 2020. The proposed considerations of the GRIDS 2 / MCR “How Should Hamilton Grow?” Framework are:

THEME	CONSIDERATIONS	HOW WILL CRITERIA BE MEASURED?
Growth allocation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the growth option direct the vast</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Anticipated growth</li> </ul>

**SUBJECT: GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review – Consultation Update and Evaluation Framework and Phasing Principles (PED17010(I)) (City Wide) - Page 19 of 27**

THEME	CONSIDERATIONS	HOW WILL CRITERIA BE MEASURED?
	<p>majority of growth to the settlement area?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the option focus growth in the built-up area and other strategic growth areas?</li> </ul>	<p>allocations based on identified intensification rates and density targets</p>
<b>Climate Change</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the growth option contribute to the City’s goal of carbon neutrality by 2050 by providing opportunities for reductions in greenhouse gas emissions?</li> <li>Does the growth option present any significant risks or opportunities associated with climate change?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GHG Emissions Analysis</li> <li>Input from City staff and stakeholders</li> </ul>
<b>Municipal Finance</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Are there any significant municipal financial risks associated with the growth option?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fiscal Impact Assessment</li> <li>Input from City staff</li> </ul>
<b>Infrastructure &amp; Public Service Facilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the growth option result in significant impacts to the City’s existing or planned infrastructure and public service facilities?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment of infrastructure and public service requirements</li> </ul>
<b>Transportation System</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the growth option provide an urban form that will expand convenient access to a range of transportation options including active transportation?</li> <li>Does the growth option prioritize development of areas that would be connected to the planned BLAST network or existing transit?</li> <li>Does the growth option result in significant impacts to the City’s existing or planned transportation infrastructure?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transportation network review</li> <li>Input from City staff</li> </ul>

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.

**SUBJECT: GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review – Consultation Update and Evaluation Framework and Phasing Principles (PED17010(I)) (City Wide) - Page 20 of 27**

---

<b>THEME</b>	<b>CONSIDERATIONS</b>	<b>HOW WILL CRITERIA BE MEASURED?</b>
<b>Complete Communities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the growth option provide a diverse mix of land uses in a compact form, with a range of housing options to accommodate people at all stages of life and all household sizes and incomes?</li> <li>• Does the growth option improve social equity and overall quality of life, including human health, for people of all ages, abilities and incomes?</li> <li>• Does the growth option expand convenient access to an appropriate supply of open spaces, parks and recreation?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed housing mix</li> <li>• Anticipated growth allocations based on identified intensification rates and density targets</li> <li>• Input from City staff</li> </ul>
<b>Agricultural System</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the growth option prioritize development of areas that are non-prime agricultural?</li> <li>• Does the growth option avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts on the Agricultural System?</li> <li>• Does the growth option promote healthy, local and affordable food options, including urban agriculture?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GRIDS 2 / MCR Agricultural Impact Assessment</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Heritage and Water Resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the growth option avoid and protect Natural Heritage Systems as identified by the City and the Growth Plan??</li> <li>• Does the growth option demonstrate an avoidance and / or mitigation of potential negative impacts on watershed conditions and the water resource system?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Input from City staff and Conservation Authorities</li> <li>• Available mapping (UHOP / RHOP) and information /studies</li> </ul>
<b>Natural Hazards</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the growth option direct development away from hazardous lands?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Input from City staff and Conservation Authorities</li> </ul>

---

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.

**SUBJECT: GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review – Consultation Update and Evaluation Framework and Phasing Principles (PED17010(I)) (City Wide) - Page 21 of 27**

THEME	CONSIDERATIONS	HOW WILL CRITERIA BE MEASURED?
<b>Conformity with Provincial Methodology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Has the growth option been assessed in accordance with the Provincial Land Needs Assessment Methodology to determine the quantity of land required to accommodate growth to the planning horizon?</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Input from City staff, consultant, and the Province</li> </ul>

The evaluation of the “How Should Hamilton Grow?” framework will utilize the same system as proposed under the Draft Evaluation Criteria and Phasing Principles (Whitebelt) Framework, which uses a qualitative evaluation system to identify how well a growth option satisfies a given criteria. There is no ranking or priority amongst the criteria. Council will have the benefit of the comprehensive evaluation of all theme areas prior to identifying a preferred growth option.

**2.2 Summary of changes to GRIDS 2 / MCR – Planning for Growth to 2051: Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria (Whitebelt Lands) – Steps 2 and 3 (Appendix “A” to Report PED17010(I))**

The GRIDS 2 / MCR – Planning for Growth to 2051: Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria (Whitebelt Lands) will be utilized to evaluate candidate expansion areas and potential urban boundary expansion phasing scenarios, in accordance with the Council direction to model the Ambitious Density growth scenario. It is acknowledged that Council has not made a decision regarding urban boundary expansion. Due to the mandated provincial conformity deadline, it is important for this evaluation to take place prior to the Council decision being made in Fall 2021. To meet the July 2022 deadline, the preferred growth option must be identified by early 2022 to allow for appropriate consultation and implementation considerations to take place. The modelling of the phasing scenarios under the Ambitious Density option and the presentation of the results in Fall 2021 will allow Council to make a recommendation on a preferred phasing option if the Ambitious Density scenario is identified as the outcome of the Step 1 “How Should Hamilton Grow?” evaluation.

Comments and feedback were received through the consultation which have led to revisions to the GRIDS 2 / MCR – Planning for Growth to 2051: Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria (Whitebelt Lands) to add clarity to existing criteria, address missing considerations, or remove criteria that are redundant or not meaningful, as listed below:

*2.2.1 Changes to Feasibility Evaluation of Whitebelt Lands (Step 2)*

- *Addition of Natural Hazards as a stand-alone theme area:* the draft Evaluation Framework and Phasing Principles had considered natural hazards under the Climate Change theme, owing to the potential impacts on hazard lands arising from climate change. However it was noted in comments received from the Hamilton Conservation Authority that the issues associated with natural hazards extend beyond floodplains, and include slope stability, meander belt and erosion allowances, and karst, and should be given key consideration and not part of a broader topic area. Due to the potential impacts on development associated with limitations from natural hazards, staff concur with this assessment. The criteria will overlap with the Climate Change and Natural Heritage themes.
- *Addition of Food Security / Protection of Local Food Network as key consideration under the Agricultural System Theme:* many comments received through the Engage Hamilton portal expressed the need to add food security and protection of the local food network as a key consideration. The comments noted the importance of protecting the local food network and local food security in light of climate change impacts which have the potential to impact food production worldwide. The criteria under the Agricultural System them has been amended to address this concern.
- *Existing and planned public transit / active transit:* several comments highlighted the importance of prioritizing public transit and active transit to new growth areas, which is a consideration already included in the draft framework under the Transportation System theme. However, there was confusion with how these measurement criteria would be measured. The draft framework had used the questions: “Does the candidate area contain an existing transit route or stop”? and “Does the candidate area contain an existing or planned pedestrian or cycling network”. All candidate areas are currently rural and do not presently contain existing public transit or existing active transportation. The questions have been modified to focus on future planned transit and active transportation given that lands in the candidate areas are outside of the urban area.
- *Public transit / active transit measurement criteria:* further to the above and also related to public transit, it was noted that the viability of transit consideration could be expanded upon to measure future population density of a candidate area as a measure of the ability of the area to support public transit / active transportation. This measure has been clarified.
- *Broaden the ‘range of housing’ consideration to include low income housing and housing with supports:* under the Complete Communities Theme, the draft framework had included as a key consideration the ability of a candidate area to provide a diverse range and mix of housing including affordable housing. Through

---

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.

comments received from the public it was noted that this consideration should be more broadly defined to also address low-income housing and housing with supports.

- *District energy criteria:* one of the considerations within the Climate Change theme is the ability of the candidate area to provide the opportunity for district energy. Comments were received which acknowledged the appropriateness of this criteria but noted that there was a lack of clarity around how it would be considered. Staff note that district energy systems have been included as an opportunity to consider aspects of energy efficiency / conservation through community planning. The Growth Plan directs municipalities to consider aspects of infrastructure and energy conservation when applying the policies of the Plan. The framework has been modified to expand the consideration to Energy Efficient Community Design which will include consideration of energy efficient design opportunities including alternative energy / district energy.
- *Proposed stormwater management:* comments were received on the Climate Change Theme related to the Infrastructure Resiliency consideration, and the wording related to proposed stormwater management. The candidate areas are rural and currently do not have a proposed engineered stormwater management system in place. The wording has been revised to consider how the area could be planned to consider stormwater management that provides resilience and climate change adaptability.
- *Removal of consideration of maximizing infrastructure capacity:* the draft framework had included two separate considerations related to water and wastewater infrastructure capacity: is there sufficient capacity in existing or planned systems, and does the candidate area maximize existing capacity within the system? After further review with staff and the Master Plan consultant team, it has been determined that the second question is redundant and has been removed.
- *Complete Communities* – comments were received which raised questions as to how the complete communities considerations would be measured. The framework has been modified to provide clarity on the measurement of this consideration, including the ability of a candidate area to contribute to the surrounding area's completeness in terms of public facilities, parks and other amenities.

### *2.2.1 Changes to Evaluation Framework - Phasing Criteria (Step 3)*

- *Readiness for Development criteria:* comments were received which noted that a criteria should be added which considers the timeliness within which lands could be developed once the lands are added to the urban area. It takes many years for lands to reach the development stage following addition to the urban area, considering the

---

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.

need for completion and updating of environmental studies, block servicing strategies, secondary planning and ultimately development applications. The completion of these studies and planning exercise can take upwards of 10 years depending on the amount and complexity of work. The new phasing criteria would consider the availability of information and studies completed as a consideration in which lands would be developed earlier in the horizon.

Land fragmentation is another factor that can be considered under this phasing criteria. Growth areas that are comprised of many smaller parcels under differing ownerships may take longer to reach development stage due to need for assembly and / or coordination. Staff propose adding the 'readiness for development' criteria as one factor to consider in relation to the phasing evaluation.

- *GHG Emissions Analysis:* as noted above, climate change, and the need to measure GHG emissions resulting from growth scenarios, was a key theme heard during the consultation. The phasing criteria under Climate Change will be modified to include the measurement of GHG emissions resulting under each phasing scenario.
- *Minimization / mitigation of impacts to Agricultural System:* the phasing criteria under Agricultural system already notes the consideration of prioritizing development of areas that contain fewer agricultural operations or livestock facilities. A comment was received that this criteria could be expanded to also consider phasing in relation to adjacent agricultural operations and facilities and to prioritize the minimization and mitigation of impacts on adjacent facilities. The criteria has been modified to reflect this suggestion which will be measured through the GRIDS 2 / MCR Agricultural Impact Assessment.

### **2.3 Summary of changes to GRIDS 2 / MCR – Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool (Waterdown and Binbrook) (Appendix “B” to Report PED17010(I))**

As noted above, the Growth Plan allows the opportunity for consideration of a minor expansion into the Greenbelt Protected Countryside from Waterdown and / or Binbrook (identified as 'Towns' in the Greenbelt Plan).

Similar to the evaluation of the whitebelt lands, staff will continue with the evaluation of growth options utilizing the GRIDS 2 / MCR – Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool (Waterdown and Binbrook) despite Council having not made a decision on urban boundary expansion. The utilization of this tool does not predetermine the need for an expansion in either Waterdown or Binbrook or City support for an expansion in either of these areas. Rather, the evaluation will allow Council to make an informed decision in the fall of this year.

---

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.



Comments were received through the consultation which have led to revisions to the Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool (Waterdown / Binbrook) to add clarity to existing criteria, address missing considerations, or remove criteria that are redundant or not meaningful, as listed below:

*2.3.1 Changes to Evaluation Criteria (Screening Criteria and Evaluation Tool (Waterdown and Binbrook))*

- *Addition of Natural Hazards as a theme area:* as per the change to the draft Evaluation Framework and Phasing Principles (Whitebelt), it was noted in comments received from both the Hamilton and the Halton Conservation Authorities that natural hazards avoidance should be added as a theme due to the potential for limitations and impacts on development.
- *Amend Natural Heritage criteria:* comments from the Halton Conservation Authority noted the opportunity to enhance the draft criteria related to natural heritage impacts to address the natural heritage system more broadly. Staff propose an amendment to the criteria as follows: “Does the expansion area maintain, restore or improve the functions and features of the area including diversity and connectivity of natural features, and **the long term ecological function of natural heritage systems?**”
- *Impact on scenic resources of the Escarpment:* comments from the Niagara Escarpment Commission noted that in consideration of the Niagara Escarpment Plan (NEP), Part 1.7.5.1, Development Objectives for Urban Areas, consideration should be given to whether the proposed urban area would impact the scenic resources of the Niagara Escarpment. This criteria has been added under the Complete Communities theme in the Waterdown / Binbrook evaluation tool to address impact on scenic resources of the Niagara Escarpment, to be applicable only to certain lands in the Waterdown area that are within the NEP.
- *Add Cultural Heritage as a Theme Area:* comments from stakeholders noted that consideration of cultural heritage resources (built form, cultural heritage landscapes and archaeological resources) should be added as a consideration under Part 2. Staff concur and have modified the framework accordingly.
- *Addition of Food Security / Protection of Local Food Network as key consideration under the Agricultural System Theme:* similar to the comments on the whitebelt evaluation framework, many comments received through the Engage Hamilton portal expressed the need to add food security and protection of the local food network as a key consideration. The comments noted the importance of protecting the local food network and local food security in light of climate change impacts which have the potential to impact food production worldwide. The criteria under the Agricultural System them has been amended to address this concern.

---

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.

### **3.0 Next Steps**

#### **3.1 Phasing considerations and growth options analysis**

Modelling of growth options (No Urban Boundary Expansion and Ambitious Density scenario) will continue in Q3, 2021. In addition, development and modelling of phasing scenarios under the Ambitious Density scenario and review of expansion requests from Waterdown and Binbrook (as applicable) will be undertaken. Staff will report on the results in the Fall of this year. Staff will recommend a preferred growth option in the fall of this year but will not request Committee to make a decision at that time. Rather, staff will request authorization to consult with members of the public about the evaluation and results and report back with a final preferred growth option for Council approval in early 2022.

#### **3.2 Mail-out Survey – reporting back**

As per Council direction, staff will report back on the results of the mail-out survey in Fall 2021 with an Information Report summarizing the survey methodology, participation rate and responses received by mail (hard copy) and email.

### **ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION**

Do not endorse the proposed evaluation tools. This option would also have the risk of delaying the GRIDS 2 / MCR process.

### **ALIGNMENT TO THE 2016 – 2025 STRATEGIC PLAN**

#### **Economic Prosperity and Growth**

*Hamilton has a prosperous and diverse local economy where people have opportunities to grow and develop.*

#### **Clean and Green**

*Hamilton is environmentally sustainable with a healthy balance of natural and urban spaces.*

#### **Built Environment and Infrastructure**

*Hamilton is supported by state of the art infrastructure, transportation options, buildings and public spaces that create a dynamic City.*

### **APPENDICES AND SCHEDULES ATTACHED**

Appendix “A” – City of Hamilton GRIDS 2 / MCR: Final Growth Evaluation Framework and Phasing Criteria

**SUBJECT: GRIDS 2 and Municipal Comprehensive Review – Consultation Update  
and Evaluation Framework and Phasing Principles (PED17010(I)) (City  
Wide) - Page 27 of 27**

---

- Appendix “B” – Revised Evaluation Framework – Waterdown / Binbrook
- Appendix “C” – Summary of comments from Public (Engage Hamilton)
- Appendix “D” – Summary of Comments from Public (Email)
- Appendix “E” – Summary of Comments from Stakeholders
- Appendix “F” – Policy Review
- Appendix “G” – GRIDS 2 / MCR workplan

---

OUR Vision: To be the best place to raise a child and age successfully.

OUR Mission: To provide high quality cost conscious public services that contribute to a healthy, safe and prosperous community, in a sustainable manner.

OUR Culture: Collective Ownership, Steadfast Integrity, Courageous Change, Sensational Service, Engaged Empowered Employees.