

Public Comments (Email) – Option 1

*Five (5) duplicate comments have been removed

| | |
|---|---|
| 1 | <p>Many people have not received or even know about this survey. The organized campaign to "Stop Sprawl" has 100 people pitching in a combined \$32,500. 1000s of people have mindlessly clicked a button in their desire to 'save something'. Money spent on placing ads in the local media and purchasing lawn signs to place on their lawns to showcase their desire to prevent other people from having lawns.</p> <p>John Best of the Bay Observer said it best - BLIND TO THE IRONY. "There is a certain irony in householders who already have their slice of the dream – an actual house, telling the next generation that they must live in a high rise for the rest of their lives; because there is only one way to stop urban sprawl– massive intensification and that means apartment towers, lots of them."</p> <p>https://bayobserver.ca/2021/07/20/blind-to-the-irony/</p> <p>Nevermind the plastic signs constructed from fossil fuel use, wielded by the same people who are constantly trying to tell us how our fossil fuel use is destroying the planet. But when they need fossil fuels...</p> <p>When we change the zoning to allow for developments in Elfrida/Glanbrook, no one is being forced to sell their property. All the dark money that seems to be creeping into local politics could divert into that to purchase these plots they can then save.</p> <p>We've known about this for a long time, it's not new. There is no difference between a Liberal 60% and a Conservative 50% at the end of the day.</p> <p>Let's continue being the ambitious city.</p> <p>I would bet dollars to dimes that if the plan was to raze Elfrida/Glanbrook to put in solar and wind installations, all the Stop Sprawl people would be campaigning for this.</p> |
| 2 | <p>Although we are in the business of farming, we have land that is adjacent to a settlement area, which has become very difficult to farm over the years. The land no longer produces quality product as it has been depleted of all minerals and nutrients after 7 decades of farming. Like ours, there are many similar situations. When it like this, it makes sense to remove land from the green belt to accommodate new homes to fill a housing shortage. I don't, however, agree with the removal of viable farmland to make room for housing.</p> |

| | |
|----------|--|
| <p>3</p> | <p>Absolutely the City should expand the urban boundary to allow for needed housing. Not everyone wants to live in a high rise downtown. Families want backyards for children to play and families to gather. The areas being considered for growth will not upset farm lands or food supply. Some people have their heads in the sand when it comes to growth. Obviously people want to buy homes in neighbourhoods...they sell out as soon as they are built.</p> <p>The forecast for homes needed should be enough of an indicator that Hamilton must grow to accommodate. New neighbourhoods provide a sense of community and the younger generations desperately need that. Let's just get on with it.</p> |
| <p>4</p> | <p>Actually, we need even more urban boundary growth than what the survey is offering, and we need it fast. Housing prices and rents have become insane in this city.</p> |
| <p>5</p> | <p>After reading all the information & living in Hamilton since 1983, we prefer to see Hamilton grow to attract more talents/businesses/investments which benefit all Hamiltonians, especially since we are located in between 2 big cities, Toronto & New York City. Furthermore, Hamilton airport has been underutilized for such a long time which is a waste of our resources. We prefer to fly out of our Hamilton airport as compared to all the headaches & costs to fly out of Toronto Pearson International Airport.</p> <p>With the growth potential, it will reduce business taxes, commercial & residential taxes which give Hamilton a competitive advantage to other cities. We have to be able to offer good jobs & more choices to our younger generations in order to keep them here and raise their family in Hamilton, instead of moving to Toronto for the sake of making a living (employment).</p> <p>Without the base of younger generations to pay taxes/ income taxes, it will be very difficult /challenging for the city to continue to provide all sorts of services to support the seniors & various social programs.</p> <p>We have experienced first hand that our children have to move to Toronto because they can not find good paying jobs in Hamilton. They are qualified & highly motivated.</p> <p>The equation is very simple -- we need more investments & businesses to locate in Hamilton in order to create jobs, otherwise we will lose our young talents to other cities.</p> |
| <p>6</p> | <p>Although I circled the first option, I really think that a VERY CAREFUL look at WHERE the expansion of the Urban boundary is going to be is key. Forward thinking, that is with environmental impact in mind, is really important here!</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| 7 | <p>Am totally in favor of Urban Growth!</p> <p>Would prefer Growth in areas to include Ancaster. One Growth area originally designated for Smart Growth was land in the Book Road area. Councillor Lloyd Ferguson convinced City of Hamilton Planning to have that area designated Greenbelt from its original designation as established by the Provincial Greenbelt Committee in 2004. Let's put it back as Development Land as it was originally designated. The people want an alternative to Stoney Creek!</p> |
| 8 | <p>As a major landowner in Hamilton with numerous properties, we question why we did not receive any surveys in the mail. We are therefore submitting our preferred option by email, and trust this vote will be counted.</p> |
| 9 | <p>Based on past results, I doubt we can achieve the required level of intensification under Option 2. There will not be enough supply to meet demand and the homes will become even more unaffordable. (The Teranet Housing Index was up 28% in the Hamilton/Burlington region in the last 12 months). Young families and immigrants will go elsewhere. Is that what we want?</p> |
| 10 | <p>But I have suggestion for all the builders. Why can't they resell the cut wood, plywood wire etc. instead of sending to dump to recycle. Meaning hire someone to set up a store area and let people but any length or piece they want. With the price of wood and accessories people would buy it. I have seen bins full of 2x4s and plywood. It would create jobs and keep stuff out of our dumps.</p> |
| 11 | <p>Clearly more land needs to be available for development given the prices of homes are unaffordable for most citizens because of a lack of supply of homes.</p> |
| 12 | <p>Expanding the Hamilton urban boundaries is a crucial part of addressing the current affordability crises at a local level.</p> <p>In multiple recent analyses of affordability rates, Hamilton has been ranked as one of the least affordable cities to live in worldwide, with respect to the cost of housing. This is the result of the confluence of several well intentioned but misguided government policies at the local, provincial, and federal levels.</p> <p>One of the more significant of these being the slow down in the construction of single family homes, despite this being the primary source of demand in the housing market. This demand will only increase. Families need homes they can make their own, can accommodate their changing composition over time, and which have private, safe, outdoor space.</p> <p>Any solution Hamilton develops to address the affordability crisis must include an</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>increase in the supply of the types of homes families need. This is impossible without expanding the urban boundaries.</p> |
| 13 | <p>General Comments: As a 25-year-old McMaster graduate and lifelong Hamilton resident, I've seen first-hand how The City's artificial restrictions on housing stock have fueled >20% year-over-year increases in housing prices and market rents. At the same time, local employment opportunities and wages have remained stagnant. While this is a non-issue for those who already own houses in Hamilton (and proudly plant their "No Urban Boundary Expansion" lawn signs), it leaves only one option for me and many others like me - to leave our hometown behind.</p> <p>Sustainable development should not only consider environmental sustainability, but also economic sustainability. When a higher and higher proportion of residents' income is going to housing, it starves local businesses of revenue and stifles local economic growth in the long-run. The solution is to keep housing affordable, not by imposing more policy, but by lifting artificial restrictions on housing supply and allowing developers to satisfy the demand for housing both within the urban boundary (with mid- and high-rise development and laneway housing) and also outside of it (with greenfield developments).</p> |
| 14 | <p>Hamilton desperately needs more housing. Thank you for caring about this issue. I hope to see our city expand.</p> |
| 15 | <p>Hamilton faces a housing affordability crisis and intensification is not enough to meet this problem. We need more suburban development (supply) to support intensification efforts.</p> <p>Housing pressures from Toronto migration and increased immigration rates require more than just intensification to support the demand of all these future Hamiltonians.</p> |
| 16 | <p>Hamilton's roads and traffic and infrastructure are all in need of improvement. The old City core is improving but needs sustained redevelopment to be a successful urban City. Hamilton needs a larger tax base and growth demands are increasing dramatically as affordable urban housing is essential to our entire inter-City network. East of Hamilton, Lake Ontario is jammed by demands to grow as other cities have run out of space to grow. Flamborough is ideally suited for growth in Hamilton North.</p> <p>We must recognize that a heavy west to east relationship as Hamilton bookends the Greater Toronto area with unique and affordable qualities.</p> <p>I always see "urban sprawl" as huge density high rise communities. The desire for families to live in their own homes in neighbourhoods is still the Canadian dream. No expansion area anywhere can beat the attractiveness of Flamborough</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| | |
| 17 | Housing prices are out of control and we need more affordable housing. |
| 18 | <p>I am a lifetime farmer that farms land from Ancaster to flamborough east. I would welcome an sitdown opportunity with the planners making the decisions on this.</p> <p>By restricting expansion of the urban expansion we are driving growth out of our community to neighboring communities not restricted by the surrounding greenbelt. This has driven farming out of our community. We own land that is being farmed that is surrounded on 3 sides by development but because it has been designated greenbelt it can not be developed. It is dangerous bringing in modern farming equipment into curbed high density roads and high density population.</p> <p>The lands fronting on Garner road between Shaver Road and Fiddlers Green should be developed and stop fooling yourselves. Much better farmland is being consumed in the province for development. Just head to the other side of Brantford to see this. All prime farmland in a low population density being converted to residential and commercial development. People are driving further for jobs because of less expensive housing availability in other communities ie Caledonia Brantford.</p> |
| 19 | I am a resident of Dundas and I believe that we should pursue growth through option 1 in the survey, through urban intensification. The more we can intensify growth within urban boundaries, leaving rural areas alone is the best option for urban growth. |
| 20 | I am a young professional, completing a phd and my husband is a paramedic. We have a good income, and have worked and saved and have watched the price of housing in this city skyrocket. We would love to have a family, in a home that is our own just like our parents, however the stifling of urban expansion and the inability to build homes to meet demand has priced us cleanly out of the city we call home. I implore you to consider all options to improve affordability for local Hamiltonians, both newly settled and long term residents such as us, who wish to continue to live in and contribute to this community. |
| 21 | I am in favour of expanding the urban boundary in Hamilton, Ontario. I believe the city of Hamilton needs more land available to build new houses. What the Province of Ontario is referring to as ambitious density. |

| | |
|----|---|
| 22 | <p>I believe Option 1 blends density increases with growth. It allows industrial areas to be used for residential (e.g. Pier 8 as I recall) while also keeping industrial areas near the waterfront...a significant advantage for Hamilton. My selection for the survey is Option 1.</p> <p>Additionally - area growth has been occurring over my life in Hamilton. It has been reasonably managed and areas such as Meadowlands (an old swamp farm area of no significant interest - my 1969 Superbee used enjoy those roads ;)) - now a significant shopping + business area.</p> <p>The remaining option (excluding new ideas) limit growth in several categories and limits generally never result in good choices...because of the limits.</p> |
| 23 | <p>I choose OPTION 1 AMBITIOUS DENSITY SCENARIO because it is the best for the development of the city</p> |
| 24 | <p>I choose option 1 with a good mixture of gentle intensification in the urban core and new housing in new lands.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intensification should not interrupt very beautiful and stable and established neighbourhoods by adding high-rises that don't fit into the character and way of life of that area. Jamming in a condo between established homes is wrong and reduces the quality of life of those neighbourhoods. 2. Intensify in the busy urban areas such as downtown, uptown, areas that have stores, businesses, transit. Intensify in areas downtown and elsewhere that are just empty parking lots. 3. A successful city must offer quality of life. High density reduces the quality of life with small living spaces and little fresh air. Wherein families should have a choice of space and air around their property, with a backyard. If we don't build real houses we are not giving people a choice. 4. Seeing that severe intensification can cause the spread of disease in this day and age, I feel we would be going backwards if we did not have a choice. We have to re-visit the whole idea of extreme intensification. Gentle intensification is the way to go in the areas I mentioned above. |
| 25 | <p>I do have a few comments.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) 3,000 acres sounds like a lot of land but people do not realize that 70% of Hamilton is rural. There are some farmers in Hamilton that singlehandedly farm more than 3,000 acres. 2) While it takes 500 years to create an inch of topsoil, we have a lot of vacant land that has poor topsoil and is not ideal for agriculture. These areas should be prioritized for development over rich agricultural areas. |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>3) There was not a lot of attention given to what intensification currently exists under the Places to Grow legislation. Some are inaccurately portraying this 3,000 acres as solely single-family homes, which is not permitted.</p> <p>4) Many of the homes demonstrating signs in favour of Option 2 are single family homes. Some are in heritage areas. Intensification also means that higher density could be popping up in their neighbourhood. In our own neighbourhood, previous supporters of intensification suddenly opposed a 26 floor tower near the Winona Costco.</p> <p>5) Ontario welcomes 200,000 or so immigrants every year. They need somewhere to live. Existing urban areas in Hamilton will not be sufficient.</p> <p>6) With increased density goals under Places to Grow, I believe we can achieve our smart growth goals with only a minimal incursion of 3,000 acres.</p> |
| 26 | <p>I drive past the signs of people opposed to it every day, and most are not farmers, but rather are people who've bought a big house out in the country and want to keep their isolation.</p> <p>I support expanding the urban limits so that farmers can sell their land to non-farmers and retire wealthy, to increase the availability of housing, and to weaken the farming lobby, because without Ontario farms, food would be no less scarce than it currently is. It's time to stop letting a vocal minority from breaking the solidarity of our city. We ARE a city and so food security based on our greenbelt would be impossible no matter the support farms receive. Let's grow as a city, without the sway of a vocal minority blocking the march of progress.</p> |
| 27 | <p>I feel Hamilton needs to expand Urban boundaries to address the increasing population and housing supply issues, especially in Waterdown.</p> |
| 28 | <p>I feel Hamilton needs to expand Urban boundaries to address the increasing population and housing supply issues.</p> |
| 29 | <p>I feel no boundary changes will further exacerbate the housing affordability issue.</p> |
| 30 | <p>I fully support Option 1 resulting in 1340 ha of urban expansion.</p> <p>My property is 100 acres and I like many rural owners lease out the land to farmers who plant soy or corn. These do not directly feed the population and provide only nominal income as farming is not my profession. As well, most of the property and the area is swampy. A far better use of the land is development. The local road infrastructure here is primed for development (hwy</p> |

| | |
|----|---|
| | <p>52, hwy 5, hwy 8 junction) with lots of available water. The increase in property value would be a huge benefit for the families like myself who have invested in the area.</p> <p>I would be pleased to provide additional information and opinion if requested.</p> |
| 31 | <p>I have not received a paper copy of the survey. I would like to support option 1, Ambitious Density scenario. Residents of Hamilton will move to where they can find accommodations that fit their needs. Not what politicians, city staff, activists decide they should live</p> |
| 32 | <p>I live downtown which is noisy and has poor air quality. Travelling east/west is difficult due to a lack of infrastructure. When I visit my friends who also live downtown there is a lack of street parking and I sometimes get tickets. More intensification and higher density will just make this worse. Let's have some of our growth occur outside the current urban boundary.</p> |
| 33 | <p>I see the "Stop the Sprawl" signs on the lawns of people who enjoy a nice big residential property, but want now to deny that same opportunity to the younger generation. Perhaps they'd like to move into a single room condo somewhere and allow a young family to have the property. Seems pretty hypocritical.</p> <p>Maybe the property tax assessment system needs to be updated - one person living in a 2500 sq foot residence/quarter acre lot should be taxed higher.</p> <p>We need growth of more than just condos.</p> |
| 34 | <p>I think the city should also increase the high of the city skyline to 50 stories in the downtown core.</p> <p>The city requires a monument landmark in the skyline... Century 21 apartment doesn't cut it anymore.</p> |
| 35 | <p>I tried to access this City of Hamilton survey on line but there were no links that I could see.</p> <p>Re the growth options : social studies involving child development indicate raising families in condo high rise style facilities with limited space is not a good social idea. The children as well as parents incur significant higher stress hormone levels then children and parents in larger ground based housing especially when that housing has its own private outdoor space.</p> <p>Studies also show that most families do not want to raise their children in high rise or even ground based condo units and the price they are willing to pay for a</p> |

traditional ground based detached home is a strong indicator of this desire.

Urban growth is driven by four factors :

1. Desire of surrounding citizens to migrate to the city as the city offers better or more affordable alternative then the community they are in or their move is job related.

2. Out of area and out of Province citizens migrating to the city for reasons similar to 1 above

3. Immigrants from outside Canada into Canada and settling in the area.

4. Children raised in the area returning from schools and elsewhere to establish their family units in the area.

The growth in Hamilton population is being driven by all four engines however the third item is driven by the federal government and by its policies to achieve population growth by immigration. Faxctors 1 and 2 then come into play.

Factor 1 is the driving growth issue as Toronto prices for housing has skyrocketed due to lack of affordable alternatives which has seen a massive migration from the GYA into the GTA west (Burlington ,Hamilton, Niagara). This will remain strong as work from home and rapid GTA transit allows further out employment opportunities. Land down town Toronto is too expensive even for many companies so we will see companies migrate to lower cost areas (eg Niagara) and using freed up capital from sale of central GTA facilities to relocate and avail itself of lower cost jurisdictions.

Hamilton needs to make significant changes in its growth patterns.

Firstly Option 1 is far better than option 2 .

However Option 1 needs to address expansion of the city into the Dundas lands between the escarpment and the bay. It makes no sense to have the urban core of Waterdown isolated from the rest of the city and the Dundas valley area is far more conducive to development needs then is the mountain expansions. The time has come to use these Dundas lands as they are far more centralized to integration into the GTA and transit use then is the Mountain and Binbrook expansion areas..

The lands in the Dundas valley are not agricultural lands but are rural lands whereas the mountain lands are actual agricultural lands let go fallow by non farm owners hoping they get transferred to rural lands with development opportunities.

I suggest the City needs to tell the Province the Places to Grow rural plans are not satisfactory. Housing in the city rural areas is at a premium already and is

even less affordable than is urban housing options. The city growth should allow expansion of the rural settlements and true rural residential lots in a formulae tied to overall urban housing expansion. The greenbelt has only made rural real estate jump in value as it does nothing to curb demand but relies on a failed economic theory stoppin supply will curb the demand.

Building massive numbers of 500-1000 sq ft condo highrise units is what intensification means and it will meet the short term goals for the needs of individuals and couples however the demand for these are the sale of downtown GTA units and migration of those owners to Hamilton (Reason 2) based on transferring their equity into something better.

stopping development on open rural lands by using global warming as the excuse is simply lazy and a convenient excuse not based on any environmental rationale. Whether you build 40 units on one piece of land or on another makes no real difference to the environment as the impact of the build is the same. However if you build on open rural lands the next thing the new owners do is plant grass, shrubs and trees and over twenty years you actually get increase canopy and CO2 absorption then the older open field could absorb, especially as the building of the units elsewhere are still creating additional environmental gasses.

Courage comes in creatively using land and expanding onto open rural greenspace with the build types allowing the market forces to take place. This is not advocating only detached single family construction but there needs to be a balance so there are sufficient stocks of all types to meet the demands of families as they grow and mature.

Urban planning has become such a big business for the city. The planning and building departments are overstretched and the red tape it has created is a major issue affecting housing construction. Lack of supply is causing price escalation based on simple economics: low supply, High demand equals price increases. Combine this with Covid affecting housing type demand and the Billions of new dollars (over 300 Billion) printed and put into circulation and no wonder the housing prices have skyrocketed.

I suggest if you want the urban housing supply to be resolved and the prices made affordable that the city develop an 18 month open season for any and all housing developers to come and make proposals re zoning and renovating areas of the city eg the North and east end. Restoration of the grey and white field sites and that restricting conversion of blocks of areas should not be heritage driven,

In conclusion the city needs to expand the urban boundary. It needs to add the Dundas valley lands into the urban boundary. It needs to allow a 20% increase in

| | |
|----|--|
| | rural settlement units and a 10 % increase in rural residential units. It also needs to encourage companies to relocate to the East and South ends. |
| 36 | I vote for option one - intensification within the existing urban boundary. |
| 37 | I would also like to comment that Hamilton needs to focus more on mid-density multi-family development (6 stories or less). We need a higher amount of family sized housing and not a flood of studio or single bedroom condo units. Amend zoning bylaws to mimic the inner-city streetcar suburbs this City built prior to the 1950s and build the 'missing middle'! |
| 38 | I would like to see Option 1 guide Hamilton's expansion. As someone who is raising a family in a condominium townhouse in an area surrounded increasingly by stacked townhouses, I believe that we need to increase affordable low density detached housing as part of our expansion plan. We have seen enough regulation of our land use by the Greenbelt as well as by conservation regulations. Areas that are currently in the White Belt need to be allowed to be developed in the next thirty years so that new residents and particularly families are not priced out of the housing market due to low supply. |
| 39 | I would like to voice my support for the city staff-recommended Ambitious Density plan (Option 1). I support urban intensification as the preferred option for growth, but understand the need to: Conform with provincial policy and maintain local control over the details of this decision Develop some new supply of ground-related dwellings in order to prevent house-seekers from jumping the greenbelt Develop parcels along the future S line BRT route to allow its future construction Use the whitebelt lands identified for future growth to guard against future public sentiment turning against Greenbelt protections |
| 40 | If Hamilton wants to grow, it must offer urban, suburban and rural residential options, like all other cities in Ontario. COMMENT: The survey is: (a) overly simplistic and lacking in informative information; and, (b) gives the impression that there are only 2 Options being considered. |
| 41 | It should be implemented along with redevelopment of existing space. For Hamilton to grow as something more than an industrial city we will need neighborhoods that will attract more educated and diverse populations. |

| | |
|----|--|
| 42 | My family is fortunate enough to own a single-family home. We believe that more residents should have this option, and not everyone should be destined to raise a family in a high rise. |
| 43 | <p>My preferred growth option is Option 1 ("Ambitious Density" Scenario) as it is the only realistic option to be able to achieve the provincial growth targets and help with housing affordability by increasing supply.</p> <p>Option 2 with no urban boundary expansion would require an 80% intensification target which is not realistic. It's already very difficult to get developments within the urban boundary approved with a current intensification rate of only 40%.</p> <p>As a result, I believe a combination of some urban boundary expansion combined with more intensification is our best option.</p> |
| 44 | My Urban Growth Option is “Ambitious Density” scenario. I didn’t see a specific plan to build a new hospital for the increased population. I think the west mountain is a good location for a new tertiary hospital especially if intensification of urban growth occurs there. |
| 45 | No urban expansion sure sounds nice, but farmers should have the freedom to sell their land to the highest bidder, just like the rest of us. Plus, there is so much NIMBYism in my neighbourhood alone, I find it near impossible to believe an 81% intensification rate across the city could be achieved. People fight tooth and nail against anything higher than three stories in Westdale, making densification a non-starter for so many citizens. |
| 46 | Not all land outside of the current urban boundary is farmland. With more people working from home families want options to live outside the current city boundary. |
| 47 | Of the two options given, I prefer Option 1 "Ambitious Density" scenario. For the sake of the environment and my personal enjoyment of green spaces, I don't want to see more greenfield lands developed, but for health reasons, especially in light of the current pandemic, it seems to make sense to mitigate the increased population with at least some lower density housing. It is an impossible balancing act and I don't envy you. |
| 48 | Option 1 - but please add infrastructure so we can charge our electric cars when we have to buy them. Start now! |

| | |
|----|--|
| 49 | Option 1 please with careful consideration and environmental studies of the lands used for expansion. |
| 50 | <p>Option 2 - Because city council are determined to have the LRT installed, which serves only the downtown population. This does not support enough Hamiltonians.</p> <p>Hamilton will become like a city of New York. The drawbacks are when another pandemic occurs, and it will, you will have "hot spots" and greater risk to people.</p> <p>Option 1 – Urban expansion, which is more like Los Angeles and the LRT is not required.</p> <p>I choose Option #1.</p> <p>PS. People who have a single family home (50' x 100' lots) have signs on their lawn that support option 2. Obviously, they do not want others to have what they enjoy.</p> |
| 51 | Picking option 1, use the land that's abandoned in the city. Use the land that the buildings that are abandoned all over the city. Expand the north end. Beautify what we already have! |
| 52 | <p>Sick and tired of a handful of people who protest when there are 537,000 people in this City. Don't listen to these clowns.</p> <p>We need more affordable homes for purchase by young families. There is huge parcels of land.</p> |
| 53 | Tall buildings do not create green space, children cannot thrive on concrete balconies. |
| 54 | <p>The city needs to look at technologies used all over the world for sewage treatment plants.</p> <p>You don't need to bring a sewer 40km to try and service an area like the airport. They can do it at a cost of 20 million dollars with a 100,000 sq ft facility any where you want.</p> <p>They were introduced to Hamilton Abbass Zaidy and Bruce Jank from https://www.ccwti.ca/ There technology will allow urban expansion at a fraction of the cost.</p> |
| 55 | These options seem to be rather rigid and a blended approach could be another way to solve this problem. Hamilton needs to expand their Urban boundaries to |

| | |
|-----------|--|
| | <p>address the increasing population and housing supply issues. Look at the growth and interest in Waterdown.</p> |
| | <p>To this issue at hand. I don't think we can reasonably put a full stop on urban boundary expansion. There are simply some realities to living in such developed areas. I am suggesting option 1 with the following consideration and concerns.</p> <p>Ensure we are critically evaluating and acting on intensification within the current boundary. The LRT development plan should be a priority. If we are going to maximize and efficiently utilize this coming infrastructure, it is imperative that the respective corridors are fully intensified with residential (sensing high rise condo, multi unit), interactive commercial (retail, grocery, entertainment, personal care) of all manner not static office, warehouse capacity. It simply can't be a alternative/substitute for the HSR service. As an Ancaster resident, what would compel me to access this system?</p> <p>Develop with consistent construct. New segregated development aside, when impacting existing connected development be respectful of the tone and environment at hand. My understanding this is to be the case however sadly I do not see this in current practice. I will jump on my soap box here as a long-standing Ancaster resident. The Ancaster of today has extensive multi unit residential. The supporting commuter infrastructure has not kept step and/or been effectively managed. The town is in constant grid lock. It has turned into a big box commercial and warehouse stop both east and west. The town centre is disparately developed with significant non-interactive commercial entities. My neighbourhood main thoroughfare John Frederick Drive is comprised of three variant developments along its length; Disparate residential construct to include back to back multi unit. Varying road allowances and intersections. Unrestricted street parking creating bottle necks for opposing traffic which creates a safety concern for sight lines as children are playing in these areas. Sidebar; what is the reason for putting landscaping elements within turn circles...they are a complete visual impedance within an intersection when you are attempting to navigate your movements in keeping with pedestrian movements and other interacting traffic. Maintaining fit and form of existing neighborhoods does put more pressure on intensification efforts. That is reflected my consideration for selecting option 1.</p> <p>I feel very well thought out (immediate phase development) intensification and carefully selected greenfield expansion, we can find the right balance and improve Hamilton along the way.</p> |
| <p>56</p> | <p>Unless people are in favour of having 6 storey buildings popping up in their neighborhoods and come to the conclusion that only they can own a single family home.</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| 57 | We all need housing. The only people who protest are those we have a home. Anyone can see that the only way to make homes affordable is to increase supply. You don't have to build on good farm land how about a place called Rockton or areas like that. Canada is huge and empty why are we artificially restricting ourselves and causing a crisis? |
| 58 | We are in support of Option 1 - Ambitious Density Scenario and we would like to encourage growth beyond the existing urban boundary and that the City of Hamilton needs Urban Expansion. |
| 59 | We are in the biggest housing crisis in Canadian history. We need to build more houses now. |
| 60 | We are in the midst of a massive housing crisis and that's not going to be getting any better. |
| 61 | <p>We have a housing crisis in Ontario because there are too many land use restrictions.</p> <p>All levels of Government have to open up the land and start developing. This is so ridiculous how our Governments have made it almost impossible for the next generation to be able to buy a home. Please stop this insanity and open up the land.</p> <p>These restrictions are destroying the future of the next generation. It's shameful.</p> |
| 62 | we need affordable housing. |
| 63 | We should not be forced to live in high-rise concrete boxes, we need land for future detached homes the pandemic should have taught us that! There is a high demand for detached homes. |
| 64 | <p>We think there should still be expansion into greenfield lands. The intensification rate of the past 10 years has been low at 39%. I would assume that this is due to a more aggressive use of greenfield lands. Option 1 as stated in the survey is to have a 60% intensification.</p> <p>To not have any greenfield housing units constructed in the next 30 years would be bad for the city when all other cities are expanding such as Vaughan and Barrie as examples. It would make competing for new businesses more difficult. It would also push already high housing prices higher.</p> <p>We therefore think that option 1 is a fine compromise where the intensification</p> |

| | |
|----|--|
| | rate is increased to 60% which is higher than the past 10 years and some greenfield lands are utilized. |
| 65 | <p>While intensification is important we don't want to end up like Mississauga with row upon row of 30 to 40 story towers. Covid 19 and kids needing space has shown the folly of that!</p> <p>Instead let's concentrate on smaller, more numerous and affordable 3 to 4 story walkups and stacked townhouses along livable streets especially along the planned LRT route! With satellite villages in the new Greenfield lands taking the overflow being also important. That's how you make a livable and affordable city!</p> |
| 66 | Yes to expansion for homes on vacant land |
| 67 | <p>Your plan MUST address housing needs and options in all of its outlying rural hamlets. This is where supply is lowest, yet demand is greatest. People want to live in smaller communities that offer friendly neighbours, fresh air, security and access to local rural markets.</p> <p>Carlisle has grown to capacity with few to no options left for new building. It is time to expand Carlisle's settlement zone and in doing so, increase dwelling options to serve people of various walks of life and life style needs (i.e. seniors, singles, renters, individuals with special needs). New development opportunities (and zoning changes) can address the need for intensification & density by permitting semi-detached dwellings, row housing, communal living and even low-rise apartment buildings. Likewise, additional commercial zoning should be added to the mix to serve the community and provide jobs.</p> |
| 68 | <p>The survey card for MCR GRIDS stated that comments can be sent to this email address. I have the following comments to add to the Municipal Comprehensive Review for Hamilton urban growth. Please include my thoughts to the review process.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am in favour of urban expansion of residential units into rural areas of Hamilton. 2. Residential unit supply is in alarming low supply. Housing purchase prices have increased far beyond the annual inflation rate and cost of living index. Apartments are in short supply. The waiting list time for assisted housing in Hamilton is unacceptable for a nation that has wealth and space. 3. New residential areas provide opportunity for a healthy mix of residential types. Single dwelling, detached homes can be mixed with row housing, apartments, and condominiums. Hamiltonians of all socio-economic and racial backgrounds can reside in these shared communities. Schools, parks, recreation centers, organizations, and retail become the place where Canadians mix and thrive. |

4. New residential area expansion will lower the demand on homes and apartments in the inner city. This is critical for the health and safety of many who are vulnerable, homeless, and in need of emergency, compassionate social services. Hamilton is a leader in providing emergency, compassionate social services, but the vulnerable citizens who need the services are being pushed away from Hamilton because of a lack of housing and apartments.

5. Immigrants and refugees are coming to Hamilton in greater numbers than at any point in our nation's history. Our nation needs these new citizens. Many of these immigrants are part of an alarming number of displaced persons throughout the world. Hamilton is uniquely suited to accept immigrants because of our excellent social outreach programs. However, we are sadly lacking accommodation, housing, and apartments.

6. Young families cannot afford to live in the GTA and are relocating to Hamilton. Additional housing supply is needed immediately to welcome this young, talented, and diverse group of young people.

7. There is a vocal minority that vilifies developers. Developers are accused of being greedy, shady, and contributors to poverty. This simple characterization is not only unfair, but has contributed to the housing crisis now existing throughout Southern Ontario.

8. Brownfields in the urban core have been available for development for lengthy periods of time but have left undeveloped.

9. Agricultural production continues to grow. Production measured in units per acre have increased dramatically over the last three decades. More food is being produced on less land than ever. Agriculture marketing boards are needed to keep supply low (prices high) in many commodities.

We need additional housing supply now... not more studies... not more virtue signaling!