

Public Comments (email) – Option 2

\*Three (3) duplicate comments have been removed

1.	<p>I say NO to Urban Boundary Expansion. Our farmland is too precious to continue to destroy it. Do you not believe that climate change is occurring? What about all the natural habitat? I would like to see any available land within the city used before any other lands are taken. Consider this scenario, our food chain to the US is interrupted for whatever reason and we need to start growing our own--where are we going to do this? Please forgive my ignorance but I feel that you should consult with Dr. David Suzuki regarding expansion into farmlands or any lands/</p> <p><b>NO TO URBAN BOUNDARY EXPANSION #2</b> Please be wise and consider all factors before making such an irreversible decision.</p>
2.	<p>Green space should be left for future generations. Doe city council and the On government ever pay attention to where our food comes from and the need for parks and greenspace for the health of us all, urban and suburban. I grew up in niagara on the lake, where so much farmland has gone to homes instead of all the fruits and vegetables available locally when I grew up down there.</p> <p>This is a plan based on what the developers want, not what is best for people, our food sources, our health, not to mention the climate. Urban development and the encouragement and support of a walkable, vibrant city with local stores and less pavement surrounded big box stores.</p> <p>Enough said.</p>
3.	<p>I didn't know about this survey until seeing a volunteer group's post on social media. As someone with interest in this issue I find it upsetting that I wouldn't have known about this survey had it not been for the post I saw. With that in mind I feel there should be greater effort on behalf on the city to ensure it's residents are aware they can formally express their opinion. The due date for submitting survey results should be extended, while more effort in notifying the public is taken. I feel there are many residents who are unaware this survey even exists, which will not result in an accurate assessment of the public's opinions. This is a significant consideration for the future of Hamilton. I urge the city to make an effort in ensuring all residents are aware of this issue because once land becomes developed, the damage is done, the natural environment gone. It seems foolish to develop and trample more of our land when the earth is dying and our environment is so fragile. This is a serious matter that should have much more thought put into it, ensuring not just those who stand to gain financial benefit in developing more land are heard alone. Financial wealth won't matter after our environment's health is destroyed. It is the city of Hamilton's civic duty to ensure all residents opinions are considered.</p>

4.	<p>There are enough vacant buildings in Hamilton. Hamilton needs to start collecting property tax on these vacant buildings and if the owners do not have imminent plans to use the buildings they should be expropriated and turned into affordable housing or sold to developers to make use of the property. There are also large amounts of industrial land around the bay that would make a beautiful development sites. I don't think these lands are being efficiently used by the businesses like Stelco and might be able to be cleaned up and repurposed similar to what Toronto has started to do with their lakefront businesses like Redpath Sugar. I know this would take decades but if we start now I think the Hamilton bay could be a world class destination and living environment.</p>
5.	<p>I prefer Option 2 – No Urban Boundary Expansion.</p> <p>Hamilton has sufficient grey and white belt lands to accommodate future housing units. The city should be focused on development in the existing urban area and around transit nodes such as the GO stations and proposed LRT route. There is no need to add new greenfield lands beyond the current urban area. Agricultural and natural heritage/greenspace lands need to be protected. The city can accommodate planned growth by intensifying in urban areas, but should do so in a manner consistent with and which suits the existing surrounding housing in order to bring the adjacent community on board. More intense development permits more efficient planning, development and utilization of infrastructure and public transit. Historic sprawl has already led to more inefficient development and higher taxes. The city should also be taking into consideration the aging population demographic and their needs to downsize to smaller properties with less maintenance, rather than assuming stereotypical growth of single family dwellings with white picket fences in greenfield areas.</p> <p>I also point out that the survey as designed is poor because it positions two diametrically opposed choices and attempts to force a choice of ambitious density through ‘scarier’ intensity percentages over the planned growth period under the no urban boundary expansion context. It would be better if the city staff and consultants educated citizens fully and informed them of the cost and other implications of a range of scenarios.</p>
6.	<p>Europe has the most liveable cities in the world. Hamilton needs better developed urban centres with intensification and pedestrian zones! (something done back in the 60s in Europe and yes, there was pushback at the beginning but now every town has a pedestrian zone with lots of nearby housing and shops to make it a bustling area). Not many people understand how liveable a city can be and this needs then needs to be ‘pitched’ to people as most are unaware how enjoyable and convenient urban living can be, especially with walkable shops and green spaces are included! Malls are dying, redirect people to local shops.</p> <p>One of the big problems I see is buildings that are left vacant throughout the city and empty lots. What does it take to encourage creative development of these</p>

	<p>properties? There are a few success stories with unused schools being converted to housing.</p> <p>The corner of Main Street and Longwood in Hamilton has sat undeveloped for years. The corner of Market Street and King Street in Dundas has a historic building that has sat for years going to seed - literally! along with the 'old Dairy Queen' on the main street (Kings St) which has been a parking lot for six years now?!</p> <p>I think that there should be a limit on how long a property can remain undeveloped and that speculation has to be discouraged and responsible development encouraged. Too many developers try to build too big and alienate people who in turn oppose their plans.</p>
7.	Fix the property we have. We can't eat buildings
8.	I am very against Urban Sprawl and building on agricultural land . There is ,we know a better way. I would be happy to have a sign ,if possible for
9.	<p>I do not support the urban boundary expansion.</p> <p>First, there should be a better and more creative use of existing derelict, and under-developed areas within the city limits. The loss of green areas and farmland to more sprawling housing is counter productive for a city with an advertised wish to combat climate change. This feels like yet another concession to profit seeking developers.</p> <p>I also think that there should be an interim evaluation of the real population growth, before creating endless suburbs where the impact on food supply, and need for transportation when we are not even certain about what the real need will be.</p>
10.	I would rather see the City build upon existing properties and preserve our green spaces.
11.	stop the development on farmland!!!!
12.	<p>The city needs to intensify the space we have.</p> <p>I do have one comment on the survey itself. How serious was the city in getting input . The very fact that the survey was bundled in with other papers that usually end up in the garbage makes me wonder if you really wanted anyone to respond.</p>
13.	<p>There are plenty of stretches of non historical properties that should be completely redeveloped within the current urban boundary. In fact, we already have too much sprawl and not enough intensification. A city this populated should be taking up a much smaller footprint and be teeming with skyscrapers.</p> <p>Climate change is real. Food insecurity is also real and with climate change will only get worse. We need to hold onto the green belt because there's no going back.</p>

	<p>Urban sprawl adds to the problem. Of course developers want to make money however, this is not the way. They simply want the low hanging fruit, literally.</p>
14.	<p>We need to protect our farm lands from further development. Why aren't empty and vacant lands not redeveloped. We need more developments in the down town core.</p>
15.	<p>I do NOT want Urban Boundary Expansion. This city needs to maximize its efficiency with the land it already has. A city needs to build UP , not out.</p>
16.	<p>Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Your mailer is a poorly designed survey with strategic behavioural psychology wording designed to scare people away from no urban boundary expansion based on the intensification figures cited</li> <li>o “Ambitious density”... I mean come on. You are basically defaulting people to your preferred option. If you are taking the time to source feedback on options, the least you could do is appear to design an unbiased survey.</li> <li>• Hamilton has sufficient lands within its grey and white belts; it does not need to expand its urban boundary to incorporate growth</li> <li>• Working within the existing urban boundary will allow more efficient development and use of infrastructure and transit (build the LRT system, you have federal funding)</li> <li>• Historic sprawl has already led to less efficient use of infrastructure/transit and higher property taxes</li> <li>• Agricultural lands and natural heritage lands need protection</li> </ul>
17.	<p>Higher density and intensification are important in the downtown core and adjacent areas.</p> <p>Many Hamilton downtown areas are dry, cement deserts. Very unappealing in their present states- because development is not directed to these areas.</p> <p>Of course, developers do not want the responsibilities and costs of re-purposing and reusing these urban lands.</p> <p>But the costs of not re-purposing these lands is much higher both aesthetically and financially.</p> <p>And greenspace development costs are a vicious cycle...</p> <p>New housing development gobbles up the surrounding green spaces and rural areas... and then costly expansion services and city transportation and structures and infrastructure are needed.</p> <p>Why are we perpetually spending taxes on new services?! (Even, at the provincial level, our elementary schools have become “disposable” after a decade?!) So that we spend more money on new schools, and sidewalks, and transit, and support services etc etc in new housing developments? All this while our existing urban areas have poor services and urban decay?</p> <p>Repairs and upgrading to already existing services and infrastructure in our our</p>

	<p>urban areas are further delayed and become even more expensive.(As well as unsightly and derelict.)</p> <p>We also need to consider housing development and urban revitalization as equity issues in our urban areas.</p> <p>Plus, we cannot keep up with the new costs of rural and green space housing development!          So Council raises taxes again and again and again....          and we cannot afford city taxes!</p> <p>We are becoming such poor people in the city of Hamilton - lacking services and finances.</p> <p>Please keep housing and urban development in our pre-existing urban areas. Start re-vitalizing our city, instead of destroying our farmlands. Losing farmlands and local food sources is too high a cost. (Are we sycophants to the Toronto-run provincial government?)</p> <p>Please STOP pushing housing into undeveloped greenlands - the costs are too high.</p> <p>PS -I have no confidence that this note will be read and this vote will be counted in the survey.</p> <p>PPS - Early in Fred Eisenberger’s mayoral career, I voted for him and his platform because he promised to stop this thoughtless and destructive and costly spread of urban development. Well?</p>
18.	<p>I am voting for Option 2 as it is critical to preserve our farmland. Creative redevelopment of former industrial lands should be prioritized and with clean-up could support significant housing development within planned communities.</p>
19.	<p>I live in the Landsdale area. I did receive the letter in the mail but misplaced it prior to sending it in.</p> <p>I would like to register my vote for option 2/3. I do not think we should expend further into farm land. We have lots of underutilized space within our boundary that we should look at maximizing use long before we look to grow outwards. As areas are redeveloped promoting mixed density options rather than the more generic stacked townhouses that tend to pop up instead. Including mixed use developments would also promote walkability and sustainability.</p> <p>My last point at this time is my confusion with the need to grow to the population numbers proposed? Why must we as a city continue to promote relocation to Hamilton over other local areas as well. I think all should be welcome to relocate to</p>

	<p>Hamilton - just unsure if this number includes active advertisement and promotion of relocation to meet growth targets or if these numbers are expected regardless and if there had been any thought put into finding ways to promote a balance of our populations within all the municipalities already existing within our region.</p>
20.	<p>It is all too easy to just expand into a crop or pasture field where at the most there are few trees in the way. The innovative developer is finding alternative locations within the city.</p> <p>Although I have lived my whole adult life in urban Hamilton I grew up in farmland and worked on farms for many years. I also studied Agriculture. I know the underestimated value of our diminishing agricultural lands, land that cannot ever revert to food producing capabilities. Mine is not a gut reaction answer to some save-the-planet feel-good moment.</p> <p>The City of Hamilton is in a position to take a leading stand on urban development into farmland. A stand that would put our neighbours in Guelph, KW and greater Toronto to shame. Let Hamilton be innovative about our future and not a lazy follower.</p>
21.	<p>Our family have been Hamilton residents for a long time, we do not want to see any green space destroyed beyond the city boundaries for housing developments.</p> <p>We would like to see 'option 2' used, using the existing space in Hamilton to build housing. A great example of space that is not being used is on Barton Street just before center mall. All of those businesses are closed and boarded up, why not convert all that space to housing?</p>
22.	<p>Since Mayor Eisenberger has been ramming LRT down our throats for years now, maybe he should be focusing his attention on building a multitude of hi-rise condos and apartments along the entire length of the LRT route, from McMaster to Eastgate instead of ruining our dwindling farmland. If you want LRT, then stack the line with people who actually will live on the route and will use it, not suburbanites who make up 70% of Hamilton's population who don't go downtown using public transit. It's just common sense, people. No one is building new expressways for you through rural farmland for new subdivisions and there are no new 400 series highways being planned. We are already cheek to cheek, bumper to bumper. And yes, we the people have a say so let's stop urban sprawl in it's tracks. Remember, a developer's motto is to make the most profit on the smallest footprint and he isn't thinking about you when he rakes in millions of profit dollars. City staff and council decide what is allowed and they represent us, the voting taxpayers!</p>
23.	<p>There is a lot of room for growth within the existing boundaries, particularly in the north end. We don't want to lose anymore farmland.</p>
24.	<p>This is important. Farmlands are vital to the health of our community. Using them to create more housing that only the wealthy can afford to purchase is irresponsible.</p>

	There are so many areas within the existing boundaries that the city that could be investing in.
25.	We have plenty of infill space to take advantage of, and hundreds of decrepit properties that need refurbishing or replacement with greater density.
26.	"No urban boundary expansion" scenario is my strong preference. We can't afford to give up our green belt or any of our farm land. Please consider the future of our planet, as expanding beyond our current borders would need added infrastructure. We have lots of unused and already serviced land to build housing,
27.	(Need for walkable communities to be encouraged, reduce need to commute/driving, maintain and honour green spaces)
28.	<p>I would like to see more use of brownfield space in the city as it would provide locations for development that already have needed infrastructure for utilities and proximity to services. As well, it would enhance the esthetics of the city by reducing derelict industrial sites, creating an overall benefit for residents and businesses.</p> <p>I also want to comment on the poor design of the survey's content and distribution. I do not have confidence that this exercise will achieve useful and appropriately considered input.</p>
29.	I am strongly in favour of protecting existing farmland and greenfield lands and prefer intensification within existing boundaries.
30.	I strongly believe we should not extend current boundaries and vote for option #2.
31.	I was disappointed to not receive the information by mail and have found that the City has intentionally repressed this ballot and denied Hamilton residents their democratic right to vote on this expansion. Please make note of my strong dissent on this topic as a wealthy and civically engaged citizen.
32.	<p>No expansion of the existing urban boundary.</p> <p>The city needs to explore many more types of housing: missing middle type buildings, conversion of single family homes into duplexes and triplexes, alleyway homes, opening up all residential neighborhoods to innovative and creative housing, along with more access to neighborhood based essential retail such as grocery stores, and accessible green spaces. Neighborhood amenities need to facilitate more walkable and bike friendly communities. Affordable housing needs to be incorporated into a new housing mix across all areas of the city. There are lots of good existing examples in cities around the world. We should be much more innovative in creating a truly vibrant and liveable city within our current urban boundary footprint.</p>
33.	Over the years I have seen green space from my youth developed into land for more housing. I can no longer remember what those areas used to look like. It saddens me greatly because there are so many preexisting lots of land (e.g. unnecessarily large parking lots, abandoned houses/lots) that could have been -

	<p>and could be - used for expansion.</p> <p>Not only would expanding the boundary have an impact on native wildlife (referring to human encroachment), it would astronomically reduce the amount of land available to farmers.</p> <p>Ontario is heavily pushing the "Good things grow in Ontario" slogan as of late. How will that be truthful if in the future we'll need to rely more on imported products due to lack of farm/rural land? Importing items such as meat and produce already emit high amounts of emissions from planes, trucks, and boats. Why would we want to increase the amount of greenhouse gases when the effects of climate change are so prevalent today?</p> <p>In 2019 I took a trip to Tokyo, Japan and had a bit of culture shock re: buildings. They expanded UP - not OUT. They towered over me and I couldn't picture Hamilton looking like that.</p> <p>Whenever I drive around the city now (be it on the Mountain or downtown), building "UP" seems like the most reasonable option. I understand that the population of Tokyo is nowhere near Hamilton's current or projected population, but I feel that higher density developments are the way to go if we want to conserve greenfield land.</p> <p>Lastly, I find it appalling that as of 2021 Hamilton is the 3rd least affordable city in NORTH AMERICA. Rental prices increase year over year at an amount that low income earners struggle to keep up with. As an adult in their early 20s, I do not want to continue living with my parents once I get a full time job. But due to unaffordable Hamilton pricing, the future is murky for not only my generation but those younger than me. It's sickening.</p> <p>I am urging you to listen to the voices of the people and not the lobbyists looking to make a buck off developments. Please take the environment and the future generations of Hamiltonians into consideration. We would like to see the city build responsibly to modify our present and improve our future.</p>
34.	<p>There is significant developable land within the existing urban boundary to accommodate projected growth without perpetuating car dependent urban form, diminishing the city's environmental assets or increasing our future infrastructure deficit.</p>
35.	<p>I believe the greenfield lands are important to maintain and there are many opportunities for expansion within current properties that need revitalizing.</p>
36.	<p>... we want option 2... you should not be taking farmlands to build houses on and wreck the environment that way... keep the farmland... farmers feed cities... Cities do not feed Farmers..!!!</p>

37.	<p>I live in the Corktown area and have for over 30 years I love seeing all of the new development. With all the unused buildings on Barton street that would be a good place to start. The only planed development that not too pleased about is the Corktown Plaza at John and Young streets. The parking is needed there for St Josephs hospital and all of the other medical services offered plus for people working downtown</p>
38.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More clarity is needed around the options presented. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Option 2: 81% of new units built within the present urban area, but what about the other 19%? The white belt? (which means the urban boundary is more fluid than indicated on the city's maps)</li> <li>o Or is limited greenfield development anticipated, particularly in smaller villages (e.g., Lynden, Carlisle)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• There is much unused and under-utilized land within the city's urban area, which can be intensified. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Large parking lots in the central city.</li> <li>o Retail parking lots all across the city that could be adapted to mixed uses.</li> <li>o Empty industrial sites new employment uses, but perhaps some may be remediated at a reasonable enough cost and environmental standard for mixed uses.</li> <li>o Major transportation corridors that can handle higher densities: B-Line and A-Line corridors; future L, S and T corridors; arterial streets</li> </ul> </li> <li>• There is often opposition to changes in the urban fabric, especially if related to new multi-storey buildings proposed in areas that do not have them. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Most fears of such development are unfounded or based on misinformation.</li> <li>o Education and outreach are needed to explain that new buildings are not a negative.</li> <li>o Higher intensity doesn't necessarily mean 20, 30, or 40 storey buildings; there are plenty of opportunities to add 3-6 floor apartments or condos throughout the city.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• We need to make better use of the infrastructure we have, to keep budget pressures down. Municipal planning and finance are intimately related. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Expansion of the urban area means infrastructure must also expand, and at an exponential rate. And that costs money, not just to build and maintain but to replace in the future. Future property tax bills would reflect this.</li> <li>o Denser residential development better supports transit use. And mixed uses mean residents can walk to many services and amenities rather than driving or taking a bus, which can save money on transportation services and infrastructure.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Urban boundary expansion should be a last resort, in small increments where it has the least environmental and ecological impact.</li> </ul> <p>I'm happy to clarify any of these points. I have a degree in urban geography, and have worked in transportation planning for most of my career.</p>
39.	<p>1) Redevelop our current vacant or decrepit properties (both residential and commercial) as mixed income residential homes via either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Subsidies for existing owners</li> </ul>

	<p>b. Outright purchase/repair/rebuild  c. Focus needs to be on “ownership” as opposed to a lifelong sentence of “rentals”  d. Focus on detached/semi-detached/low-rise – not towers  2) Support a federal “minimum Basic income” which would eliminate most of our existing ineffective social programs and allow all citizens to own a home</p>
40.	<p>1. We are in the Greenbelt so let's keep undeveloped land green and farmland.  2. Hamilton has a lot of derelict, abandoned or underused sites that can and should be redeveloped. COVID has given us a chance to reimagine a lot of things and why not the city too? Redeveloping can plan for amenities within walking or cycling distance. Maybe even reduce car use.  3. A lot of fill from new construction sites ends up here in Puslinch, Halton etc and is dumped onto otherwise good farmland. My neighbour's have done this and it's no longer a farm, it's also too unstable to be built upon. What possible value does it have to anyone?  4. Build up not out.</p>
41.	<p>1. Farmland and other green spaces are precious, never to be recovered once turned into housing and commercial areas.  2. Servicing additional areas would be expensive, with costs falling on current residential taxpayers while developers pocket the profits.  3. The proposed LRT opens areas of the city that need redevelopment, and should include affordable housing that is not economically viable in suburban sprawl.</p>
42.	<p>1. To call option 1 “Ambitious Density” is misleading. There is no increase in density when developing greenfield.  2. How many have not received the mail-out survey? At what point does this exercise become pointless?</p>
43.	<p>1. We are in the midst of Global Warming. We need to do more to protect the earth and its inhabitants from future disasters.  2. We need to preserve our farmlands! A future without farmlands is scary.</p>
44.	1000 times NO
45.	A long term land use plan must include farmland. In the Hamilton area we already lost a lot of valuable farmland. If we truly expect over 200,000 people by 2051 how are we going to feed them? Please do not expand our boundaries but increase the density and work on a more efficient transit plan.
46.	A search would reveal that I live in a condominium complex which is a high density use of land which I support.
47.	A strong no to further urban sprawl. I choose option 2
48.	Absolutely NO Urban Boundary EXPANSION scenario.

	<p>Why plan for 236,000 more people by 2051? Spend your time on finding land in the City of Hamilton, there are lots of places in the city of Hamilton available for more houses and/or Apartment Buildings for the Greedy Developers to build. Do not use our Green Spaces to accommodate those people. If there is no more room to live around Hamilton e.g. in Dundas, Ancaster, Stoney Creek and all the other beautiful place around Hamilton, then there is no more room for more people. There are lots of other areas to live.</p> <p>BUT DO NOT USE OUR GREEN SPACES TO BUILD MORE HOUSES, JUST TO PLEASE THE DEVELOPERS. That is our farmland, we need to eat. This is our recreation land where people and children can go for hikes and play.</p> <p>Use your brains, we do not want to start looking like the big Cities. Toronto, New York, Tokyo etc. etc. where you cannot breath fresh air anymore.</p> <p>Besides there are enough empty spaces in the City of Hamilton to build apartment buildings, houses etc. But do not use our URBAN Land.</p>
49.	<p>Absorbing more greenspace for development seems to be very short-term thinking. I believe that "smart" cities and smart planning and not based on continuous urban sprawl, but on well-planning intensification.</p>
50.	<p>Agricultural soil and climate in our area create the opportunity for improved food security in an uncertain future. Removing the topsoil for development would be criminal as it deprives our children and grandchildren of future opportunities in a rapidly changing and unstable world.</p>
51.	<p>All but 4 yrs of my life have been spent as a resident of Ancaster. I am adamant in choosing Option 2 of your survey.</p> <p>The option of urban intensification along the proposed LRT route is a definite "Yes" for me. Fully funded infrastructure replacement along the route is the "gift of a lifetime" for the city.</p> <p>Thank you for submitting this in lieu of the mail-in survey, ( which we have not found yet)</p>
52.	<p>Although I live in the east end of Hamilton, I work downtown. On my commute, I see a lot of run-down spaces seemingly abandoned for one reason or another. It breaks my heart to see these once great buildings and homes empty, dilapidated; when people are living on the streets, in parks, or just in situations they cannot leave due to cost or vacancy. With the integration of Torontonians leaving the city for more affordable housing, we are unable to compete with the limited spaces available, which I am sure, is what this plan is to help.</p> <p>Beautifying our city, using vacant land already within the city limits, and keeping the green belt green and safe for wildlife should be our priority. All that said, Option 2 would be my vote.</p>

53.	<p>Although I understand the need for additional single family homes in Hamilton and enjoy living in a fairly newly built one myself, based on what I am seeing being built recently mainly on the east mountain in area like Central Park. Developers are building small mainly townhouse and back to back town homes that can easily replace older under developed properties in the downtown core and east end area. This would improve the look and livability of these residential or industrial area’s and bring more people into Hamilton’s downtown.</p> <p>More housing stock is required to hopefully reduce the unaffordable costs of Hamilton homes for the younger generation but I know if we expand the urban boundary most new homes built in these area will not be single family.</p> <p>I vote no to urban expansion</p>
54.	<p>Although it is important that a survey about urban sprawl be presented to residents, I am disappointed that I did not receive an official paper copy. And once I was notified of the survey by email, I was shocked that the survey material was not very well explained.</p> <p>Absolutely, intensification is needed for housing, but please leave our greenland space alone! Farmland is at a premium and we will need every hectare of it to feed this growing community of ours. Build up, not out. Spend money on updating the much needed inner city infrastructure.</p>
55.	<p>Although our family resides in Hamilton (Flatt Av.), I do not think we received the recent City of Hamilton survey about urban expansion that we were expecting to receive through the post. I am therefore sending me my answer by email.</p> <p>My response is:</p> <p>Option 2: No Urban Boundary Expansion Scenario.</p> <p>I think urban expansion is a shortsighted solution, which solves issues in the short term but creates larger ones in the long term - what I most worry about is the loss of our ability to produce our own food. What we should be doing instead is intensifying residency in the urban core of Hamilton, which will increase vibrancy and help Hamilton become the city it deserves to be.</p>
56.	<p>And a civil engineer i think option 2 is the most sustainable option. We dont need more roads to maintain. Also there are many areas of hamilton that need to be cleaned up/redeveloped/gentrified before we start building somewhere else. Option 1 is like having a messy house and just buying a new one.</p>
57.	<p>As a 27 year Ancaster resident, we are sickened by the amount of housing built up around us. Enough is enough. Our infrastructure, roads etc cannot handle any more!</p>

58.	As a building industry professional, I know Hamilton has more than sufficient developable land available. The costs of green field development is not born by developers, but is transferred to the City.
59.	<p>As a citizen of Hamilton who lives in a rural area I vehemently support option 2 “No Urban Boundary Expansion”.</p> <p>We need to protect what farmland we have left in Hamilton, let alone Southern Ontario as a whole. Our great country is a food provider to the world and we need to remain as food independent as we can. When you look at a map, the vast majority of Ontario is not suitable for farming and the major city centres in Southern Ontario keep sprawling outwards and eating up precious farmland and natural areas. Southern Ontario has been well known for its soil and the ability to grow great crops and it seems like that has been forgotten over the years. You can’t eat money and once that farmland is gone it will never come back.</p> <p>We need to protect what natural areas there are in Hamilton. This pandemic has shown us how important it is to go outside and enjoy nature. It offers people a healthy activity and we also need to protect our biodiversity and what wildlife we have left in the area. Furthermore, with the increased devastation being caused by global warming we need to ensure that we have as much green space as possible in order to help combat this.</p> <p>I believe that it is in our best interest to make the current urban areas more dense and intensify the living accommodations that we have. We need to build up and not out. These sprawling developments with single house dwellings that encompass large amounts of land are not the answer. We need to build high density units that can have a much larger amount of people living on an area of land. There are many areas in the city where you see unused space, chronically closed stores or empty buildings. We need to find a way to turn these areas that offer little value into areas where people can live as opposed to building on new, previously undeveloped areas. We have the potential to create some beautiful areas that have communities comprised of high density housing units that are focused in already developed areas that already have a pre-existing infrastructure.</p> <p>These are a few of the reasons why I strongly believe in option 2, “no urban boundary expansion”. New people coming to Hamilton is not going to stop (because it is an amazing city), Immigration is not going to stop, the population is going to continue to grow. At some point we will need to realize that we have to intensify in the areas that we have already used. Once the decisions that our politicians have made have used up all of the land, what will we do then? Once the farmland and the nature is gone it is very difficult to bring back. I hope the decision that is made does not take this lightly. (Attached as a letter)</p>
60.	<p>As a grad student in the early 1970s I compiled the report of a conference in SW Ontario under the title “Best of Both Worlds” which resolved to preserve No 1 farmland. Of course that never happened. Better late than never. Hamilton should start now.</p> <p>Also resolved publicly since I moved to Hamilton in 1981 has been the development</p>

	<p>of Hamilton International Airport as a competitive alternative to Pearson for both freight and passengers. Of course most passengers will want transit to the city centre and to the constituent municipalities.</p> <p>Hamilton could not do better than to emulate Amsterdam with an integrated bikeway network, obviating all of the “Bikeway Ends” pavement notices.</p> <p>Eliminating combined sewers and storm water overflows to end runoff into Cootes, Hamilton Harbour and Lake Ontario.</p> <p>As the creator of #StreetcarNamedLRT, I believe that the \$ billions about to be committed to replacing the B-line will be a lethal misallocation.</p> <p>The citizenry will reap far greater benefits by reallocations to the non-LRT projects noted above in the near term, and reconfiguring a real overhead-wireless LRT from the HIA to the Core.</p>
61.	<p>As a home owner in Hamilton, I did not get a survey. I am disappointed in that. Regardless, I am giving my thoughts now.</p> <p>I have copied my Ms. Pauls, who represents my Ward.</p> <p>There are lots of infill sites in Hamilton that could be put to better use, lots of decaying quasi industrial sites, unused school real estate, and under utilized shopping areas. Redevelop what we have been using poorly or not to best advantage, and for heavens sake, protect farmland. At some point we will realize that we are having to import everything we eat, and the carbon footprint on our basics will be ridiculous.</p> <p>Farmers bought farmland. They have had generations of tax credits for farmland. They should not be encouraged to sell farmland as urban sprawl, or over manicured golf courses fraught with pesticides. Sorry to say it, but we do not need to become the next sprawl of suburbia for Toronto. And in so doing, destroy the wetlands for native wildlife, make things harder for bees, put in big homes with more concrete and more pesticides. Use what we have made a mess of, and leave the white belt alone. We will need it.</p>
62.	<p>As a homeowner I think it is irresponsible of the city to allow development in farm, green lands, and Wetlands regions</p>
63.	<p>As a long time resident of Flamborough and current resident of Waterdown, I am strongly opposed to and more expansion and destruction of more rural and farmland.</p>
64.	<p>As a longtime homeowner and tax payer on the West mountain, I did not receive the survey.</p>

	<p>I am NOT in favour of expanding our city into farm land. COVID-19 confirmed that safe food supply is critical!</p> <p>I recommend housing infill projects - similar to the townhouses being built on Wilson St West in Ancaster. I support downtown parking lot blocks becoming condos or rowhouses.</p> <p>With all the discussion on LRT (which I strongly support) and public transit, expanding the city further will create more difficulties with providing transit.</p>
65.	<p>As a mature student in Urban and Regional Planning, I must point out how counterintuitive it would be to expand our city's urban boundary further.</p> <p>Each Provincial Plan and Act directs the development of our urban areas to preserve as much agricultural and natural land as possible. That must especially be true of areas filled with Class 1 and 2 soil compositions. We cannot get this gift of land back once it is plowed over. While our current provincial leaders continue to bypass our municipalities' planning powers with many detrimental MZO's, it must be a municipality's focus to preserve as many of the natural gifts around us as we can with the powers we have. I am certain all of our councillors are well-versed with the plans and acts that give a municipality its directives in planning, but in regards to wasting agricultural lands please look over these chapters indicated:</p> <p>Place to Grow - 4.2 Policies for Protecting What is Valuable 4.2.6 Agricultural System</p> <p>Provincial Policy Statement - 2.0 Wise Use and Management of Resources 2.3 - Agriculture</p> <p>Almost the entirety of the Greenbelt Plan objects to this Urban Sprawl.</p> <p>When it comes to Urban (Re)Development the Urban Expansion proposed also goes against:</p> <p>A Place to Grow - 2.2 - Policies for Where and How to Grow Especially 2.2.1 - Managing Growth</p> <p>Again, the Provincial Policy Statement directs municipalities away from urban expansion as outlined in all of the policies in Section 1 - Building Strong Healthy Communities</p> <p>I am fully aware of the housing crisis this area is experiencing but the urban perimeter growth will not use land as effectively as within our already built in environment in terms of producing housing units. It would seem unlikely, and unfitting that dense housing strategies will be used in these current rural environments. The development of sprawling townhomes will not benefit those seeking affordable</p>

	<p>housing. Along with a lack of affordable property we are also seeing a lack of affordable rentals available as tenants are now being pushed to auction-like scenarios that see rent becoming higher and higher than a monthly mortgage. We must seek to redevelop vacant urban land, retrofit current buildings and infrastructure, and intensify development around our developing transportation systems including walkability, cycling, and public transit. We must, as the Provincial Policy Statement indicates, develop strong, healthy communities. Sprawling development catered to the automobile is only taking leaps backward.</p> <p>The stretching of our current built environment will also cause more strain on our current water, sewage, waste, and transportation infrastructure. There are already existing problems with our current public transit system reaching each area of our already expansive city. We must better utilize, repair and better develop the current infrastructure of all systems and adding on to those systems will only weaken them further.</p> <p>There are many other harmful aspects of this expansion proposal that can and should be discussed. It is my hope that my fellow Hamiltonians feel this way and to come to an educated, researched conclusion that the expansion will only stretch and strain this city more.</p> <p>I am willing to continue this conversation with you, should you so choose. I hope to help this city as I continue forward in my chosen career path - and hope to meet many of you in doing so. I implore you, as councillors, to vote for the greater good.</p>
66.	<p>As a resident of Hamilton who loves this city for what it is; I also love the farmland that surrounds Hamilton. it is so close and accessible and partly makes the city wonderfully varied and different.</p> <p>I would like to exercise my opinion and say that I fully support option #2 that supports a NO URBAN BOUNDARY EXPANSION SCENARIO.</p> <p>Farmland is most valuable and not to be exchanged in favour of expanding cities.</p>
67.	<p>As Council has declared a climate emergency, expanding the urban boundary with no plans for enhanced public transit would only add to the current climate change emergency.</p> <p>Secondly as we are reminded time and again that we have a growing infrastructure deficit, adding more sewers, roads, sidewalks etc will only add to that growing deficit over future years.</p> <p>Third, as the city, provincial, and Canadian taxpayers are going to spend a minimum of \$3.5 B on an LRT in the lower city, every effort should be mad to intensify around that transit project. There are numerous unused and vacant buildings on streets such as Kenilworth N, Barton, Cannon, King and Main that if redeveloped would</p>

	<p>meet the need of intensification and ensure the LRT is worth the investment.</p> <p>Lastly with climate change comes droughts as evidenced in the US southwest, floods becoming more frequent which will tax our current farm food production without us adding to the problem by paving over farmland to appease developers and their lobbying.</p>
68.	<p>As mentioned on the card I put in the mail I disagree strongly with Urban Boundary expansion. More attention needs to be paid to the current condition of housing within the present city boundaries.</p> <p>There is much housing in the lower city than needs attention through repairs, renovation, and replacement. There are former parking lots that could have housing built on.</p> <p>I drove past the west harbour lands the other day and it is a mess of weeds, broken pavement etc. why not give some attention to that land, and other former industrial areas.</p> <p>I look through the colour real estate ads in the Saturday Spectator just out of interest every weekend. There are multi-million dollar homes already near the present boundaries. Big home, big lot size, and developers, real estate agents continuing to profit and owners struggling to pay the mortgage.</p> <p>Is this right and moral?</p>
69.	<p>As multi-generational descendants of this area, who have farmed this land and respected its integrity, please respect the rural areas which keep the urban part of the city healthy and support the remaining agriculture in the area. Once this land is developed, the detrimental effects cannot be reversed.</p>
70.	<p>As my children have stated during our discussion on this topic, why would we destroy our fresh air, countryside, and farmland that we need for a healthy future? We must protect what we have now rather than take away the land that we need to grow our food plus destroy the trees and natural environment. Such foolish thinking for a country that was known for it's natural beauty and clean waters!!</p> <p>Please be sure to add our vote for OPTION 2 in Hamilton's growth plan.</p>
71.	<p>As noted in this article "it is a long-established principle of environmental economics that while the land beneath urban cores has been largely stolen from nature, cities provide ecological benefits... "densification," makes carbon-friendly public transit work. It also allows us to concentrate services such as sewage treatment and energy systems." <a href="https://www.cbc.ca/news/business/suburbs-covid-climate-column-don-pittis-1.6105357">https://www.cbc.ca/news/business/suburbs-covid-climate-column-don-pittis-1.6105357</a></p>
72.	<p>As someone who grew up in rural Ontario, I understand the importance of green spaces and the farmland surrounding cities. There are ways to densify and make deeply affordable housing options in our city without sprawl. As such, the two option choice put forward by the city is dismaying: between adding new units and sprawl or no new units and preserving green space. This is a false dichotomy that neatly</p>

	<p>matches the perspective of predatory developers hoping to sell us on having a say in the new houses they hope to turn our fields, farmlands, and green spaces into.</p> <p>Positioning the choice this way demonstrates a lack of imagination in developing a strong, sustainable, affordable housing plan for our city. Hamilton currently has 11,000 residential units which are sitting empty. Our housing crisis is not an issue of not enough places for people to live nor an unwillingness to build. We need to better utilize the spaces we have, build upwards instead of outwards, and insist that units not sit empty when there is a high demand.</p>
73.	<p>As technology changes the need for personal car will decrease. Self driving cars and in our future. We will have subscriptions to car services. This will reduced needs for parking lots.</p> <p>Also with more and more online services, brick and mortar stores will become a thing of the past.</p> <p>With less expansion we will preserve green space that helps us hit our carbon targets.</p>
74.	<p>As we navigate climate change. It is vital for our forest and urban farms to remain. I say NO to Urban boundary!</p>
75.	<p>As you can see, we live in the Mill St. Heritage District in Waterdown, and we are members of the volunteer Heritage Committee. My wife Lisa and I are firm believers in the “Option 2” as outlined on your questionnaire.</p> <p>As owners in the old village, we see the value (and are prepared to invest in the care and upkeep of our old house). We volunteer our time to help protect the unique character of the older homes and commercial buildings in our core neighbourhood. We’re betting, that we are not the only folks who value the character homes in the old core – the proof that we are right, is that younger families are now moving into the Mill St. Heritage District. Without protecting the old core, Waterdown would just become another bland vanilla suburb (indistinguishable from any other in North America). That said, Hamilton has become a prime destination for new families unable to enter the red-hot Toronto market – where do we want those thousands of new families to live?</p> <p>We deplore the loss of farmland and Greenbelt lands being paved-over for yet another vanilla subdivision – intensification of the existing urban spaces is the only logical move. Here in Waterdown, we do not want infill (or property renovations) in the core to be medium or high-density – letting that happen would simply be the thin edge of a wedge that would see the entire core ultimately intensified. I know this smells of NIMBYism, but it is not – rather let’s call it ‘enlightened self-interest’. As we protect and defend our old houses and neighbourhood from being paved over, we also protect the character that the new neighbours surrounding the old core love. So, direct the needed intensification to happen along Dundas, and Hamilton Street – it is already underway, that’s where it needs to happen. This will allow for an efficient public transit system, bike lanes, and pedestrian space.</p>

76.	<p>As you know, Canada is a growing and thriving community, that relies greatly on strengthening our local economy. Our lives and financial independence is at risk, Taxes rise, the dollar rises, food rises and become overly priced for low income and locals who rely on there new formed and growing country Hamilton farms are vital for our communities. I feel like Hamilton has been in a rubble with finances and I don't feel investing into industrial businesses, over farmland will benefit us, I feel we should invest in ourselves before making bigger investments and leaving people out of food, and essentials. Hamilton needs investment in Art and Literary, and Sports activities, homelessness, shelters children's aid and care, foster care, and urgently the local economy above all else because that is the foundation of us and the resolution towards building a healthy and safer community. Our Greenland should be persevered for survival! There is plenty of room for renovation for housing and etc.</p>
77.	<p>At a time in history when public health has impacted every global decision over the past year and a half, protecting our long term access to farm land, fresh foods, and steps towards food sovereignty is more important then ever.</p>
78.	<p>Be 22nd Century Smart! Not just 30 years ahead, with small and short term minded, quick hit, urban sprawl projects!</p> <p>Let Objectivity. Wisdom. Innovation Rule Decisions!</p> <p>(Versus Doug Ford denialation and pervasive set of destructive and undermining principles and depraved actions).</p> <p>I.E. Flying cars. Flying Taxis. LRT. Sharing ECOmomy. Remote Work.</p> <p>While none of the above require more highways and the consequential, plowing out of natural habitats and farm lands, and which must really be our number one priority, Doug Ford is enriching his CONstruction backers.</p> <p>Here Our ON revenue is going to unsustainable building projects! That! And Privatized entities like, long term care programs, with their 'too late' - A/C!</p> <p>And All on Tax Payers Backs!</p> <p>Not the Green funded type policies had we a Mike Schreiner Premiership!</p> <p>Ford = Zero Stimulation Innovation or Revenue Generation.</p> <p>Ford killed EV! LRT! TDSBs! THC! CBD! Covid19! LTC! ECOmomy!!!</p> <p>Lastly</p> <p>Let's do something wild with the waterfront. It's so retro and industrial! What horror</p>

	<p>sport climbing sensational something could that backdrop provide?</p> <p>I know everyone's way ahead of me there. Just think! There's no limit!</p> <p><b>BUT MORE THAN ANYTHING GOT TO RETROFIT EVERYTHING!</b></p> <p>Including the waterfront.</p> <p>There are no limits!</p>
79.	<p>Be be advised that our household of 7 people do not condone the expansion of urban ban growth.          We recommend building up, not out.          We appreciate your consideration.</p> <p>As very long time resident of Dundas we appreciate the farming community and it's importance in our lives.</p> <p>Do not expand the boundaries please!</p>
80.	<p>Both my husband and I vote for no urban boundary expansion (no. 2). We do not want to see Hamilton's boundaries extended and firmly support the Stop the Sprawl movement.</p>
81.	<p>Boundary expansion costs taxpayers millions of dollars. We can't afford to maintain the infrastructure we already have. We don't need to destroy more farmland, wetlands and green space, land that is vitally important to our survival and the survival of the earth. With well planned intensification, low and medium rise housing, granny flats and laneway dwellings, we can provide housing within our boundaries without gobbling up more land.</p>
82.	<p>Build UP - not OUT. This is such a no-brainer. Who is working down there at City Hall!?</p>
83.	<p>Build up Hamilton's empty lots, drug houses King Street empty houses,. Take down the Red Rose Motel and others like it.</p> <p>Don't touch Dundas Driving park or other parks where families still have picnics.</p>
84.	<p><b>BUY CANADIAN .....REALLY</b></p> <p><b>SAVE OUR FARM LAND &amp; GREEN SPACES THAT WILL BE IRREPLACEABLE IF WE ALLOW THIS TO HAPPEN</b></p> <p><b>PLEASE LISTEN TO THE CITIZENS OF THIS GREAT CITY OF “HAMILTON”</b></p>
85.	<p>City families have no idea what it takes to get food to them. There should be mandated learning and witnessing hands on farmers raising animals and planting and harvesting crops. Farmers will be the losers if this option is not met.</p>

86.	Consider me an emphatic vote in favour of no urban boundary expansion. We need to increase urban density and stop paving over our green areas. Convert empty commercial structures downtown into living spaces!
87.	Delay urban expansion indefinitely.
88.	Density encourages mix-use spaces, as well as the option for more affordable units (1-4 bedroom apartments, condos, and townhomes) that the city of Hamilton desperately needs to keep up with housing demand. Our green spaces are so precious, and should be protected. In addition, expanding outwards would necessitate the expansion of infrastructure and services, which in turn would increase the strain on existing resources. The city could better use funds to help maintain and improve existing services and infrastructure instead of adding more and more that will be poorly maintained.
89.	Did not receive any surveys, Really not fair to find out on a news cast the day before.
90.	Didn't receive a survey and just read about this this evening. Please preserve green spaces and farmland. Hamilton deserves to keep its mix of grime and natural spaces. It's what makes us unique.
91.	Do not expand in our rural areas that is what makes Hamilton so beautiful and the means to buy locally. Stop destroying our beautiful rural Hamilton.
92.	Do NOT expand urban boundaries – this is ludacris! And why I enjoy living here. If you expand the boundaries, making the city bigger, I plan on moving away for sure
93.	Do not take what farm land is left The info structure of Ancaster can not handle any more growth of new subdivisions.
94.	Do not think it should be expanded rurally. We do not have the roads and we need the farms.
95.	Do not touch Greenspace. The city needs to leave the existing green spaces and surrounding farmlands alone.
96.	Do not use green areas and farmland for further development.
97.	Downtown Dundas is already seeing intensification and we have brown fields and other spaces that could be developed, which would be more responsible than using valuable green fields. I expect this would support our local shops, help bring fresh activity to the industrial sector and allow more people to enjoy our lovely community in Hamilton.
98.	Downtown is just parking lots, parking lots, parking lots. Intensify within the urban boundary. Don't ruin our farmland. Housing won't matter if we're all starving.
99.	Dundas residents want zero intensification in our town, or surrounding rural areas. Developers are not welcome. Dundas will separate from Hamilton; Strongly recommend drastic reduction to the general intensification plan.

	<p>Dundas has a tremendous sense of community which is absent in most “sub-urban” areas.</p> <p>If Hamilton council pushes significant intensification in our town – I am confident there will be a strong movement to separate from greater Hamilton, and our family, (and Spencer Creek neighborhood) will actively support it.</p>
100.	<p>emphatically choose Option 2 - No Urban Boundary Expansion.</p> <p>We cannot continue to make life easy for developers at the cost of precious farmland. We are fortunate enough to live in an area with some of the richest, most fertile farmland in the world, and tearing it up for more "Monster Homes" would be a travesty.</p>
101.	<p>Especially with all the infrastructure investment we are making currently with LRT</p>
102.	<p>Expanding into new rural lands robs us of farmland vital to producing food for our cities. It also becomes more land that requires servicing and maintenance, while fewer resources become available for existing core areas of the city. For a city our size, we can easily withstand more higher rise developments and redevelopment of the many older, decaying areas that need revitalization and offer the space to do it.. Witness huge sections of streets like Barton.</p> <p>As part of the development of an LRT route across the city, there is sound reason for intensification. Advance both new development of higher rise housing, along with businesses along this corridor, and revitalize older areas that are currently single or low rise units into higher rise housing, along with the necessary accessible parks and playgrounds. Many cities have done this now quite successfully, so we need not recreate the wheel, but study what has worked well and what hasn't.</p> <p>The worst case scenario would be to continue to expand further into farmland while the core of the city further decays.</p>
103.	<p>Expanding into our green spaces and farmland reduces our local food economy and would increase our environmental impact by forcing food suppliers to source from further areas.</p> <p>I also believe that the areas that are already available for development can be improved with a wider variety of housing complexes as well as other infrastructure, but that the developments need to be made more affordable to all Hamiltonians.</p>
104.	<p>Farm lands need to be protected, urban sprawl is a very real thing and more over nobody can afford to buy houses in Hamilton now so why are you making the land developers, builders, and realtors more wealthy. You know full well busses, schools and other services will not get out there and yet you'll charger them for it in taxes.</p> <p>No, No, No fix down town</p>
105.	<p>Farmland is not unlimited. Developers are not going to build affordable rental highrises on greenfield sites. They'll build single family dwellings on the smallest lots</p>

	<p>they can get away with unless there's more money for them in big houses on bigger lots.</p> <p>I live in the Gilbert neighbourhood. It is a mix of condo townhouses, semis, single family homes and 100 units of Hamilton City Housing townhouses. The school board closed the school (adjacent to the park), sold the land and a developer built about 40 large houses which each now sell for \$1 million. This is not acceptable infilling.</p> <p>Build rental units and condos on available land within the present urban boundary, esp. on downtown parking lots.</p> <p>Also, homes in our neighbourhood are being converted to accommodate more than one family and then rented. In my view, in such cases one of the units ought to be occupied by the owner (or one of the owners) or one of the tenants be understood to be the site superintendent or caretaker with responsibility for maintaining the property and given enough money to do so in such a way that the appearance of the property conforms with those around it. Properties with absentee owners tend to become run down, the occupants feel no obligation to maintain them and tenants may feel no need to be good neighbours in consideration of those living around them who own their own homes and wish to be proud of their own houses and the neighbourhood. Poorly maintained houses also lower the real estate value of properties around them which is unfair to their owners.</p>
106.	Farmland must be protected - otherwise we cannot feed our growing communities.
107.	Farmland should not be turned into developments of any kind, otherwise there will be plenty of houses but no food. We need to start protecting rural areas far more stringently.
108.	Farms are needed for food and we definitely do not have the roads that can handle an expansion. They can't handle what we have now!
109.	<p>February 11, 2020 I attended Joe Minicozzi's presentation hosted by Councillors Nann, Danko and Wilson and attended by Councillor Pauls.</p> <p>Mr. Minicozzi indicated that when the City of Guelph proposed to expand the urban boundary of their City, Mr. Minicozzi was retained. He was able to demonstrate based on the City's records (tax, assessment, property, zoning, etc.) that future growth could be accommodated within the current urban boundary. Council subsequently adopted the report and abandoned the proposed expansion.</p> <p>Why hasn't this been done for Hamilton? No more land is being created.</p> <p>We need to responsibly and effectively use what we've already got. It is imperative</p>

	<p>with climate change, quality and sustainability of life that we need to retain our non-urban boundaries.</p>
<p>110.</p>	<p>First thing that I have to say is that I know for a fact that not everybody got the notice in the mail for the expansion survey. I just heard about it on chch news this evening. My daughter didn't receive it either. They need to redo the way it was organized to give everyone a chance to voice their opinion.</p> <p>We live in the green belt countryside on Ridge Road in upper Stoney Creek. We are surrounded by fertile farm land above and below us. I see fields upon fields of soybeans, vineyards, fruit trees, potatoes, corn etc. It is called the Golden Horseshoe for this reason. To destroy all of this fir housing would be an horrific irreversible blunder. Where will all of this crops be grown then? Import?</p> <p>We choose option #2. There is an urban boundary for a reason! The planners need to take a drive throughout our countrysides and see for themselves how important and remarkable our green fields are to our food chain. Once their gone they can't return!!!!</p>
<p>111.</p>	<p>Focus on the dilapidated downtown, under-utilized storefronts and abandoned buildings that are lining the streets of Hamilton with boarded up windows.</p> <p>If we wont open our doors to industries and businesses in the industrial areas, rezone these areas and vacant land to residential.</p> <p>We are looking for an easy way out here targeting farmland whereas the city has ample room that is under-utilized within the core of the city.</p>
<p>112.</p>	<p>For whatever reason I don't seem to have received a paper copy of the survey. I live in rural Hamilton as my family had for generations. Originally the greenbelt was presented to the voting public as a necessary step to prevent cities such as Hamilton from slowly eliminating wild and agricultural lands found outside of the urban boundaries. I don't think we should abandon that concept, especially when there is so much more capacity to build "up" within the existing boundaries. I would select option 2</p>
<p>113.</p>	<p>General comment is that intensification should be spread through urban and suburban areas along main arteries. Even having mid to high rise or more dense developments within walking distance to major arteries would help promote public transit along those arteries. Wilson Street in Ancaster comes to mind.</p> <p>The lower city of Hamilton cannot handle intensification as intended, even with an LRT. You canning have the majority of people in an urban core living on multiple levels above grade and have them all travel on 1 single level at grade without traffic congestion issues. A subway or dedicated rail line would be required for the intensification levels proposed in the downtown core. With larger properties in general in suburban areas- especially in subdivisions built in the 1950's up to the early 1970's- mid to high rise or denser multi-unit developments would have less of an impact on neighbouring properties than it would in the downtown core which</p>

	<p>already has older denser developed residential areas.</p> <p>Redevelopment of existing vacant multi unit properties in the city should also be prioritized. There currently are 2 empty old apartment buildings on Wentworth Street South of Main that have been boarded up for the 14 years I have lived nearby and neighbours have told me the buildings have been that way since the early 1990’s. Large fines or taxes on vacant/abandoned multi tenant units should be implemented to encourage redevelopment and add to the housing stock.</p>
114.	<p>General comments: I applaud council's recent changes to by-laws in favour of intensification. There is much more that can be done within the existing city limits. Expanding the urban boundary will not meet the critical need for affordable and social housing, and is at odds with the City's declaration of a climate crisis. I would like the city to show leadership and incentivise the building industry/developers to align with the needs of a climate resilient, zero carbon city. Hamilton is already attracting people that want to live in an accessible, high density yet environmentally forward-looking city and will not lose prospective residents by foregoing the 20th century car-centred suburban model. Council can show 21st century leadership by sending a clear message that Hamilton is charting a new path.</p>
115.	<p>General comments: In future, send out municipal surveys in the usual letter sized formats with the City of Hamilton emblem clearly emphasized in the header. This was thrown out in my household with the junk flyers. What was your motivation for the changed look of this survey?</p> <p>Last, I take exception to your choice of the word "ambitious" in option #1. When I was at Mac Eng &amp; Soc in the 90s, I studied urban intensification. It is much more <b>AMBITIOUS</b> to keep repairing and revitalizing an older city core and leave farmland for growing crops to feed the city's population. That's what Toronto's starting to do in the more progressive neighborhoods such as Junction City, where I lived. Local farmer movement "locovore". If Hamilton choses to keep expanding and putting more money into new suburban sewars, etc, <b>YOU</b> will have trouble finding money to fix the older sewer system in the very old neighbourhoods in Hamilton. Frozen and broken watermains in the old Hamilton City should never happen. Repair the Hamilton that you <b>CURRENTLY</b> have.</p>
116.	<p>General Comments: As a city, we should do everything possible to protect ourselves from the ill effects of climate change. This includes preserving what local farmland we have as once converted to housing it cannot be retrieved.</p> <p>Additionally, Hamilton has many central regions with potential for urban renewal which would provide the city with more income all while costing less to service. Furthermore, new housing created within the urban boundary would be suitably dense, within proximity to amenities, and therefore walkable and more affordable. Reduced reliance on cars is in line with addressing climate change concerns.</p>

117.	<p>General Comments: as the urban centre intensifies, please consider widespread implementation of green infrastructure to help mitigate for contaminated stormwater runoff from City streets into our local waters. Phosphorus loading from surface water can be mitigated through rain gardens at the street level and plants are natural resources in reducing phosphorus loads, while also bringing green space into urban landscapes.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration!</p>
118.	<p>General Comments: I hope that Hamilton will not just focus on intensification in the downtown core – medium density residential with green space and room for families should occur across all wards of Hamilton. A good example of this would be the Good Shepherd building at King and Ray. I am in support of more medium density residential expansion in the downtown core as I feel the focus has ONLY been on high density intensification which often is not family friendly due to small living spaces</p>
119.	<p>General Comments: The option titles on the "ballot" appear to have been designed by advocates of Option 1. Option 1 is NOT "Ambitious Density" in any way, but relies on urban sprawl into the countryside for 35% of the housing units. It is time to be truly ambitious, and challenge developers to get serious about constructing the housing units that may be needed in the existing urban areas. There is no evidence to show that the existing urban area lacks the space needed</p>
120.	<p>Hamilton and surrounding areas have tremendous farmland and green space — this is a major reason I moved here over 10 years ago and have chosen to stay and raise my 2 kids (3 and 5, who both want to be farmers). Please don't let urban sprawl and cookie cutter housing/commercial development destroy this or the possibility my kids could one day become farmers in the outskirts of Hamilton</p>
121.	<p>Hamilton does NOT need to take over our precious Farmlands to build more homes that are not affordable to most people needing housing. Fix the empty buildings, build new apartments on empty parking lots.</p>
122.	<p>Hamilton has a lot off old and abandoned buildings. Use those buildings and land to re-establish new housing areas and communities. We need the Greenspace/field for the wildlife and trees and more trees and to help with the watershed/table. Remember wildlife needs housing too not just us humans. Trees/Plants help clean the air for us to take healthy breathes. Do we want to be permanently wearing an oxygen masks to breathe like other polluted countries? Do we want to become like that?</p> <p>Also expanding doesn't mean everyone will get housing, the poor and middle class still gets nothing because the houses and community are built for the rich and higher class of people.</p>
123.	<p>Hamilton has adopted the sprawl model in the last 20 years - just look at the ways in which the city has pushed against old boundaries on the mountain. We have, as Canadians, a terrible tendency to avoid infrastructure. Most of the expansion was</p>

	<p>made without leaving proper rights of way for bikes or transit. It is not eat way to develop a city.</p> <p>Hamilton remains a low density city that can easily be ‘densified’ leading to a vibrant place. That is the next step in development - inside the current city limits. Let’s take a pause on covering over agricultural lands and do it thoughtfully if and when that happens.</p>
124.	<p>Hamilton has many older areas that would benefit from having restructuring done. Covering more farmland with cement does nothing but create very expensive housing, and not putting money into the cities ageing infrastructure, creating more problems.</p>
125.	<p>Hamilton has not efficiently or effectively serviced the current land area that it now occupies and should not take on additional land that will further dilute its efforts to serve existing communities and surely result in increased taxes with sub-oar municipal services. I live in Stoney Creek, if I need it, I have no way to access public transit to the new Go stations either at Centennial or Grimsby. I pay a public transit levy on taxes but of course have no access to it unless I walk bike or drive about 3 km. Looking south, the Redhill is a disaster – too much traffic because there are no options for travel. The mess over the LRT shows how the City is unable to effectively plan its existing services so expansion will not help that. Until Better service is available to connect with Regional mass transportation facilities (e.g. LRT from the Mountain to connect with Go Trains) we will continue to have gridlock. How does expansion of the urban foot print help that.</p> <p>In summary, show that you can properly plan and manage what you have got before grabbing more land which will only further delay the improvement of all levels of services within the existing urban envelope</p>
126.	<p>Hamilton has plenty of existing urban areas which need to be developed and/or redeveloped further! We do not need to take any further green space for development!</p>
127.	<p>Hamilton has sufficient lands within its grey and white belts; it does not need to expand its urban boundary to incorporate growth. Historic sprawl has already led to less efficient use of infrastructure/transit and higher property taxes. Working within the existing urban boundary will allow more efficient development and use of infrastructure and transit.</p>
128.	<p>Hamilton has to take the footprint it already has and use it in a more efficient and environmentally conscious way. Spreading out the city only takes away agricultural land (less opportunity to have small farms producing local produce), less definition between cities, more driving, and bigger houses (need more gas, electricity, building materials and therefore more waste).</p>
129.	<p>Hamilton is already a dense enough space. We need more quality, not quantity.</p>

130.	<p>Hamilton is ripe with opportunities for significant intensification. One need only look at the acres of near-vacant strip-mall lands on the mountain for opportunities to build - or simply address the decades-neglected upper levels of our downtown built inventory to multiply the resident capacity in our city.</p> <p>We needn't become a city of skyscrapers to do this. Prioritising and incentivising human-scale, midrise development is crucial.</p> <p>We have no need for outward expansion to meet provincial goals, cannot afford to continue adding to our infrastructure obligations, and have many opportunities to avoid further loss of critical agricultural lands.</p>
131.	<p>Hamilton is the "ambitious city" let's be ambitious; to provide housing needs within the current urban boundaries, let's be ambitious; to fight against climate change.</p> <p>Hamilton has declared a Climate emergency, but the proposal to extend the urban boundary, seems to be counteractive to that declaration....by paving over valuable farmland, and by forcing many more vehicles on our roads. It makes more sense, in my opinion, to develop along current bus/walking and cycling routes, let's preserve as much farmland as possible. It may be likely and very important to have local farmland to feed our own citizens in the future.</p> <p>Land owners and Developers (which are likely the land owners/or relatives who bought up land to speculate that these boundaries will change) will be the only winners here. We all know this new housing will not truly be affordable.</p> <p>Either way, our tax base will increase, however with option 2 we will utilize and/or upgrade the current infrastructure, instead of paying to build and maintain new infrastructure</p>
132.	<p>Hamilton must first maximize the use of land &amp; buildings in existing areas. There are many very old and decrepit buildings in existing Hamilton Boundaries. Focus on improving, renovating, replacing, re-building to improve the existing city and infrastructure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Many areas in Hamilton are still perceived as old, low income and not attractive to raise a family versus say Oakville and Burlington. The ongoing waste of what could be a beautiful waterfront is a perpetual blight and eyesore on the city with heavy industry, storage silos, smoke, pollution.</li> <li>- Constantly looking for new land whilst ignoring improving and making more efficient what we have does not seem right to me. The only reason we are looking for 3300ac is because it is there. Countries in Europe use their land far more efficiently and innovatively.</li> <li>- Finally a good example is Binbrook where I live. Lack of planning led to residential expansion before infrastructure was ready including sewerage and schools. Minimal bike lanes, no trails to walk in, lack of public schools, inadequate maintenance of grass cutting, no bus service (yet our taxes still increase). It seems more about a race to expand and build houses than anything else.</li> </ul>

133.	<p>Hamilton need not become another concrete jungle such as downtown Toronto and what is already happening here.</p> <p>Use existing available lands.</p> <p>Limit buildings to under seven storeys for commercial on ground and second floors and the upper storeys for mostly truly affordable living accommodations.</p> <p>Assure adequate green space is available for all living there.</p> <p>If buildings are higher than that, they must have more green space, and even green roofs to help keep down the air pollution that is already bad.</p> <p>Preserve and plant more trees, to help keep the city cooler and to help improve air quality going forward.</p> <p>Leave farming land alone; it is terrible to see what the trees cut down around the airport. PLEASE make what had already been done there suffice.</p> <p>Green areas cannot be replaced and are valuable.</p> <p>Accept lower density levels, and work within them.</p> <p>Our generations to come deserve nothing less.</p> <p>Involve Indigenous citizens to help what would be best for green land preservation, and incorporate their wisdom.</p> <p>The drastic changes they have had to endure from the colonization of this precious land must not worsen.</p>
134.	<p>Hamilton should NOT extend its urban boundary into surrounding agricultural land to accommodate more homes.</p> <p>Please choose to intensify housing density in the existing urban area.</p>
135.	<p>Hamilton, has, for years been growing outwardly too fast and is consuming far too much arable land. Our planning department needs to come up with a different plan...NOW!</p>
136.	<p>Hamilton has really come a long way in the 25 years I've lived here. A lot of great urban intensification, brown-field redevelopment and restoration and reuse of lower city buildings. But it seems there still is a lot of room for more. Hamilton is not an easy city to service with the mountain (it's like 2 cities) so further outward expansion is very costly and not efficient.</p>

<p>137.</p>	<p>Have you travelled on the Linc or the QEW during rush hour. If I wanted to live in an overcrowded city I would move to Toronto. I honestly can't imagine how our roads and highways would handle an expansion, unbearable to think about. I do not support this urban boundary expansion.</p>
<p>138.</p>	<p>Having worked with and studied issues such as land use and sprawl I believe option 2 is easily the most sustainable and necessary option as we face many issues such as climate change, the increasing costs of urban sprawl, degrading infrastructure and a general desire for densification. It is proven that sprawl is both economically and environmentally unsustainable. The book “Small Towns” explores these topics in depth. Urban sprawl simply is not financially solvent in the long run. The costs of adding new storm, sewer and utilities lines further and further out to expanding suburbs adds costs and over time these services will eventually need to be replaced. Existing residents will have to foot these increasing bills for servicing, increasing our property taxes year over year. By increasing intensification along our existing urban boundary we can also at the same time make those vital improvements to our roads and infrastructure and avoiding constructing more that will need costly repairs in the long run. There are also plenty of opportunities to grow within our existing urban boundary, such as brownfields which in the early 21st century has been more more feasible to redevelop, while expensive at first, over the long run will prove the more financially reasonable and environmentally friendly choice. This will provide a mix of detached housing, townhouses, apartments, mixed use developments and mid rises (aka. the “missing middle”) and affordable housing. This will provide further choice to citizens in more variety of housing choices based on ones preferences and needs at the same time providing affordable housing in areas where citizens will enjoy better transit options and employment opportunities. This will also allow us to make better use of our existing infrastructure, including roads, sewers and parks while preserving valuable agricultural land. In the coming decades with climate change, agricultural land will become more scarce and vital, and in Canada only a small portion of our land is arable, meaning we need to preserve what we have. Further, it will help build more vibrant connected neighbourhoods, improve walkability, support better transit and see more efficient transit usage and help keep schools open. Hamilton recently with help from the federal government got the green light for the LRT after it being cancelled by the Ontario government, this investment into our city will help revitalize downtown and connect the lower city and is a major help in keeping our city sustainable in the decades to come. Hopefully in the coming decades expanding further and connecting the city in ways we've never seen before. This will bring business to vital commercial areas which will increase tax revenues far more than chain box stores along “stroads” in suburban areas. In summary, we have the opportunity to shape Hamilton into a more environmentally and economically sustainable city for the future by avoiding further expansion and sprawl.</p>

139.	<p>Here are our reasons and some suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Urban boundary expansion, almost always, results in urban sprawl consisting of strip malls, car dealers, chain restaurants etc. and don't actually add residential density.</li> <li>- The prediction for population growth is grossly overstated. Hamilton is a rust belt city with a steady decrease in household income. The manufacturing jobs in the past are not ever coming back. People cannot afford new homes in new suburbs based on minimum wage service jobs and high taxes.</li> <li>- We already have a shortage of park space (now, mostly taken up by tent cities, that the authorities will do nothing about), a shortage of farmland and of conservation green space</li> <li>- But most importantly of all, if the city requires more acreage for intensification of housing, here are some suggestion of where they should start:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Large expanse of vacant serviced land located between Victoria Ave. &amp; Wellington St, from Birge Ave in the south all the way to Burlington St. to the north.</li> <li>2. Acreage available at the abandoned Studebaker plant from Ferrie St to Rail lines in the north, between Victoria St. and Mars Ave.</li> <li>3. Large abandon tract north of Barton St. to rail lines to the north, between Queen St. and Bay St.</li> <li>4. North &amp; south sides of Barton street from James St. all the way to Ottawa St. This area consists mostly of abandoned properties owned by absentee land lords, many who do not pay their property taxes, also has high levels of street crime, prostitution, rampant drug use etc.. It should all be razed for condos and stacked town homes combined with new parks (assuming that the lofty goal of an influx of 236,000 more residents actually come to fruition).</li> </ol> </li> </ul> <p>In conclusion: It would be bad urban planning to expand the urban boundary while the inner core of the city, literally, rots from within. If it is the cities intention to become a bedroom community of Toronto, then state that that is the intent and the people that now live in Hamilton and what little manufacturing that is left, are to abandoned to their fate. No decent jobs, schools that are falling apart, rotting infrastructure, and poor housing.</p>
140.	<p>Here are some reasons why:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Poorly designed survey which pits two straw dog positions against one another with wording designed to scare people away from no urban boundary expansion based on the intensification figures cited</li> <li>• Hamilton has sufficient lands within its grey and white belts; it does not need to expand its urban boundary to incorporate growth</li> <li>• Working within the existing urban boundary will allow more efficient development and use of infrastructure and transit</li> <li>• Historic sprawl has already led to less efficient use of infrastructure/transit and higher property taxes</li> <li>• Agricultural lands and natural heritage lands need protection</li> </ul>

141.	Hi, we have 2 family members in our house so 1 is voting through the mail in survey and 1 is voting by way of this email.
142.	<p>Hi... we did not get the survey re urban sprawl in our area at all... nothing in the mail.. I double checked all the junk for weeks already...</p> <p>... we want option 2... you should not be taking farmlands to build houses on and wreck the environment that way... keep the farmland... farmers feed cities... Cities do not feed Farmers..!!!</p>
143.	<p>Higher density and intensification are important in the downtown core and adjacent areas. Many downtown areas are dry, cement deserts. Very unappealing in their present states- because development is not directed to these areas. Of course developers do not want the responsibilities of re-purposing and reusing lands.</p> <p>And it is a vicious cycle... Housing development is pushed into green spaces and rural areas... and then expansion services and city-costing transportation and structures and infrastructure are needed.</p> <p>Repairs and upgrading to already existing services and infrastructure are further delayed and become even more expensive.</p> <p>We cannot keep up with these new costs! So Council raises taxes again and again and again.... and we cannot afford city taxes!</p> <p>Keep urban development in our pre-existing urban areas. Start re-vitalizing our city, instead of destroying our farmlands. Losing farmlands is too high a cost</p> <p>Please STOP pushing housing into undeveloped greenlands - the costs are too high.</p> <p>PS -I have no confidence that this vote and this note will be read and counted. Representational government is flailing. PPS - Early in Fred Eisenberger’s mayoral career, I voted for his platform because he promised to stop this thoughtless and destructive and costly spread of urban development. Well?</p>
144.	However, I also think that the city needs to change it's zoning laws (especially in the lower city) to ensure urban densification is realistic. Multi-family dwelling zoning and alley-way properties not only zoned in but encouraged with building incentives. And when all the NIMBY people show disapproval you can point them to this survey and

	<p>how almost all the responses in their postal code show that they didn't want urban expansion.</p>
145.	<p>However, I have to say that I take exception to the titling of the options in the City Site. It appears that you are promoting option 1 with the adjective ambitious. This suggests that the other alternatives are not ambitious, not exciting, not forward thinking. This is shameful and not conducive to good polling of opinions</p>
146.	<p>I also think there could be much better use of pre-existing buildings and vacant land already in the downtown core and surrounding areas.          Businesses or individuals who restore old buildings could be provided tax breaks or other government incentives to promote restoration.          A vacancy tax could be implemented for businesses and individuals who do not reside in their properties full-time. Particularly in buildings which have been deemed unsafe and are derelict.          The city should be supporting construction downtown and reducing the red tape required for building permits. Additional funding for the municipal programs which review and approve building permits could also help fast track approvals for residential permits.          Hamilton is full of potential which is already downtown. Spreading to farmland would be an easy way out of a complex problem and will surely have dire consequences for the next generations!</p>
147.	<p>I have had concerns about the provincial government's reduction to conservation and environmental protection rules for some time. With population growth comes a need for more food and the pandemic has shown us the value of local supply so loosing local farm land seems inappropriate.</p> <p>Another thought is the planned investment of the city in the LRT. Why put lots of \$ into the LRT but build more housing in the suburbs or outskirts for people who can not utilize it ? It would make more sense to increase the density in areas that would use the LRT.</p> <p>Working from home seems to be a permanent scenario now, so businesses may be downsizing their office size which could allow for more space available for affordable housing.</p> <p>Therefore my opinion is for option 2 of the survey choices.</p>
148.	<p>I absolutely choose option 2. We need to spend our tax dollars on revitalization of the city core and encouraging people to choose living there. Our downtown is a disgrace! We need to change this and protect our farmland. No more sprawl!!!</p>
149.	<p>I am a born and raised Hamiltonian, who is now on the cusp of raising my own family in this city.</p> <p>Action on the climate front cannot be limited to federal and provincial governments – municipal leadership also has its role to play. For instance, we can resist urban</p>

	<p>sprawl and focus on affordable housing options in our thriving urban centres; we can transition our bus fleet to electric vehicles; we can commit all future procurement of vehicles and buildings to meet energy efficient standards. These changes to our policies must be made NOW, as climate change is an urgent threat – even though few of the harmful effects of climate change can be felt in Hamilton at the moment, in the coming years our city will face threats associated with climate change due to climate refugees, adverse and severe weather events, and more. I know that you have been a long-time ambassador and guardian for our city in your tenure as a councillor, so I know you care about our city and the people who inhabit it, and most specifically the future generation of inhabitants in this city who despite having NO hand in creating the climate problem, will certainly face its most adverse punishments.</p> <p>Please accept this email as my vote NOT to expand the urban boundary. Stop the sprawl!</p>
150.	<p>I am a generational farm work, and Hamilton resident. Our relationship as a city to the farmland around us must not be severed for GTA sprawl. We have INVALUABLE resources in our soil and our agriculture, that cannot be bought and sold, and cannot be replenished.</p>
151.	<p>I am a resident of Hamilton and have lived here for 5 years now. I have grown up coming to visit my grandparents weekly, so this city holds a place in my heart.</p> <p>One of the most amazing things about this city is that if you need to escape the city, all you have to do is take a quick drive and you have some of the most amazing spaces around us. All those fields where framers are working to grow our food.</p> <p>There are so many places to build units here already, taking away the farms around us make no sense.</p>
152.	<p>I am a resident of Hamilton and I am supporting option 2, with 81% intensification.</p>
153.	<p>I am a resident of Stoney Creek mountain and did not receive my survey. I am voting against further expansion into rural areas/green space. These spaces need to be preserved. It would be a much better idea to have developers take advantage of space within the city core and bring residents there.</p>
154.	<p>I am absolutely against this sprawl and adamantly believe that our farmlands and greenspaces must be protected. These lands are absolutely necessary to keep the people that the City speaks of, and generations to come, properly fed and with clean air and open spaces. Farmers Feed Cities - we cannot forget this and pave over them simply for the sake of expansion. We must grow in a smart way, improving city infrastructure and thinking in a less suburban, car-centric way. We cannot continue to move further and further, eating up and paving over essential farmlands.</p>
155.	<p>I am against expansion and therefore select option 2 ‘No Urban Boundary Expansion’. We must Save our green spaces and farm land.</p>

156.	I am against expansion into our farm lands . I did not receive a flyer/vote and neither did any of my neighbours . THIS IS A FARCE LIKE THE TRAIN TO NOWHERE
157.	<p>I am against using our greenlands to expand the housing in Hamilton.</p> <p>I would like to use the existing vacant spaces in Hamilton to build and make the most efficient use of these lands for housing.</p> <p>We need our Green lands/Farming Lands in this area.</p>
158.	<p>I am all for Option 2 but would like to add some comments.</p> <p>This link goes to a presentation for densification of Brock University. <a href="https://brocku.ca/facilities-management/wp-content/uploads/sites/84/Campus-Plan.pdf">https://brocku.ca/facilities-management/wp-content/uploads/sites/84/Campus-Plan.pdf</a></p> <p>Look at pages 33 – 36. This idea of retail / business / residential stacking is a great idea. Hamilton should make that mandatory along major streets.</p> <p>So much of the city is becoming urban desert. Look at Kenilworth Avenue...it is really just a stretch of wasteland now. It should be more a retail residential stacked area.</p> <p>There are plans for a condo at Concession and East 15th. This is a great idea and should expand take up the whole block from East 15th to East 16th. Yet the apartment on the west side of East 15th has applied for and is now being allow to add stacked towns to its parking lot. This does not make sense. A good plan would be to allow an expansion of the apartment with higher densification. In my opinion this addition of stacked towns are only setting up the area for the installation of deterioration aspect.</p> <p>The city should make the strict ground rules and then planners and builders should only be allowed to meet or exceed the minimum standards, not reduce the standards for a quick profit as it seems happens so often.</p>
159.	I am an urban designer am see amazing infill opportunities in Hamilton especially for livable communities.
160.	I am choosing OPTION 2 : 0 boundary expansion!!! Please preserve whatever of the green belt we have still left!!!
161.	<p>I am currently proud to call myself a Hamiltonian and proud to live downtown.</p> <p>However some disturbing thing are happening in our city for the sole benefit of developers and politicians who do not have our backs. We must stop sprawling( destroying) precise farmlands.</p> <p>I'm sure you have done some research however I will list a few things briefly. More dependents on cars, higher taxes with neglect in current urban infrastructure to</p>

	<p>focus on the new infrastructure. All of these things will increase our emissions at a time when you have promised action to reduce and correct climate change.</p> <p>Also don't forget what happens when we rely on other for essentials like what is happening with vaccines. Let's not let that happen with food.</p> <p>Lastly, please take a look at all the abandoned building and opportunities for small lane way housing. I for one have given up on owning a house. Even rent is so unaffordable that I can't even move out of a building invested with bed bugs, roaches and poor plumbing.</p> <p>We can continue to adapt and innovate like true Hamiltonians or we can do what they did 50 years ago and keep repeating the same mistakes.</p> <p>Is that there legacy you want to be remembered for? We can all do better, together.</p> <p>Let's create a city we can be truly proud of.</p>
162.	<p>I am excited to see what kind of development comes alongside the LRT, and would love to see a push for tiny house communities within the city limits.</p> <p>Thank you again for allowing me to be a part of shaping what Hamilton will look like.</p>
163.	<p>I am in favour of further development occurring through intensification of the urban core.</p>
164.	<p>I am not in favour of expanding the urban boundary to accommodate sprawl. Hamilton needs to become more innovative and creative in building on available sites within the current boundaries. Inbuilds would work well in the downtown core. There are lots of empty buildings to work with and vacant lots. Detached single family dwellings should be the last choice not the go-to by developers.</p> <p>Most importantly we need land to grow food and off-set global warming. Think long term!!</p>
165.	<p>I am not sure if I received a copy of the urban sprawl survey card that was sent out, but I would like it to be known that I am opposed to any further sprawl in the Hamilton region, especially for the purpose of new housing. We need to keep our surrounding lands protected for farming and environmental reasons</p>
166.	<p>I am opposed to urban expansion beyond the current urban boundaries. There are plenty of opportunities to develop new housing and businesses within the existing boundaries.</p>
167.	<p>I am opposed to any boundary expansion for the following reasons: 1) There is plenty of scope for property upgrade in the downtown areas. This should be used before valuable farmland is destroyed.</p>
168.	<p>I am opposed to further expansion of houses into farmland.</p>

169.	<p>I am really not in favor of more urban sprawl. So I vote for Option 2. I also wonder how we could repurpose brownfield lands in the city core and revitalize them for housing. It seems that there are vacant lots all over the north end, for example. They are eyesores and I would love to see them restored before we pave over farm lands. I would also like to see density increase and public transit increase at the same time. Our dependence on cars is too severe and unsustainable.</p> <p>So, keep things tight and dense...that’s my suggestion.</p>												
170.	<p>I am selecting OPTION 2 - "NO URBAN BOUNDARY EXPANSION"  I feel that the older part of Hamilton is in real need of renewal in many areas and with the new LRT. and deals with new developers, it would encourage more businesses to open, therefore creating more jobs for people who can access public transit better and thereby reduce pollution.</p> <p>Up on the mountainside, there are a lot of people who have to have cars to commute to their jobs which adds to pollution, and why would the powers at city hall want to destroy greenfield lands which become more scarce every year.</p>												
171.	<p>I am very much in favour of Option 2: "No Urban Boundary Expansion"</p> <p>The City of Hamilton resembles Toronto of the 1970's and I believe has tremendous potential to be revitalized and made into a world class city with reclaiming of brownfield areas for aesthetic redevelopment as is currently being done on the waterfront.</p> <p>Additionally from an environmental and agricultural perspective I strongly believe we need to preserve our greenspaces.</p>												
172.	<p>I am voting for option 2 – no expansion of the urban boundaries. I checked some data on Ontario cities from Stats Canada. The following is a comparison between Toronto and Hamilton, along with provincial figures.</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"></th> <th style="text-align: center;">Density (2016)</th> <th style="text-align: center;">Growth Rate (2011-2016)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: left;">Hamilton</td> <td style="text-align: center;">544.9/km2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: left;">Toronto</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4,334.4/km2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4.46%</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: left;">Provincial Average</td> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">4.6%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Although we may not want Hamilton to be as densely populated as Toronto, the above statistics indicate that there is lots of room for expansion within the present</p>		Density (2016)	Growth Rate (2011-2016)	Hamilton	544.9/km2	3.7%	Toronto	4,334.4/km2	4.46%	Provincial Average		4.6%
	Density (2016)	Growth Rate (2011-2016)											
Hamilton	544.9/km2	3.7%											
Toronto	4,334.4/km2	4.46%											
Provincial Average		4.6%											

	<p>urban boundaries. The density of Hamilton is low and our rate of growth is below the provincial average. Moreover, there are many empty, undeveloped lots within the present city boundaries. Please do not expand the urban boundaries or build on green spaces or present farmland.</p>
173.	<p>I am writing to express the need for our beautiful area to stop urban boundary expansion.</p> <p>Hamilton is a growing city, with beautiful bones, but it is also extremely run down and not being used to its full potential. If we can put the money to be spent towards uplifting downtown and the already existing neighbourhoods, I think Hamilton will benefit greatly, physically, socially and financially.</p> <p>Green space is invaluable, and you cannot get it back. On top of having farmland to service and feed the surrounding area (which should be enough to quash the idea of eliminating it), a huge draw to Hamilton, as a city, is it's proximity to nature and green space - if we pave over that greenspace, Hamilton loses one of it's main charms.</p> <p>Make downtown hamilton a cultural, creative, business hub, with interesting new architecture to sit beside the already beautiful heritage buildings. Please leave our greenspace as is, please.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to hear my opinion.</p>
174.	<p>I am writing to oppose the expansion of construction in the city of Hamilton's periphery. With most Canadian cities including ours built on the best farmland in the region, expansion jeopardizes the food security of all residents.</p> <p>A better solution is incentivize new construction in the core, and create more pathways to increase density in the suburbs by deciding large properties.</p> <p>Better use of existing suburban areas will also help to offset the long-term costs of replacing aging infrastructure that serves sparsely populated parts of the city in the next 50 years.</p>
175.	<p>I am writing to voice my total support for Option 2 as listed on the questionnaire mailed to Hamilton residents. We *must* preserve our rapidly shrinking green spaces, and halt the spread of urban sprawl, immediately.</p>
176.	<p>I as a resident of Ancaster choose Option 2, and vote to save farmland and stop the development of farmlands surrounding the Hamilton Airport.</p> <p>The residents of Ancaster and surrounding areas Do Not Want commercial and urban developments in our rural areas. Save farm lands and our future!</p>

177.	I based my answer on protecting valuable farmland and animal habitats. Our rural lands are a gem and expansion out to happen vertically and not horizontally. The Climate Crisis is hugely impacting the planet and expansion would only exacerbate that issue.
178.	I believe an independent review of the Province's projections should be obtained. Due to the lack of transparency this Council continues to display it is my preference that this issue be deferred until after the next Municipal Election.
179.	I believe few issues the city faces equal how we decide to build for growth. I believe the key to a just and equal society free to enjoy life is in creating a living environment that is comfortable, convenient, clean and creative in its use of available space. We know all the negatives entailed in building out. Why pursue a plan we know future generations will ultimately regret?
180.	I believe Hamilton has sufficient grey and white belt lands to accommodate future housing units. The city should be focused on development in the existing urban area and around transit nodes such as the GO stations and proposed LRT route. There is no need to add new greenfield lands beyond the current urban area. Agricultural and natural heritage/greenspace lands need to be protected. The city can accommodate planned growth by intensifying in urban areas, but should do so in a manner consistent with and which suits the existing surrounding housing in order to bring the adjacent community on board. More intense development permits more efficient planning, development and utilization of infrastructure and public transit. Historic sprawl has already led to more inefficient development and higher taxes. The city should also be taking into consideration the aging population demographic and their needs to downsize to smaller properties with less maintenance, rather than assuming stereotypical growth of ‘single family dwellings with white picket fences’ in greenfield areas.  I also point out that the survey as designed is poor because it positions two diametrically opposed choices as straw dog positions and attempts to force a choice of ambitious density through ‘scarier’ intensity percentages over the planned growth period under the no urban boundary expansion context. It would be better if the city staff and consultants educated citizens fully and informed them of the cost and other implications of a range of scenarios.
181.	I believe Hamilton has sufficient grey and white belt lands to accommodate future housing units. The city should be focused on development in the existing urban area and around transit nodes such as the GO stations and proposed LRT route. There is no need to add new greenfield lands beyond the current urban area. Agricultural and natural heritage/greenspace lands need to be protected. The city can accommodate planned growth by intensifying in urban areas, but should do so in a manner consistent with and which suits the existing surrounding housing in order to bring the adjacent community on board. More intense development permits more efficient planning, development and utilization of infrastructure and public transit.

	<p>Historic sprawl has already led to more inefficient development and higher taxes.</p> <p>I also note that the survey as designed is poor because it positions two diametrically opposed choices as straw dog positions and attempts to force a choice of ambitious density through ‘scarier’ intensity percentages over the planned growth period under the no urban boundary expansion context. It would be better if the city staff and consultants educated citizens fully and informed them of the cost and other implications of a range of scenarios.</p>
182.	I believe that it is a waste of our environment to expand the boundary
183.	I believe that supporting and creating policies that drive brownfield investment into already developed areas will help create the population and economic density required to support the thriving arts and cultural and scene that makes cities and attractive place to live (and raise a family!). I know that can be challenging - but it also reduces long term strain on public utilities (cost of running water lines and police presence out to new subdivisions) and transportation links (increase ridership on lrt) by creating a more walkable and connected urban core.
184.	I believe there is a lot of underutilized land within the city that should be developed/re-developed before any urban expansion happens into rural areas.
185.	I believe urban sprawl is not the answer and would like to see expansion from within current city boundaries.
186.	I believe we need growth, but we can't keep devouring our farmland.
187.	<p>I care about sustainability in Ontario, which includes protecting local farming, providing accessible public transportation options, leaving green spaces intact, while continuing to create affordable housing options.</p> <p>Option two is clearly the best option to prioritize this ideal in Hamilton.</p>
188.	I choose to vote for Option 2- no further expansion of urban boundaries . We need our farmlands in Ontario. I live in Watertown which has already been overdeveloped for the infrastructure we have. Do not increase the boundaries of Hamilton. Rethink how to make the city work within it's current boundaries.
189.	I choose #2 as well as suggest that maybe the city look into using abandoned commercial land. As well as unused buildings. That have fallen into ill repair or that have been abandoned. Before they decide to use up more green or brown space for new housing surveys. It's a shame as to how much green space that has been lost in the past 25 years. Think Green Hamilton. Think about the natural habitats that you will be removing by building. Think about our climate before you choose to develop more green spaces. Let's keep the falls flowing. And leave the Redhill Creek and Chedoke creek thrive again. Make choices based upon restoring the bay and the lake back to what our ancestors enjoyed when they settled here.

190.	<p>I choose Option 2 "NO URBAN BOUNDARY EXPANSION"</p> <p>All those houses boarded up for the LRT should be considered in planning low income housing. Because of covid I have not traveled on the bus through downtown Hamilton in a while, however, my friend took me for my vaccination recently and we drove through the downtown core and I was appalled at the number of boarded up houses and buildings. I hate to say it but it looked like a ghetto. Hamilton should concentrate on fixing up what we have instead of expanding and giving grants to these builders who want to build these high rise monstrosities and shopping centres. After covid is over I have relatives that want to visit from British Columbia and I am embarrassed that I will have to take them through downtown to travel to many of our fabulous tourist attractions in and around Hamilton. We need to make downtown Hamilton a city to be proud of. Please no more urban expansion until we fix up our core!</p> <p>P.S. I have lived in the lower city for over 45 years.</p>
191.	<p>I choose option 2 for no further expansion of the city boundaries. Use what we currently have as the city boundaries city. We cannot afford to lose valuable farmland for producing food for this city, Province and Country.</p>
192.	<p>I choose option 2 for now. Housing should be creative and affordable. There remains several empty lots in my neighborhood but who can afford to buy and build. The developers make their profits without contributing to a neighborhood.</p>
193.	<p>I choose option 2 that will not increase the urban boundaries of Hamilton for more urban sprawl. Use what you have and re think it.</p>
194.	<p>I choose Option 2, as there are plenty of lots available for housing already existing within Hamilton. I DO NOT support using farmland for housing.</p>
195.	<p>I choose option 2. No Urban Boundary Expansion.</p> <p>My reasons are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We have so much unused / under-utilized space in the already-built up, already-serviced parts of the City and need to encourage density and growth in these areas where tax dollars have already paid for urban infrastructure. Global studies have shown that suburban growth cost more than it pays in tax dollars because of more roads, more cars driving on and wearing down existing roads, and more infrastructure and urban services are needed. Infill development on the other hand generates net gains for municipalities through tax revenue.</li> <li>2. We can't keep destroying the farmland that should be feeding us especially given the Climate Emergency and the instability (cost + supply) of the global food system.</li> <li>3. We ought not to put good planning and global best-practices aside just because greenfield development is slightly easier for big developers and their easy-money sub divisions.</li> </ol>

	<p>4. Urban density is good for our City culture. Density breeds walkability (less travel time between destinations) which breeds urban vibrancy and small business success. Dense urban cores become destinations when they are vibrant and full of life.</p> <p>5. More sprawl entrenches the need for more residents to drive to and from their homes. More density allows those who choose, to walk and cycle more and utilize public transit more. Not only is this good for the health of Hamiltonians and the safety of our streets, but it means less pollution and fewer green house gas emissions.</p> <p>6. The greenfields that surround Hamilton are simply beautiful. Nature is more beautiful than money. Let’s not "pave paradise and put up a parking lot" when there is a very feasible alternative for smart density starring us in the face.</p>
196.	<p>I chose Option #2.. keep residential contained within the present urban boundaries... use lands that were formerly industrial.. now almost lakeside? LRT may then be better and more fully utilized. Rural/urban folks won't use the LRT much, and will still have to pay for it. This may help to bring more revenue, and decrease that cost.</p> <p>Agricultural land needs to stay agricultural, and rural / urban roads are already too congested. LRT is not a solution for this congestion, so let's stop the spread.</p>
197.	<p>I chose Option 2: "No urban boundary expansion" scenario, but with some reservations;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Even if Option 2 is the preferred choice and is implemented, when will 'enough be enough' and that urban boundary expansion is eventually inevitable? If - when - that happens, the preservation of our prime agricultural land will of greater importance at that time! How will that be accommodated while recognizing the vital importance of our food-producing lands?</li> <li>• The City's 'brownfields' should be given top priority for intensification before any consideration is given to 'Option 1'!</li> <li>• The LRT project is supposed to encourage intensification throughout the downtown core.</li> <li>• The term 'Intensification' should be stressed and stressed again that it means more than just high-rises.</li> <li>• If Option 1 is eventually decided upon, is it possible to 'control' boundary expansion to exclude prime agricultural land and environmentally sensitive areas? Only 5% of our nation is prime farmland!</li> <li>• How – and will – and should - 'controlled' density goals be implemented in various areas across the City? Highest densities should be prevalent in the larger economic areas, like the downtown Hamilton core.</li> <li>• How reliable / accurate / trustworthy are these forecasts for such long-term planning to 2051?</li> </ul> <p>Those are my thoughts and concerns for now.</p>

198.	<p>I chose this because the former will only add more cookie cutter housing that will only benefit the short run. Wouldn't it make more sense to build up rather than out? This would make better use of existing infrastructure and warrant the need for better public transportation.</p> <p>Our government seriously needs to start thinking of the big picture, like 100 years from now - instead of just what is cheaper in the moment. INVEST in our city; that means not always choosing the cheap and easy route.</p>
199.	<p>I currently live in Ancaster, where the city is constantly ruining the community by allowing developers to build as many townhomes as humanly possible on one acre of land.</p> <p>I did not receive the urban boundary expansion survey, but please add me to the growing list of people who are 100% against urban expansion. Leave our farmland alone just for more tax dollars.</p>
200.	<p>I definitely want NO URBAN EXPANSION for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>FINANCIAL</b> Hamilton cannot afford to maintain its existing infrastructure and has a multi-billion dollar backlog. Even though the developers may pay some money for some infrastructure, the existing taxpayers will be on the hook for a major expansion of water, sewage, roads, fire protection, policing, and storm water services. So the infrastructure deficit will increase as our taxes rise.</li> <li>2. <b>FOOD</b> Global warming is reducing the ability of southern farms to produce food for us. These 3300 acres of farmland will be a crucial asset for feeding the city in the future.</li> <li>3. <b>STORM WATER MANAGEMENT</b> Rainstorms are getting more intense due to climate change. Hamilton already has a \$150 million problem to clean up Cootes due to huge contamination by sewage diluted by storm water. The Red Hill Creek valley is equally compromised. Houses in the lower city are routinely flooded out. Paving over 3300 acres will make storm water miseries much worse. Or, we can build massive storm water infrastructure to handle the problem and create a financial problem (see 1). Local First Nations have also threatened legal and political action if we further compromise our water quality.</li> <li>4. <b>TRAFFIC CONGESTION AND INCREASED CLIMATE WARMING.</b> This proposed new suburban city will be almost entirely dependent on cars, school busses and trucks for employment, schooling, work, play and shopping. Existing regional roads will be overwhelmed and will have to be expanded using more concrete and asphalt. Built up areas create heat island effects. So the city will face both climate change acceleration and increased financial pressure.</li> <li>5. <b>MOST IMPORTANT, TO PAVE OVER FARMLAND AND CREATE A 3300</b></li> </ol>

	<p>ACRE SUBURB IS NOT REVERSABLE. Once this is done, the farmland is gone forever.</p> <p>Hamilton has lost 66,000 people from its older urban area. Combined with mild intensification and the use of brown fields, another 100,000 to 150,000 people can easily be accommodated within existing boundaries. This will take us forward for about 20 years. If the growth pressure continues and the other problems noted above have been resolved, the decision can be re-visited then.</p>
201.	<p>I did not (or did not realize) receive the recent survey on Hamilton’s sprawl. Our household vote is no. Our vote is to utilize ‘abandoned properties’ within the city limits to accomplish the goal of housing. Utilizing and enhancing existing infrastructure. We live in the Allison neighbourhood in Hamilton/Glanbrook. Our desire is also for the city to ensure that businesses and home owners that require the larger properties like farmers, horticulture businesses of varies kinds, landscapers, contractors, golf courses, sod farms etc are feasibly able to maintain these properties and stay within the urban boundaries of Hamilton. If this is not the correct way to have a vote counted please advise of the correct manner.</p>
202.	<p>I did not receive a copy of the paper survey, but I would like to express my opposition to urban boundary expansion. Development within the current urban boundaries should be done first, rather than developing into the greenbelt.</p> <p>The planet is experiencing an environmental catastrophe and we, as a species need to figure out better way to live in the urbanized spaces we've already environmentally decimated, rather than pushing even further into places that could be better served by biodiversity and climate harm reduction projects.</p>
203.	<p>I did not receive a flyer or survey to provide this feedback at my home, and am writing you today to ensure that my response is counted.</p> <p>I understand that we have a shared desire to promote economic activity in this city and provide housing for people who need it.</p> <p>However, I believe that the intensive construction and natural disruption that results from boundary expansion is an unacceptable cost for our communities to bear. The large-scale development that will most certainly result from a boundary expansion will disproportionally benefit developers over Hamiltonians. This area has unique natural value and its resilience and ability to support those around it will only continue if decision-makers can prioritize the protection of green and agricultural space.</p>
204.	<p>I did not receive a paper mail out. I would like to state NO to urban sprawl. Reuse existing buildings and spaces in the city. Quit going after farm land and territories that wildlife desperately need for survival. Build up not out.</p> <p>NO  NO  NO</p>

	<p>NO NO NO NO to urban sprawl</p>
205.	<p>I did not receive a survey in the mail. My vote is Option 2 and the fact that the city would consider any other option is incredibly short sighted. Please don't let this be yet another failure by the city of Hamilton.</p>
206.	<p>I did not receive a survey regarding the matter of increasing boundaries at the expense of precious green space. Please no more urban sprawl is my vote. Preserve the green space we have! Seriously we are in an environmental mess as I know you are fully aware. Politics should not dictate our future.</p>
207.	<p>I did not receive the paper survey flyer but strongly wish it to be noted, that as a Hamilton homeowner and taxpayer I am adamantly in favour of OPTION 2....NO BOUNDARY EXPANSION!!</p>
208.	<p>I did not receive the survey. I live near the Eramosa Karst. A unique land form. Current building in the area is extremely worrisome. What was the reasoning for its approval?! Farmland in the Binbrook area has been devastated. Eating local foods is encouraged. That does not mean eating food grown in greenhouses!</p>
209.	<p>I did not seem to have received a survey in the mail.</p> <p>I am opposed to urban boundary expansion onto farmland, and I would have chosen option 2.</p> <p>I think that current areas not being well utilized would be better for redevelopment. Our farmland should be preserved.</p>
210.	<p>I do not appear to have received the survey (or may not have realised what it was and recycled it) but would like to express my strong preference for Option 2 "No Urban Boundary Expansion". Hamilton is already a very spread out city which causes issues for transit and increases traffic congestion and pollution. We certainly need more housing but that can easily be incorporated within the current boundaries without removing thousands of hectares of arable farmland or other green spaces from the surrounding areas.</p>
211.	<p>I do not believe our roads can handle more population and I also do not believe in destroying our green space and farm land to make room for more people. If this happens in my area I will be moving away from the Hamilton area without question.</p>
212.	<p>I do not believe that Hamilton has sufficient infrastructure to allow further development through intensification of the existing urban area. This year alone, Westdale had flooding after a failure of the storm water system. There have been numerous unplanned power outages, as well as planned ones, in the area.</p>

	<p>Sewers in most of the city have not been upgraded recently.  Many roads are in need of repair.  We have not switched infrastructure to more renewable means.  There are not enough local supermarkets- where would you put them? Schools as well.  Hospitals need to be enlarged.  Many more family doctors need to be recruited.</p> <p>Perhaps we need to consider smaller planned walkable communities outside of our existing cities, that utilize green power.  Maybe Hamilton doesn't need to grow.</p>
213.	<p>I do not believe that the City of Hamilton will need more than 80,000 new housing units over the next 30 years. Also, there is a huge backlog of infrastructure repairs that are required just to maintain the current level of population. How many years will it take to clear this backlog?  Further, thousands of existing homes are on wells or cisterns, and septic fields. Where is the plan to provide services to those homes?</p>
214.	<p>I do not support urban expansion through the development of farm land and natural areas which include wet lands. We are in a food supply and climate crisis. We cannot rely totally on imported food. That also contributes to global warming. We have a wonderful farming area right here which can supply us with food. We cannot afford to have more land gobbled up by endless housing developments. This only benefits developers and suppliers of building materials which deplete our resources in order to supply the needs of each individual home. Most of these new homes are larger than required for the average family. More fuel, more consumption through having to furnish these larger homes. This is not a solution to decreasing landfill. All of this costs all of us. It costs more money and loss of rural lands which can never be recovered for our descendants.  Say NO” to urban sprawl.</p>
215.	<p>I do not think it is wise to expand the urban boundaries given the large amount of unused and under used space within the existing boundaries.</p> <p>In particular, Hamilton should plan for 0 new housing units through development of new greenfield lands beyond our current urban boundary.</p>
216.	<p>I do not want any additional urban sprawl. I want to protect the farmlands so we have local food</p>
217.	<p>I do not want any more farm land to be lost for housing. We need to grow our own food. Higher density within existing boundaries is the best solution in my opinion.</p>
218.	<p>I do not want green spaces developed. Make existing areas denser.</p>
219.	<p>I do not want Hamilton to continue expanding the urban boundaries. We need farm land one of the things that makes Hamilton great.</p>

220.	I do not want to see any expansion of urban boundaries of any kind. There is sufficient brown field in Hamilton that can be used for growth. Greenspace MUST NOT be used for growth. We also need to encourage purchases of homes to buy older homes rather than new ones. Whether this be property tax deduction or some other method to allow this. We cannot keep paving over our greenspace because of the profits that developers are seeking and politicians who are lobbied by these people that always seem to side with them.
221.	I don't agree with taking our green space, where are our animals supposed to go your taking away thier homes. We need green space for our ozone. So I say don't touch our green space.
222.	I don't like to see food-producing farm land paved over. There are lots of derelict buildings and empty lots within the present boundaries to accommodate future expansion.
223.	I don't want to see the greenfield lands touched at all! No development, no construction, just look after the nature surrounding Hamilton. We have such a beautiful area of nature so close to the city - Hamiltonians are lucky we have the best of both worlds - please don't diminish or take that away from future generations.
224.	I enjoy my green space, hiking and biking from the Dofasco trail through to the Dundas Valley, including the Dundas to Brantford rail trail  Please keep Hamilton green
225.	I feel strongly that our greenfield spaces need to remain as farmland, wetland, and green spaces. We need to be able grow our food locally-now more than ever. ( I am not a farmer but choose local produce and support our undervalued farmers). Wetlands are important for the environmental benefits they provide. I would prefer a city that is "walkable" with good transit, amenities, "mom and pop"-stores in neighbourhoods such as the James St.N area.I have lived in various are of this city and moved from "the mountain" near Rymal and Twenty Rd. to downtown so I wasn't car dependent. The more we build "out" instead of "up" the more fragmented and less affiliated with the city we become and cars are a prerequisite. Developers should be accountable for building sustainably; solar panels, geothermal heating, less glass walls, more affordability. Use the inner city lands. I feel that they( developers) are only interested in the money they'll make and really don't care what the city's needs are- and are prepared to circumvent the bylaws using whatever means they can. Let's use our spaces more creatively so intergenerational families can live "together" or people can either rent or own the smaller units on existing properties. We can make this a truly ambitious ,progressive city that embraces its past and looks to its future.
226.	I feel there is ample space and opportunity within the existing boundaries to allow for responsible, sustainable development that makes use of or improves existing

	<p>infrastructure.</p> <p>Furthermore, expanding residential development further tends to increase municipal taxes as more services are required to extend further outwards. My understanding is these costs are not always covered by the new developments' tax base alone. I feel the City should work with developers to augment what we have within the boundaries we've got. This should also work well with the existing planned expansions to public transit, like the LRT and BLAST bus upgrades.</p>
227.	<p>I fully support intensification - I'm tired of watching our green space / farm land get eaten up by developers.</p>
228.	<p>I grew up in Hamilton and wish for its success as a city. I'm at a point in my life where I can decide where I want to live and spend my most productive years. I love Hamilton and the direction it is going with its unique art scene and small businesses. However, the amount of suburban area and inaccessibility is concerning. Sprawling suburbs and the roads that lead to them alienate our most vulnerable population, do not help with the need for affordable housing and transportation, are unsafe for our children to grow up, and is both environmentally and financially unsustainable.</p> <p>With regard to the recent City of Hamilton survey, my response is:</p> <p>Option 2: No Urban Boundary Expansion Scenario.</p> <p>I hope to see Hamilton move towards a direction where it becomes a city I am proud to be from, and a city where I want to stay and contribute to its development into a safe, accessible, welcoming place for the challenging decades ahead.</p>
229.	<p>I had in March when the issue first appeared in the press written my councilor Terry Whitehead with an explanation of my concern about sprawl to the south of the city (below in italics). I would add that I see around the city a lot of abandoned commercial/industrial land which certainly should be used first, a prime consideration being facilitating transportation to the core.</p> <p>Given a variety of things that are happening including the permission from the Ford Government to cities to expand boundaries, I would urge you not to support the southward sprawl of Hamilton, further into prime agricultural land. I have an interest in maintaining those agricultural areas as during the summer we often drive (in our electric hybrid car) out to the roadside markets for much of our vegetables and year round get better quality chickens and other meat from Fenwood farms among others. Aside from getting generally better quality food, it is also one way we try to minimise our carbon footprint. I'm thinking of the world we will leave our children!</p>
230.	<p>I have a worry that the city I've grown up in, and now raise a family in, will be irretrievably diminished by the ambitious option provided, and as such, would like to strongly voice my objection to ANY further expansion into the rural zone. Living on the boundary of suburban/rural, taking the kids biking and hiking through</p>

	<p>friend's farmland and undeveloped lots, as well as the greenbelt, is a quintessential part of our daily lives.</p> <p>I'm saddened to see the development of land my friends and I used to make treeforts in, and hope my family will continue to have many more adventures in a recognizable city. If the Manhattanization of Hamilton continues, and the voices of longtime residents are ignored in order to accommodate new builds, we will have to leave the home I was raised in, and lived in for 40 years, in order to find a better life elsewhere, an option I've avoided all through amalgamation, foolish political decision after decision, and the neglect of local bus service.</p> <p>As such, my preferred choice is for new homes to be built within established urban zoned areas, let's build up, not out.</p>
231.	<p>I have already seen too much good farmland being taken for development, residential and industrial all around the Hamilton GTA and we are jamming the homes so close together with no green space for runoff water and rains to go. We must do better planning and revitalize the existing brown fields and properties purchased for the Stadium and LRT !</p>
232.	<p>I have also travelled a lot through Canada and Europe and have some other ideas.</p> <p>Reasons:</p> <p>* When we expand (i.e.Binbrook), we then need new schools, infrastructure that ties into our water waste systems, electricity, fire stations, rec centres etc. This puts pressure on the older systems wreaking havoc causing flooding in older neighbourhoods, and prevents existing structures like parks, schools, rec centre from getting the repairs they desperately need (like Sherwood).They have to go to the end of the line because the new neighbourhood needs everything! If we build up the older neighbourhoods we may be able to stop closing schools within the city. Lets make the city a cool place to live.</p> <p>* Streets like Kenilworth are a disaster! Getting worse and worse everyday!!! How about making the whole street a mix of affordable and upscale condos to build up the neighbourhoods ready to use the new LTR when it goes through (hopefully). The main floors of these condo and apartment building could be shops and restaurants like the Acclamation Condos on James street north. I think this would help give that neighbourhood the facelift it desperately needs. Ottawa street is doing we'll and I see new housing going in around the Glow neighbourhood on Parkdale. That is a great start. If you expand into green space which we will eventually run out of, these city neighbourhoods will get worse. I am aware of gentrification so a variety of mixed housing would be required in all the areas you decide to build new housing on within the city. I'd also have this variety of condos along the LRT. People will want to live close to it. Also be sure to provide lots of parking at the stops of the LRT. Nothing more frustrating than getting to Burlington station and there are no spots.</p>

	<p>* In Innsbruck, Austria they have an amazing LRT that goes up the mountain. It is super cool, you might want to check that out for the future. They also have a pass you can buy that gives you access to everything the city has to offer. Admission to art galleries, museums, sights and transit pass for the day or week. A discount family pass as well. So smart!!!!</p> <p>* I drive to the beach strip quite a bit because my son works at Adventure Village. I was thinking the beach strip could offer a few more activities. We love the free beach volleyball nets in Port Stanley and there is no where to play for free on the beach. Unless the city plans to save the Sandbox that is something to consider. I love the idea of the Sandbox and hope that stays open along with Wild Water works. I'd also expand and put rides at the beach like we used to have and more restaurant choices. Same with the Pier 4 area. A trolley along the beach strip like in Pier 4 would be cool. Especially if it started on Barton street. Long term I'd love to see some outdoor performance spaces like the one at Williams at the beach. In Victoria B.C. buskers are always on the pier on weekends and there is big step seating for people to stop and watch. I can see a beach strip with restaurants and shops like Port Dover all along the strip! Especially since Covid has increased the amount of people down at the beach. Are the bikes at the beach that people can rent? I haven't seen them. I also have rentals for canoes, kayaks, jet skis along the beach.</p>
233.	<p>I have filled in a survey card from my household in Dundas, requesting Option 2, but the card wasn't large enough for me to express my frustration with the process. I think the survey can only be meaningful to those who attended the Open Houses, or participated in public meetings where the terminology was explained.</p> <p>Offering statistics like "60% densification" and "80% densification" is not helpful. Perhaps you intended to drive citizens to read the list of documents on the website, but I wonder how many would do that?</p> <p>At first reading, one does not know whether 80% densification refers to the number of people per square KM, or the number of housing units, and what impact this would have. It could be simply a six story building where there is now a vacant lot within city limits. Not a big deal, in fact, an improvement. But I can't know this without making myself an expert-for-an-hour on municipal planning.</p> <p>Similarly, is 60% pretty dense, or is what we have now? I had to delve deep into the documents listed on the website to discover that several cities have accepted a target of 50% as a minimum, for new areas, but I am wary of this, as it appears to have been a standard adopted after the Ford government began rolling back hard-won protections for the environment, greenbelts, etc.</p> <p>I decided to plunge into the material listed on the website. I am a retired lawyer, and consider myself able to wade through staff reports as well as the next person. I was wrong.</p>

	<p>I read in the staff report about 77 persons and/or jobs per hectare. Again, a degree in municipal planning should not be needed in order to form an opinion. I need to know, what does 77 PJH look like? Does it look like highrises? Does it look like Westdale? I have read several of the documents linked on the website, and although it is all fascinating, I still do not feel that I grasp the issues. MY CONCLUSION: The City is not going to get a meaningful, informed response from this survey.</p>
234.	<p>I have lived in Hamilton my entire life and have been proud to say I'm from Hamilton. Although I do not always like change, I understand that changes do have to happen. Having said that, I still believe that Urban Boundary Expansion is not yet necessary. We must keep as much Green Space as possible and developing farm land and the Green belt is NOT the way to go.</p> <p>Intensive redevelopment of existing commercial land would be one method. For example: New construction to replace existing old “strip malls” should be limited to plans with commercial space on the lower floor and housing units on upper floors. With culture changing due to technology – we will need less gas stations, bank buildings, and government offices and fewer large shopping malls. These lands could be rebuilt for current and future needs with combination new commercial and residential units.</p>
235.	<p>I have lived within the Hamilton area my entire life. One of my fondest memories of growing up was driving up on the escarpment and seeing the farm fields and trees. I loved it so much that in 2007, I purchased my first home in Binbrook. I was drawn to the area because it was surrounded by farm fields and was close to the conservation park.</p> <p>As the years went by, it saddened me to watch fields getting levelled so that another subdivision could go up. Over the next 13 years it seemed that the area just became row upon row of cookie cutter houses or huge parking lots for shopping centres. I began to feel claustrophobic because the streets had been built small and they were constantly lined with cars because drive ways could only accommodate a single vehicle.</p> <p>In my own protest, years ago I started to turn away from shopping at big box stores. I go directly to farms and small family markets now in hopes that I can help support farmers in the area. In my mind, if they can see the public supports and appreciates their work, they will be less inclined to sell their land to developers.</p> <p>I am writing to tell you I am firmly against any legislation that prioritizes the development of sprawl over protecting green space and farm fields. I have two sons that will never know the Hamilton I grew up in, but hopefully we can protect what space is left for them.</p>
236.	<p>I have NOT received the paper survey and am most upset about this. I watch my mailbox daily and it remains EMPTY. I don't trust that it was truly sent to all ward 1</p>

	<p>households and it adds to my ire about having SO LITTLE say about what happens in my own ward. The tail wags the dog in this city and it MUST stop. Our councillor gets 1 vote on LRT, for instance, while 15 other votes from disparate parts of the "city" can vote it down. It's a crazy set up. Don't let this continue by adding another few hundred thousand residents to the outlying areas, who can then strangle the core of the investment and infrastructure it needs. Please block this. Developers in this city/farmland surrounding have way too much power and I'm sick of subsidizing sprawl while my own road falls apart and our sewers are over 100 years old. Thank you.</p>
<p>237.</p>	<p>I have previously lived in London, Ontario where they have chosen to continue to allow suburban sprawl all around the city. This is deeply troubling for two reasons.</p> <p>First, WE NEED FOOD. Local food sources increase sustainability and food security. We lose something of significant value if we destroy nearby productive farmland and fill it with likely insufficiently dense housing such as single family homes.</p> <p>My husband and I, as high-income young professionals, will never move back there because we know that we will end up seeing massive tax increases or crumbling infrastructure that will be the inevitable result of their local government's short-sighted plans. It would be deeply unfortunate if Hamilton chose a similar path.</p> <p>If some degree of development on greenfields is absolutely necessary, Hamilton should make a concerted effort to ensure that these are high-density developments that are actually neighbourhoods. What I mean is that the developments must not simply be full of houses but need to contain community centres, shops, restaurants, libraries, and other walkable amenities so that residents don't have to depend on cars and so these developments can develop a sense of community and place, rather than being soul-less subdivisions.</p>
<p>238.</p>	<p>I have read about Urban Sprawl ,and we have seen what it has done to many places. Many of us from the City of Hamilton feel that before we go bounding off to build on good farmland that we need to protect for just that ,we need to spruce up what we have. Having visited the The First City Centre, to be vaccinated I was saddened to see where the once vibrant downtown was looking forgotten or only half remembered. Our sewers are in many places in need of updating to prevent flooding with Climate Change on our backs, and yet we are ready to prepare for something that is not necessarily going to happen. Sure it is easier to expand ,but what are you leaving behind ,an inner city that slowly fades into a slum, is this what we intend when we could have a city with a superb LRT ,less cars on the inner city roads, expanding with time. New buildings that make us feel this is a City to visit ,and live in ,not a sprawling city that it takes an hour to get to where you wish ,and again the thought of affordable housing that makes us proud that we have looked after those of us who need a decent affordable home .Hamilton has the talent ,let's show what can be done. Sprawl is not the answer. thank you !</p>

239.	<p>I have voted for Option 2: No Urban Boundary Expansion. I have recently completed a short paper on land use laws to preserve agricultural land and discourage urban sprawl based. I hope you can review my paper and focus on improving communities within the existing urban boundaries. I purchased my first home two years ago when I was 25 years old in the Crown Point East neighbourhood, worked as a leasing agent for the past 3 years in the lower city and have transitioned into real estate appraisal within the city. Based on my experience, I can see that the lower city requires improvement in housing, pedestrian walkways/bike lanes and roads. There are so many existing services that can be updated to provide for denser populations rather than creating new services in rural areas for low population densities. Instead of expanding the boundaries, the city should look at opportunities to create more housing options in the current boundaries such as amending zoning to permit and encourage mid-rise developments and purpose-built rentals. I believe Hamilton is a great city and has the capability to provide for future population growth within the existing urban limits.</p>
240.	<p>I hope you will consider other options for accommodating the anticipated growth of our city, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•making it easier for homeowners to create legal basement apartments and second dwellings (current zoning restrictions around parking, among others, are cumbersome and not necessary if home owner is willing to create a safe and comfortable unit for someone to live in) - there is too much red tape!</li> <li>•renew and redevelop infrastructure in the downtown cores - there is ample opportunity for investment in Ottawa St., Barton (North end), and Centennial Pkwy areas</li> </ul>
241.	<p>I implore our city to be bold by saying no to sprawl, by saying no to eating up precious greenspace, by saying no to land speculators outside the existing urban boundary.</p> <p>By 2051, the demands on how people want to live, the way we commute... will look vastly different.</p> <p>There will also be a massive shift in existing housing stock as the baby boom generation transitions - currently many are remaining in their existing homes, built for families, because they have no other option.</p> <p>I'm also dead set against the long-term costs of maintaining the infrastructure/services to support sprawl development being spread across the general tax base.</p> <p>You give an option of Ambitious Density of No Urban Boundary Expansion. This seems extremely leading and a misrepresentation of the options.</p> <p>Why can't we have an ambitious density and intensification scenario within the current urban boundary?</p> <p>Do we lack the creativity to imagine what that can look like? Or is cookie-cutter sprawl being proposed as intensification?</p> <p>As someone who spent years working in the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, who was involved in the last review of the Greenbelt, in the last changes to places to grow,</p>

	<p>what is being proposed in counter to all the municipal feedback that went into those previous reviews. I understand the amount of land that is currently available in the existing growth plan. I am opposed to an7 urban boundary expansion.</p>
242.	<p>I just received your survey regarding the city of Hamilton's growth over the next 30 years.</p> <p>I have to say that as a resident of southern Ontario I have watched an alarming amount of prime agricultural / rural land paved for suburbs or highways in recent years and I don't believe that this should be the plan for Hamilton's growth.</p> <p>Growth is great! It can bring new life, industry and creativity to any area and it is welcomed. But urban sprawl can be suffocating and horrendous. Especially when that sprawl comes at the cost of our wetlands and greenspace. Farm land is necessary for healthy urban life!</p> <p>There are many areas of Hamilton that could use some reinvigoration. Why not focus the development efforts on these areas? Growth within a city can be great. As long as consideration is being taken to maintain sites of historic value and that new developments aren't pushing people onto the streets I believe an increased population in the area can lead to many new and exciting things for Hamilton.</p>
243.	<p>I just wanted to add my voice to the many who have asked that there be NO urban expansion. Please, think about that would mean... thousands of acres of prime farmland being paved.... that can never be undone... once it's gone, it's gone. We are always encouraged to buy local, to support our Ontario farmers... if urban expansion continues into agricultural areas there will be no farmers to support, thus no local food available. It is so wrong to consider urban living a "preferred" situation. Rural lands are just as important, for environmental and ecological reasons, as well as agricultural.</p> <p>Please consider this. Council members are supposed to represent their constituents' opinions and be their voice. Rather than bend to the demands of wealthy developers that put money in the city coffers, do what is best for the people and lands of rural Hamilton.... take a stand and say NO to urban expansion.</p>
244.	<p>I know the city needs intensification so let's look at more multi unit buildings in the core rather than eroding our boundaries and expanding into greenspaces. Are we learning nothing from catastrophic flooding and wild fires around the world? We need to fundamentally change the way we are living.</p>
245.	<p>I live in a neighbouring community and believe there would be detrimental impacts to my area (traffic, developing prime farmland) that would negatively impact my area.</p>
246.	<p>I live in Copetown so did not receive a questionnaire. I'm opposed to more building on farm lands. We need those lands to stay as they are for the future. While I</p>

	understand the city’s position on more growth, please look at other ways this can be done.
247.	<p>I live in the greater Hamilton area. Please do not extend the city boundaries anymore. Just fill in the urban area. Protect the green space that makes Ontario unique and beautiful. Protect the farms, livestock and habitat so that Canadians can keep supporting ourselves even when the world economy is terrible or things like the pandemic hits. There is plenty of room to expand within city limits where there is already infrastructure and shopping etc.</p> <p>My family, neighbors and community vote NO boundary extension.</p>
248.	I live on the first country road in Ancaster. Me an my family are very concerned for the future of the area. Please do not expand the boundary’s.
249.	I may not currently live in Hamilton, but I called it home for a decade. My parents and grandparents grew up there. My close friends and family live there. Hamilton is home to me. Please take my request seriously.
250.	I must have missed this survey but feel very strongly about it and wish to choose option #2 which is to NOT support urban boundary expansion of any kind at this time. Please make a note of this and give much due consideration when making these changes for our future that cannot be reversed or taken back.
251.	I never received my survey. Parts of Hamilton look like a war zone. Redevelopment of these areas, along the LRT route is so important. Hamilton is a dump! Infill is necessary! Option 2 for me. No boundary expansion! Fix up Hamilton within the boundaries developers. Leave green space alone!
252.	<p>I object to option 1. I live in a rural area where the city has granted development where there is no water or sewer service provided by the city. In spite of some professional opinions, the water table is affected by the development and I have experienced flooding and impact to water quality and volume. I have received little support from the city to resolve problems created by the development up stream of me.</p> <p>Farm land is shrinking increasing the cost and risk of losing accessibility to affordable resources.</p> <p>I would have expected the city to provide a survey on line instead of an email response. Millennials prefer a more simplified method such as text or online surveys. Surely the the city has the resources to reach all residents if they want a robust response.</p> <p>Many residents I have spoken with did not differentiate the paper survey from junk mail.</p> <p>I question the effectiveness of the results of this survey if it does not solicit input in a delivery format that will include all residents.</p>
253.	I oppose taking anymore greenspace for housing development. WE NEED THE FARMLAND TO PRODUCE FOOD. The city needs to step up and develop the empty and abandoned spaces within the community. Look to the British Isles where

	<p>they protect their Green Space. We need to make it clear that abandoned properties need to be utilized and not sit empty bringing down property values in neighbourhoods. Which brings to me the properties purchased for development that are sitting half demolished for years, example the south side of Gore Park and the corner of James St S and Jackson. The White elephant that is Jackson Square and how many times are you going to waste money changing Gore Park. Time we bring in a whole new set of councillors and mayor.</p>
254.	<p>I pick option 2 . I think reusing lands would be an all round better expansion idea. Not only would new housing be provided and construction jobs but infrastructure would also have to addressed at the same time. This also would expand/ increase jobs and many other benefits.</p>
255.	<p>I prefer Option 2 – for the new housing to go in the existing urban areas. I would like a clearer definition of what the existing areas are. I know what areas are available and in need of redevelopment in the Hamilton core. Work on those areas first, where the transportation and amenities exist.</p>
256.	<p>I prefer option 2 - no urban boundary expansion. As well, we need a lower intensification rate. Just look at how quickly COVID-19 spread in large apartment buildings. Increasing population of a city year after year is unsustainable.</p>
257.	<p>I prefer option 2 on the condition that the municipality recommend to the senior levels of government that the level of permitted immigration be adjusted to accommodate a lower level of population growth at the local level. By doing so, option 2 will be viable.</p>
258.	<p>I prefer Option 2 "no urban boundary expansion' scenario. Also, any expansion should be done in the lower city. I believe the mountain infrastructure and the access could not handle additional new housing. Specifically on the West Mountain.</p>
259.	<p>I prefer option 2, no expansion, let’s clean up our empty buildings to pay tax first</p>
260.	<p>I realize that "sprawl" or "intensify" are broad generalizations to accept or reject. I do not see how suburb-style sprawl developments promote any appreciable concept of livable communities, which seem to rely heavily on automobile use for travel, provision and recreation. Sprawl is an easy solution that in the longer term is unsustainable, and will remove arable land that could be critical for food and resource production as the population increases. Regrettably, I am not a planner, so I can't propose alternate solutions but I do see the need to innovate if we are to continue to effectively grow--and not just bloat--as a city. I know enough to know that there are passionate innovators out there in the world of planning, architecture and engineering in both business and academic sectors with the skillsets and resources we'll need. I think intensification can be done, and done impressively to enhance our already great, if undervalued, collective community.</p>

261.	<p>I realize that this won't be your favourite option, but the simple fact is we need to stop urban sprawl. Our farmland and green spaces are vital; we need to do more to protect these important spaces. Please. With the LRT coming and the already great public transportation we have in Hamilton and connecting areas, we can better develop the existing urban areas and be just fine. In fact it would be wonderful to revamp and build up the downtown core, and expand the urban areas we already have. We need to leave the farms and greenspace alone. We need farms to feed us, and animals need space to live (the more you sprawl the more nature seems to be invading our space causing havoc, when in fact it is we who are invading theirs).</p>
262.	<p>I received the survey questionnaire. My choice is option 2 as I don't believe that the City should be granting more permits to cut into green space. I live in an urban sprawl area on the outskirts of Hamilton and have seen what will happen if you give developers a green card to continue building.</p> <p>I believe that it is better off to build upwards than outwards in this city. I don't buy the argument that building more detached homes will drive down the house prices. I've been hearing this same story since 2011 that housing prices will drop and for some reason or another, they never do, they only go up. If you keep building homes, the developers aren't going to drop their prices if they realize that there are still people to buy at the already over inflated costs. All this will do will permanently eliminate fertile green space permanently. Let the developers go elsewhere and make money, they've made enough here.</p>
263.	<p>I received your survey and I believe it is necessary to make proper use of the existing urban areas outlined in option 2 of your survey. I also believe what needs to be included in the planning for the future is more inclusiveness for people who are low -income (seniors, young families just starting out, people on disability) to integrate rather than separate or divide along a financial lines. Gentrification to me is the enemy of truly 'rich' communities since it tends to concentrate certain demographics into one area. I think that we have a great opportunity to bless and enrich ourselves and each other's lives with more of a blended communities approach. I do not find condo buildings particularly attractive. I do love the idea of taking older infrastructure like old mills, factories, and the like being cleaned up and converted into living space. Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinions.</p>
264.	<p>I relish the opportunity to vote for option 2, "no urban boundary expansion". I trust that my vote, that I mailed, will get counted as I am aware that many households never received the mailout or inadvertently threw it out. I am dismayed that the City of Hamilton would even contemplate such a foolish land grab. As Greta Thunberg would ask, "How dare you?" Since many others such as Don McClean, Drew Spoelstra and Nancy Hurst have made excellent points concerning the issue, I am taking a different approach.</p> <p>1. The City of Hamilton is obligated to follow the targets of Bill 136, the "Places To Grow Act" of 2005. It dictates that the City grows up not sprawls out. Hamilton has the space and the services are already there. Hamilton has many areas of unsightliness and that suggests an opportunity for "cooperative renewal" as well.</p>

	<p>2. Sprawl costs in so many ways. Food producing land is irreplaceable, essential, and fully utilized throughout the world. How will 2051 look with a population of over nine billion people, climate change that is out of control as temperatures continue to rise, and oceans that are totally fished out. Container farming, greenhouses, hydroponics, aquaponics ,artificial food and organic farming can't meet the challenge. Did you know that prolonged daily temperatures over 43 degrees stops all growth?</p> <p>3. We recognize two hundred other countries. Did you know that Canada is ONE OF ONLY SIX food exporting countries left? Even the USA began importing more food than it exports about eight years ago. How are we going to feed the increasing population of the world? Please don't join the bad examples of Markham, Vaughan, and Stouffville. There are ways to overextend a currently very successful global food system. An obvious one is society demanding to cover good arable land with wood, concrete and asphalt.</p> <p>4. Housing developers must change their approach or find other employment. Design what's currently needed. Step up to the challenge.</p> <p>5. Do municipalities ever have the courage to resist dicta imposed by the provincial or federal governments? Canada routinely accepted about 250,000 newcomers every year. Now our Prime Minister wants 400,000 for EACH of the next three years. How can any city manage what's coming at that rate of immigration when artificial intelligence takes more jobs every year? The AMO -all 444 of them- should give major pushback and negotiate on behalf of all Canadians.</p>
265.	I say number 2 so no urban expansion at all build apartments not huge subdivisions
266.	I strongly support option # 2, No Urban Boundary Expansion. We need to maintain the rural landscape for food, recreation and general health purposes. One has only to walk around downtown Hamilton to see the huge tracts of underdeveloped land.
267.	I strongly support Option 2 - no urban boundary expansion. We need to stay within our current urban boundary, to protect remaining rural and agricultural productive lands, reduce urban sprawl, and reduce impacts to climate change. There are plenty of underutilized, low density and vacant lands within the urban boundary that can be used to meet the expected growth targets. In addition to freezing the urban boundary and smart intensification, planning policies should be revised to encourage and make it economically attractive to develop existing lands within the urban boundary.
268.	I strongly support Option 2. Hamilton is blessed with agricultural & natural areas that contribute significantly to our economy, quality of life and environment. Can Intensification of the existing urban area would protect these assets & preserve them for future generations.
269.	I strongly support the no urban boundary expansion. Preserving our existing agricultural and green space areas is part of what makes Hamilton a great City and I would argue is more ambitious. This option is sure to face far more pressure from self-interested developers who are after a quick profit rather than the long term

	<p>improvement of our City and residents who do not wish for changes in their neighbourhood and outnumber those residents in rural areas who feel the same. But the reward will be a much more sustainable City in the long term from both a tax base vs amount of infrastructure supported perspective and from a food security perspective and from a climate change perspective.</p> <p>I was incredibly disappointed to see the language choice over the title of the two scenarios as “ambitious density” is not at all accurate to the scenario it describes which is instead a lack of ambition about density. It comes across as an attempt to bias the response. I am concerned that some respondents will mistakenly think that ambitious density refers to working to drastically increase density within the existing settlement area without carefully reading the descriptions.</p>
270.	<p>I support no expansion of the urban border. There are many areas within the city borders that are abandoned or boarded up. The city would benefit from developing those eyesores into new developments. Build within the current boundaries, support the existing infrastructure.</p>
271.	<p>I support Option #: 2 "No Urban Boundary Expansion " Although the Province of Ontario is large, only a small percentage of the province is ideal for Agricultural Production. The City of Hamilton is fortunate to be located where the greatest diversity of plants anywhere in in Canada will grow and thrive. We have a wide variety of soils and an ideal climate for tender fruit and vegetables production. We have already lost too much of this land for urban growth. The Ontario Government's ad campaigns promote buying local, but how can we do that if the City of Hamilton allows its urban boundaries to expand into this prime agricultural land. There are many brown fields within in the City limits that could be repurposed for urban use. Let us see the Hamilton City Council do the right thing, not only for the citizens of Hamilton, but for everyone in the province and stop urban expansion into these agricultural lands.</p>
272.	<p>I support option 2 -- No Urban Boundary Expansion Scenario</p> <p>Reasons for this response include, but are not limited to, the following concerns: My ideal Hamilton will maintain its forests, wetlands and farming communities. Not only are these the “lungs” of the city, they help protect us from natural disasters such as flooding and wildfires. See also the CBC news report, Natural landscapes key to Canadian cities, rural areas for building climate resilience, experts say   CBC News. Farms also provide the food we eat.</p> <p>Similarly, parks, ranging from the large (Gage Park and the Royal Botanical Gardens) to the small (Tom Street Parkette) are necessary to maintain a vibrant community. Streetscaping with native flowers and trees contribute to a livable and walkable city. One only needs to walk on York Boulevard between Hess and Bay Streets: on a sunny day it is much cooler and more pleasant to walk under the shade of the trees on the north side of York.</p>

	<p>My ideal Hamilton will provide a mix of owner-occupied and rental accommodation, ranging from studio spaces to larger apartments and townhouses. Neighborhoods would welcome singles and families, and youth through senior citizens, all with welcome arms. Streetscaping and building entrances would meet the different physical abilities of its residents. Wider sidewalks, clearly defined bicycle paths, and careful tree planting would be natural elements of the street design.</p> <p>A mixture of mid-rise buildings and townhouses with central greenspaces for play and relaxation, such as the Good Shepherd complex at King and Pearl or the condominiums at Queen and Duke, should be encouraged to increase the rate of intensification. I think greater emphasis should be placed on these courtyards, rather than on deep front yards. As for buildings themselves, I am intrigued by developments such as the V6 Leslieville project in Toronto (Debut of an all-wood midrise, Toronto Star, July 3, 2021), built using wood, a renewable and sustainable resource, rather than concrete and steel.</p> <p>Mid-rise buildings also contribute to reducing the effects of climate change. See "How to outfit buildings to better handle hotter temperatures", CBC News What on Earth, 15 July 2021. This article states that priority should be given to mid-rise buildings as they more easily shade each other, and benefit from the shade of nearby trees, as opposed to taller buildings.</p> <p>My ideal Hamilton will foster local neighborhoods through a mix of commercial and residential buildings. Hamilton should encourage a vibrant street life through zoning which allows for businesses on the ground floor and residential apartments above. I think that during the past year people have come to realize the benefits of walking or riding a bicycle. Residents should be able to walk to a variety of small restaurants and coffee shops, to the doctor's office and dentist, to a local farmers' market and a grocery store, to places of worship, and to shops such as a hardware store, clothing or crafts and knitting stores -- the list is endless. This also reflects the Neighbourhood Development section of the City Initiatives Neighbourhood Development   City of Hamilton, Ontario, Canada .</p>
273.	I support option 2 as I feel that urban sprawl is not healthy for the future of the planet and in the specific Hamilton case there are plenty of empty, underutilized and brownfield sites throughout the city that should be developed. I think that strategy will help with the revitalization of the downtown core and other degraded urban environments within the city boundaries, while continued suburban development will do the opposite.
274.	I support option 2 in the current survey. New housing should be built in conjunction with the new LRT, to aid in core revitalization. Thanks.
275.	I support option 2 on no urban boundary expansions. It would have been nice to receive the information through proper channels.
276.	I support Option 2 strongly. There is much opportunity to infill while being sensitive to established

	<p>neighbourhoods, with light to moderate infill.  City council should not support intensive infilling in established neighbourhoods, to avoid overcrowding and to preserve green spaces, for healthy communities.  Preserving farmland, natural habitats and water sources is vital for short term and long term climate and population benefits.</p>
277.	<p>I support Option 2, no expansion of urban boundary. If the city spills into present green space to means more roads, more sewers. More electric and inter net hook ups , more traffic more cars and more pollution. Intensifying within present city boundaries would lessen those pressures, and save the. City money There are enough down fields and unused capability for growth within the present boundaries to accommodate future needs.</p>
278.	<p>I support option 2, no more use of farm land ,and keep the green belt.  More effort should be put in cleaning up the brown fields.  It will be interesting to see what council will do with the results of this ridiculous survey , as usual the developers will get their way in the end.</p>
279.	<p>I support option2, NO Urban boundary expansion. We need our precious local farmland, once it is gone, it is forever gone.</p>
280.	<p>i support OPTION2...NO URBAN BOUNDARY EXPANSION.....KEEP THE GREENBELT GREEN.....</p>
281.	<p>I support population growth within the city of Hamilton. And I want to rural/agricultural land preserved. However, and this is a significant caveat to my support of option 2, the city must be fully committed to intensification within the existing urban boundary and fight against NIMBY attitudes.</p>
282.	<p>I think if we can increase the population density within the city urban boundaries, especially in the lower city, it should help the city budget with infrastructure spending. And if the LTR is built, there will be a lot more people who could make use of it, instead of having to be driving vehicles in the city.</p>
283.	<p>I think it s unfortunate that better development strategies cannot be determined consistent with neighbourhoods and traffic patterns. I live by the Scenic hospital lands and no fair regard was considered for the existing neighbourhood and proximity to the trails. Those who tried to represent citizens here feel they were treated dishonestly by politicians and the developers have been allowed to design density that benefits them.  It is endless development tactics to justify maximum density.  It is disappointing.</p>
284.	<p>I think primary focus should be put on affordable housing and re-building abandoned neighbourhoods within the city rather than building outwards. There’s plenty of room for development within the city if you take a good look!  A secondary concern is access. Many access into and out of hamilton mountain from the highway are already clogged. The red-hill/Linc can’t handle another 20,000</p>

	residents commuting daily from the top of the escarpment to the QEW! The infrastructure simply isn't there to support this “urban sprawl”!
285.	I think scenario #2 is best for the city. We are growing too fast and the sprawl is a mess. The city needs to grow with-in it's own boundaries.
286.	I think the Option 2 “No Urban Boundary Expansion” Scenario will prove to be the best for the City. Together with the planned LRT project, this option will encourage gentrification and “beautify” the existing fabric of the downtown core. Look at the Locke street neighbourhood as a success story, as well as King William and James Street North that are attracting people to the downtown core. This is sustainable growth! The green-belt is in place for a reason, to prevent unsustainable growth for future generations. Let's keep our vital natural heritage and farmlands in place for future generations to benefit from. Moreover, let's revamp our downtown core and make it an attractive place to live, work and enjoy.
287.	I think there is lots more that can be done for housing within the boundary before looking at expanding the boundary. We need to protect our greenspaces.
288.	I think we can do it and it's smarter urban planning. Nice to think we might leave something better for our children and their children in this way.
289.	I understand that development will happen, but the services (police, garbage, infrastructure, sidewalks) available to areas in the Greater Hamilton Area (i.e. Flamborough) are generally poor. Any additional urban spread in the greater area will put a tax a system that is already overextended. Focus on efficiencies and improved plans for greater service, rather than spread
290.	I understand that this option will increase pressure for increased density in my neighbourhood, which abuts both the LRT corridor and a principal node in the transportation plan, and I'm willing to accept that consequence. My hope is that more infill potential will be realized and that mid-twentieth century and more recent low-rise commercial strip buildings can be renovated and rehabilitated to provide additional lower cost rental units above them, with modern passive techniques for reduction of energy use and water runoff. Hamilton could be a leader in creative thinking to protect resources for our future generations. My hope is that the provincial government will take account of the voices of citizens in Hamilton whatever the outcome of this survey.
291.	<p>I urge you to put more thought into development that does not consume more rural land and farm land around Hamilton.</p> <p>We all need food security and fresh air, as the pandemic showed us (and it won't be the last pandemic in the next 30- years). People come to Hamilton from other areas of Ontario specifically because of the ample access to green spaces, it is our main asset and a treasure, not a "free" resource to trample on.</p> <p>Cookie-cutter development that ate up the farmland around Waterdown looks and</p>

	<p>feels like a suburban desert: no character, nothing that distinguishes one street from the next. Sure, it is probably more profitable for developers but it is really BAD for our social fabric. We don't need any more McCastles. Kids, teenagers and older adults need to have physical places that facilitate and encourage meaningful social interactions, which are naturally created in the denser urban environments. Liveliness of street life forges social and cultural bonds.</p> <p>Please consider the interests of many generations of likely multi-ethnic families that will choose to make Hamilton home in the next 20 years. As a new immigrant to Canada I know how isolating the first few years of life can be.</p> <p>Neighborhoods create a strong and safe society.</p> <p>Build clusters of smaller condo buildings (8-12 storey) with rooftop gardens, pool and ping pong tables, shared library/performance space/music rehearsal, industrial kitchen to make jams/canning together and a tool shop. That way people of different backgrounds and ages can engage in hobbies, learn from each other and build real relationships.</p>
292.	<p>I vote option 2 with the comments (option 3) the real development needs to focus on renewable lands WITHIN the city of Hamilton boundaries.. there is significant private business interest in expropriation of prime farm land that must be protected.</p>
293.	<p>I vote for Option 2 - No urban boundary expansion.</p> <p>Maintaining the green space around the city is so important for the environment here and eventually local food production.</p> <p>I moved here 5 years from Toronto. I had not lived there all my life, but was born there and ended back there, not really by choice. It used to be a beautiful city - now it is just a mess. The planning you are doing is so important to ensure Hamilton grows as one of Canada's best places to live.</p> <p>The increased density - sure not everyone's ideal - should mean better, more often and efficient public transit throughout the city, making it easier to get around without a car. However please think about increased parking in multi-level parking garages for those of us who can't walk far and prefer our cars.</p> <p>And please provide safe, secure parking areas for bicycles. I have a blind friend who was walking along a busy Toronto street with his white cane and he tripped over a bike and broke his leg. I might also ride a bike if there was a safe spot to secure it when I go shopping.</p> <p>Sidewalks in some areas need to be wide enough for wheelchairs and prams and people walking alone or with dogs.</p>

	Parks - with flowers for pollinators and native plantings would be my suggestion as well - perhaps the parks could be joined by trails.
294.	I vote for Option 2 No Urban Boundary Expansion. We need to protect our green space!!!!
295.	I vote for Option 2 on the land development survey - future expansion should take place within the current urban development boundaries.
296.	I vote for option 2. No expansion of Urban boundary. I never received my survey in the mail. Have you seen the dumps in east Hamilton that could be renovated into new housing? We have miles & miles of derelict housing that could be re- purposed. Tell these builders to get creative
297.	I vote growth option number two, not expanding into farmland and to stay within the city. Lower Hamilton has plenty of room to grow and beautify. Dilapidated houses, empty (unused) space, no parks or trees.  Instead of destroying more land for selfish gain, why not fix what we have already destroyed?
298.	I vote NO to expanding Hamilton's urban boundary! We need to conserve our precious farmlands! No more urban sprawll! The time is now to make the right decision for our future!
299.	I vote no. We need to conserve our land. In my opinion construction is the leading cause of climate changes
300.	I vote to not expand urbanization. There are a lot of places to rent, many. There's lots of housing. There is a lot of work in this city, and outside of it. People need to get to work and pay rent. One job not enough? get another one. Lots of boarded up houses in my neighbourhood alone,
301.	I vote; #2 No rural expansion  A question and dare I ask, is this vast need for housing solely due to general population increase (births) or is it driven by money . Maybe it's time to pause immigration for a few years and work to improve what we've got and help those who become victims and continue to lose ground. Apartment rents rose about 15% in 2013-14. No one would listen or couldn't comprehend what renters were trying to express concerns to government. All I heard bac was, there are rent controls. There are no controls for those wishing to move. In 2015, I moved to an apt and when I moved 4 years later it was renovated again and increased another 20% plus now pay for hydro and parking.

302.	I want number 2 , no more growth, we will look like Toronto in years to come. Do you not see how they are ruining Burlington?
303.	I want to save our amazing green space and farmland! Build up what we have, make Hamilton a high density, vibrant environment. There is just too much to lose if you expand - land, jobs, money (taxes)! Make the right choice!
304.	I want to see increased density in every ward - not just downtown.
305.	I wish to make my wishes known. We need to stop the sprawl, and utilize the urban lands instead. We have gone to the limits , in my estimation. There are plenty of ways to make it work, from what I have read.
306.	I wish to vote against the disgusting urban sprawl that is happening and the traffic grid lock that it will cause . Ford and his developer buddies don't give 2 hoots about tomorrow just now people. I hope he gets voted out asap. My wife and I choose option 2 , no to urban sprawl. Lots of empty space within the city limits .
307.	<p>I would also like to express some concerns with several aspects this survey process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why is this issue being put to a survey of the general public at all, instead being decided by the (hopefully better-informed) representatives the public has already elected?</li> <li>• Why is there any debate on this issue at all given the City’s declaration of a climate change emergency? Shouldn’t that declaration be informing the City’s decisions on an issue like this, and isn’t Option 2 the only appropriate response given our climate change emergency?</li> <li>• Why was an easy method for completing this survey online not provided, and why did many houses (like mine) not receive the survey?</li> <li>• Why is one of the options, Option 1, given the meaningless, subjective and positive descriptor “ambitious” in its title, while the other is not? Will this not skew people’s perceptions of the two options and undermine the usefulness of the survey results?</li> <li>• Why is the option that promotes lower density the one that has the word “density” in its title? Again, isn’t this likely to cause confusion and undermine the usefulness of the survey results?</li> <li>• Why was so no useful and accessible information provided to the people being asked to complete this survey? The paper survey appears to have included no substantive information about the different implications of each option, and the website includes a disorganized and overwhelming 'document dump' of complex reports and assessments that are not accessible to members of the general public. A clear, easy to understand, and impartial summary of the major implications of each option should have been provided along with the survey and on the website to ensure survey respondents had at least some understanding of the issues they were being asked to comment on.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for taking our responses into consideration.</p>

308.	<p>I would also like to reiterate the concerns raised by many residents about the terminology used in the urban boundary expansion survey sent to residents. To name one option "Ambitious Density" creates inherent bias, implying that it is more ambitious and therefore preferable (as opposed to Option 2, which simply states "No Urban Boundary Expansion.") This is confusing at best, and misleading at worst.</p>
309.	<p>I would also recommend repurposing unused factory buildings, as was done by the City of Toronto in the King-Dufferin neighborhood, into condos and affordable housing. The reclamation of office space, unused storefronts, and unused school buildings would also be beneficial.</p> <p>I would also recommend that the city look to reclaiming the Westdale and West-Hamilton homes currently used as off campus living spaces and return them to family dwellings which would greatly benefit the city by re-establishing viable, livable neighborhood with families who will keep up the house and property. This would also reduce the need to constantly police these areas for drugs, loud/uncontrolled house parties, and street parties. Students should be housed on campus or in specifically built buildings that would be managed by either McMaster University or Mohawk College (who should be held accountable for their students behavior – after-all, most receiving Government Grants and funding to attend school not to party. At present both areas are an eyesore and present a very degraded and unwelcoming appearance when entering the city from the west end.</p> <p>Leave our farmlands and green spaces alone.</p> <p>You can't eat concrete!</p> <p>We are having enough trouble growing the food our people need to survive without the City of Hamilton giving into Premier Ford and his desire to pave over the entire province to enrich himself and his builder buddies.</p>
310.	<p>I would like to cast my vote to Option 2: No Urban Boundary Expansion as I feel we need to protect our farmland. This can be done by increasing the housing in current urban areas.</p>
311.	<p>I would like to have my survey option recorded in support of : Option 2, No urban boundary expansion.</p> <p>I have a farming business and own property that is in an area that is constantly threatened by development. We are currently opposing the re-routing of a truck route through concession 11 east and Milborough Line. Previous to this, we fought successfully to prevent the invasion of valuable farmland by St Marys to open up a massive, below the water table quarry application.</p> <p>Our area is very productive in greenhouses and market gardening, which supplies locally consumed fruit and vegetables in the cities of Hamilton, Kitchener, Guelph and most of the GTA. The depletion of farmland should be a priority in making the decision to expand the urban development boundaries. The inventory of farmland is</p>

	<p>slowly being eroded and needs to be addressed. Historically, we have allowed urban development of some of the most fertile land that was producing tender fruits on both sides of the Q.E.W highway from Hamilton through to St. Catherines. It’s a travesty and we don’t learn from our mistakes. This land was highly productive sandy loam, providing outstanding yields for the production of high value fruit such as cherries, peaches and apricots to name a few, which require the tempered climate of the peninsula for prosperity. The decisions made to allow industrial and residential buildings erected on what was very productive high value farmland to embellish the profits of developers is unforgivable.</p>
312.	<p>I would like to note that I am in support of not extending the urban boundaries in Hamilton. We have enough vacant lots in our city that we should be developing those instead of destroying farm land.</p>
313.	<p>I would like to quote Joe Minicozzi, an urban planner and architect, who has done a lot of research into the best ways for cities to grow. He expresses himself on this topic far more eloquently than I could.</p> <p>"When we look at tax revenue per hectare, we quickly see that our built-up areas provide much higher tax revenues to the City than our lower density areas. Higher density development is a more efficient use of the land the City occupies. When we intensify existing built-up areas, we leverage existing infrastructure rather than expanding it. More intensive development makes more efficient use of land, and the density leads to significantly higher tax revenue from residents and businesses.</p> <p>Dense cities are more walkable, which lowers health costs while boosting economies and creating animated streets.</p> <p>In other words, the creation of dense vibrant downtowns through intensification and good policy will create an economic engine for the City that help to maintain and/or possibly lower residents' tax burdens."</p> <p>The other reason to avoid urban sprawl is obviously to avoid destroying our natural green spaces and farm lands. We definitely don't need to put more stress on our environment or food supply than we already have done.</p>
314.	<p>I would like to register my preference as option 2, no land needed, with comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I feel that redevelopment of existing sites within the city should be considered also, maybe even first. I mean derelict buildings – get after the owners and enforce the bylaws regarding use. Or ‘foreclose’ for taxes owing and take control. Even not derelict, there must be plenty of brown space that can be put to better use.</li> <li>• Not all rural land surrounding the city is first-class farm land. The land that is not arable, or ideal for agriculture should be identified and used appropriately. Having an “all or nothing” proposal seems to limit research in the area.</li> <li>• I know, I am a notorious fence sitter, but in this case I feel more info is warranted and a ‘compromise’ between the two might be a solution.</li> </ul>

315.	<p>I would like to register my vote as being option 2 no urban boundary expansion.</p> <p>We need to preserve important farmland and the diversity of different ecosystems.</p> <p>A solution for effective intensification would be to do a city audit of underdeveloped but habitable areas in the urban Hamilton area. These could be developed so that areas that are already intense won't be over burdened.</p> <p>Better roads, access, pedestrian/bike lanes, walkways, parking, traffic ease measures should also be adopted to make congestion easier to deal with.</p>
316.	<p>I would like to see a referendum on the options presented.</p>
317.	<p>I would like to see more options for healthy seniors who would like to move out of their homes, but enjoy their gardens. Perhaps 2 or 3 story condos with green space or gardens because many do not want to downsize to high rise condos in concrete areas.</p> <p>If there is boundary expansion, do not allow large properties with mega houses. Tasteful townhouses and semis and low rise apartments are more sustainable.</p>
318.	<p>I would like to see Option 2 be accepted and intensify downtown Hamilton from derelict, vacant buildings and parking lots into energy efficient, low maintenance structures geared for all people. I expect affordable housing options included in all areas of the city, urban and suburban. As the population changes, existing properties can be renovated, upgraded and include granny suites, tiny houses instead of urban sprawl. Heritage buildings can and should be revitalized with the proper incentives and with developers who can think beyond the norm. All buildings should be geared towards a walkable/mass transit population with commercial and residential readily available for residents in all areas. With intensification must come accompanying green space and easy outdoor access from units after experiencing the pandemic as more may follow. Along with highrises downtown, I expect mid rise building options to be available throughout all of Hamilton's communities. Aging people and families may prefer closer to ground level options.</p> <p>"Ambitious density" is the NO URBAN BOUNDARY EXPANSION Scenario.</p>
319.	<p>I would like to state my preference for OPTION 2, no green field development. The city needs to intensify the current footprint, where the infrastructure is, and not expand into valuable farm land and green space. When is enough enough? Why does Hamilton have to continue to grow outward while the city Center crumbles. If we are about to spend millions on a LRT system for the downtown, build or rebuild the downtown. Where I live used to be considered the “fruit belt”. That term probably means nothing to people living in the city, but at one time this area was all productive fruit farms that fed many people. Now I’m being surrounded by new housing development and told there’s much more growth coming to the area. Shop local, buy local, live sustainably. All just popular words for city people who want to live in homes that are built on farmland.</p> <p>When the land is gone and our Great Lakes our polluted and the water is not safe and the wells have dried up, then where will people live and get their food? Nobody</p>

	<p>ever thinks further then they can see today. What about future generations? What Kind of places will be left for them to live and where will the food come from? A sea container from some other country instead of from some of the best farmland in southern Ontario? What a shame to even consider urban expansion. But who is really listening anyway.</p>
320.	<p>I would like to state that both my husband and I are in favour of Option 2 on the city survey for growth. We do not believe that the city of Hamilton should be planning to develop ANY farm/rural land. It is important to keep our city’s rural and farm areas for the sake of free space, environmental biodiversity, and quality of life.</p>
321.	<p>I would like to strongly voice my support for option 2, and no urban boundary expansion.</p> <p>My primary concern is for moving towards a city model that is less car centric, and more sustainable. A future that is less reliant on fossil fuels necessarily must find ways to locate food resources closer to urban centres. The best use for lands surrounding the city is for farming, nature conservation and recreation.</p> <p>Hamilton should be carefully planning the development of all vacant (parking lots) in the downtown core and incentivizing mixed density development in aging housing areas.</p> <p>Building further out from the city core requires long term infrastructure support that is more costly to maintain than adding services to the core. Low density suburban sprawl does not add enough to the tax base to offset these costs long term and will only add further stress to roads and highways.</p> <p>It would be refreshing for our Council to think about innovative ways to evolve the city rather than just repeating the developer friendly but short sighted approaches that have damaged so many cities.</p>
322.	<p>I would like to voice my displeasure on the idea of expanding boundaries. This is a stupid idea. We do not have the infrastructure to permit more houses into valuable greenspace and farmland. If there were roads/highways to move these people that would be one thing. But there isn’t. There are plenty of empty spaces in Hamilton proper as well as a large section of dilapidated or run down buildings and houses that could be appropriated and the space made for more efficient use. There needs to be some density in the downtown core. If you are planning on going ahead with the ridiculous LRT then why would you not build where that is going? If people need places to live, they will go where the options are. If you add more density to the city, people will move there as that would be the only choice they have. Wise up and think of the future. Thanks for the opportunity to voice our opinions.</p>

323.	<p>I would like to vote for option 2 - “NO URBAN BOUNDARY EXPANSION” SCENARIO</p> <p>Also, some feedback, the way option 1 is labelled is misleading. Rather than being labelled "Ambitious Density Scenario". it should be simply be labeled "Urban Boundary Expansion"</p> <p>There is nothing that makes it more ambitious than option 2, in fact it would be harder to achieve option 2 than option 1 as it requires even more density, so there is no need to try and make option 1 sound fancy with vague descriptions like "ambitious density".</p> <p>At least try to make all your survey options neutral in the future, and not try to spice up the option you want people to pick and call it public consultation.....</p>
324.	<p>I would like to vote for option 2 No urban boundary expansion. Regular bus routes to green spaces will help to ensure that increased population density does not impart a negative impact on mental and physical health.</p>
325.	<p>I would love to see the downtown core be cleaned up and revitalized.</p>
326.	<p>I would prefer the city of Hamilton and developers to reuse and recycle existing urban land.</p>
327.	<p>I would prefer to increase the density of the downtown and nearby areas. We are building a LRT and it makes sense to have people living near the LRT in order to make it useful. I am opposed to building on the farmland that still exists. Please do not bulldoze over the land that feeds us.</p>
328.	<p>I, among many others, believe it is critically important to act immediately- with courage and innovation- on really great city planning. We have so many buildings that can be retrofitted and renovated to accompany our growing need for housing. We have such opportunity in our inner city land use to begin integrating green recreational and agricultural spaces within communities. We can follow the lead of world- renowned destinations like Singapore and Copenhagen to put our city on the map as a shining example of people + planet infrastructure and planning. But not by expanding outward. The city of Hamilton has recently been granted billions for infrastructure development. It is my firm belief that this, and other allocated funds, should be put to use ACTING immediately on intensification and renovation within our current boundaries to make more livable, sustainable communities for OUR immediate future, and the future of our children's.</p>
329.	<p>I’m in favour of more housing of many types, but no boundary expansion.</p>
330.	<p>I’m vehemently opposed to urban sprawl.</p>
331.	<p>I'd also like to point out that we have yet to receive a physical notification of the survey, but were happy to take the extra step of finding the online survey to register our concern that we do everything we can to protect the green space that protects</p>

	Hamilton's air quality and beauty, and to protect the agricultural land that helps provide Hamilton and other communities with food security (as the pandemic and cyberattacks have shown how easily disrupted food processing and imports are).
332.	If another option is selected by the committee it will be one more reason not to vote for Doug Ford again.
333.	<p>If developers want space to develop they can redevelop inner city brown spaces, ie older, or closed or abandoned buildings as well as complete the ridiculous disaster of the church-condo 'development' Connolly construction on James South.</p> <p>What city with such limited architecture of note would permit such a project? Only Hamilton.</p>
334.	<p>If the City falls prey to developers, we will pay extra taxes to extend utilities for kilometers just so they can build large expensive houses, the most lucrative option for them. Who would buy those? Certainly not people who need affordable housing! It would be car-owners, who would then clog the roads and pollute even more. Agricultural land needs to be protected if we are to have any food security.</p>
335.	<p>If the pandemic and its disruption of goods and services, what climate change is doing, particularly the heat dome, drought, and forest fires in the West, have taught us anything - is that we are lucky to live here versus there, and we should become more self-sufficient, protect our local environment, and rely less on imports. We could also be over run with refugees if the future is as dire as some say. Ergo save our farmland, green spaces, wet lands, and survival of what is left of our birds, pollinators, etc. I don't have any grandchildren but if you do or hope to someday, and intend to survive what comes next (over and above acceleration of climate change such as the latest forecast of "moon wobbles" in the next decade), Option 2 is the only logical scenario.</p> <p>There is much within current borders that could use a refresh but it seems less likely to happen if new development is allowed outside the core. Head east on Barton past the General Hospital for example. I believe the City can meet the need for affordable housing units through development in the existing urban area. Also recommend that these developments include green initiatives like solar power, recycle grey water, roof top gardens, etc. We need to encourage density for a customer base which can support local businesses and better efficiency in mass transit, walkability, and bike lanes.</p> <p>How likely is it really that people of lower income and seniors such as myself would be able to do long distance commutes, let alone afford hybrids or electric cars? Have you been to the Centre Mall - can you shop there without a car? Not really and definitely not in this heat. We are not the only city with these issues, and it behooves us adapt the best of what others around the world are doing.</p> <p>You've probably heard this all before, so I thank you if you have read this far. Hopefully Option 2 succeeds. (And that reincarnation is not true as I am terrified to think what the future will be like if decisions like this are not made right and right now.)</p>

336.	<p>If we had received a copy of the Urban sprawl survey we would be selecting Option 2 No sprawl. It also would have been nice to have done this survey in the fall and not when people are out of town.</p> <p>As a teacher in the Upper Stoney Creek area and previously in Binbrook, I have seen first hand how difficult the expansion is on infrastructures and school building capacity where students can only have physical education once a week, congested parking lots and portables 2 years after opening.</p> <p>There is a show on HGTV called Building the Block where 2 people are buying and renovating affordable housing in areas of Detroit in an attempt to revitalize that city. Why not focus on areas if Hamilton where buildings already exist? Why not try to focus on creating spaces for the unhoused and young adults who can't afford to move out of the downtown core but whose presence could bring Hamilton back to life?</p>
337.	<p>If we must build 110,000 + new housing units over the next 30 years, then develop within the existing urban area. Build up, not out. There are rundown neighbourhoods and derelict properties all over Hamilton that would benefit from urban renewal. Clean up and use existing vacant industrial land. Use the space we already have.</p> <p>Some potential living spaces are not maintained to a truly livable standard. Force landlords to keep their units in clean, fully functional and safe condition. Prevent them from forcing renters into a yearly state of instability through the ruse of “renovictions”, certainly an unethical if not fraudulent practice really devised to raise the rents. This practice also temporarily decreases the available number of housing units and ultimately makes housing less and less affordable for the citizens who already live here.</p> <p>Should the LRT, really only a glorified streetcar, ever actually be built, its severe limitations are that it will only service the lower part of the city and will only travel along an east-west corridor. Most Hamiltonians will see no personal practical benefit from its existence. There are already several times between 7:00 A.M. and 7:00 P.M. on a workday when traffic in Hamilton is a nightmare; taking away driving lanes is supremely unhelpful to the majority of Hamiltonians for whom the LRT will never be of use. It would be more advantageous to the majority of transit-taking Hamiltonians to increase the number of north-south/ east-west bus runs; make the vehicles electric, if that is LRT’s most attractive selling point. Use the miles and miles of properties between Stoney Creek and Westdale, that were expropriated for the LRT construction, to build affordable housing, apartments and condos.</p> <p>There is no need for Hamilton to expand into and invade the surrounding rural and farm lands. These lands are among the most fertile in the country and must be preserved. Once they have been developed, these resources will be lost forever. We need to take the long view for the sake of future generations. If we have learned nothing else from Covid, we have seen the pitfall of too much reliance on foreign</p>

	<p>suppliers, and have re-awakened to the extreme importance of being capable of self-sufficiency. We should never lose our food-production capability by giving these lands over to developers and sprawling businesses.</p> <p>A cautionary lesson! Drive west from Toronto along Highway 5 (Dundas Street) toward Burlington. The urban sprawl into the countryside has burgeoned to such an extent in the last thirty years that only the city signs indicate where one city ends and the next one begins. The green spaces have been swallowed up by buildings. I do not want that for Hamilton thirty years from now!</p> <p>110,000 new units, built vertically on existing and re-developed urban properties, will still provide Hamilton with one hundred and ten thousand tax-paying households and businesses.</p> <p>Leave the Greenfield Land alone!</p>
338.	<p>If you were serious about the data you are gathering, you wouldn't let them give the options cute nicknames. "Ambitious Density"? Everyone admires real ambition, but what we are talking about here is just greed.</p> <p>With the amount of available space to build, paving more green space is a disgusting, stupid idea.</p>
339.	<p>If you're going to build, build up, not out. We need to protect what precious farmland we have. I refer to the lyrics in the song, Big Yellow Taxi "You don't know what you got 'til it's gone...they paved paradise and put up a parking lot.</p>
340.	<p>I'm disappointed in the labelling of Option 1 as "ambitious density." It is purposefully leading language. Hamilton should allow for (more) and (better) promote cost-effective housing such ADUs and laneway housing. This would increase density and offer more affordable housing options in a city that is getting increasingly unaffordable for tenants.</p>
341.	<p>I'm saying a big, fat NO to Urban Boundary Expansion.</p> <p>Create a diverse and vibrant city instead. All the resources are in place and you will spare the farmland and greenspace that we so desperately need to save!</p>
342.	<p>I'm strongly in favour of growing within our existing boundaries.</p> <p>No urban boundary expansion.</p> <p>Build the LRT and let development naturally happen along the corridor.</p> <p>Create a vibrant urban community with a wide variety of transportation and housing options.</p>

343.	<p>I'm writing about the recent City of Hamilton survey, on sprawl, we have some of the most precious natural areas and farmland in the province, we need to be less dependent on "outsourced" food and support local farming which also compliments sustaining the natural areas in our region. I strongly oppose urban expansion outside existing urban areas.</p> <p>The existing urban areas of Hamilton are under-utilized the downtown core and urban mountain areas need more density to ensure the vibrant and flourishing existing urban core.</p>
344.	<p>I'm writing today to register my position as supporting Option 2, "No Urban Boundary Expansion." No greenspace, wetlands, or farm land should be developed to accommodate growth in Hamilton. Instead, we should be focusing on building more affordable multiple family dwellings within the urban boundary.</p>
345.	<p>In answer to your survey , which I do not remembering receiving . I am adamantly against Urban Sprawl in Hamilton.</p> <p>Our precious farmland is not to be sacrificed by the greed of the developers , who are of course in the pockets of our "wonderful" premier !!</p> <p>Is nothing sacred anymore ? Do they really understand what contributes to climate change ? We surely have adequate depiction of climate change this summer !</p>
346.	<p>In 2010 I rode my bicycle across the southern US from California to Florida. The most profound memory I have of that trip was the utter fragility of California's Imperial Valley due to water supply issues, and by extension the supply of many of the fruits and vegetables on our grocer's shelves. It's survival depends on tapping into water from the Colorado River, a resource that is in great demand, particularly from major west coast cities. I have a photo of myself standing among sand dunes, by anyone's measure a true desert, and in the background, about an hour away by bicycle, is the valley I just described. Irrigation is all that stands between the two. If you have been following the news lately, the situation has only gotten worse. In view of this, our city must preserve, and utilize our farmland to FEED the predicted number of new citizens, not house them.</p>
347.	<p>In addition, I strongly advocate limited terms for city councillors, so that we may strategically plan for the future health of the entire city.</p>
348.	<p>In an environmental crisis, we need to support our green belt and farmland</p>
349.	<p>In my neighbourhood alone, there is the plaza at Mohawk and Sherman where the Walmart is closing. The church on Mohawk which is being merged with another. Even the mall may be reconfigured, considering changing shopping patterns. I think we will regret losing farmland.</p>
350.	<p>In my opinion, the City of Hamilton should be encouraging developers to acquire vacant and derelict lands within the current urban boundary to develop and re-develop those areas. The focus on development should be mainly in the lower city,</p>

	<p>especially considering the fact that the LRT is going to be constructed there. In addition, the City has been concerned about revitalizing the downtown for many years. The downtown has been suffering from urban blight for a very long time. The deterioration of this part of the City also erodes our tax base because these properties are of lower value and hence, under the market value assessment system, the City generates lower tax revenue from this area. There would be no better way to revitalize the downtown than by coupling new residential development along with state-of-the-art transportation systems such as the LRT. City planners should be devising programs that will motivate developers to work with the City to completely revitalize the lower city and concentrate all new urban development there. We do not need to expand the current urban boundary when we have so much space within the existing boundary that is either under-developed or derelict. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input.</p>
<p>351.</p>	<p>In particular, we need to see an increase in mixed use spaces, expanded redevelopment of the many empty lots in forms like what was done at Barton and Magill.</p> <p>Mixed cost models, bringing affordable housing into neighbourhoods that traditionally haven't been to further diversify the population in age, gender, race will be critical to a healthy city.</p> <p>Especially as we consider the impact of adding 250k or more people over the next 30 years, destroying the farmland that supports this city's food supply will be folly at best.</p>
<p>352.</p>	<p>In reference to the flyer concerning “How Can the City Grow?”, my choice of option would be #2 - no expansion.</p> <p>1. We cannot afford to lose any more farmland to urbanization &amp; developers. There is a finite amount of agricultural land available &amp; the existing land is already under severe pressure from development &amp; climate change. In the greater GTA &amp; area, we have some of the country's finest agricultural land for fruits &amp; vegetables, &amp; other market gardening. Where does the City &amp; the Province think we will get our food from, if development continues to gobble this land. People complain now about the price for food; how will they feel when they cannot afford to buy imported fruits &amp; vegetables from the USA or other nations, or cannot trust the safety &amp; quality of the imported foods. Globalization of food has pushed out small farmers overseas to the point where they cannot even afford to feed themselves ( see Guatemala, Peru, Indonesia etc) where Big Ag has taken over their lands to supply produce, palm oil, etc. to see Western nations.</p> <p>2. Along with the squeeze of development our finite agricultural lands are suffering from climate change - droughts, flooding, destructive winds, searing heats &amp; it is only getting worse. Development &amp; it's “concrete jungle “ exasperate the problems. By 2051 Canada &amp; the world will be in deep trouble because of climate change &amp; it's going to hit the pocketbooks of everyone from food cost, heating costs, insurance costs &amp; more.</p>

	<p>3. The City cannot service it's current urban boundary with adequate transportation - how will it do so with an expanded boundary. It can't- instead there will be more cars, more pavement, more concrete jungle all of which increases the factors contributing to climate change.</p> <p>4. There are many areas within the City that are boarded up, brown fields, vacant industrial areas that could be mediated , cleaned up &amp; used to meet the needs for new housing.</p> <p>5. The City needs to insist that developers build housing that fits the needs of families - not more 800 sq ft condos that barely service 1 individual, let alone a family of 4. There needs to be a moratorium on mega homes; a re-thinking of conventional housing, and a re-education of the population.</p> <p>For these reason &amp; more I say NO to any expansion of the City's boundry.</p>
353.	<p>In response to the below, would favour option 2.</p> <p>The properties within Hamilton are often abandon and not optimally use. Also the rural area and nature of the natural biome that surrounds Hamilton is one of the hugest draws of the city, it would be a shame to flatten this when there is already urban land available for use.</p> <p>Hamilton has also done an impressive job with the vehicle infrastructure with nikola tesla, link, mountain pass, cenntial parkway, red hill valley not to mention the optimization and flow of traffic through one way streets. The city is well positioned for an influx of urban density.</p> <p>Would also caution and learn from Toronto's errors when it come to affordable housing for those hamiltonians living below the poverty line and create proper infrastructure for them (aka avoid the "temporary" respite centres toronto popped up in the last two years).</p>
354.	<p>In response to your "survey" entitled "How should Hamilton Grow to 2051?" I vote a definitive NO! to Urban Expansion.</p> <p>With climate change issues increasing around us daily (forest fires and BC heat wave, tornados in Barrie, flooding in Waterdown three years ago) I am enraged that you are even wasting time and paper on such a "survey"</p> <p>How dare you even consider paving over more green spaces and farmlands, thus allowing rich developers to continue to make huge profits! More urban sprawl will necessitate more cars, more highways, more roads, more parking lots, more big box shopping malls. Of course the other half of that equation is that there will be fewer trees, less biodiversity, fewer parks, fewer trails. The Option #1 scenario means more greenhouse gasses and increasingly more climate change.</p> <p>If getting through the covid crisis taught us anything it was to look to the science (vaccine development etc) and not the investors (those with investments tied to "for profit" long term care homes). Use the talents of our scientists to assess and develop more "people friendly" projects such as are being developed on McNab St.</p>

	<p>with the retrofit of the Ken Soble Tower. Our downtown core is in decline. We need new infrastructure development and renovated buildings with renewable energy, wise use of space and thoughtful green spaces, local shopping initiatives in order that our young people will be able to afford housing.</p> <p>This catering to developers must stop!!</p> <p>Oh, and btw, I find that the format of your "survey" is ridiculous. Many of my environmentally conscious friends have opted for a "no junk mail" PO box which means we don't receive mail that is not specifically addressed to us. For some reason the postmistress decided to put the "survey" in my mailbox. Most of my friends did not even receive it!</p>
355.	<p>Instead of adding new subdivisions, the City should be rebuilding crumbling infrastructure in all North End areas and organizing the construction of new affordable housing.</p>
356.	<p>Intensify the density in the old city of hamilton and redevelop the brown fields for industry instead of continuously expanding into green field areas.</p>
357.	<p>Invest in density, protect our future.</p> <p>There's few clearer paths then this, and no "do-overs" if we get it wrong.</p> <p>Say no to expanding the urban boundary!</p>
358.	<p>Investing into our existing infrastructure and vacant city spaces will strengthen our economy, strengthen our community in the city, and is much better than developing more green spaces into unaffordable homes, which you must own a personal vehicle to live in. Please choose the more sustainable choice and invest in your existing community. The people of Hamilton will thank you.</p>
359.	<p>is enough space within the city limits that is not being properly used, do not expand to the rural area and green space, and farmland.</p> <p>It is important to keep our green space and build more environmentally friendly within the city limits to help with climate change and human caused problems</p> <p>Please keep our rural area rural,</p>
360.	<p>It is absolutely wonderful that the City is asking residents an important question on city boundaries. I'm in favour of Option 2 – no urban boundary expansion.</p> <p>My reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preserve greenfield sites</li> <li>- Revitalize inner-city neighbourhoods</li> <li>- Prioritize walkability, bikeability, and transit-oriented development (for all income levels)</li> </ul>

	<p>- Increase density of tax dollars within downtown neighbourhoods that can use the money</p> <p>- Promote mid-rise density within the current urban boundary (4-8 storeys) rather than low-rise or high-rise (contributes to vibrant communities, reduces reliance on the car, allows residents to take the stairs for health and fire, potential to increase resiliency during blackouts)</p> <p>To allow Option 1 to go ahead would be short-sighted and would do a disservice to the folks currently living in the city.</p>
361.	<p>It is absolutely wonderful that the City is asking residents this vital question. My partner and I are in favour of Option 2 – no urban boundary expansion.</p> <p>Our reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve greenfield sites</li> <li>• Revitalize inner-city neighbourhoods</li> <li>• Prioritize walkability, bikeability, and transit-oriented development (for all income levels)</li> <li>• Promote mid-rise density within the current urban boundary (4-8 storeys) rather than low-rise or high-rise (contributes to vibrant communities, reduces reliance on the car, allows residents to take the stairs for health and fire, potential to increase resiliency during blackouts)</li> </ul> <p>To allow Option 1 to go ahead would be a tragedy in planning in Ontario.</p>
362.	<p>It is critical to protect farmland, wetlands and ecological systems that would be devastated if expansion was permitted</p>
363.	<p>It is extremely important to preserve the farmland surrounding our city.</p>
364.	<p>It is imperative that the City of Hamilton, provide clear, concise and timely information to the residents of the community. Especially in communities impacted by the decision making. It is also important that more research is done before decisions are made. In addition to providing information to the residents, it is important that Hamilton listen to the wants and needs of those residents.</p>
365.	<p>It is important to intensify in existing land and neighbourhoods, focusing on more people in smaller spaces, like townhomes and condos and co-ops. This will also make home ownership more reachable for those starting out and require less cars on roads as transit intensifies</p>
366.	<p>It is my conviction that the Urban boundary should not be expanded, that survey option 2 should be the principle that guides urban development in Hamilton. While there are many reasons that various developers of all sorts of facilities - residential, commercial, industrial - may find it most convenient to build flat out onto greenspaces, those lands that are currently farmland, forest and wetland are not properly valued for their roles as sources of food, habitat for wildlife and areas that mitigate climate change. This may sound a little extreme, but pushing the urban</p>

	<p>boundary outward is a tacit approval and continuation of policies that are responsible for beginning and accelerating climate change.</p> <p>Though many may yearn to enjoy what has been "normal" - the detached home with the front and back yard - but this is not sustainable, and Hamilton - and all cities - need to start acting sustainably, not merely in in the way we're used to.</p> <p>I've often described Hamilton as Canada's largest small town, where we cloister ourselves in our neighborhoods and use the pattern of life that we have enjoyed to measure the "goodness" of future plans. We need to stop spreading out, creating new little, disjunct definitions of who we are, and to build up into the Ambitious City of the future, not the 80's.</p>
367.	It is the only option that take the cities climate emergency declaration seriously and will also facilitate transit and a better more walkable like for city residents.
368.	It is very important to me, and it should be to everyone, to preserve every acre of farmland that is capable of producing our food for the production of our food. There is so much land going unused in this city due to changing industrial demographics. Build on these spaces and leave the countryside alone!
369.	It is well known in the scientific literature on both climate change and ecosystem/watershed health that intensification has fewer impacts than sprawl.
370.	It light of the current extreme weather events globally, the threat of climate change is ever present. I believe intensification of housing is one key act towards more sustainable living and climate change mitigation.
371.	<p>It makes no sense to use farmland to build housing since once farmland is gone, it is gone forever. Would you like to live in a nice, fancy home but have nothing to eat?</p> <p>The only feasible solution is option 2, if there actually is a need for growth. But, don't be thinking you're going to solve density problems on the backs of the suburbs. It looks like we're going to have an LRT that most people don't want and fewer are going to use. Any future density increases must be centred along the LRT corridor.</p>
372.	It would be devastating to Hamilton’s rural and farming communities to consider this expansion - and lead to a sprawl situation that would be extremely costly for the City to support in terms of service support, but would likely still leave surrounding rural communities with sub-par service compared to the central City. Instead, please consider developing the hundreds of parking lots in Hamilton, and building up our great city instead of building out. We already have an incredible amount of space in the downtown and central city to expand that is completely under utilized - please do not spend hundreds of millions of provincial and tax payer dollars on unnecessary sprawl development.
373.	It would be much more costly to build residencies in the rural area of Hamilton then to build within the city.

374.	It's bad enough that everyone from Toronto was allowed to buy up houses in Hamilton making it unaffordable for the children raised here. Now you want to create a concrete city like Toronto by taking rural land.
375.	Keep greenspaces green!
376.	Keep the farm land for the farms.  We need food. There is lots of empty land in the city to be used first.
377.	Leave our Farm Lands alone and build denser housing.
378.	Leave the greenspace alone. There are so many areas within the City that could be demolished and be replaced with higher population use.
379.	Lets be leaders in the way we grow- please choose the responsible, sustainable option, utilizing existing infrastructure.
380.	let's use the space already available and in-fill the tons of abandoned buildings.
381.	Lots of room within current urban boundaries. Promote multi-family development. Boost intensification rate!
382.	Low-density development costs all core taxpayers dearly in both direct and environmental costs. I for one do not want to pay for more of it.  The city of Hamilton boundaries are large enough. There are hundreds of lots within our core that are ripe for development. City council needs to focus on these areas and develop Hamilton into the city it can be. I do not want more suburban sprawl that will take away valuable land, cause more runoff issues, and worst of all be further economically subsidized by dense downtown wards.
383.	Make the City better not bigger. Use your downtowns potential, bring decent shopping back - let old underused space such as Barton street become something of value and use to its neighbourhoid again. Too many empty lots . So much to be done with what we have!!!!
384.	Many areas to improve within the ghost areas v. Expanding into green lands
385.	Meanwhile, I also support the exploration of other suggestions that will not lead to option #1 "Ambitious density" scenario by, for example, better using the existing empty homes in Hamilton.
386.	Must stop abusing use of our very limited greenfield lands. Use existing spaces within urban areas with creativity and incentives for affordable housing to middle class, low income and at risk populations in particular.

387.	<p>My believe is that Hamilton does not need to expand their boundaries for now or the near future we have a lot of space to be used for housing may it be low income or affordable housing just drive through down town Hamilton or Barton, Cannon or King streets the amount of boarded homes or buildings is huge or empty lots just siting there over grown with weeds. Hamilton has a lot to offer but it needs a upgrade one example is The General Hospital one off the best cardiac hospitals in the country but it looks like it is in the slums especially when you drive along Barton Street it is embarrassing use and fix up what we got before we expand. Get rid off farmland where are we going to get our food you have too import them in people are already complaining about high food cost . Our roads are a joke some third world countries have better roads then us also our infrastructure is in bad need off upgrades it’s falling apart fix it and use what we have before we start destroying our farmland and green space for development and profit , Hamilton has a lot of potential use that up first before we start to expand we still need our farmland and green space . Who what’s to drive an hour or two to take our kids on a nature walk.</p>
388.	<p>My choice is for option 2 as this area is unique with the soil, farmlands, and vineyards. Houses on green space are taking away farming. I support local farmers and never chose to live in a Burlington or Mississauga like area.</p>
389.	<p>My choice is Option 2 - use existing available lands and not expand the boundary</p>
390.	<p>My choice would be for Option 2. The boundaries for Hamilton include all the former areas of Dundas, Ancaster, Flamborough, Stoney Creek, Glanbrook. Single family dwellings combined with townhouses, and other can be accommodated within the urban boundaries, and as is now happening, development can go up making use of existing transportation and infrastructure (with some updates) for cost savings. That balance should be maintained. We value our greenspaces, our surrounding farming and conservation lands as part of our standard of living in the golden horseshoe, and we find it frustrating at how easily developers make deals with City Hall - especially when they propose building that requires changes to bylaws, and standards that the people, who chose Hamilton as home, support.</p>
391.	<p>My comments are that I am very disappointed at the processing of applications for developments on and around our city. I am more than a little dismayed to see and read about the lack of accountability for developers who flout the rules for approved plans and do their own thing anyway. There have been several examples in the press this year. The proposed McMaster development with Knightstone for Traymore Ave student accommodation, Vrancor in the Strathcona neighbourhood are examples of how far removed from the neighbourhood design the proposed designs are. I am hopeful that we can work more positively to increase density in use and at the same time produce/create more affordable housing.</p> <p>I am cautiously optimistic about citizen responses as I notice increasing lawn signs and raised voices on this particular survey.</p>
392.	<p>My family lives in Dundas, always have and always will. Dundas should not be part of any urban intensification as we are in a valley and therefore have natural</p>

	<p>boundaries to our town. Over the past few years we have been 'threatened' with high rise housing. Right now there is a proposal to build a high rise apartment/condominium structure on Main Street that would be 9 stories high. Right across the street from this proposed build is the old town hall. This is a historic landmark. We do not want our town core to become a centre for high rise buildings as this would dramatically affect the historic charm of our town. Dundas is used all the time for movie shoots and television programming. It is used because it is an authentic small town that has protected the Victorian buildings, turn of the century lampposts and streets adorned with mature trees and gardens.</p> <p>There is no need for Dundas to change in an attempt to increase population density. I believe a study was conducted a short while ago that clearly indicated that our town has grown in population and housing. There must be limits to growth as everything is negatively affected when communities grow too rapidly with no sense of boundary, no sense of the need for individuals to feel they are an important part of their town. I fear we are at a time in history where there is not enough awareness of the importance of human interaction and am awareness of others. Smaller communities can more easily foster inclusion and positive self worth.</p> <p>In closing, I will once again state that population intensification is not needed in Dundas!</p>
393.	<p>My first choice would be Option 2 in the short to medium term of 10 to 15 years. A 30 year crystal ball is not very reliable. Only expand the urban boundary if absolutely necessary. Urban sprawl costs everyone. I think that developers will just build monster homes if allowed to expand in a relatively uncontrolled manner. Most developers only want to make money in the short term and do not have to live with the long term consequences. The enormous need for affordable housing will not be met by expanding the boundary because people that could use this housing need to be closer to transit and other infrastructure. More roads and more cars are not the answer.</p>
394.	<p>My general comment is that I question why you called the first option ambitious rather than a more plain title such as "urban boundary expansion" so it's a more neutral presentation of the option as compared to the second option of "no urban boundary expansion"</p>
395.	<p>My household choses NO SPRAWL in the City of Hamilton and surrounding areas. Farm land is way too important and essential for a survivable society. Let builders 'build up' and restore empty buildings for living accommodations.</p>
396.	<p>My husband and I did not receive a survey. We vote No to Urban expansion. Repurpose and grow housing units with green space especially for low income housing. You have empty houses all over the city or that you board up and are dangerous for homeless who use them for shelter.</p> <p>We need greenspace, farms etc. Food is an important factor...let's think about climate change. Think outside the box.</p>

397.	<p>My husband and I use the local parks, greenspace, and Bruce Trails on a daily basis. We would hate to see this space of beauty and personal restoration disappear. We also don't want to invite extra traffic, noise, pollution, and crime into these protected spaces either. With increased concerns about our climate and the environment, we all need to do our part to preserve the little green space that we do still have in our community. I really hope we give serious consideration to the social and economic impact that urban sprawl will have on our city. We need to balance the need for real estate demand and additional tax dollars with the need to keep our natural spaces alive and thriving for generations to enjoy in the future.</p>
398.	<p>My husband, two children and I have been residents of Dundas since 2006. We chose to live in the heart of Dundas, a walkable community where our children could walk and cycle independently and use public transit rather than rely on a car. It greatly enhances our quality of life.</p> <p>I choose Option 2, freezing the urban envelope, intensifying and exhausting the possibilities within its existing boundaries before converting the precious rural areas of the city. This increases quality of life, improves existing communities in need and reduces long term tax burden. We have an incredible opportunity to improve our existing communities within today's urban envelope before expanding. Using equal parts Missing Middle know-how, creative infill and a good measure of political will, it is a formula for success. We must put all of our focus and effort into developing within the existing urban envelope first.</p> <p>I am in favour of maximizing intensification within the existing Urban Boundary before converting rural areas of the city.</p> <p>Other ideas</p> <p>If Option 1 has to go through, that rural land should be rezoned to create walkable missing middle communities much like the core of Dundas. It absolutely should not be zoned for large suburban unaffordable single family dwellings that rely on a car culture. People love old style walkable towns with a vibrant mixed-use zoned core. It's a proven formula that improves quality of life.</p> <p>Other Comments</p> <p>With so many issues on the table, it is time to get back to meeting the basic needs and rights of our greater community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- food security, affordable housing, health, safety</li> <li>- social equalizers such as public transportation, cycling and walking</li> <li>- environmental human rights to clean air and water, and addressing the climate emergency</li> </ul> <p>Option 1 add to these issues rather than addressing them.</p>

	<p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>
<p>399.</p>	<p>My ideas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Protect our agricultural lands (climate change is destroying a lot of good agricultural lands)</li> <li>- Protect our natural areas (wetlands, forests, shorelines)</li> <li>- Be more efficient with present urban land for housing and industry.</li> <li>- Be creative with our housing: allow smaller houses or secondary structures on existing lots (increase the density).</li> <li>- Stop building monster houses.</li> <li>- Do not let developers get their way (they would pave all our rural land for a buck)</li> <li>- No tall high-rise apartment/condo towers, keep them to a reasonable height (10 to 12 stories is good enough)</li> <li>- Exception for high-rise along transit lines or at transit nodes/stations where taller structures could be built (maximum 25 to 30 stories).</li> <li>- Build quality structures that look good.</li> <li>- Build a city that we can be proud to live in (feels good, looks good, smells good, sounds good, you get the idea)</li> </ul>
<p>400.</p>	<p>My option is number two but with a very important caveat (which might make this option #3 instead).</p> <p>Any development in the existing urban area MUST follow current zoning by-laws. Too often, developers submit plans far above approved limits, resulting in massive structures too intense for the neighbourhood. Zoning is too often treated as a suggestion to be negotiated with the City, usually to the detriment of existing property owners. For example, there is currently a proposal in my neighbourhood at the former Brock University site on King Street that proposes 871 units ABOVE the current allowable limits.</p> <p>I welcome the development in my area, but keep it to the strict limits imposed by the bylaw with no negotiation. Developers must know that the rules are there to be followed.</p>
<p>401.</p>	<p>My preferred growth option is 2 - no urban expansion.</p> <p>We should be renewing and building up the downtown core. Put more money into infrastructure and start building a mix of homes. The Eastern stretch of Barton is in absolute shambles - it should be made more dense and more efficient.</p> <p>I know developers with deep pockets make good “arguments” for expansion, but we need to think long term. Once we destroy our farmland soil, there is no getting it back.</p> <p>We can see the devastation happening in countries we source our food from. When they run out of arable land, they won't be shipping what they have to us. We need to</p>

	<p>be able to provide for ourselves, and destroying farmland will guarantee that we can't. It really is a life or death choice.</p>
402.	<p>My preferred option is # 2 NO urban boundary expansion. Given all that is going on with climate change and recent drought and wild fires only to get worse as time goes on we need to retain any existing land that can be farmed.</p> <p>We should be developing on existing vacant lots including various little use parcels of land located within existing City boundaries. Point in case is the parcel of land located at corner of Upper Sherman &amp; Mohawk. It is one ugly eyesore and wasted space given the grocery store vacated its premises a few years ago and Walmart announcing closure of its store at this location. I am sure there are others of this nature.</p> <p>We should be building more high density buildings within the City and having appropriate transportation infrastructure such as bike lanes and reliable busing so people can use public transit instead of driving their cars everywhere.</p>
403.	<p>My preferred option regarding Hamilton’s urban boundary would be to keep the boundary as it is now. I believe we need to stop urban sprawl and we as a city should prioritize the protection of our environment and the invaluable agricultural lands surrounding Hamilton.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and for all of the work that you do.</p>
404.	<p>My preferred Urban Growth Option is #2, the No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario.</p> <p>Intensifying the existing urban area makes sense to me for many reasons. As the population increases, access to locally grown food becomes even more important. Hamilton is very fortunate that it includes highly productive farmland and we are so close to the Niagara peninsula, another productive agricultural area. Healthy, affordable food is an integral part of a healthy communities. Also, the more urban our lives become, the more digital our lives become, the more important it is to have access to nature and greenspace. There is a clear link between mental and physical health and outdoor play and access to walking trails, nature trails and rural areas. Hamilton has the opportunity to create urban areas that are welcoming, affordable and thriving and rural communities that welcoming, thriving and productive. This has economic benefits, health benefits and quality of life benefits</p>
405.	<p>My reasons are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. We have so much unused / under-utilized space in the already-built up, already-serviced parts of the City and need to encourage density and growth in these areas where tax dollars have already paid for urban infrastructure. Global studies have shown that suburban growth cost more than it pays in tax dollars because of more roads, more cars driving on and wearing down existing roads, and more infrastructure and urban services are needed. Infill development on the other hand generates net gains for municipalities through tax revenue.</li> </ol>

	<p>2. We can't keep destroying the farmland that should be feeding us especially given the Climate Emergency and the instability (cost + supply) of the global food system.</p> <p>3. We ought not to put good planning and global best-practices aside just because greenfield development is slightly easier for big developers and their easy-money sub divisions.</p> <p>4. Urban density is good for our City culture. Density breeds walkability (less travel time between destinations) which breeds urban vibrancy and small business success. Dense urban cores become destinations when they are vibrant and full of life.</p> <p>5. More sprawl entrenches the need for more residents to drive to and from their homes. More density allows those who choose, to walk and cycle more and utilize public transit more. Not only is this good for the health of Hamiltonians and the safety of our streets, but it means less pollution and fewer green house gas emissions.</p> <p>6. The greenfields that surround Hamilton are simply beautiful. Nature is more beautiful than money. Let's not "pave paradise and put up a parking lot" when there is a very feasible alternative for smart density starring us in the face.</p>
406.	<p>My selection would be option 2. Develop the downtown leave the mountain as is and especially rural areas.</p>
407.	<p>My vote is option 2, but with a suggestion that medium density is considered over the other options and the city ensures there is plenty of green space (parks) developed as well. The pandemic has magnified a lot of problems with the way we have designed cities to date (including lack of public transit, housing, etc.) but also it has highlighted how important outdoor space is for mental health. We should be encouraging citizens to use our green spaces and other forms of transportation outside of cars if we want to ensure we create a city that is family-friendly, healthy and home to many vibrant communities.</p>
408.	<p>My Vote: I strongly support containing development within the urban boundary. Do not build in the green fields. I thought this urban sprawl approach to eating up agricultural lands and protected greenfields was behind us!</p> <p>There is soooo much available land in this City, with low density 1 and 2 storey housing and acres and acres of mostly empty parking lots throughout the urban area of Hamilton that could be developed. The area east of James St. all along Barton St. for example which has so many closed up businesses on the street frontages could benefit hugely from thoughtful residential development and mixed use development to provide good jobs. The low density suburban model on the Mountain has tons of rooms for more people.</p>

	<p>Consultation Materials are Missing Important information: Some important information is missing in your materials, in particular a clear statement about what greenfield development means and why it has been prohibited to protect these lands, with a clear diagram / map. I had to dig to find a map with the outline of the Urban Boundary. I think that should be put upfront on the website.</p> <p>Also the negative implications of removing greenfields and the impact on climate change, water and air quality and sustainability on many levels of sprawl needs to be clearly articulated. I thought we were so over this as an approach to urban development! This feels like going backwards to even entertain this question.</p> <p>When we hear the term "add 236,000 more people by 2051" it may sound like a lot. But divide that by the large land area in the urban boundary and what is the density? This statistic needs some context to be better understood. Show how that number of people can be accommodated within the urban boundary!</p> <p>Revamp your questions: I also find your category of Option 1 - ambitious density - misleading and frankly offensive. There are more ways to be ambitious here! The heading makes that option sound appealing, whereas the "No urban boundary expansion" heading has the word "No" in it - and that sounds more defensive and less appealing. How about "Protect Greenfields and Contain Growth for Healthy Community Development" as your Option 2 title? This printed material is revealing a bias in the question format.</p> <p>Other Urban Development Format to Achieve Ambitious Goals: I also want to advocate for urban designer Ken Greenberg's approach to mid rise development as the optimum form for community development. This is being developed in other municipalities - Brampton - and I think it would be a huge net benefit for Hamilton to adopt this. Density can be achieved with mid rise!! Create walkable neighbourhoods with complete streets and mixed use with mid-rise buildings and lots of trees and connected park system - this will improve the City in so many ways and be a very appealing place to live and work.</p>
409.	<p>My wife and I strongly object to Option 1. We need to preserve green space and farmland, NOT BUILD ON IT!!!!</p> <p>Option 2 is our choice. There are acres and acres of unused land within the city, especially in the lower city. The City collected acres for a new stadium near the waterfront and then in an abject stupidity decided to replace the old stadium on Balsam Ave.</p> <p>Where we live in Dundas is a perfect example of how old industrial property can be developed into housing.</p>

	So bottom line. Option 1 is NOT an option. It should be rejected!
410.	Myself and my husband vote for Option 2, not to build on farmland and open spaces. Both are so important for so many reasons.
411.	No boundary expansion is needed, there is plenty of vacant and unused land in the Hamilton down town area. Start developing the vacant land and remove all of the old industrial buildings that are sitting vacant in Hamilton. Stop expanding out into areas like Flamborough and Glanbrook. The farm land and peaceful country areas are being ruined by poor decisions made by Hamilton politicians. This needs to be stopped ASAP, poorly planned trucking routes are also another big problem, stop letting transport traffic pollute our farm land and quiet countryside. Please stop the insanity of the urban expansion,
412.	NO BOUNDARY EXPANSION! I've lived in Waterdown for 27 years, I've watched it turned from a beautiful town to an exploding area with homes everywhere you look! STOP BUILDING HERE, DO NOT TAKE ANYMORE OF THE GREEN SPACE, please leave the land alone, you have so many area in downtown hamilton that have been left a mess with age, FIX WHAT YOU HAVE BEFORE YOU BUILD MORE, clean up, fix up, sell existing locations, use your heads. I know we did not have a choice when you combined us with Hamilton and we lost A LOT in that union, we've been robbed of our town feeling, the wildlife have little area left to go, our children have little left to play on, stop this nonsense, don't humor us with these vote options and ignore what we say! LISTEN!!! Build elsewhere! we don't want anymore, we can barely afford to live here as it is now.
413.	No development in green belt and agricultural lands.
414.	No development of green space.
415.	No expansion of urban boundaries. Our rural communities must be protected.
416.	No expansion outwards! Preserve our natural spaces and agricultural lands!
417.	NO greenspace to be used for residential, industrial or business purposes on a local as well as provincial basis.
418.	No more moving into the greenbelt.
419.	No more tax breaks for empty buildings. Empty lots and buildings with no tenants need to become housing options. Expanding into rural is lazy, dangerous and unimaginative.
420.	No new development on farmland
421.	NO to expansion leaving room to breathe as this city suffocates and we desperately need to keep land for our food supply.

422.	<p>No to Hamilton urban boundary expansion. Protect farmland and green space within our present boundary. Tract housing by developers is not the answer. Intensification also lowers costs for city services, health care, education and other social services. I hope someone is listening.</p>
423.	<p>No urban boundary expansion but intensification should be directed and restricted to within specific zones designated for growth. Ie. in fills within commercial urban areas that fit with development. Limits need to be placed on developers wishing to fundamentally change a neighborhood’s look, culture and feel with projects beyond traditional community height restrictions, neighborhood homes and land use.</p> <p>Stop allowing developers to set land use agenda.</p>
424.	<p>No Urban Boundary Expansion Scenario. Our lower city has so much potential and I would love to see it be invested in. Plus, the further we continue to sprawl outwards, the less reliable public transportation there is and the further away things are, forcing more use of cars rather than taking transit, walking or cycling, which has an impact on climate change and physical health. I am new to Ancaster in the last couple years, but lived the rest of my life in the lower city. As a young professional and hobbyist musician, I would love to see the lower city returned to it’s glory. Let’s use what we already have.</p>
425.	<p>NO urban boundary expansion!!!</p> <p>The lower city, the core, is filled with vacant and under utilized buildings and land that are ideal areas for redevelopment. THAT is where we should have density intensification instead of destroying farmland, natural areas and green spaces.</p> <p>The only people who benefit from expanding the boundaries are the developers who don’t care about people or the environment, their only interest is profit.</p> <p>STOP destroying our city and our planet for the financial gain of developers and their “friends”!!!</p>
426.	<p>NO URBAN BOUNDARY EXPANSION!!!!!!</p>
427.	<p>No Urban Boundary Expansion. Hamilton has a fragile ecosystem surrounding it with wonderful Greenspace. If you need to have more urban sprawl how about looking after our falling escarpment, stopping the LRT and building in the empty spaces along King Street? Our city needs change within the city not in the surrounding areas. Once we loose our Greenspan it's gone forever. LEAVE IT ALONE!!!!</p>
428.	<p>No Urban Boundary expansion. I believe we have enough space within the city to build additional housing including brownlands that are sitting empty. Focus should include more affordable housing for low income earners and those with disabilities</p>

429.	No urban boundary expansion. Stop destroying our greenspace. Make your website easier to access for people who know nothing about how to access your website
430.	No urban boundary expansion. We need to protect our greenfield land.
431.	No urban boundary expansions OR new development or use of greenfield spaces. Leave the boundaries where they are. Develop the older parts of the city where there is space. Leave our greenspace ALONE!
432.	No urban expansion of lands, create more density within the present boundary.
433.	<p>NO! NO! NO! urban expansion into rural lands.</p> <p>We are paving paradise and this needs to stop. This rampant misuse of farmland and environmentally sensitive spaces is leading to pollution, degradation of the land, the water table and water management, as well as increased transit times across sprawl, drastic overuse of resources and a decline in the quality of life.</p> <p>With Earth's climate problems and the floods, droughts and disasters ensuing around much of the world, we cannot count on the supply chain providing for our needs. We need to maintain local sustainability of our food resources to feed the people in this area of Ontario.</p> <p>During Covid lockdown we see how people have flooded out of urban settings to seek relaxation, stress reduction, exercise, and connection to our Earth. Putting up buildings, roads, and taking over environmentally sensitive spaces restricts the availability of green space and decreases our quality of life. Don't do this.</p> <p>The pressure from political and business folks to build and grow at all costs, only lines the pockets of developers and investors. We need to invest in the people of this city. Growth is not all good. Cancer is a growth - an invasive, strangling growth. We need well researched, balanced thinking on growth. Keep the city limits as they are. Intensify as appropriate while keeping the integrity of existing neighbourhoods. Improve our infrastructure and community resources, and make Hamilton a livable city for all its residents.</p> <p>Thank you for accepting these considerations.</p>
434.	Noooo expansion Ford and doesn't care about our green space
435.	NOT in favour of anymore urban expansion, there is already an increase in violent crimes, drugs, guns , a lot to do with the already massive development in this city, as well, the increase in wildlife in the city i.e. rats, coyotes, deer due to the disruption of their natural habitat
436.	Not to expand the urban boundary and destroy farm land.
437.	<p>NUMBER 2 “No Urban Boundary Expansion Scenario”</p> <p>The LRT is going to be built in Hamilton. In order for this project to be a feasible alternative to everyone driving their own cars and further polluting the environment, the current civic boundary should be utilized and intensification should occur. We also need to have our local farming lands intact to be able to provide the foods that we so desperately need and will need even more in the future.</p>

	Thank you for allowing the residents of Hamilton to have their say.
438.	Once farmland is gone, there is no way to get it back. A country that cannot feed itself will not survive.
439.	<p>One thing that makes Hamilton livable and likable is the fact that we can escape to the countryside quickly, either in a car or on a bike. We can hike rail trails and see wildlife such as pheasants and wild turkeys, With more sprawl, that connection with nature will be minimized to the brow. As it is, we can no longer escape the light pollution at night, More sprawl would make Hamilton like any other congested and paved city - unremarkable.</p> <p>So definitely, no more decreasing farmland and the rural lands.</p>
440.	<p>Ontario has lost an average of 175 Acres of farmland per day for two decades now.</p> <p>The majority of the quarter million by 2051 will be newcomers, many of which will be climate refugees. Expansion will only exacerbate the already critical situation of climate change and unsustainable suburban infrastructure costs, especially in light of out of control inflation and the looming sovereign debt crisis.</p> <p>It's not too late to develop the city's core so that Hamilton does not end up a giant costly suburb like the GTA.</p> <p>A mix of single occupancy units and family homes are easily achievable. There's a lot of potential downtown. The upstart capital will be more expensive per square foot than buying a farm, but that will not stop developers from having shovels ready and realizing profits.</p> <p>I live near Queen and King, and despite a few residents who display anti-development/NIMBY sentiments, most aren't concerned with recent condo developments in the area, and in fact most of us welcome modernizing the core.</p>
441.	Option #2 is the only viable option for Hamilton moving forward. We have an abundance of neglected/abandoned properties that could be redeveloped for our city's growing needs. Greenspace/rural/farmlands are more essential now than ever before.
442.	Option 1 requires more infrastructure charges beside buying the land and also higher taxes for all Hamiltonions. For option 2, small strip malls could easily add a second story for housing and basements in houses could be utilized more than they are. presently. without the heavy costs. We don't want to be big like Toronto with all their problems.
443.	Option 2 - rebuilding the existing urban landscape, is the only way to move forward. This should have been done back in 1990's. The core of Hamilton has been deteriorating since the 1970's. Incompetent and greedy planners and developers

	<p>saw easy \$\$\$ with expanding outward to farmlands and green space. Geographically, Hamilton is a beautiful city. The development of the city has resulted in ugliness that can be corrected with time and thoughtful commitment . Option 2 only</p>
444.	<p>Option 2 , because there is no short term need ,say 5 years ,and there is too much uncertainty between now and 2031 to make unnecessary disruptive moves . So , what to do now . Empower the Planning Department to fulfill their professional mandate .That is to deliver the proper range of housing . They have not done this for many years due to small groups of neighborhood agitators , usually called NIMBYS , who pressure weak politicians , and non focussed planners , to stop any sort of intensive development . It has been so bad that really the planning process has been turned over to people who do not want to be inconvenienced by any change . The result is massive. Tracks of single family , and townhouses stuffed onto minimal lots , high rises Downtown , where most locals do not want to live , and no high rises where local people want to live .Therefore the Mountain has thousands of houses with seniors who are trapped because there is no where to move . This is further worsened because the limited supply of housing of interest to seniors has driven these unit to prices higher than many nice detached . In a well planned market people can downsize ,and have money left over , not here . To open up single family homes for families so that schools , and recreational locations can be efficient ,Hamilton must push high rise condo development for Hamilton Mountain , Ancaster , and Stoney Creek . High rise to mean minimum 200 units , of one ,or two , bedroom units minimum 10 stories , maximum 20 . There is a clear need for 10000 such units over the next five years , this would open up , say 7500 existing homes , and eat up much of the demand that will exist from local buyers . If we are housing out of town people that needs a further number above the ten thousand . But still not boundary enlargement , this can be helped by a sincere promotion of granny flats , second homes on existing , and up zoning on creative locations . It is an embarrassment that a no brainer location for intensification , Old Chedoke Hospital lands , was lost to bad townhouses , and a dismal low rise apartment. It is hoped that such a travesty is not allowed again . It was certainly not the development industry that pushed for this result . It was weak Municipal leadership . There are tons of visible , logical , locations now , but they are not making new ones , so let’s not lose them . Clearly there are other Hamilton housing disasters , social housing , non profit housing, affordable housing , and targeted housing .with intelligent planning , intelligent rules , an increase in Municipal taxes to pay for social , and special needs care .Again it is a overall housing plan , based on the greater good , based on the greater need , and based on a cooperation amongst the parties . Now it takes forever , is adversarial , and mired in politics . Not sustainable , not climate friendly , not what the people want , not efficient , not smart economically .</p>

445.	Option 2 for me. We need farms and to rebuild the vacant core of Hamilton including east and west downtown. So many buildings without people paying taxes and are empty.
446.	Option 2 is best for housing expansion at this time. In the far future, please consider rural area land use as the Europeans do where communities are walkable, the housing density is greater, but green space is carefully considered so that it appears spacious. I had the opportunity to listen to Dr Charlie Hall in Boston 2017 at America in Blooms symposium where he talked about building communities in that manner: it sounded wonderful!
447.	Option 2 is my preferred route: add housing within the urban boundary through 15-20 storey highrise, mid-rise, townhouse/condo, duplex and single home developments in un- and under-used lands on the waterfront and throughout the city. We would be unwise to invest in LRT and then encourage growth in the suburbs, far from the centre. Let's build the City of Hamilton with all aspects of sustainability in mind: water quality, farming, Green Belt, Conservation Authority, and public transit.
448.	Option 2 is our choice. We would have to rely on other countries for our food and this is what all the pandemic was about.
449.	Option 2 is the best way to protect our valuable farmland and the environment. We need to protect our green space.
450.	Option 2 must be the way to move forward. It is the only option to allow restoration to the decaying neighbourhood of our city. Option 1 is what has been done for decades and the results are terrible. These are not communities where people connect and feel a sense of belonging. Start repairing Hamilton. Stop the destruction of land.
451.	Option 2, any plans for urbanisation of greenfield is forcing us towards catastrophic climate disasters. Find ways to grow that also reduce/reverse impact upon the environment.
452.	Option 2, NO URBAN EXPANSION. SAVE OUR FARMLAND FOR FOOD!
453.	Option 2, please. Plenty of space to redevelop in the city. Like Barton Street, King Street. Leave the farm land and green space and do not develop it!
454.	Option 2: No Urban Boundary Expansion Scenario. I did NOT receive the ballot in the mail to vote on this and want to make sure that my views are taken into account. There is room to sustainably grow within our existing boundaries and these options are what should be explored. NOT allowing development beyond the current urban boundary.
455.	Option 2: No Urban Boundary Expansion Scenario. It makes no sense to expand urban boundaries for low density growth when there is so much under-utilized space within the lower city. Low density growth = incredibly expensive infrastructure

	<p>maintenance and lower tax revenue. High density growth = more distributed and less expensive infrastructure maintenance per capita and much higher tax revenue. It's a no brainer - no urban boundary expansion.</p>
456.	<p>Option 2: No Urban Boundary Expansion Scenario. There are many opportunities within the city. Demolish old abandoned buildings i.e. Barton street between Ottawa and Wentworth. City should level the land and the developers will come in droves. It will also allow for old infrastructure to be updated for everyone's benefit. i.e. sewers</p> <p>Option 1: Expanding the boundaries will just result in more abandoned buildings in the inner city. An eyesore and embarrassment as a city resident. These run down areas are avoided by myself and others. I avoid driving down that road as it is very sad. Let's fix what we already have in place instead of a band aid solution of expansion which will just add to the existing eyesore and would not reflect a complete City of Prosperity.</p> <p>The solution appears to be obvious.</p>
457.	<p>Option 2: No Urban Boundary Expansion Scenario. There is plenty of vacant land and vacant industrial / commercial lands that can be redeveloped in Hamilton. Please do not create urban sprawl and let this beautiful city rot in the middle.</p>
458.	<p>Option 2: No Urban Boundary Expansion Scenario. We should be focusing on utilizing our existing infrastructure and building communities within our existing boundaries. Urban sprawl does nothing to address urgent needs in Hamilton. I have seen nothing demonstrating how urban sprawl will lead to more affordable housing, better transit, more cross cultural connections, or increase a sense of cohesion across the city.</p>
459.	<p>Option 2: No Urban Boundary Expansion Scenario.</p> <p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In 2019 Hamilton declared a climate emergency but I have yet to see the city apply the "climate lens" to any decision that they make. The density will not be high enough to bring in regular public transportation and would be car-dependent.</li> <li>- With drought in many parts of the world we cannot afford to pave over farmland.</li> <li>- Sprawl depends on current taxpayers to develop the necessary infrastructure to support the new housing while this infrastructure already exists in the current urban boundary. Hamilton taxes are already high enough.</li> <li>- The most popular neighbourhoods in Hamilton are walkable and sprawl is definitely not!</li> <li>- The vast majority of these homes will not be affordable and are being built for Toronto residents who can no longer afford Toronto homes.</li> </ul>
460.	<p>Option 2: No urban sprawl. Councillors need to encourage the use of lands within the current City Boundaries that are sitting empty or land with old buildings that are sitting empty. We need to reuse the properties we have not take farmlands away. Hamilton and Canada need to work toward becoming self sufficient, not taking away lands that we need to grow food, feed animals and keep our greens spaces.</p>

461.	<p>Option TWO is the only defensible one. The farm land in this area is the best in the country. How can you possibly contemplate paving over more of it? Redevelop under-used and abandoned industrial land. Build more parking garages and turn parking lots into building sites. Place limitations on the building of "show mansions". Allow for the building of "granny cottages" in large back yards.</p> <p>Think outside the box.</p>
462.	<p>Other suggestion - do not expand on twenty road west, already way too congested.</p>
463.	<p>Other Suggestions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There are opportunities within the current urban boundary for growth on existing brownfield sites. There are also an abundance of vacant buildings where adaptive re-use, renovation and addition could occur.</li> <li>2. The municipality should look to implement programs and policies to encourage successful and meaningful development within the City. (grants, loans, tax-relief, development charge reductions, innovative solutions, etc.)             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. To promote development, offer incentives to those who own un-developed, under-developed and brownfield properties</li> <li>b. Look at ways to discourage vacant properties and absentee land owners.</li> <li>c. Reward heritage property owners. Encourage adaptive re-use, conservation, restoration and preservation (make it more attractive to maintain a heritage property than demolish) - demonstrate the City's respect and pride in its heritage</li> <li>d. Don't make the paperwork/read-tape more challenging and time consuming than the incentive is realistically worth to a property owner/developer.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Intensification does not have to come at the cost of urban greenspace. Promote the integration of greenspace, landscape, rain-gardens, exciting/interactive/engaging and animated streetscapes</li> </ol>
464.	<p>Our city is filled with brownfield spaces which we can develop and ability to build upwards to provides spaces and homes to Hamilton's future population. We are so lucky in this region to be surrounded by fertile farmland with which to feed the people who live here. It is a resource worth protecting at all costs. Please make the sensible choice, do not expand the urban boundary.</p>
465.	<p>Our city should do everything possible to accommodate future growth on under-utilized, already serviced land. We cannot afford to keep building out additional infrastructure and adding to our capital maintenance deficit.</p>
466.	<p>Our existing farmland and greenspace should be preserved and there is much opportunity to use existing properties within Hamilton for population intensification. This scenario is better for the health of the city and most importantly for the overall health of the environment.</p>
467.	<p>Our farmland is a precious resource and with a growing population along with a quickly changing climate will ensure food security. Farmland should be used for its economic potential as farmland. There is plenty of room for new housing and an increase in density within the current urban boundary.</p>

468.	Our farmlands are being eaten up by development, this has to stop now!
469.	<p>Our Greenbelt and farmland need to be preserved for local food supply, climate action, watertable management</p> <p>Affordable housing and support for seniors required in core urban setting</p> <p>Build up not out, -provide affordable housing for the homeless and low income families priced out of the markets.</p>
470.	Our household strongly supports option 2. No urban boundary expansion. Enough is enough. Farms are needed locally not pavements
471.	Our opinion is that option #2 is the best - no urban sprawl. It's sad to see houses going up where there used to be green spaces.
472.	<p>Our position on Hamilton Growth to 2051 is "Option 2 - No Urban Boundary Expansion". With so much brown field within the city limits, it would make more sense to develop those properties first, before looking at expanding the boundaries! We are fully aware that there is industrial development going to take place around the Hamilton International Airport, and there will be a large need for skilled workers. The City of Hamilton needs to look at improving bus services to these areas, as well as creating more housing, by cleaning up the brown field sites within the city. Downtown Hamilton, has too many vacant spots that are used as parking lots and buildings that are not up to standard. We need to protect existing farm land and green space! Our environment is fragile and by continuously expanding outward, we increase our pollution foot print.</p> <p>Hamilton is growing, and we need to seriously look at how to improve transportation that is environmentally friendly and reliable, not only East to West but North to South, and connecting the far ends of the city limits, as well as reducing automobile usage within the city!</p>
473.	<p>Our response is option 2 – no urban expansion, there is lots of vacant land within the city limits on which to build affordable housing.</p> <p>Why ? When I went to the Demazenod Farm in Ancaster , I was shocked at how close housing has encroached on this farmland ! There are huge homes literally right across the street .</p> <p>When will humans learn that once you build on farmland, food insecurity worsens and there is less land on which to grow food.</p>
474.	Our rural spaces are already quickly disappearing and they need to be preserved.
475.	Over the last 28 years I have seen the city slowly impede into valuable farmland, specifically the employment lands reserved around the airport and, most recently, pot farms. I also see the abundance of empty buildings downtown Hamilton left in disrepair. Perhaps we need to focus more on cleaning up the city before enveloping more of our much needed urban areas. Why else would we be spending an

	exorbitant amount of money on a LRT transit system if all we are doing is encouraging Hamilton residents to 'spread out'. What about our Green Space? Is it something that our Government is willing to protect until it comes that they need it?
476.	Preserve as much farm land as possible.
477.	Please add my input as a vote against urban expansion We need to stop this insane spread over farmland and waterways Every time we concrete over green space we interrupt water flow to the Great Lakes water system, wells, fish and wildlife habitats I myself have been witness to the effects of a simple patio laid down in my backyard We added a wooden deck then put a stone walkway to the back and a stone patio across the back and side, leaving 2 large flower beds on each side ( we have a large backyard) and a long grassy area as well On the first hard rain which are becoming more frequent our basement window started leaking because the patio was getting flooded from over saturation on grass and gardens So imagine all that concrete covering the earth and people adding hardscape driveways and patios sidewalks and roads Too much for our storm sewers are able to manage
478.	Please choose to intensify housing density, rather than developing the Whitebelt. Our natural areas are too important.
479.	Please concentrate on developing within existing boundaries.
480.	Please consider adding more perennials to the city's road boulevard gardens to save money and beautify our city.  Bring back the inclines to connect the lower city to the upper city.  Add more native flowering plants and grasses to the Lincoln Alexander Parkway.
481.	Please create policy that requires a minimum amount of units that are affordable and family friendly (I.e., 2 bedrooms +).
482.	Please decide on Option 2 as I truly believe that is the best option, although I would prefer a lower intensification rate ( 55-60% max). I understand the growth aspect, but I also know that Farmland and Conservation areas being threatened and are increasingly under pressure to be over taken with housing and commercial buildings. Once this priceless land is gone, there is no getting it back which is a huge loss for people and wildlife:  People: will have nothing other than maybe some trails that they have to drive to as the houses, townhouses and apartment buildings are built as close as possible to ensure the city receive as much as possible for their taxes  Animals: that are increasing forced to have to find other areas to live because people want to encroach on their habitat. The smaller insects as well will disappear - the plant life they depend on will dwindle

	<p>Plant life: trees and forests are uprooted to accommodate houses, townhouses, apartments and because of that lack of shade, there will be more air conditioners using electricity and freon gas, that is very harmful to the lungs and environment - the US has banned its use in 2020</p> <p>Please don't make the same mistakes we have made in the past. Please take a more environmentally centered approach so we can have a city that respects farmland, farmers and the food they provide; greenspace that will allow people to have room to enjoy as well as fresher air and the wildlife can remain in their habitat as it will still be available to them.</p> <p>We need to have a vision that will give our children and grandchildren a place they will love to be a part of and proud that today's decision makers made a choice for them and not for the builders. Please choose wisely as I reiterate that once it's gone that's it and that will be a very sad day! That responsibility will be on the decision makers to live with.</p>
483.	Please do not allow an expansion of the urban boundaries of Hamilton.
484.	Please do not expand housing onto the small number of farmlands/rural lands that are left.
485.	Please do NOT expand our urban boundary to take more farmland and forests. We have lost too much already.
486.	Please do not interfere with our farmlands and green spaces
487.	Please don't do what they are doing in Oakville! It is absolutely disgusting and so sad! There is nothing left!
488.	Please don't make us look like Toronto it stinks and you cant see the lake .
489.	Please ensure we create policies that ensure liveable intensification and more options for housing and housing types (such as sensitive infill), in conjunction with livable transportation options. We want to ensure quality infrastructure in future years and not stretching our resources so thin with more sprawl, eliminating valuable agricultural / natural areas.
490.	Please focus on infill before spreading out into the farmland.
491.	Please just use the under utilized land we currently have that is within our current urban boundary.
492.	Please leave Dundas alone before it ends up looking like Waterdown. It's ridiculous up there now. We want our town to remain small. I moved to Dundas to get out of a big city. It's nice here as it is, especially with the wildlife all over. Please don't cram in buildings/condos/townhouses on every free piece of land. It's perfect the way that it is!

493.	<p>Please leave our urban areas alone and keep your pollution in Hamilton. I know it's all a money and tax grab and the core Hamilton councilors will over vote the urban councilors but for once do the right thing.</p> <p>Why not rip out your North end slums and rebuild your condos and apartments there to compliment your bay front. None of us urban dwellers go down there anyway so it won't impact us</p> <p>These are reasons why after being born and living in Stoney Creek for over 60 years I will be moving out to Haldimand area. Hamilton has ruined Stoney Creek and all the other urban areas.</p>
494.	<p>Please make the only responsible decision on our behalf. We all need good homes and access to appropriate city services but absolutely need to protect local green space. Please Protect our wild spaces and farmlands. We want a healthy city and healthy province. We don't need endless sprawl of housing developments and big box stores.</p>
495.	<p>Please note my vote is for scenario 2, no urban boundary expansion.</p> <p>While on the subject of public input why not send one of the never received surveys around for the LRT.</p> <p>It's nice that the developers can have their way and no doubt will on this boundary expansion but I'd like to see how many Hamilton residents what their taxes going up year after year to pay for public transit that most people will have to drive to and pay the city to park for the "honour of being taken for another ride".</p>
496.	<p>Please save greenfield lands beyond the urban boundary.</p>
497.	<p>Please save our farms and Green Belt!</p>
498.	<p>Please stop subsidizing sprawl while downtown roads fall apart and our sewers are over 100 years old.</p> <p>Why is it ok to keep raising inner city taxes to subsidize more sprawl? This must stop. Please intensify in the existing city. Thank you.</p>
499.	<p>Please stop the reckless and irresponsible urban sprawl! I select option #2</p>
500.	<p>Please stop the sprawl! Protect our soil and green spaces!</p>
501.	<p>Please, stop the relentless destruction. It is enraging to see the countryside being transformed year after year into tract housing. It is NOT sustainable. Stop. We are destroying ourselves when we destroy farmland and countryside.</p>
502.	<p>Please. Stop destroying the farmland in the area and start cleaning up the decay in the urban area.</p>
503.	<p>Population and housing growth should be planned for within the city's existing urban boundary through intensification and redevelopment in existing neighbourhoods and communities.</p>

	<p>There is no need to expand city boundaries onto farmland. I assume it is easier to build a new community but the infrastructure upgrading would still need to be done in existing neighbourhoods.</p>
504.	<p>Prefer option #2 but with NO further development in Ancaster/Dundas.</p>
505.	<p>Preserve our nature! Preserve our agricultural lands. No expansion outward!</p>
506.	<p>Prior to City's bursting with Urban Sprawl, Communities should be created with greenspace, commercial, residential both low to medium heights, where folks can work, shop, live and play in the area, rather than just wiping out our precious agricultural lands with urban sprawl, that does not create a real community. I am sure that bright minds can envision something better than just the "OLD School" urban sprawl that has come with a lot of negative impact.</p>
507.	<p>Protect farmland at all costs. Hamilton always touts sustainability, that includes food production land.</p>
508.	<p>Protect our farmers. Protect our greenspaces. If this pandemic has taught us anything surely it is the importance of nature and that which comes from it for our physical and mental wellbeing. These things should not be luxuries for the wealthy, they should be available and accessible to all.</p> <p>I have zero confidence that the City of Hamilton will fight for the citizens of our city. I have watched in horror for many years as decisions have been made and plans executed for political gains, without thought to our future generations. The city I grew up in and loved is gone.</p> <p>Does my opinion really matter? I think this survey is nothing more than a token, so the City can say 'we consulted our citizens...'</p> <p>Believe it or not, I am not a cynical person, just someone who is heartbroken that the almighty dollar will win again.</p>
509.	<p>Protection of city soil, water and air (no fossil fuel emissions) are essential concerns in new expansion of any new land development. Start with development in urban areas.</p>
510.	<p>Really, bottom line is we cannot keep developing prime farmland and still have food &amp; water security.</p> <p>The idea that cities can have unlimited boundary expansion (each time they run into the limit, they just change the boundary) has to change. The fact that this is done by the Planning department is somewhat amusing..... Planning usually involves looking ahead, looking ahead at just one factor (like the 'need' for boundary expansion to accommodate growth) while ignoring others is irresponsible.</p>

	<p>I see 4 main factors in the middle to long term - water, food, population and infrastructure debt. Canada having 20% of the worlds surface fresh water will be a target for some sort of coercion or takeover due to water shortages (which in turn is due to climate change) in neighbouring countries - outright theft of the Great Lakes water for starters (there is already at least one town in the US that 'grew' in the direction of the Great Lakes and as a result, started drawing water from it in contradiction to the Canada-US Great Lakes pact). 2nd, as water shortages become more acute in counties around the world, those countries cannot continue to export ever more precious food, starving Canada if we can't feed ourselves. 3rd the world population was once thought to be on a trajectory to 14 billion or more.... currently, however, in most G8 countries population growth (exclusive of immigration) is well under replacement level and on target for &lt; 11B, with the countries that are currently supplying most of the immigrants also on a falling population trajectory, that source of growth will dry up too. 4th, Once population starts to decline, our already large infrastructure debt grows and becomes insurmountable.</p> <p>So, given the above, do we expand by sprawl now in the short term, just to have a Japan or Italian type issue down the road where houses are being abandoned due to population collapse? As a result cities struggle to keep up infrastructure and fail?</p> <p>As I understand, Hamilton already has a large infrastructure debt, if Hamilton focused on infill, all those development charges would be able to be applied directly to the current infrastructure dept, when the population starts to decline, no sprawl to maintain....</p> <p>I guess the bottom line problem is that we need the Planning staff to get those currently in Office to look ahead, not just at the problem de jour.</p> <p>It is a struggle to keep this short and not go off on more tangents (that are relevant, just a 'little further out there'), however, I have tried to keep focused and immediately relevant. However, should you want to discuss further, pls feel free to reach out.</p>
511.	<p>Reason are many but include the recent Council endorsement of a 6 story high-rise in 'downtown' Binbrook. At the time, advocates were making the need to preserve agricultural land and prevent sprawl their case. Residents were hearing that 'building up' was the only way to go.</p> <p>Fast forward to 2021 and the narrative from the developer community appears to have shifted – by about 180°. Enough.</p>
512.	<p>Reasons for this are as follows:</p> <p>We need to protect Southern Ontario farmland The past years have revealed the vulnerability of current globally-integrated food systems. Disruptions associated with climate change, including ongoing droughts</p>

	<p>and fires, are increasingly affecting the agricultural export powerhouses (like California), on whom we now rely for many of our fresh food and vegetables. Experience with Covid has shown the perils of depending on complex international supply chains, especially given the just-in-time approaches to inventory adopted by many grocery chains. To ensure the safety of our food supply, we need to produce food locally.</p> <p>In this context, sacrificing any portion of our farmland is a mistake. This is particularly true given that the area around Hamilton is home to some of the best farmland in Canada. Our farmland is precious, and irreplaceable.</p> <p>We have a duty to protect Southern Ontario greenspaces Hamilton is part of the lucky and small stretch of Southern Ontario that is home to Carolinian forests and meadows. Carolinian ecosystems are amazing, complex, lively spaces that have been largely wiped out by centuries of urbanization, agriculture, and industry. Those of us who live here now have a duty to protect remaining meadow and forest spaces for future generations.</p> <p>Densification can make existing neighborhoods better for all residents Densification of existing neighborhoods can be done in ways that maintain and improve existing and new residents' quality of life. Densification can also be done in ways that are inclusive of people's varying needs. We can and should expect builders to construct more multi-room apartments and condos in mid-and high-rise buildings. We can and should demand site plans that ensure that residents have access to ample greenspace. Doing so will help limit the demand for detached single-family homes, by creating viable alternatives.</p>
513.	<p>Recognizing that constraints imposed by current provincial policy complicate matters, I would suggest that proceeding with Option 2 is a more responsible planning option at this time. Subsequent governments might well reverse or relax current restrictions imposed upon urban municipalities by the current government in the 2020 plan. Once you develop agricultural land, there's no going back.</p> <p>I think most people would believe that developing city brownlands and upgrading existing building sites is more complicated and costly for developers than greenfield development, which would explain the current 2020 plan as an outcome of developer lobbying. However, the boom in housing prices in Hamilton means the value of attractive and creative intensification projects should more than cover developer margins. With hope, there's a way to encourage mixed income diversification within these urban areas and discourage rampant displacement through gentrification. The boom provides the City an excellent opportunity to leverage and capitalize on Hamilton's growing popularity and use the growth in property taxes within intensified areas to update and rehabilitate facilities and services.</p>

514.	<p>Redeveloping existing urban areas to allow for slightly more density makes more sense.</p>
515.	<p>Redevelopment within current city boundaries should be enough to satisfy housing needs within the community if we rethink the status quo.</p>
516.	<p>Resources should be directed to replacing current infrastructure and roads within the existing boundaries. Precious farmland should be preserved. While infilling within the City, low and mid rise should be the aim - not huge towers that contravene the height restrictions.</p>
517.	<p>Save our food, save our land, save our insects, animals, plants, wildlife, save our future, protect it for our future generations.          If the urban sprawl passes and farmland is destroyed for housing, eventually they will be empty houses because if their isn't food, there won't be any people to live in the houses.          Build eco friendly homes within the city and support our farmers and natural ecosystems.</p>
518.	<p>Save the farmland</p>
519.	<p>Short answer is Option 2 No Urban Boundary Expansion</p> <p>The long answer would involve a long discussion about what the word “Ambitious” really means when it comes to saving farmland, stopping climate change, and getting creative with ways to use the land within our city boundaries to house people. I am not going to go there today. I am not sure that the city even wants to hear from me or any other resident of Hamilton when it comes to this issue. Why do I say that? When the survey is worded such that the ambitious plan is to expand and the option to save farmland is worded as saying no, then I think the city has already made a decision and the survey is just doing lip-service to residents.</p> <p>If you really want to know what we think than you would not disguise a survey as junk mail.</p>
520.	<p>Simply put, municipalities gain more value from density.</p> <p>Density increases the amount of taxes received per square foot. This is through both raw tax income as well as getting better value from liabilities (IE Infrastructure) This will give the city more funding for more projects.</p> <p>Density increases the amount of business that can be supported in the city. We’ve learned from the failure of Hamilton City Centre that we cannot draw in people outside the city downtown to shop. They will continue to hit the large strip malls on the outskirts of the city. If we want to support business in the city it must be fueled by people in the city. Better density will increase the number of these businesses the city can support as well as the variety.</p>

	<p>Density provides better support for transit options. The newer, more environmentally conscious generation favours mass transit over personal transportation. Between the shift to remote work and the housing crisis in Toronto, Hamilton has been given a great opportunity to fill a void and prosper. With better density, we can support the kind of transit these people expect and do our part in reducing green house gas emissions while also drawing in a younger generation of wealthy tax payers.</p> <p>I hope that this helps provide some clear reasons why the City of Hamilton should oppose sprawl and embrace urban density. It is a key step on the path towards having a vibrant, walkable city.</p>
521.	<p>So much work/repair needs to be done in the downtown core of Hamilton! There is immense potential in the city and there also is a huge need for housing in the downtown for the lower income population and ESPECIALLY the homeless! It only makes sense to develop/refurbish the inner city and to leave the farmland/greenbelt alone! The country/farmland is quickly disappearing and I find that heart breaking! Part of the charm of the Hamilton area is the fact that it is so close to the greenbelt. I beg of you all to leave our greenbelt alone!</p>
522.	<p>Start building up instead of taking our green space!!!</p>
523.	<p>Stoney creek is definitely getting way too populated which especially noticeable on the roads.</p>
524.	<p>STOP urban sprawl !!! my choice is opt #2!!</p>
525.	<p>STOP THE URBAN SPRAWL - we do not need anymore strip plazas - townhouses - and or stores on every corner!!!!!!</p>
526.	<p>Stop urban sprawl and continue to pursue intensification within existing boundaries.</p>
527.	<p>Suggestions, do not build on twenty road west, too congested now.</p>
528.	<p>Suggestions: No farmers, No food! Use green houses and hydroponic gardening besides keeping farmland for crops and animals for food.          There are too many people already. Where is everyone to supposed to work to support themselves to earn a decent living.          Need more businesses and places to work.          There already is too many people that are homeless and on welfare! The world cannot sustain so many people.          Decrease imports. In my opinion, China is winning world war 3 in economics. Scrutinize newcomers better. If they come here and end up being involved in criminal activities, deport them.          Believe that someone working here for only 10 years, gets a pension sent to the country where they live. Change that. Too much money is being sent elsewhere from Canada. That info might be incorrect but that is what I understand.          Do not want our city of Hamilton to turn into another Toronto!</p>
529.	<p>Take care of downtown infrastructure first</p>

530.	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to provide input on options for future city growth. I am a long time Hamilton resident with background training in Urban &amp; Regional Planning and Health Care Policy. I think it is essential that Hamilton move forward with Option 2 “ No Urban Boundary Expansion”.</p> <p>1.0 Self-Sufficiency &amp; Sustainability - One of lessons learned from the recent pandemic is that we need to be self-sufficient for many things including food necessities and agricultural production. It would be unwise to take larger swaths of agricultural land out of production in one of the most fertile parts of Canada.</p> <p>2.0 Urban Form &amp; Zoning – One of the critiques I hear from visitors from other countries about our urban landscape is that it is filled with “brown boxes”. They comment on the lack of mixed use housing and variation in the urban landscape. This forces the housing buyer to purchase in larger subdivisions with a lack of variation in housing design and choice. There is ample innovation in many cities throughout the world. Stockholm has introduced innovative housing in a variety of ways. One recent urban housing project included a 4 level building that followed an innovative S-design and included units with 2 and 3 bedrooms and significant outdoor space for each unit built into the design. Communities in France often have a number of 3 and 4 level units with variation in housing design. I sincerely hope that Hamilton doesn’t resort to just building a ton of 30 story condominiums. Condo’s have there place but our urban landscape needs much more variation in housing options and expanded choice. We should not rely upon large developers to continue to build standard “brown box” housing and utilize Zoning and other incentives to encourage much more innovation in urban form and housing options.</p> <p>3.0 Green Space – It is essential that while we intensify the existing urban area we ensure green space is provided for our city population. As you are aware, existing Zoning requirements necessitate that developers keep up to 10% of the developed land dedicated to green space. As we intensify development, the city needs to be very thoughtful about how green space requirements will be met. We cannot assume that by adding many condominiums that existing green spaces will be adequate to serve our expanding population and our existing city residents. Green space provisions need to be assessed and incorporated with every development. Large condominiums could provide space dedicated to vegetable gardens and other green space needs ( ie 1 or 2 floors could be protected for green space uses or alternatively the developer could be asked to contribute to a green space fund to allow new parks to be created. We are seeing innovation in how green is being incorporated more and more into the city landscape and Hamilton needs to ensure we build that into our city.</p> <p>4.0 Bike Trails – the city has been working diligently to add more bike trails and lanes. Cities like Tuscan, Arizona have introduced integrated bike trails connecting about 112 miles of bike trails. They are used by pedestrians and cyclists and are heavily used. Hamilton should continue the work of integrating our bike trails to make a loop that connects the upper and lower parts of the city.</p> <p>5.0 Waterfalls – the city is doing a good job at controlling access to the Waterfalls in Hamilton. The key issue is sustainability. If we have many visitors accessing the</p>
------	--

	<p>Waterfalls they will surely deteriorate for future generations. Thank you for the opportunity to provide input into the planning process.</p>
531.	<p>Thanks for doing the survey! This is an important topic I feel. I'm against any further sprawl as I feel the cost of it is just not sustainable on top of the cost of sprawl we already have to deal with in this city. Regardless of whether people want single detached housing or not, if it's not sustainable, then it's simply not sustainable. And the fact that certain council members refuse to remove area rating for transit means we'll have even more sprawl..with no public transit. And that's simply lunacy in my mind. Especially when the city's declared a climate emergency and they don't even have transit in that plan as a way to combat further climate damage.?? That's crazy. So by adding even more sprawl and a clear "NO" to offering a decent transit option to those outlying areas says to me some of these councilors just don't get it.</p> <p>Lets take full advantage of the plan and ability to intensify the core. Utilize existing infrastructure. And in particular, have the LRT, the spine of the BLAST transit network set up completely and properly, so that we can get people around the city efficiently. Don't wait for tons of cars to clog the core like Toronto did before they figured they needed to finally think about doing something about it with transit.</p> <p>We can either make the city we want, or we can just let the city "happen". My vote is to make the city we want.</p>
532.	<p>The city should be working within the north end and central region brown fields (below the escarpment) for intensification.</p>
533.	<p>The city sprawls enough. We don't need to pave over green land resulting in loss of farm land, increased commuter traffic, more infrastructure to maintain. There is more than enough brown land and empty lots in the city to allow for significant amounts of mid-level livable intensification within urban boundaries suitable for families.</p> <p>We have some beautiful country side near Hamilton. Lets keep it that way!!</p>
534.	<p>The current “new” city boundary has proven NOT to be economically sustainable under the current “old” Hamilton control, unless taxes are raised beyond current levels. (As a citizen of the town of Ancaster, I would prefer de-amalgamation. Each former community could then control their own destiny, as it should be in any democracy.)</p> <p>To continue development outside the “old” city of Hamilton will destroy and eliminate our locally grown food supply. Paving over agricultural land will contribute to further climate change and negatively add to our infrastructure costs (sewers, water, roads, fire, policing, etc.). Again, unsustainable.</p>

	A better option (socially and economically) ... Build the LRT and develop the lands along its route with high density housing. (Again - Option #2)
535.	<p>The existing urban boundary can accommodate the increase in housing required by the projected population growth. We do not need to expand our urban boundary and further degrade our environment, threaten both our water security and our food security. Further we can meet our housing needs without further degrading what little wild areas, eg. escarpment, we still have in our urban boundary.</p> <p>This survey is very concerning. It clearly promotes one option over the others. Credible surveys are neutral. Propaganda promotes a particular viewpoint like this so-called survey.</p>
536.	The farmland is too precious for us to just pave over it, don't be ridiculous, just leave it be.
537.	The growing population by 2051 will require the greenfield lands for growing food and also land for trees to help reduce the CO2 from the atmosphere. Keep it green for future generations of people to enjoy nature as well as birds and wildlife to thrive.
538.	<p>The land proposed for Urban Boundary expansion (e.g., Option 1) should be protected from development because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The land has high quality soils for farming, and farmland is in short supply in Ontario</li> <li>2) The land is in the middle of Ecoregion 7E, which has THE MOST DIVERSE FLORA AND FAUNA IN ALL OF CANADA (and less than 1% of this land has been protected for wildlife)</li> <li>3) The sprawl that could occur on this land would undermine the efforts the make Hamilton a livable city by placing detached units away from the infrastructure Hamilton has developed and is developing (e.g., transit)</li> </ol> <p>We are currently living in uncertain times with respect to both the Covid crisis and the climate change crisis. In the face of this uncertainty, predicting 20 years into the future is very problematic. In the middle of this uncertainty, the Ford government made matters much worse by: 1) extending the forecast period to 30 years, 2) doubling the projected increase in population, and 3) adding a new “market based” assessment rule. These 11th hour intrusions have turned the MCR/GRIDS process into a total farce.</p> <p>Whats worse the Province is “requiring” that the recommendations of this farce be set in stone, so that local taxpayers will be forced to fund this ongoing destruction of the environment for the next thirty years.</p> <p>The latest perturbation added to the process, the government mandated “market based” assessment, is a very odd Orwellian oxymoron.</p> <p>When Adam Smith wrote the “The Wealth of Nations” in 1776, he did so because governments were stifling the economy (and innovation) with their heavy handed intrusions into the market place. Smith (and most economists for the next 225 years....) think that the best results are obtained when “the invisible hand of the</p>

market” acts to regulate the economy – without government interference. Government intrusion (like the current MCR/GRIDS process) directly undermines the operation of the market by replacing the invisible hand of the market with the heavy fist of government. By changing the rules to force an Urban Boundary expansion, the Ford government is interfering with the market’s ability to assign the highest value use to the land by mandating that the land must be used for detached units.

Instead of letting the market operate, the Ford government commands that vast sums of public money be spent to pre-provision a guess about how many detached units might be wanted 30 years from now. Highly oxymoronic.

In order to intelligently plan for what our children and grandchildren will need in 2051, we need to go beyond the current MCR/GRIDS/”Market” process that is constrained by a guess about how many detached units we might want 30 years from now.

More important things to consider include:

Q1: What is best for people?

A1: Option 2: No Urban Boundary Expansion

The romantic notion of Ontario is that it is a vast unpopulated land: “A Place to Grow - Ontario”. At a simple-minded level, this is true.

The numbers with respect to land area:

There are 7.9 billion people on the planet. The total land area is 153 million square kilometers. This means that on a world average basis there are 52 people for every square kilometer of land on the Earth.

There are 14 million people in Ontario. Ontario’s land area is 1.08 million square kilometers. This means that there are 13 people for every square kilometer of land in Ontario.

There are 584,000 people in Hamilton. There are 1,138 square kilometers of land in Hamilton. This means that there are 512 people for every square kilometer of land in Hamilton.

There is a lot of land in Ontario (bigger than Texas, eh?). Ontario is currently occupied at about 25% of the world average. Ontario could easily be “A Place to Grow”. By comparison, Hamilton is 9.8 times (980%) more crowded than the world average and 39.4 times (3940%) more crowded than the Ontario average. This crowding results in the disputes over land use that occur during these planning processes.

But - these numbers do not take into account the quality of the land.

The survival of people depends on agriculture, and hence farmland. Growing up in Texas, I was told “Don’t cuss a farmer with your mouth full”. Considering farmland is crucial to intelligent planning.

The numbers with respect to farmland:

There are 7.9 billion people on the planet. There is about 49 million square kilometers of farmland to support them. This means that on a world average basis there are 160 people for every square kilometer of farmland.

There are 14 million people in Ontario. There is about 51 thousand square kilometers of farmland to support them. This means that there are 275 people for every square kilometer of farmland in Ontario.

In stark contrast to the general land numbers, with respect to farmland Ontario is now looking crowded. Ontario is 1.7 times (170%) more crowded than the world average with respect to farmland.

The reasons that a somewhat “empty” Ontario is so short on farmland are due to the last Ice Age and the Canadian Shield. The last Ice Age scoured most of the soil off of the rocks across most of Ontario north of Hamilton. The rocks that were left exposed are Canadian Shield rocks, some of the oldest rocks on the planet. Much of the useful nutrients for plant growth were weathered out of these rocks long ago. So not only is soil largely absent, the underlying exposed rocks are not a good source for producing quality soil.

Ontario has done a poor job of protecting the scarce farmland that it has. In the current planning process, the central government of Ontario erred badly by assigning most of the planned growth to areas with the best soils.

Ontario is already a net food importer (we import twice as much as we export). Because of climate change, it would be unwise to assume that we can continue to rely on other jurisdictions to protect enough of their farmland to feed us while we continue to pave ours.

Right now 11 states in the United States are experiencing “extreme drought conditions”: New Mexico; Arizona; California; Nevada; Utah; Oregon; Washington; Montana; North Dakota; Colorado; and Wyoming. In more normal times, many of these states send copious food to Ontario. Climate change means droughts like this will be more numerous in the future. Right now, heat waves are killing farm workers in the fields. Both the number and duration of these heat waves has increased every decade for the last five decades.

We need to be thinking in terms of protecting our ability to produce enough food to feed ourselves. Ideally, if we cared about people in the rest of the world we would protect all of our farmland so that we can help out these other areas when they are in distress.

The crowding with respect to farmland is much worse in Hamilton than it is in Ontario as a whole.

There are 584,000 people in Hamilton. There is about 560 square kilometers of farmland to support them. This means that there are 1,039 people for every square kilometer of farmland in Hamilton.

With respect to farmland, Hamilton is 3.8 times (380%) more crowded than Ontario, and Hamilton is 6.5 times (650%) more crowded than the world average.

So, Ontario is short on farmland, and Hamilton is even shorter on farmland. It is important to protect farmland in Ontario, but it is even more important to protect it in Hamilton.

The numbers discussed above are for farmland in general. It is important to add that the farmland in Hamilton is way above average in quality - literally the best of Prime. Most of the farmland in Hamilton is “Prime Agricultural Land”. Prime Agricultural Land is rare and precious – only 5% of the land area in Canada qualifies as “Prime Agricultural Land”. Furthermore, the Prime Agricultural Land in Hamilton

is mostly Class 1 soils. Class 1 soil Prime Agricultural Land is the top 10% of Prime farmland (only 0.5% of land in Canada has Class 1 soil). Paving over the best of the best farmland in Ontario based on a guess that in thirty years someone might want to put a detached unit on it would be horribly misguided. In the future, the need to eat is certain. Much, much less certain is what the “market” might want in 2051 – and that is a preference, not a requirement. To be clear: we are not talking about whether or not there will be enough housing units to live in. The MCR/GRIDS/”Market” basis for wanting to pave farmland is the guess that in 30 years “the market” might prefer a certain number of detached units. In thirty years it will not matter if you can get the dwelling shape of your choice if you starve to death inside of it. The fact that the MCR/GRIDS/”Market” process places a guess about future desires about dwelling shape before and above considerations of food security underscores just how badly the Ford government has broken the planning process.

Q2: What is best for everybody else?

A2: Option 2: No Urban Boundary Expansion

The lack of balance in the MCR/GRIDS/”market” process is shameful. A small army of public and private sector planners have toiled away exuding a mountain of paperwork that is singularly focused on trying to anticipate the “wants” 30 years into the future of a single species whose numbers are increasing.

Meanwhile, the current “needs” (for survival) of all of the other species that live in the area have been ignored. Many of these species are suffering population declines due in no small part to past bad decision making. As a result, unless balance is restored in the planning process the numbers of many species will continue to dwindle until they are extirpated (made “locally extinct”).

Hamilton is in Ecoregion 7E. According to the OMNRF, “The flora and fauna in Ecoregion 7E are the most diverse in Canada”. Environment Canada used to have on the web an interactive map that showed that Ecoregion 7E had the most Species At Risk of any Ecoregion in Canada (that map has since disappeared due to lack of funding).

The area proposed for Urban “Boundary” Expansion falls within the smaller subregion of 7E known as Ecodistrict 7E5. According to the OMNRF, “Less than 1% of the ecodistrict comprises protected areas.”

Page 68 of the September/October 2020 issue of Canadian Geographic shows a map of “Canadian Biodiversity Protection Hotspots”. On the map, protecting the green areas has “the greatest potential to stem biodiversity loss while protecting it for the future”. The area that the MCR/GRIDS/”market” process proposes for Urban “Boundary” expansion is one of the green areas.

In order to restore some balance to local planning, abandon expanding the Urban Boundary. The land that is used for farming has greater biodiversity value than sprawled detached units. If there is land that is suboptimal for farming, that land is badly needed as living space for all of the other species that live in Ecodistrict 7E5. Please grant some conservation easements in order to increase the amount of land we protect for wildlife above the currently dismal level of 1%. The other species that live in Hamilton need a little help if they are going to survive.

Q3. What is best for everybody?

A3: Option 2: No Urban Boundary Expansion

This is the logical union of Questions 1 and 2, but there is a deeper reason that needs consideration.

We need to protect farmland for people, and we need to protect biodiversity for the sake of the other living species. (Some of this is selfish: we may find some of these species useful to us in the future.)

But beyond that, there is another reason we need to protect intact ecosystems.

This has to do with something known as ecosystem services – things that ecosystems do that help stabilize the conditions on planet Earth (and keep it habitable for everybody).

There are easy obvious examples, and probably other things that ecosystems do for us that we don't even know about (but we might get a nasty surprise if they were gone).

The most obvious one is air purification. Plants that are photosynthesizing do many vital things for us. The most immediate need they provide is oxygen. They also remove carbon dioxide from the air, and they also purify many other pollutants out of the air. Part of the problem we are having with global warming is that we have not preserved enough plants to absorb all of the carbon dioxide we are producing by burning too much fossil fuels. In order to return the planet to a more healthy balance, we need both more area covered by plants and to burn less fossil fuels. (Expanding the Urban Boundary to pave farmland for detached units hurts us all on both sides of this equation.)

Another easy one is water purification (both surface and ground water), and flood protection. Having intact vegetated areas (including wetlands) both decreases the severity of flooding and helps purify water. (Expanding the Urban Boundary will result in increased pavement and other hard surfaces that will increase water pollution and flooding.)

One of the less predictable ecosystem services has to do with stability. Larger ecosystems tend to be more stable due to the fact that there are enough members of all of the species present so that none are lost due to chance fluctuations in numbers. Eco-speak is “stochastic processes loss”. If you carve up ecosystems into too small pieces, the small pieces will lose some species over time just due to chance. If the lost species was a “keystone” species (e.g. a species that kept other species in check by eating them) then the remaining ecosystem might suffer plagues of overpopulations that a healthy ecosystem would have kept under control.

As far as we currently know, there is only one example of life existing anywhere in the universe. All life on Earth appears to have arisen from a shared common ancestor. It has continued to thrive for more than 3 billion years. Even though we know a lot about what keeps the system running, we cannot be certain that our understanding is complete. (And even less certain is what conditions are best for the long term survival of Homo sapiens.) Until our understanding of the ecosystem that supports life on earth improves, it would be prudent to curtail killing parts of the surface of the planet with pavement based on the patently misguided guess that in thirty years that our “want” for detached units will be more important than our “need” for food, water, and oxygen.

	<p>Look, I understand that Hamilton and Ontario are in a difficult box with respect to planning in this area. Land is already in short supply. Compounding the short supply, this land is of the highest quality in all of Ontario with respect to climate and soils. It can support either farming or wildlife better than most other land in Ontario. While the soil and the wildlife cannot easily be transplanted, housing can easily be built elsewhere.</p> <p>If we insist on killing the goose that killed the golden egg by paving this farmland, then we may find that the population guesses were wrong. Or worse still, people might arrive and sit in detached units and find they don't have anything to eat. This is the problem with the MCR/GRIDS/"market" process. By myopically focusing on the single issue of dwelling type, it entirely misses the big picture. Detached units are a "want"; food, water, and clean air are "needs". Planning for "needs" must take precedence over planning for "wants".</p> <p>Until the planning process can be fixed to reflect this reality, we all must act to protect our future.</p> <p>Right now, that means: Option 2: No Urban Boundary Expansion</p>
539.	<p>The lesson from housing developments over the last 70 years is clear: Continued low-density suburban growth is not economically or environmentally sustainable, and leads to boring, lifeless communities without a sense of place.</p>
540.	<p>The more we expand into arable land the more we increase our reliance on transporting and importing food. That has an impact on our ability to meet carbon emission targets,</p> <p>The more sprawl, the more infrastructure we will have to maintain in the future. At present we are in a significant deficit to support existing infrastructure. Remember the wooden watermains.</p> <p>Unless of course, the developers are prepared to create a trust to fund the maintenance of new infrastructure for the next 75 - 100 years - we simply can't afford this.</p>
541.	<p>The neighborhoods and communities we already have need more focus. Hamilton needs to keep its farmland.</p>
542.	<p>The political left should want density because it is better for the environment. The political right should want density because it is more tax efficient. The only ones in favour of destroying the greenfields are developers and those gullible enough to fall for their strawman arguments(pretending that urban density is pro-homelessness, anti-immigration, etc.)</p>
543.	<p>The surrounding greenscape is a defining feature of the City of Hamilton. As a lifelong Hamiltonian, going for scenic drives to the surrounding townships has always been a favourite pastime. We are slowly losing our rural landscape and prime farming land that is essential to our overall health as a species. The surrounding wetlands have been affected so much already and we cannot afford to further diminish them. Hamilton prides itself on its preservation of its many waterfalls and that same care should be extended to the wetlands/marshes. Our whole</p>

	<p>ecosystem is dependant on each other and we have already seen how expansion has negatively affected our surrounding landscape.</p> <p>In my opinion, being able to retreat to the expansive green/rural surrounding is what makes Hamilton a great city.</p> <p>There are many abandoned buildings, factories and parcels of land that have been left forgotten from the industrial era that could be revived. Barton and James street is a great example of such endeavors.</p> <p>Please think of future generations and what preserving our surrounding green space and rural land would mean for their overall well being.</p>
<p>544.</p>	<p>The title of Option 1 constitutes false advertising. Nothing about this option is in any way ambitious; this is simply business as usual. There is no need to endanger the greenfield lands that help to keep the city itself healthy.</p> <p>Hamilton is not especially densely populated for its population, and we enjoy surrounding greenfield areas that are both fertile and temperate. Quebec has established a significant tourist attraction in the Eastern Townships; they know that once greenfields are ‘developed,’ they are essentially lost forever. Here in Ontario, as we face increasing uncertainty from climate change, we need to focus on preserving vulnerable areas that can be used for growing food (locally!), for managing water (gradually being recognized as a valuable, vulnerable resource), and for recreating. Furthermore, as demonstrated by numerous floods in recent years, the last thing Hamilton needs is more pavement.</p> <p>There should be absolutely no expansion into greenfield areas at least until existing subdivisions have been made healthy and safe by implementing cycling/walking trails that provide all residents safe access to essential services. If the city truly wants to be ambitious, it should take a good, hard look at how farmland and ranchland has been converted into subdivisions along the Front Range of Colorado, where health has been prioritized through the deliberate inclusion of cycling/walking trails. Accessible trails not only allow non-drivers to access essential service, they also promote exercise and lead to measurable public health benefits (note that Colorado's obesity rate is lower than Ontario's).</p>
<p>545.</p>	<p>There already is far too much good agricultural farm land disappearing. Current roads in the Glanbrook and Elfrida areas already can't handle all the recent expansion which is still ongoing. I feel the with the City allowing so much rural expansion already farmers and farming in general is being discounted. People that are moving to the rural areas from urban centers don't understand farming and particularly the planting and harvesting seasons and the need to share the roads with large farm equipment. It is cumbersome enough for large equipment to maneuver the rural roads, now add to it the extreme traffic congestion. How does a custom sprayer or combine navigate traffic circles? Traffic lights had to be installed</p>

	<p>at multiple intersections on Highway #56 just so equipment could get across. I would prefer that my tax dollars be spent on redevelopment in the current urban areas which are in desperate need of revitalization and upgrading. Not only are there vacant properties but also infrastructure is in desperate need of upgrading (check property insurance rates in certain flood areas in the City). If we continue to develop our Green Land how will the wild life be affected? Where will they live and where will their food supply come from? Farmers are being blamed for declining bee numbers, has anyone ever thought that maybe their food supply is disappearing due to urban sprawl? . By the way, I am not a farmer, just have great respect for their work and where my food comes from! Continued development of farm land threatens our food supply.</p> <p>I live in the rural area of Glanbrook and it saddens me to see all the development. I worry as to when my back yard which is full of wildlife will be gone. Please direct our tax dollars and developers dollars to upgrading current areas that are in need and leave the rural green spaces as is.</p>
546.	<p>There already is far too much good agricultural farm land disappearing. Current roads in the Glanbrook and Elfrida areas already can't handle all the recent expansion which is still ongoing. I feel with the City allowing so much rural expansion already farmers and farming in general is being discounted. People that are moving to the rural areas from urban centers don't understand farming and particularly the planting and harvesting seasons and the need to share the roads with large farm equipment. It is cumbersome enough for large equipment to maneuver the rural roads, now adding to it the extreme traffic congestion. How does a custom sprayer or combine navigate traffic circles? Traffic lights had to be installed at multiple intersections on Highway #56 just so equipment could get across. I would prefer that my tax dollars be spent on redevelopment in the current urban areas which are in desperate need of revitalization and upgrading. Not only are there vacant properties but also infrastructure is in desperate need of upgrading (check property insurance rates in certain flood areas in the City). If we continue to develop our Green Land how will the wildlife be affected? Where will they live and where will their food supply come from? Farmers are being blamed for declining bee numbers, has anyone ever thought that maybe their food supply is disappearing due to urban sprawl? I am a farmer, and feel there is a lack of respect for our work and where food comes from! Continued development of farm land threatens our food supply.</p> <p>I live in the rural area of Glanbrook and it upsets me to see all the development. I am worried about the disappearance and the consequences of farmland. We need to be concerned as to where our food will come from if we eliminate the valuable resources we have in our own backyard! . Please direct our tax dollars and developers dollars to upgrading current areas that are in need and leave the rural green spaces as is.</p>

547.	There are a lot of parking lots in Hamilton and empty buildings. There should be an infill plan
548.	There are a lot of sparsely inhabited areas within the City, i.e. Barton Street and we need to protect our farmland.
549.	<p>There are ample empty lots, unused properties, and boarded-up old buildings within the existing boundaries of Hamilton that can be used for the construction of new residences.</p> <p>I favour increased density that is sensitive to established neighbourhoods.  I am opposed to further consumption of green space inside and outside Hamilton’s borders.</p> <p>If a few zoning bylaws need to be changed and some brown-field properties in former industrial areas cleaned up, well . . . the city has the authority to undertake these things.</p>
550.	There are hundreds of vacant buildings in this city, lots of potential to increase vertical density, and we must prioritize the preservation and care of the Greenbelt.
551.	There are lots of spaces in Hamilton that could be re developed to accommodate the increase planed for. How are we going to feed these extra people if we don't have farmland ? We can't rely on importing our food, didn't Covid 19 shut down teach us anything?
552.	There are many abandoned buildings, and vacant lots not used within the city.
553.	There are many creative options within the city boundaries to address the much-needed affordable housing. Please do not take rural land for this.
554.	<p>There are many run down delapidated buildings in Hamilton. Why can't the money go into revitalizing these buildings. Renovate and beautify our city. Down town Hamilton should be a place where everyone wants to be but instead there are many areas so run down and forgotten. If I were moving to this city I would want to start in a place where everything is at my finger tips. I wouldn't most likely have a car so transit would be important and with the new transit system being put in place it only makes sense to utilize it. Young people love the night life and being close to all the festivals and activities down town would be a good place for them. This would be good for local businesses and merchants which also provides job opportunities. Leave the green space for the animals and for people to visit and enjoy!</p>
555.	There are plenty of empty parking lots downtown that can be redeveloped. The city also has an opportunity to make it easier for duplexes and triplexes, like Minnesota has done, to achieve higher densities in the built up area.
556.	There are so many dilapidated, unused buildings and plots of land in ward 3, the East end and the downtown core (our ward), which we would like to see developed

	for current unhoused people, low-income earners and struggling Hamiltonians before the city considers expansion.
557.	There are so many negative impacts caused by urban sprawl: higher emissions from vehicles, loss of farmland, loss of wildlife just to name a few. There are PLENTLY of areas within the core that could be developed. Start looking at schools that have been closed, former industrial land, unused parking lots. With our world literally burning (just look at BC) creating urban sprawl is just adding to climate change.
558.	There is a strong case to limit urban sprawl in Charles L. Marohn's book "Strong Towns: A Bottom-up Revolution to Rebuild American Prosperity", that includes the basic economic argument that it is far less expensive to invest in in-fill and upward growth in current urban environments than it is to invest in new infrastructure required for urban expansion. As well, we need to protect land for agriculture, if we are to sustain some level of food security in the future.
559.	there is more than enough space for intensification in the city, especially in and around downtown, where there is an over-abundance of surface parking. We should worry about developing these areas before we expand outwards and take up more farm land and greenspace.
560.	There is no need to use farmland for residential expansion. There are many, many locations within the city centre and within its outer boundaries to accommodate various housing options (high rise, detached and attached housing). Farm land is too important – once gone, there is no return!
561.	There is plenty of infrastructure owned by private entities just holding it in Hamilton currently as well as housing that don't meet environmental standards. Focus on that and public options rather than expansion outwards
562.	There is plenty of land still to be developed within the current boundaries. Force the developers to build on the land they own within the current boundaries before we open up any more space and lose more farmland and green space. Concrete from Niagara Falls to Toronto is not progress.
563.	There is significant developable land within the existing urban boundary to accommodate projected growth without perpetuating car dependent urban form, diminishing the city's environmental assets or increasing our future infrastructure deficit.
564.	There is so many unoccupied building in Hamilton that can and should be updated and used for homes.
565.	There is sufficient land available within the current boundaries of Hamilton to meet population growth for many years. Let's develop what we have, establish efficient rapid transit, enrich our city as a livable, walkable, desirable place to live.
566.	There is tons of reclaimable land in Hamilton already.

567.	<p>There is very little information on which to base a recommendation. Clearly there is a great deal of land in the core of the city that could be developed to provide accommodation for the growing city population. The construction of the LRT will spur that development and I favour a large part of the city growth to be accomplished by intensification. 81% seems like a challenging target but potentially is possible over the next 30 years. I prefer that greenfield be preserved to the maximum extent possible for agriculture and to help protect from climate change. Therefore, I favour Option 2 but with the realization that the 81% goal may not be realistic.</p>
568.	<p>There should be NO urban boundary expansion in Hamilton. Expanding would mean: 1) increased taxes to service greenfield development 2) destruction of agricultural lands which we need to eat more local 3) increased pollution and road congestion to and from the new suburbs. Developers want to build Million Dollar homes which will provide ZERO affordable housing. The City and Council should not be swayed by the greed of developers!</p>
569.	<p>There's no going back after you've developed all the greenlands and wetlands and farmland. There is enough development already.</p>
570.	<p>This City has do many brown spaces and vacant buildings that expansion is not necessary.</p> <p>Expansion is this council's way to avoid fixing problems that it has already created. Clean up Cootes and stop creating environmental wastelands.</p>
571.	<p>This city needs affordable housing and a basic standards of living!! Do not use farmland to build suburbs. We are in an ecological collapse. We need more interdependent energy efficient infrastructure not expensive carbon heavy individualized suburbs.</p> <p>Hamilton is in ecological and social crisis. We need better transit and housing. Invest in density all the way!!</p>
572.	<p>This is a disaster! We never received a copy of the survey! We are STRONGLY opposed to expansion of the urban boundaries and we choose option 2. Develop within current boundaries and protect our green spaces and farmland! Shame on the city for poor communication of this huge decision!</p>
573.	<p>This is about profit for the few to the detriment of the many. Developers will never stop. The city's role is not to pander to these profit seeking corporations. It is to act for the benefit of all citizens. The pandemic has made it exceedingly clear. We need all the green space and farmland we can salvage. Developers like virgin land because it is cheaper for THEM. They create sprawl.</p>

	<p>The home builders association that supposedly represents the developers who would profit greatly from the expansion is, not surprisingly, the biggest supporter of taking more farm land out of production. It would be a fantastic money-making opportunity.</p> <p>It is hard to believe that I even have to mention climate change. We could all smell the smoke from fires burning in Northern Ontario this week. A result of the changing climate - a situation that is only going to get worse. But some will pretend it isn't happening. The City has an obligation to meet its climate targets. This development is contrary to that commitment.</p> <p>During the pandemic we starting seeing food shortages. Most people recognized that safe-guarding farmlands is incredibly important to humans. You can't farm it once it's paved.</p>
574.	<p>This is an extremely important issue, we need to protect our green space for farming and naturalization and we have space within the urban boundary where we can build already.</p>
575.	<p>This is because I believe the City of Hamilton cannot afford the economic or environmental costs of continued urban expansion when other obvious options to accommodate population growth.</p>
576.	<p>This is the perfect time to upgrade the existing infrastructure within Hamilton by forcing developers to renovate brownfields and aging properties within the city. Letting them bulldoze farmland is the most cost effective way for them to build, only setting us up for additional maintenance costs in the future.</p> <p>Stop the spread, clean up what we have !!!</p>
577.	<p>This survey should have been offered online instead of paper. It would have been less expensive and quicker to tabulate results. A paper version could have been included in Property Tax bills to save double postage.</p>
578.	<p>To accommodate the anticipated population growth to 2051, I believe Hamilton should focus entirely on the intensification and redevelopment of industrial and underused lands in the lower city and infill development of larger lots throughout the City.</p> <p>The City of Hamilton should pass new zoning regulations to enable and encourage infill homes to achieve intensification. This should involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zoning for reduced lot parcel sizes to enable owners to subdivide property to provide decreased lot widths and reductions to overall square footage</li> <li>• Permitting of Accessory Dwelling Units up to 800 square feet to be built on any residential lot. These accessory dwelling units can either be part of the main building – attached units, basement or attic apartments – or detached units – commonly called “granny flats”, as well as garage apartments</li> <li>• Zoning for the installation of “tiny homes” of less than 300 square feet</li> <li>• Zoning to permit single-family dwelling retirement villages where residents do not own the land but purchase the house following the model of various retirement villages around Ontario such as Morningside in New Hamburg, Ontario.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes to regulations or legalities to make it easier for people to co-own homes</li> </ul> <p>Although street parking is often a stumbling block for intensification, I believe the progress that will be made over the next 30 years in self-driving cars, car sharing and electrified transportation will gradually eliminate this concern so this should not delay zoning changes.</p> <p>The City should also research housing models for cities outside of Canada where urban intensification is commonplace – i.e. Europe, Hong Kong, etc. – and take tips from cities like Pittsburgh that have redeveloped industrial areas.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>
579.	<p>To my knowledge, very few residents in my neighbourhood have been consulted by receiving the mail-in ballot. My understanding is that our city councillor and MPP have been contacted regarding this matter</p>
580.	<p>To prioritize urbanization when half of Ontario is on fire due to climate change would be the biggest monstrosity of 2020; even more-so than the Covid-19 pandemic. Urban life is not more important than our city’s natural greenery &amp; farmlands &amp; should not be treating at such. Option 2 should be the only option. Save our farmlands!!</p>
581.	<p>Too bad little effort was made to ensure all residents received this survey. The questions are not typical of a professional survey and the survey was delivered with junk mail, or not delivered at all. It is outrageous to send out a survey in summer and during a pandemic. Why wasn’t it sent with property tax bills?</p>
582.	<p>Try utilizing more urban space for housing. Hamilton is situated in the Niagara Peninsula which is some of the best farmland in Canada and it should be protected from urbanization.</p>
583.	<p>two reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If you ever want LRT to work you’ve got to intensify the current city</li> <li>2. I’m suspicious of any growth predictions made by Metrolinx. They are no more than a lobbying group for developers</li> </ol> <p>I also want to comment that your flyer on this survey is very misleading. Hamilton is not mandated by the Province to grow by 236,000 people. We are predicted to grow by this amount and again, I am suspicious of this prediction. What Hamilton is mandated to do is to come up with a plan. Neither the province nor the city can mandate growth. They can encourage it only. They can also discourage it if they choose, and they can direct it. The City has agency here. You should not make it seem as if your hands are tied on this growth. What if it doesn’t come to pass? The City would look bad for not fulfilling it’s “mandate”. I wonder if the use of the term mandated growth was done deliberately in order to force people to believe that we need an LRT system and an expanded urban boundary, again, so that the</p>

	<p>developers and their lobby group Metrolinx can benefit. Thank you.</p>
584.	<p>Until we have learned how to develop the existing land we now occupy more sustainably, we should not be pushing into valuable farmland or the Greenbelt. The south mountain and Stoney Creek has been developed in a severely inefficient, car-centric and costly way. Until we show that we will promote intensification and transit oriented development city-wide, I cannot support any expansion of the existing urban boundary.</p>
585.	<p>Urban Boundary expansion means eliminating valuable farm land in the area where I live. I live on Glancaster Rd between Twenty Road and Dickenson Rd. Farm Crops including wheat, , corn and soya beans are grown both in front and behind our property. Behind us was a golf course and many beautiful trees were planted and were maturing nicely. Existing older trees were also there. The golf course was sold and a developer cut all the trees and demolished all the buildings. Currently soya beans are being grown as the developer is awaiting approval for housing on this clearcut property. It is located at Twenty Rd west. . We do not need more housing in this area. There is too much traffic now for these rural roads. I am not in favour of Urban Boundary Expansion.</p>
586.	<p>Urban grown survey REPLYREPLY ALLFORWARD Mark as read</p> <p>Farmers feed people. Keep green spaces Stop the sprawl... Build upwards not out.</p>
587.	<p>Use existing infrastructure, build the LRT to provide modernization in our transportation and get people on public transit. We do NOT need more urbanization without regard to the impacts on our traffic, transit, environment, schools and so much more.</p>
588.	<p>Use land within current City of Hamilton Urban boundaries as it will provide housing as well assist in revitalization of existing urban areas.</p>
589.	<p>We absolutely need to reduce further expansion onto green spaces and farmland. We are destroying ecosystems, causing drainage issues, and will lose important food producing space. Further expansion massively increases our carbon footprint It is already very frightening.</p>
590.	<p>We all know Hamilton has to grow but we are of two minds....we don't want to see farm land disappear nor do we appreciate watching the present Council sacrifice the City plan to please the developers. People buy in an area because of surroundings and views....along comes new ward</p>

	<p>rep and a new city plan pro developers. So it is with mixed feelings we support Option Two.....</p>
591.	<p>We are both strongly against development on greenfield lands, agricultural lands, or greenbelt designated lands.</p>
592.	<p>We are in a climate crisis. Preserving natural farmland will set us up to grow and eat locally, and in doing so, live more sustainably. Further intensifying our city with multi-unit dwellings will eliminate the need to expand the urban boundary in order to build even more unaffordable single family homes. We are privileged to live in a city with rich farmland. We must recognize that and preserve it; we must prioritize our citizens and the local environment, rather than private construction interests.</p> <p>I would also like to note that I find the wording of this survey intentionally misleading. Labelling boundary expansion as "Ambitious" is likely to influence citizens who are not adequately informed of the risks of paving over farmland to choose option 1. What would be *ambitious* would be intensifying the many vacant lots already available to build up our existing infrastructure, and rezoning commercial areas of Hamilton that appear to be abandoned (e.g. Barton Street) to create a variety of housing options for Hamiltonians. We should be intensifying what we already have and re-imagining our city to be a vibrant and welcoming place, no matter where you are, rather than continuing to build outwards to the continued neglect of our existing urban areas.</p>
593.	<p>We are in a climate crisis. Preserving natural farmland will set us up to grow and eat locally, and in doing so, live more sustainably. Further intensifying our city with multi-unit dwellings will eliminate the need to expand the urban boundary in order to build even more unaffordable single family homes. We are privileged to live in a city with rich farmland. We must recognize that and preserve it; we must prioritize our citizens and the local environment rather than private construction interests.</p> <p>I would also like to note that I find the wording of this survey intentionally misleading. Labelling boundary expansion as "Ambitious" is likely to influence citizens who are not adequately informed of the risks of paving over farmland to choose option 1. What would be *ambitious* would be intensifying the many vacant lots already available to build up our existing infrastructure, and rezoning commercial areas of Hamilton that appear to be abandoned to create a variety of housing options for Hamiltonians. We should be intensifying what we already have and re-imagining our city to be a vibrant and welcoming place, no matter where you are, rather than continuing to build outwards to the continued neglect of our existing urban areas.</p>
594.	<p>We are in the midst of a climate crisis - this choice is a no brainer.</p>
595.	<p>We are losing too much greenspace every year, what is left for my grandchildren. Far too many habitats are being destroyed.</p>

596.	We are opting for option 2 and definitely do not want any more invasion into green space outside of the city boundaries. There are lots of empty buildings, strip malls and lots that could be developed into housing. Current spaces have to be utilized better!
597.	We believe that farmland is a precious resource key to Hamilton and the region's sustainability both short-term and long-term. Preservation of rural areas positively impacts Hamiltonian's health, well-being, and quality of life. Additionally, Option 2 will preserve carbon sinks and create a smaller carbon footprint which are important to slowing down climate change.
598.	We believe that our municipality needs to be strongly committed to urban intensification and increasing density in greenfield (suburban) areas within the urban boundary, to avoid opening the door to more and larger urban boundary that will be damaging to the environment. Our greenbelt should not be for sale to housing and commercial developers. We need this land for growing food and increasing and restoring biodiversity.
599.	We can do better, so let's do it!  Thank you for putting together this comprehensive public engagement effort.
600.	We cannot afford to lose any more green space, and we should put efforts into better using the urban space that already exists.
601.	We cannot afford to sacrifice more farmland in the name of housing developments. Crops, rural areas and forests help to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. We need to support our local farmers, not buy up their land for housing developments. We see climate change manifest in the wildfires (B.C. and Northern Ontario), tornados (Barrie) and flooding (Western Europe). We can no longer sit by idly and destroy ecosystems by paving over them for the sake of economic prosperity. We need to live more compactly on the urban footprints that we have, sustained by good urban planning and mass transportation infrastructure.  We need to consider the implications of our current actions like urban sprawl and how they will affect future generations living in the Hamilton area. Children deserve better than to grow up in concrete jungles without the benefits of nature.
602.	We can't afford to lose more farm land, when there are unused properties in the downtown that could be utilized for housing.
603.	We choose option 2 - No Urban Boundary Expansion. We would also like to respectfully suggest that you investigate if premises within the existing urban area where companies have gone out of business, could now be used for new housing units.
604.	WE CHOOSE OPTION 2. WE WANT 0 URBAN EXPANSION. WE NEED ALL THE LOCAL FARMS AND GREEN SPACE THAT WE HAVE AND CAN GET. THIS IS JUST A BUNCH OF BEING SHOVED DOWN OUR THROATS IN THE MIDDLE

	OF THE PANDEMIC BY DOUG FORD AND HIS DEVELOPER FRIENDS. THERE ARE ENOUGH VACANT SPACES BOTH BUSINESS AND RESIDENTIAL TO BUILD AFFORDABLE HOUSING OUT OF IN HAMILTON WITHOUT DISTURBING THE GREEN SPACE.
605.	<p>We definitely must protect our farming land to be able to take advantage of buying local produce.</p> <p>There is much undeveloped land within the urban boundaries of Hamilton. We need to make sure that what we build fits in with existing neighbourhoods and also that we are building affordable housing as well. Marginalized populations need to be able to find transportation, jobs, housing and amenities in the core.</p> <p>The homelessness and poverty that exists in Hamilton is shameful. Let's make a name for our City by turning this around and acting as a leader and example of outstanding community planning.</p>
606.	We did not receive the survey and our vote is for option 2. The farmland is too valuable a resource.
607.	<p>We did not receive the survey in our mail! Good way to put through Fords desire to give all his contractor buddy's the green space to build!</p> <p>We do not want this.</p>
608.	We do not need to lose more prime farmland & Need to preserve EVERY bit we have..
609.	We do not need to take over anymore green space to allow for urban more development. Focus on fixing the existing urban developments and leave the green area of nature as they are! Stop the urban sprawl, it is unnecessary and unwanted!
610.	We do not want any more expansion into fields and farmlands etc. Ancaster and other communities around Hamilton do not need any more townhouses, multilevel dwellings, high priced homes, etc.
611.	We feel strongly about this issue and do not support expansion. Therefore we are choosing option #2. You cannot destroy prime farmland. Just do infills or higher density. Stop the spread for all our sakes
612.	We feel that there is enough usable and/or reclaimable land within the current city boundaries that can be used for new housing and/or redevelopment of existing buildings. The City plans to spend an enormous amount of money on transit to make the City more urban friendly and cut down on the use of individual cars in the City. Yet you want to develop more urban sprawl on farm land that should be used to produce food. Most or all of the land that you show in your urban expansion is all productive farm land and is in use producing viable and profitable crops now and some of this land is used for growing tender fruit crops now. This is land that you want to destroy and it will never be regained elsewhere. Some of the land that the City would like to use for residential has been in some families for over a century and has been continued to used for agricultural purposes to benefit the citizens of

	<p>Hamilton. The best example of this blind urban sprawl is the development of Binbrook and the development that has started in the village of Mount Hope. All of that development is geared to its residents having numerous cars in order to get to work, shopping, recreation, etc. This creates a huge environmental footprint.</p> <p>We are not opposed to development in the City as we are aware that it will help with the tax base for all of its citizens. We are concerned that both the provincial and local governments are not concerned about the impact this urban sprawl will have on its current and future residents or the negative environmental impact that it is going to have.</p> <p>All of this urban sprawl causes hardship to the existing residents in the rural areas around the current city boundaries. With all the current construction and proposed construction not only of residential development but road and services development, it causes significant changes to water tables and flood runoff. With these changes the City is turning a blind eye to assisting existing residents who have experienced changes to their wells and are hoping of obtaining City services that are nearby. The City is eager to build new sewage lines and water lines for development areas to satisfy the builders and developers but are not willing to properly address the problems created by this to current and long standing residents of Hamilton and the surrounding areas. The people who moved out into the rural areas did so to have some space to enjoy their lives and those of their children and not have urban sprawl as their neighbours which the City seems eager to welcome.</p> <p>We have lived almost all of our lives in the City of Hamilton and have also worked and operated a business in the City. We have seen the ups and downs that the City has experienced but find it hard to understand that the City would be willing to sacrifice good agricultural land for high density residential development with a high price tag.</p> <p>We would suggest that the City of Hamilton do all of their residential intensification within the current City urban boundaries as they stand right now and not intrude into the so called "Whitebelt" area that has been opened up for development by the Provincial Government. The City should balance their outlook a bit more with a split between developers and their lobbyists, the home builders associations and with the current and long standing residents of the City.</p> <p>Thank you for allowing the opportunity to express our concerns.</p>
613.	<p>We have a high population in the Golden Horseshoe. It is the most southerly part of the Province and Country with the longest growing season. We need to protect our farmland. Hamilton has many areas in the downtown area that need to be addressed. We are planning an LRT along the King street corridor and expect development along that route so we should attend to that rather than building on farmland. It doesn't need to be all high rise either . Row houses or townhouses so that some families may have single dwellings at street level. There is a lot of</p>

	<p>unused land and buildings within the Hamilton City Boundary that could be utilized. There should be a list somewhere at the City with city owned buildings that could be renovated and re-purposed. Fix the downtown core by building some housing. Attract some new businesses. Groceries that are walkable to. Build some affordable housing for families, seniors and those on disability. Housing that they could be proud to live in. Use our tax money wisely. It's time to start looking at the whole instead of each component separately. Be sure neighbourhoods have all components to minimize driving. Expansion of urban boundary creates more driving.</p>
614.	<p>We have already lost too much greenfield lands in Southern Ontario to housing developments. There is plenty of properties within our current city landscape that can be cleaned up, repurposed and rejuvenated.</p>
615.	<p>We have already paved too much of paradise. Stop the sprawl!</p>
616.	<p>We have an amazing opportunity for infill development, midrise, and to improve the existing city. Hamilton doesn't need more suburbs.</p>
617.	<p>We have been looking at an LRT to move people within the lower city. Why would we then not fill the vacant lower city with housing to utilize the new LRT?? To expand outside of the city will result in more vehicles on the road - I was recently through neighbourhoods by Stonechurch and almost all of the driveways have more than one car. There is not sufficient public transit (or if it is there, people aren't willing to take the time to use it to travel).</p> <p>The infrastructure is in place in the lower city (some needs updating). It is not in place in the greenbelt.</p> <p>We are currently seeing extreme heat waves, droughts, isolated severe weather from climate change. Keep the greenbelt!</p> <p>It is cheaper for developers to build on new land than to incur costs to clean up industrial land, but those costs would be passed along to the buyers, so the profit margin may be a little less. There will still be a profit. Do not let the greed of capitalism result in the lack of arable land.</p>
618.	<p>We have buildings that can be torn down that can be used! I do not want to see high rises! Apartments should not be higher than 6 floors! Who wants to live in these high rises especially after the collapse of the building in Florida and the pandemic..</p> <p>We don't want to live in a city like Toronto.. that's why we are in Hamilton!</p>
619.	<p>We have significant under-utilized assets downtown Hamilton, that could be developed into residential units. For example changing zoning bylaws to permit ground floor residential in mixed use buildings would help fill up many vacancies downtown and add a significant number of residential units very quickly. We have</p>

	<p>likely hundreds of vacant commercial units downtown that would benefit from this.</p> <p>Also streamlining the permitting and approval process for secondary units in existing single family homes will be helpful. Including alleyway houses and “granny flats”.</p> <p>Providing incentives to either of these two options will likely produce results quickly.</p> <p>There are many creative solutions to this problem that don’t involve destruction of farmland, increased traffic, and favouring a select few developers.</p>
620.	<p>We have so much space already developed that can be used for growth. We need to protect our rural areas to use for our increased demand for food, wildlife, birds, beneficial insects, bees, water management and and potentially carbon capture with trees.</p>
621.	<p>We have to focus on increasing density along already built infrastructure and resist the environmental disaster that is endless sprawl and suburban development. A prosperous downtown and Hamilton mountain relies on it!</p>
622.	<p>We have unused land (parking lots, land kept vacant for future development) to fit many more housing units. And there needs to be affordable housing as well.</p>
623.	<p>We moved here because of the fact that it was part of the Escarpment Conservation on our property as well as a protected Green area. Doug Ford is not respecting that designation.</p> <p>Thank you for the consideration in asking Hamiltonians what they would like to see. FYI we did not receive any paper survey in the mail.</p>
624.	<p>We moved to our current location several years ago because of the small town feel, close proximity to the rural area and local foods, availability of larger lots and mature greenery and trees. I do not wish to move again if my neighbourhood becomes "citified".</p> <p>I have a number of comments/questions that I hope are being considered:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Where are the approximately 100,000 extra people expected to come from? If they wish to live here and commute to work they will be very disappointed with the already over-taxed highway system. Even a short commute within the city isn't a pleasant experience due to the volume of traffic.</li> <li>2. It does not appear that any of the projected growth will result in housing that young couples can afford. The townhouses currently being constructed near the urban boundary are more than \$500,000. That is not affordable for a young family.</li> <li>3. Developers are currently able to purchase land where there were 4 to 6 houses, and perhaps a maximum of 25 people, and build 100+ townhouses on this land. This increases the population in a single small space by 300 to 400 people. Our utilities are already at capacity - we experience hydro interruptions, there are water and sewer issues, the roads were not designed for the volume of traffic, etc. Please consider this and do not allow it to continue happening.</li> </ol>

	<p>4. Please do NOT allow developers to completely flatten a space. Make and enforce guidelines that ensure mature trees and natural areas remain intact.</p> <p>5. Make a plan for the displacement of wildlife. We already have coyotes, deer, fox, raccoons, and more inside the urban boundary because their natural habitats have been removed.</p> <p>6. Offer enticements for farmers to allow them to maintain a consistent and decent standard of living.</p> <p>I am not completely against a small amount of expansion taking place outside the existing urban boundary. However, I am if the above cannot be addressed properly. Given that your survey doesn't offer a hybrid option, my choice is Option 2 - No Boundary Expansion.</p>
625.	We must do better to avoid destroying agricultural land.
626.	We must protect farmland and green space. Within the city there is plenty of brownfield land, surface level parking lots, mall conversions without loss of commercial space. Intensification within the city is where population growth should occur.
627.	We need farm land .... Look around you , with the drought we are looking at food price increases that some will not be able to afford.
628.	<p>We need farmland for food and to protect the environment from climate changes</p> <p>Floods in China recently were said to have been caused by replacing farmland with surveys of houses upsetting natural balances of water flow.</p> <p>Often developers get their own way with no environmental or other follow up.</p> <p>What we get is overcrowding of overpriced monster homes and detriment to the environment and food supply</p>
629.	<p>We need farmland to feed populations.</p> <p>Denser cities will draw in more families and allow businesses to thrive.</p> <p>Rural expansion will require extended school bussing, which is already a disaster.</p> <p>There are many empty lots in Hamilton that can be converted to livable, affordable space.</p>
630.	<p>We need farms. Animals need space. We cannot keep removing their homes for growth. Farmers need to grow produce as other goods. By removing those farms then we lose out on those products.</p> <p>Leave the green space alone!</p>
631.	<p>We need our farmland and green space!</p> <p>Look at the forest fires across Canada and we should preserve our rural green spaces.</p> <p>There are plenty of areas in the city that could be rebuilt. So many empty parking lots! So much space near Bayfront that was purchased for the stadium! This would help create an accessible city and make education and recreation facilities easy for</p>

	<p>all to access. It doesn't make sense to have empty schools and empty lots in the city limits and then built new ones in the farmland areas!</p> <p>Look at the recent successes of Locke St, James St and Ottawa St and leave the farmland alone!!!!</p>
632.	We need our farms & not 1 inch more of them should be lost!
633.	We need the farm land.
634.	WE NEED those green spaces and farmland. The world would be in a sorry state without them.
635.	We need to focus on wise use of the existing urban land, not urbanization of even more farmland and natural landscapes. I'm very concerned about what rezoning will do for our food security, climate and green spaces around the city. Please make the right choice for long-term human health and sustainable growth; that is, no expansion of the urban boundary.
636.	We need to increase density within the current urban boundary.
637.	We need to keep our greenspaces green. We have some of the best greenspace in the world and it's increasingly precious. We also need as many housing units as possible. Option 2 is a win-win.
638.	We need to keep the beauty of our city and not become another concrete jungle everywhere we go in the city.
639.	We need to keep the green belts in the city and the farm land. It would be better to revive downtown Hamilton. Cleanup the City and build Hi-rise at downtown Hamilton
640.	We need to maintain green space for agriculture and farming, and the enjoyment of nature
641.	We need to preserve farmland and green space in and around Hamilton. We need creative housing projects within the existing urban boundaries to create new and better walkable communities, attractive yet more dense neighborhoods, with access to parks and undeveloped lands for all of us.
642.	We need to preserve our greenbelt and farmlands from further urban expansion in order to slow climate change and keep a “local” food supply chain intact.
643.	We need to protect the farm land if we develop it all then there will be a shortage of areas to grow our food.
644.	We need to protect what we have for the future.
645.	We need to reclaim and develop some of the vacant and unused properties in the downtown core and surrounding neighbourhoods.
646.	We need to stop squandering our green space as much as possible.

647.	<p>We need to stop this foolish thinking that we can endlessly grow the population - it is time to plan for a peak population and then stabilize it at that level. We need to demand the power to control our own development and to set our own peak population level. We need council to petition the province to grant cities such powers so that control of development is at the local level, not the provincial level where the land developers can operate with no oversight.</p> <p>Drive around downtown Hamilton and look at the hundreds of acres of vacant land - not just parking lots, but huge tracts of vacant industrial lots - there is enough land here already. So first of all, deduct from the proposed urban boundary expansion the amount of vacant land that can be developed in Hamilton. Then deduct the amount of residents that can be housed on this land and housed via higher density.</p> <p>You will have no need to expand the urban boundary.</p> <p>Most importantly, the City of Hamilton should have the power to determine what the population of the city will be, not the province. Therefore, city council should propose and vote to support a policy whereby Hamilton determines what it's population should be.</p> <p>Let us as a city decide to set a maximum limit on our population - a limit that protects natural lands and agriculture, a population limit that does not overwhelm our infrastructure, a limit that does not lead to gridlock on the roads and underfunded social services.</p> <p>It is time for Hamilton to determine what our peak population should be, not land developers or the province. Perhaps we decide that there should be no more than 750,00 people and we demand the power to have no more expansionary residential development beyond that point.</p> <p>We cannot grow the population endlessly - at some point the population must stabilize, and we, the city of Hamilton, must demand the power to control our own development. Not land speculators, not the province.</p>
648.	We need to work at diversifying our neighbourhoods with denser housing options
649.	We need to work harder and more collectively at using existing space to make new space for our city and not expand our perimeter in the name of capitalism.
650.	<p>We should be supporting our farmers not destroying them. Supporting local should be promoted proudly. We also need to preserve our wildlife. This expansion will also make climate change much worse.</p>

651.	We should build up, not out, with more public transit, and less traffic gridlock. We have too many suburban developments and too many cars. If we are not careful, we will get the same climate warming and wildfires as are now happening in the west. We need to protect against climate change.
652.	We should instead go into the inner city and build townhouses with backyard space so that parents could put a wading pool in for their children. No highrise buildings should be built but instead communities that include small fourplexes for seniors to live in, lowrise buildings with garden plots nearby and other such well planned buildings for people. Leave our farmland and that.
653.	We should not take more Agriculture lands and greenspace. We are already having more than 155 million people without food. This covid virus is not making it any easier. Worse of all climate change. We have even in our own country drought, floodings, forest fires and more... This expand throughout the world so is it not time to think what is more important????????? Food and water is the most important thing in life!!! We are destroying ourselves !!!!
654.	We should not take more Agriculture lands and greenspace. We are already having more than 155 million people without food. This covid virus is not making it any easier. Worse of all climate change. We have even in our own country drought, floodings, forest fires and more... This expand throughout the world so is it not time to think what is more important????????? Food and water is the most important thing in life!!! We are destroying ourselves !!!! Maby less immigration??? Help people "build" there own food gardens!!
655.	We should not use farmland for development when inner city, already serviced, properties are available. (Where do you think our food is going to come from?)
656.	we stress that in order for option 2 to be successful and long term, the city must develop & maintain a strong and efficient transit network within the city as well as establish good connections with neighboring transit programs.
657.	We support Option 2 – keep growth within existing Hamilton borders. Leave farmland for agricultural use. Rezone industrial lands to allow for housing – industries such as Dofasco and Stelco are mere shadows of their former selves and the land could repurposed for housing.
658.	We support Option 2. "No Urban Boundary Expansion" Scenario.  Hamilton has a chance through its growth strategy to drive innovation on so many fronts and realize its vision to be the 'Ambitious City', in ways that perhaps have not even been considered.

The marketing bias baked into the survey which refers to expansion of the urban boundary as 'Ambitious Density' is misplaced. Option 1 is status quo and more aligned with the ambitions of the developers who would benefit from it, than with any ambitious ideals that the city might adopt for its vision of the future. Option 2 could be very ambitious indeed, and it would arguably have greater impacts on the economic growth and vitality of the city.

Hamilton already struggles to balance the needs and priorities of its amalgamated constituents, and is chronically handicapped in its attempts to realize its development goals, let alone form a coherent and compelling vision of what it can be as a city. Urban boundary expansion will only serve to exacerbate this.

There are ample lands within the existing urban boundary that need investment, revitalization or re-development. A growth strategy with no urban boundary expansion would focus on what we have, and accelerate revitalization across the city. Strategically placed intensification and land re-use, balanced by thoughtful and deliberate preservation of urban greenspace, architectural treasures, and quality housing stock, could revitalize neighborhoods, increase the economic viability of infrastructure and service upgrades (like public transit, sewer/storm water, roads, social housing), and address the urban blight that plagues Hamilton at a disproportionate level to other Canadian cities.

Working within the existing urban boundary can be a driver for innovation in urban development and reward developers who are willing to participate and drive Hamilton's heritage preservation, growth and transformation into a center for urban innovation. Hamilton has some great momentum now, but does not set a very high bar for the architectural integrity or quality of its projects (E.g. we don't need another uninspired monolithic development downtown or sprawling cookie cutter survey on the boundary). Hamilton could be a city where architects and developers vie for projects with world class architectural integrity and innovation at their core. But Hamilton's public servants seem to be trapped in procedural excess, preoccupied with social justice and lacking in the bold development vision that could really transform the city.

This is to say nothing of the environmental benefits of land preservation, potential for intensification of local food production, and the unquantifiable value of the greenspace and farmland under consideration for development, which cannot be reclaimed once it has been developed. Hamiltonians are fortunate to have this farmland and greenspace preserved in their urban backyard (and their urban psyche), sitting so delicately at the boundary of the Greenbelt, and cut through by the heritage biosphere of the Escarpment. We have a choice to preserve this land and its ecological equity, rather than squander it for the short term economic benefit of a handful of developers, and convincing ourselves it is the only solution to solving our housing challenges. Why would we make that choice when the alternative is so much more compelling?

659.	<p>We think Option 2 "no urban boundary expansion" is more sustainable, being</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• better for the environment,</li> <li>• better for supporting transit (bring on the LRT!),</li> <li>• better for business,</li> <li>• better for fostering social equity, and</li> <li>• better for lowering our taxes.</li> </ul>
660.	<p>We value a mix of farmland and rural land</p>
661.	<p>We want to preserve as much green space as possible.</p>
662.	<p>We would do ourselves a significant disservice by continuing to deplete greenfield lands, and especially in reducing arable lands.</p> <p>With the continuation of our world's climate emergency, intensification has multiple benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- intensification will contribute to increased use of public transit and reduce the need for individual automobiles</li> <li>- intensification reduces new areas the city would need to service, likely mitigating costs over years ahead</li> <li>- intensification will result in more housing options, and hopefully more affordable housing options, given Hamilton's historically low vacancy rate and need for greater affordable housing stocks</li> </ul> <p>By investing in intensification and working to enhance our parks and amenities in the lower city, and making it easier to get around the city quickly we build a Hamilton that's better for Hamiltonians and for the climate.</p>
663.	<p>We would like to recommend Option 2 for future development.</p> <p>There are too many area's that we believe should be levelled completely and rebuilt for the future urban communities. Short of something being historically significant in any reasonable degree, dead urban sprawl only encourages squatting and criminal behavior. A case in point would be Barton St. Between James and Ferguson. Does anybody wish to admit it is anything but an eyesore waiting to be updated.</p> <p>Streetscapes are simple window dressing for the ugly within and entire city blocks with empty storefronts need to be prioritised before consideration of digging up farmland.</p>
664.	<p>We would rather see improved infrastructure in the downtown area and more development of available properties for affordable housing.</p>
665.	<p>We've got more than enough unused land within the city to use.</p>
666.	<p>What are the plans for some of the schools that have been closed, HillPark, LindenPark, SirJohnA Macdonald, these buildings have been sitting empty, while our Cities Homeless have no where to go!!!</p>
667.	<p>What do you want to overcrowd this city like Toronto?</p>

	Have you looked at the highway between Burlington skyway and Niagara ?? It can't handle the current levels
668.	What makes anyone think that buying up good farm land and expanding the boundaries will allow for people to afford the housing. The builders will just build bigger and more expensive houses. People in Hamilton still won't be able to afford the homes. The builders will just get richer and the houses will just still be out of reach for most families. They are just thinking of themselves and not the average home buyer. Builders don't care about the land just there pockets. We need affordable house here in city. Take down derelict homes and buildings within city and build smaller affordable homes .
669.	When are people going to realize you cannot bring nature back once the forest is cut down. Where does the wildlife go live when their habitat is gone? Please stop. Start building higher in the spots already ruined with buildings.
670.	When it comes to giving people good quality of life, mixed use space with transit options is critical. Being sixteen years old, one of the things I love about Hamilton is being able to get places without having to ask my parents for a ride. Biking or taking the bus is great, but only because I have everything I need close to where I live. That's why I think that option 2, consolidating urban spaces, is the best choice.  Protecting farmland and promoting environmentally friendly transit options all at the same time? Sounds good to me!
671.	While I am completely excited by the potential of Hamilton's population growing significantly over the upcoming 30 years, we need to work with our existing Brownfield sites and underutilized areas within Hamilton's current extents to increase our housing base. Expanding City Limits is not the solution. We need to go higher and increase density in key pockets across the City to accommodate these future residents. This is not to say that there should be 50 storey towers everywhere. This can be a mix of housing types, relevant to geographical location and lifestyle choices.  I would also encourage the City to look at developing urban farming models which help to feed our population locally as much as possible and work with people and companies to financially assist them in starting up these endeavours so that we can work towards a more self sufficient future. Concepts such as Vertical Farming, while in its infancy and unproven, would lend itself well to being an experiment within Hamilton not only because of its size but also there tendency within Hamilton for innovation and risk taking. <a href="https://www.thebalancesmb.com/what-you-should-know-about-vertical-farming-4144786">https://www.thebalancesmb.com/what-you-should-know-about-vertical-farming-4144786</a>  I also think it would be fantastic if the City of Hamilton - which is the right size city to do this - looked at an economic structure that is sustainably based. A few months back, TIME magazine published an article about what Amsterdam is doing with Doughnut Economics (Kate Raworth) and it sounds fascinating and hopeful. It takes

	<p>strong leadership and vision to look at ways to create a more sustainable future and I suspect at first it will be extremely challenging but something needs to happen to secure a future not only for 2051 but also reaching far beyond that time.</p>
672.	<p>While I appreciate the Province's need to ensure that there is space for POTENTIAL growth, I believe strongly we are dooming our future by not protecting agricultural lands. People do need housing but also need to be fed and Southern Ontario generally has one of the best soil/land for farming. This needs to be preserved, as much for the rural nature of the land as for those who are in the farming industry; if farmers feel that their land is valued for what it can produce, they may be more willing to use it for that rather than sell it to the highest bidder.</p>
673.	<p>While I understand that growth is needed there are so many places in the city of Hamilton that are abandoned and the land can be reused. We need our farm land. Please, do not use our greenfield lands beyond our urban boundary. To me it would be a mistake. Food is already so expensive and we need to support locally. Why ship it in, when we can grow it right here? I know I am only one voice, but I am one voice that can be heard.</p>
674.	<p>Who will move into these new housing developments? Not immigrants or young home buyers. They are already priced out of that market. It will be people looking to move from Toronto or investors looking to add to their accumulation of properties.</p> <p>How about putting restrictions on monster homes? Instead how about putting multi family homes on those properties. Duplexes or even quads would make much more sense, with an eye to keeping the character and flavour of existing neighborhoods and historical buildings intact.</p> <p>Repurpose vacant commercial buildings into interesting lofts in the city.</p> <p>There are many unused avenues in existing areas of Hamilton. Aging infrastructure needs to be repaired and maintained. Expanding the urban boundaries is costly to the environment. Benefits are to developers not the average citizens</p>
675.	<p>With ever shrinking green space, developing within existing urban areas is the optimum solution to ensure future generations have access to both green space and locally farm produced products.</p>
676.	<p>With nothing much to do during the pandemic, my wife and I have been travelling the rural roads in this area and have been disgusted by the development in the rural areas. There are far too many big houses on big lots on Concession roads. Hamilton is bad but Brantford is disgraceful. There is plenty of space available within the urban boundary – North America must be the only place in the world with one story retail without residential accommodation located above it.</p> <p>Get creative, use development charges to offer significant inducement for multi-story residential/commercial facilities including redevelopment.</p>

677.	With regard to the recent City of Hamilton survey, I am hopeful that the city's leadership will choose the 'no Urban Boundary Expansion Scenario'. I believe this to be the best case for mitigating climate, traffic woes, and a future burden on maintenance of water, sewer, and hydro
678.	With regard to the recent City of Hamilton survey, my response is: I do not agree with using the rural areas near Mount Hope Airport in Hamilton. The rural lands here are needed MUCH MORE than building large, sprawling buildings and commercial areas. The rural area provides work for local farmers and also provides foods locally. These lands are needed for future generations and for protection of the very very necessary Environment. Building yet another ridiculous highway is completely over the top . There are too many paved highways around this area which only increases more gas polluting vehicles on the road. I have lived in Hamilton all my 59 years and I won't sit idly by and let this deliberate destruction of important rural land and the Environment as well. Hamilton City Council is way off the mark doing this and they need to see the long term view past just having their cozy seat in Hamilton City Council. I have concerns for the future generations that there will be a beautiful Nature and Environment left for them and for the rural farmers as well
679.	With regard to the recent City of Hamilton survey, my response is: quit building houses and quit letting people into our country if we don't have the room
680.	With regard to the recent City of Hamilton survey, my response is: No Urban Boundary Expansion, we need the agricultural lands, stop the urban expansion
681.	<p>would like to provide the following comments regarding How Can the City Grow:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Intensification around the LRT will provide the city with opportunity to increase ridership and therefore recover operating costs.</li> <li>- As Torontonians (and any other person under 40) buy into Hamilton they expect a walkable, navigable community and intensification will meet those expectations</li> <li>- It should be the goal to protect our farm land to ensure food sovereignty in Ontario</li> <li>- There is an obvious abundance of brownfields within the existing urban boundary that could be developed prior to expansion to farmland</li> <li>- Intensification allows city services such as potable water and sewer to be sustainable via dense property taxes whereas urban expansion leaves the city in an unsustainable fiscal situation as infrastructure ages</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for taking my comments into consideration.</p>
682.	You need to populate the downtown area, especially if LRT goes in. More high rises and condominiums are needed. Less restrictions on high rise heights. We need employment lands around the airport for the future.
683.	<p>Hi! I made the same comments on my survey card, but am typing it here in case you can't read my writing on the card or in case it gets lost in the mail.</p> <p>Postal code: L9H ***</p>

Preferred Urban Growth Option choice: OPTION 2.

General comments:

1. As part of Option 2, please promote gentle densification in single-family residence areas. Examples: permit/promote

- Multi-generational housing arrangements (more people per house)

- Granny suites

- Laneway housing

- Conversion of houses to legal apartments

- McMaster's Symbiosis program that carefully pairs seniors with students that live with them and provide companionship and light assistance for reduced rent

- Et cetera!

2. Re. farmland, climate change is already causing widespread crop failures.

Canada is dependent on foreign countries for much of our food and will not be first in line in case of shortages. We have very limited arable land and have already squandered much of our farmland. For our own food security, we MUST protect ALL of our remaining farmland.