

**J. Pitman Patterson**  
T 416.367.6109  
PPatterson@blg.com

**Katie Butler**  
T 416.367.6353  
KButtler@blg.com

Borden Ladner Gervais LLP  
Bay Adelaide Centre, East Tower  
22 Adelaide Street West  
Toronto ON M5H 4E3  
Canada  
T 416-367-6000  
F 416-367-6749  
blg.com



**4.14**

February 22, 2022

**Delivered by Email (clerk@hamilton.ca) (mayor@hamilton.ca)**

Mayor Eisenberger and Council  
City of Hamilton  
71 Main Street West, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor  
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Dear Mayor Eisenberger and Members of Council:

**Re: File: Official Plan Amendment UHOPA-22-001**  
**File: Zoning By-law Amendment ZAC-22-003**  
**Folder: 2022 100024 00 PLAN (1087541)**  
**Subject Property: 65 Guise Street East (Pier 8, Block 16), Hamilton**  
**Item 5.3 Planning Committee Report 22-003 - February 15, 2022**

BLG has been retained as land use planning counsel by Parrish & Heimbecker Limited (“**P&H**”) the operator of a grain handling terminal and flour mill on Pier 10 in Hamilton. We write regarding our client’s concerns in respect of the proposed Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment (the “**Proposed Amendments**”) at the property municipally known as 65 Guise Street East, Hamilton (Pier 8, Block 16) (the “**Subject Property**”) and the associated introduction of new sensitive land uses in a 45-storey tower.

Our client is the owner and operator of a large grain handling terminal and state of the art flour mill on Pier 10, including the dockwalls and finger pier extending toward Pier 8 which is used for the loading and unloading of ships (the “**P&H Facility**”). The P&H Facility which is approximately 270 meters from the east side of Pier 8, and ships dock on the finger pier as close as approximately 150 metres. In 2017, P&H completed a \$45 million investment in a new flour mill on Pier 10 which was supported by the City of Hamilton and all other levels of government. The new mill is the first greenfield site flour mill built in Ontario in 75 years.

P&H has made a substantial economic investment on Pier 10, and a significant contribution to the establishment of a successful agri-food hub in the port. These efforts have been supported by all levels of government and the Hamilton-Oshawa Port Authority. The Port of Hamilton and the industries it hosts play a major role in the City’s economy. Given this role, the City has recognized the need to work in consultation with the Hamilton-Oshawa Port Authority to harmonize planning initiatives. The City’s Official Plan recognizes the need to protect existing industrial areas in the Port and to establish appropriate separation and mitigation measures.

This is not the first time the proposed introduction of sensitive uses on Pier 8 has raised serious issues of land use compatibility with existing industry on and around Pier 10. In 2017, P&H and others appealed to the Ontario Land Tribunal (“**OLT**”) objecting to the City’s approval of Zoning By-law No. 17-095 and draft Plan of Subdivision 25T-201605 (Case No PL170742). P&H’s appeals (the Phase II appeals) raised concerns about the proposed use of the Pier 8 lands on numerous grounds, including that the proposed sensitive land uses were incompatible with the use and operation of the P&H Facility, which could expose P&H to potential action for damages or injunctions or both, enforcement action, and environmental compliance approval issues. As described in the Staff Report (PED22031), on September 16, 2019, the City agreed with the WSC, Harbour West Neighbours Inc. and Herman Turkstra to resolve some of the appeals (the Phase I appeals). On August 14, 2020, the City, Waterfront Shores Corporation (“**WSC**”) and P&H entered into a settlement agreement setting out measures to address the incompatibility issues raised in the P&H appeals (“**Settlement Agreement**”). P&H, the City and WSC also entered into an agreement pursuant to the *Industrial and Mining Lands Compensation Act*, RSO 1990, c. I.5, which was registered on title to the Pier 8 lands on or around August 25, 2021 (the “**IMLCA Agreement**”). The IMLCA describes, among other things, the proposed sensitive uses of the Pier 8 lands and the incompatibility of sensitive uses proximate to the use and operation of the P&H Facility.

The Settlement Agreement and IMLCA Agreement facilitated settlement of the P&H appeals, and the OLT issued its order on September 22, 2020 approving Zoning By-law 17-095. The Settlement Agreement and IMLCA Agreement were carefully negotiated on the basis of the arrangement of development blocks, built form and uses contemplated in Zoning By-law 17-095. A 45 storey multi-residential building was not contemplated on Block 16, nor was such use or built form approved in Zoning By-law 17-095.

Our client is concerned that the P&H Facility once again will be threatened by the proposed introduction of sensitive land uses on the Subject Property, and that there has been inadequate consultation with existing industries, contrary to the approach directed by the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change under the NPC-300 publication, which states:

Where a site in proximity to a stationary source is in the process of being developed or re-developed for noise sensitive uses (such as residential), it is considered the responsibility of the proponent/developer of the noise sensitive land use to ensure compliance with the applicable sound level limits and for this responsibility to be reflected in the land use planning decisions.

NPC-300 goes on to state that the involvement of owners of stationary sources in the land use planning process “is highly recommended” when an adjacent new noise-sensitive land use is proposed, and that a “cooperative effort” between the proponent and the stationary source owners is desirable. Pursuant to NPC-300, it is the responsibility of the proponent of the new noise sensitive land use to ensure compliance with applicable sound level limits.

We have reviewed the planning application materials available online, including the proponent’s Planning Justification Report and the Noise Feasibility Study dated October 25, 2021 (the “**Noise Study**”). In respect of the Noise Study, P&H’s acoustical engineers are currently reviewing that study to evaluate the characterization of noise sources, the impact on the proposed Block 16 tower, and the sufficiency of the mitigation measures noted in the Noise Study. As matters currently stand, there is no comfort to P&H that appropriate mitigation measures will be implemented, or more generally, that

the proposed use and built form are appropriate. The Planning Justification Report refers to “*potential* mitigation measures that *could* be implemented”. The Staff Report (PED22031) is remarkably entirely silent on the history and process of resolving compatibility issues with P&H for Pier 8 development, and says nothing about the Settlement Agreement or the noise issue at all. There is no discussion of, or commitment to, implementation of mitigation measures to ensure compatibility, surely a threshold issue when approving new uses and built form in a zoning by-law amendment.

Given the close proximity to stationary and other noise sources and industry such as the P&H Facility, ensuring compatibility and compliance with Provincial guidelines should be a fundamental driver when evaluating the Proposed Amendments and the introduction and distribution of new uses in the area and at the Subject Property.

We submit this letter in advance of the statutory public meetings being held for the Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendments where this item will be considered by the Planning Committee and subsequently City Council. Our client seeks an outcome which protects industry in conformity with the Official Plan and Provincial guidelines.

Our client requests copies of subsequent communications in this matter, and notice of all meetings and decisions in respect of the Proposed Amendments.

Yours very truly,  
**BORDEN LADNER GERVAIS, LLP**



Pitman Patterson

CC : Stephen Robichaud, Director, Planning and Chief Planner

Lisa Kelsey, Legislative Coordinator, Planning Committee

Client