



April 18, 2022

**Conner Harris**  
Direct Line: (416) 597-5422  
conner@rbllp.com

**VIA EMAIL**

General Issues Committee  
City of Hamilton  
Hamilton City Hall  
711 Main Street West, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

To Whom It May Concern:

**Re: City of Hamilton GRIDS 2/MCR  
Staff Report PED 17010(q) – Evaluation of Urban Boundary Expansion Requests  
Waterdown  
Urban Boundary Expansion Request – 347 Parkside Drive, Waterdown, ON  
Our File No.: 1556**

We are counsel to 2441066 Ontario Inc. (“244”) – the owner of lands known municipally as 347 Parkside Drive, Waterdown, ON (the “Property”). That Property is located on the edge of, but slightly outside, the City of Hamilton urban boundary.

In December 2021 our client submitted a request to the City for consideration of an urban boundary expansion to incorporate a portion of its Property into the urban boundary as part of the ongoing GRIDS 2/MCR process. A detailed planning justification report and rationale for the request was included with it. Those documents are included with this letter for consideration by the Committee.

244 was disappointed to learn that City staff has recommended approval only of an urban boundary expansion request at 329 and 345 Parkside Drive, and not on our client’s Property. We encourage the Committee to reconsider that recommendation and approve an urban boundary expansion request in accordance with the planning justification report included with this correspondence.

The lands at 329 and 345 Parkside Drive abut 244’s Property immediately to the south. Including our client’s lands within an urban boundary expansion will result in logical synergies with the neighbouring property for which approval has already been recommended. This is further compounded by the northern boundary of 244’s urban boundary expansion request representing the right of way for the proposed By-Pass Corridor. If 244’s lands are not included within the urban boundary they will be an orphan parcel of rural, vacant lands surrounded on two immediate sides by an urban boundary, and on the other side by a busy highway.

This is not good land use planning and makes little practical sense. Even the staff report recommending approval of the expansion at 329 and 345 Parkside Drive recognizes the impracticality of our client’s parcel remaining outside the urban boundary.

Our client disputes several of the assertions in the staff report about its request. The first is that staff identified the request at 329 and 345 Parkside Drive as being the only request which satisfies the 5ha maximum as directed by the City in November 2021. This is not technically accurate – that request actually seeks an expansion of 5.2ha. It therefore slightly exceeds the 5ha maximum directed by Council.

244's expansion request similarly exceeds the 5ha direction only slightly – being a total of 6.6ha in size. But if the stormwater facility and natural heritage features delineated on the Property are backed out from the size calculations then the request seeks an expansion of only 4.4ha in size. This more appropriate sizing brings the request well below the 5ha limit directed by Council.

Even if the larger sizing of 6.6ha is considered, this still falls well below the maximum 10ha contemplated by the Growth Plan. We encourage the Committee to demonstrate flexibility and practicality in its consideration of these requests in a manner that encourages good land use planning.

At page 1 of Appendix E to Staff Report PED17010(q), it is noted that 244's boundary expansion request appears to propose residential uses for the entirety of the expansion area. This is not, strictly speaking, accurate. As noted at page 16 of the planning justification report in support of our client's request, it specifies that "when specific land uses within the proposed UBE are refined in future planning exercises (ie. zoning), the delineations of uses can be further refined and designed to conform to the maximum 50% residential requirement".

As you can see from the excerpt above, our client has been – and remains – willing to work with the City to ensure that any expansion request approved for its Property complies with the governing approvals and guidance from Council. We would welcome an opportunity to work with staff to ensure that the request meets that guidance and can be recommended for approval.

244 urges the Committee to approve its request for an urban boundary expansion on its Property. A representative of our client will be attending the Committee's meeting on April 20<sup>th</sup> to speak to this matter and would be pleased to address any questions that the Committee may have.

Sincerely,

**RAYMAN BEITCHMAN LLP**



Conner Harris  
CH/rf  
Encls.