

SUMMARY OF POLICY REVIEW

The following policies, amongst others, apply to the proposal.

Provincial Planning Statement (2024)		
Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Planning for People and Homes</p> <p>Policy: 2.1.6, 2.2.1, and 2.3.1.2</p>	<p>Planning authorities should support the achievement of complete communities by accommodating an appropriate range and mix of land uses, housing options, transportation options with multimodal access, employment, public service facilities and other institutional uses (including schools and associated childcare facilities, long term care facilities, places of worship and cemeteries), recreation, parks and open space, and other uses to meet long-term needs.</p> <p>Planning authorities shall provide for an appropriate range and mix of housing options and densities to meet projected needs of current and future residents of the regional market area by permitting and facilitating all housing options required to meet the social, health, economic and wellbeing requirements of current and future residents, promoting densities for new housing which efficiently use land, and requiring transit-supportive development in proximity to transit, including corridors.</p> <p>Land use patterns within settlement areas should be based on densities and a mix of land uses which efficiently use land and resources, optimize existing and planned infrastructure and</p>	<p>The proposed development does not support the creation of complete communities. The development accommodates an appropriate range and mix of housing, transportation options, and open space to meet long-term needs and it makes efficient use of land and supports transit.</p> <p>The proposed development does not enhance the well-being of residents. The concept plan does not demonstrate adequate pedestrian connections, which discourages active transportation. The proposed development does not support transit as it proposes to remove density from proximity of a proposed rapid transit route along Barton Street.</p> <p>The concept plan does not demonstrate that the new buildings and streets are organized in a logical manner. The development lacks pedestrian connections, streets are misaligned, open space is disconnected, views of the Niagara Escarpment are obscured, and streetscapes are repetitive.</p> <p>The proposed development meets five of the ten criteria used by the City of Hamilton and Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism for determining archaeological potential. The applicant prepared a Stage 1-2 (P038-1241-2023) archaeological assessment which examined the archaeological potential of the site. The assessment recommended that a Stage 3 archaeological assessment be completed to address the archaeological potential</p>

	public service facilities, support active transportation, and are transit-supportive.	of the 23-192H1 (AhGv-58) Site. Staff concur with this recommendation. The proposal is not consistent with these policies.
Settlement Area Policy: 2.3.1.1	Settlement areas shall be the focus of growth and development. Within settlement areas, growth should be focused in, where applicable, strategic growth areas, including major transit station areas.	The proposed development is located within a settlement area. The proposal is consistent with this policy.
Employment Policy: 2.8.3	In addition to policy 3.5, on lands within 300 metres of employment areas, development shall avoid, or where avoidance is not possible, minimize and mitigate potential impacts on the long-term economic viability of employment uses within existing or planned employment areas, in accordance with provincial guidelines.	The subject lands are located within 300 metres of employment areas as the lands located on the north side of Barton Street are designated as an employment area. The proposed development has not demonstrated that it protects the long-term viability of these employment uses. The proposal is not consistent with this policy.
General Policies for Agriculture Policy: 4.3.1.3	Specialty crop areas shall be given the highest priority for protection.	The proposed development has not demonstrated that it protects specialty crop areas with the lands south of Highway No. 8 are designated “Specialty Crop” in the Rural Hamilton Official Plan. Air drainage patterns exist between these lands and Lake Ontario over the subject lands and modifications to the street layout and building height have the potential to disrupt these drainage patterns. An Air Drainage Analysis, prepared by WSP Canada Inc. dated April 12, 2024, was submitted and the analysis has not been approved. The proposal is not consistent with this policy.

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
Natural Hazards Policy: 5.2.1	Planning authorities shall, in collaboration with conservation authorities where they exist, identify hazardous lands and hazardous sites and manage development in these areas, in accordance with provincial guidance.	A Stormwater Management Report, prepared by Urbantech dated May 2024, was submitted. The report should be consistent with the findings and recommendations of an approved Watercourse No. 9 quantitative analysis to ensure there is no impact from downstream flooding and erosion hazards as a result of the proposed development. The Watercourse No. 9 quantitative analysis has not yet been completed. The proposal is not consistent with this policy.

Urban Hamilton Official Plan		
Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
Urban Design Policies – General Policies and Principles Policies: B.3.3.2.2 – B.3.3.2.10	The principles in Policies B.3.3.2.3 through B.3.3.2.10 inclusive, shall apply to all development and redevelopment, where applicable. These principles include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fostering a sense of community pride and identity; • Creating quality spaces; • Creating places that are safe, accessible, connected and easy to navigate; • Enhancing the character of the existing environment; • Creating places that are adaptable to future changes; • Promoting the reduction of greenhouse gas emission and protecting and enhancing the natural environment; • Enhancing physical and mental health; and, 	The proposed development does not create a sense of community pride and identity. The concept plan does not demonstrate that the proposal is designed to respect the surrounding environment, built heritage, appropriate streetscape, nor respect prominent views. The proposed development does not create opportunity for views of the Niagara Escarpment, which is located south of the proposed development. The Concept Plan shows a row of stacked townhouse dwellings without any view corridors aligned to public streets. The proposed development has not demonstrated that it protects the designated heritage property located at 265 Lewis Road. The proposed development does not create quality spaces that are accessible and easy to navigate. The concept plan does not demonstrate that the new buildings and streets are organized in a logical manner. The development lacks pedestrian connections, streets are misaligned, open space is disconnected, views of the Niagara Escarpment are obscured, and streetscapes are repetitive.

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Urban Design Policies – General Policies and Principles</p> <p>Policies: B.3.3.2.2 – B.3.3.2.10</p> <p>(continued)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designing streets as a transportation network and as a public spaces. 	<p>The proposed development does not promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, nor does it enhance the well-being of residents. The concept plan does not demonstrate adequate pedestrian connections, which discourages active transportation. The proposed development does not support transit as it proposes to remove density from proximity of a proposed rapid transit route along Barton Street.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with these policies.</p>
<p>Hazard Lands</p> <p>Policy: B.3.6.5.6</p>	<p>Hazard lands shall be conserved and land uses or activities which could be affected by prevailing hazardous conditions such as flooding or erosion, or could increase the inherent hazard, shall be prohibited in hazard lands and on lands adjacent to hazard lands.</p>	<p>The proposed development has not demonstrated that there are no downstream flooding or erosion hazards as a result of the proposed development.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with this policy.</p>
<p>Tree Management</p> <p>Policy: C.2.11.1</p>	<p>The City recognizes the importance of trees and woodlands to the health and quality of life in our community. The City shall encourage sustainable forestry practices and the protection and restoration of trees and forests.</p>	<p>A Tree Protection Plan, prepared by Adesso Design Inc. dated June 3, 2024, was submitted in support of the development. A total of 57 trees have been inventoried and 25 trees have been proposed to be removed.</p> <p>The Tree Protection Plan has not been approved. The decision to retain trees is to be based on condition, aesthetics, age, and species. There are eight trees (three Black Walnut, two Sugar Maple, two Basswood, and one Ironwood) proposed to be removed that are identified as being in fair to good condition. Opportunities to retain more trees are to be explored. In addition, five trees (two Green Ash, one Eastern Red Cedar, one White Cedar, one Silver Maple) have been identified as boundary trees and it has not been demonstrated that permission has been granted for their removal from neighbouring landowners.</p> <p>To ensure existing tree cover is maintained, 1 for 1 compensation is required for any tree (10 cm DBH or greater)</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
Tree Management Policy: C.2.11.1 (continued)		<p>that is proposed to be removed. A Landscape Plan will be required to confirm compensation tree plantings and cash-in-lieu requirements.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with this policy.</p>
Transportation Policy: C.4.5.12	A Transportation Impact Study shall be required for an Official Plan Amendment and/or a major Zoning By-law Amendment.	<p>A Traffic Impact Study, prepared by GHD Limited dated April 5, 2024, was submitted in support of the proposed development. Staff found that the local transportation network can support the proposed development. However, the Traffic Impact Study is not approved as revisions are required.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with this policy.</p>
Infrastructure Policy: C.5.3.6	All redevelopment within the urban area shall be connected to the City’s water and wastewater system.	<p>A Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, prepared by Urbantech Consulting, A Division of Leighton-Zec West Ltd. dated May 2024, was submitted in support of the development. Development Engineering staff do not support the proposed development as the proposed sanitary and storm outlets are inconsistent with the Block 3 Servicing Strategy.</p> <p>A Watermain Analysis Report, prepared by WSP Canada Inc. dated April 2024, was submitted in support of the development. Staff found that the report does not demonstrate that the municipal water system can support the proposed density.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with this policy.</p>
Cultural Heritage Policies: B.3.4.1.4, B.3.4.2.1 g), and B.3.4.2.1 h)	Ensure that all new development, site alterations, building alterations, and additions are contextually appropriate and maintain the integrity of all on-site or adjacent cultural heritage resources.	<p>A Scoped Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment, prepared by NPG Planning Solutions Inc. dated June 4, 2024, was submitted in support of the proposed development. The proposed development is adjacent to 265 Lewis Road, which is located on the west side of Lewis Road and is a designated property under the <i>Ontario Heritage Act</i>. Staff require revisions to the Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment to address the impact of the</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Cultural Heritage</p> <p>Policies: B.3.4.1.4, B.3.4.2.1 g), and B.3.4.2.1 h)</p> <p>(continued)</p>	<p>Ensure the conservation and protection of cultural heritage resources in planning and development matters subject to the <i>Planning Act</i>, R.S.O., 1990 c. P.13 either through appropriate planning and design measures or as conditions of development approvals.</p> <p>Conserve the character of areas of cultural heritage significance, including designated heritage conservation districts and cultural heritage landscapes, by encouraging those land uses, development and site alteration activities that protect, maintain, and enhance these areas within the City.</p>	<p>stacked townhouses on Block 15 and the townhouses along Lewis Road on Blocks 9 and 10.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with these policies.</p>
<p>Archaeology</p> <p>Policy: B.3.4.4.3</p>	<p>In areas of archaeological potential identified on Appendix F-4 – Archaeological Potential, an archaeological assessment shall be required and submitted prior to or at the time of application submission.</p>	<p>The subject property is located within 250 metres of known archaeological sites, within 300 metres of a primary watercourse or permanent waterbody, 200 metres of a secondary watercourse or seasonal waterbody, or 300 metres of a prehistoric watercourse or permanent waterbody, in an area of sandy soil in areas of clay or stone, in areas of pioneer Euro-Canadian settlement, and along historic transportation routes. These are five of the ten criteria used by the City of Hamilton and Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism for determining archaeological potential. The applicant prepared a Stage 1-2 (P038-1241-2023) archaeological assessment which examined the archaeological potential of the site. The assessment recommended that a Stage 3 archaeological assessment be completed to address the archaeological potential of the 23-192H1 (AhGv-58) Site. Staff concur with this recommendation.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with this policy.</p>
Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response

<p>Noise Policy: B.3.6.3.1</p>	<p>Development of noise sensitive land uses, in the vicinity of provincial highways, parkways, minor or major arterial roads, collector roads, truck routes, railway lines, railway yards, airports, or other uses considered to be noise generators shall comply with all applicable provincial and municipal guidelines and standards.</p>	<p>A Noise Feasibility Study, prepared by Howe Gastmeier Chapnik Limited dated April 5, 2024, was submitted in support of the development. Staff analysis found that Barton Street, Lewis Road, and Highway No. 8 are sources of road traffic noise. Winona Elementary School and Innesville Restaurant to the west are potential stationary noise sources, however these noise sources are not expected to be significant.</p> <p>The report recommends standard Ontario Building Code requirements will mitigate road traffic noise and that warning clauses shall be registered on title and/or contained within any future rental agreements. These measures will be addressed through the future Site Plan Control and Building Permit stages.</p> <p>In addition, for the stacked townhouse adjacent to Highway No. 8 on Block 15, installation of central air conditioning is required.</p> <p>The proposal complies with this policy.</p>
<p>Neighbourhoods Policy: E.2.7.2 and E.2.7.4</p>	<p>The Neighbourhoods element of the urban structure shall permit and provide the opportunity for a full range of housing forms, types, and tenure, including affordable housing and housing with supports.</p>	<p>The proposed development consists of residential uses.</p> <p>The proposal complies with this policy.</p>
<p>Neighbourhoods Designation - Function Policy: E.3.2.1</p>	<p>Areas designated Neighbourhoods shall function as complete communities, including the full range of residential dwelling types and densities as well as supporting uses intended to serve the local residents.</p>	<p>The proposed development consists of residential uses.</p> <p>The proposal complies with this policy.</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Neighbourhoods Designation – Scale and Design</p> <p>Policy: E.3.2.7</p>	<p>Development of lands within the Neighbourhoods designation shall be designed to be safe, efficient, pedestrian oriented, and attractive, and shall comply with the following criteria: new development on large sites shall support a grid system of streets of pedestrian scale, short blocks, street oriented structures, and a safe and attractive public realm, garages, parking areas, and driveways along the public street shall not be dominant, adequate, and direct pedestrian access and linkages to community facilities/services and local commercial uses shall be provided, and development shall comply with Section B.3.3 – Urban Design Policies.</p>	<p>A Development Concept Plan (Ultimate), prepared by Glen Schnarr & Associates Inc. dated May 23, 2024, was submitted in support of the proposed development. The concept plan does not demonstrate that the proposed development is designed to be safe, efficient, and pedestrian oriented.</p> <p>The system of streets does not provide short pedestrian scale blocks. Connection should be provided between Blocks 5 and 6 to connect Street ‘B’ with Condo Road ‘A’ on Block 14, between Block 12 and 13 to connect Street ‘A’ and Condo Road ‘B’ on Block 15, and between Block 9 and 10 to connect Street ‘B’ with Lewis Road. In addition, more pedestrian connections should be provided between Block 15 and Highway No. 8.</p> <p>Block 15 is not designed with a safe and attractive public realm. The stacked townhouses along Condo Road ‘B’ are designed with dominant garages.</p> <p>Direct pedestrian accesses to community services are not provided. Condo Road ‘D’ on Block 14 and Block 18, which contains the pedestrian access to the Stormwater Management Pond in Block 17, are misaligned.</p> <p>And finally, the proposed development does not comply with Urban Design Policies in Section B.3.3 as outlined above.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with this policy.</p>
<p>Low Density Residential – Design</p> <p>Policy: E.3.4.6</p>	<p>Development in areas dominated by low density residential uses shall be designed in accordance with a mix of lot widths and sizes compatible with streetscape character; and a mix of dwelling unit types and sizes compatible in exterior design, including character, scale, appearance, and design features; shall be encouraged.</p>	<p>The concept plan has not demonstrated an appropriate mix of unit widths or unit types. Within each of the proposed townhouse blocks there is no variation in unit widths. In addition, Blocks 7 and 8 and Blocks 2, 3 and 4 have the same unit widths and are located next to each other resulting in a repetitive streetscape.</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Low Density Residential – Design</p> <p>Policy: E.3.4.6 (continued)</p>		<p>The lack of diversity of dwelling types results in an undesirable streetscape.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with this policy.</p>
<p>Medium Density Residential – Design</p> <p>Policy: E.3.5.9</p>	<p>Development within the medium density residential category shall be comprised of sites of suitable size and provide adequate landscaping, amenity features, on-site parking, and buffering if required. The height, massing, and arrangement of buildings and structures shall be compatible with existing and future uses in the surrounding area.</p>	<p>The condominium development located on Block 15 represents medium density residential development. The proposed development has direct access to proposed collector road Street ‘A’ and contains multiple dwelling building types.</p> <p>The proposed development of Block 15 is not suitable in terms of landscaping, buffering, massing, and height. The buffer space between the stacked townhouse dwellings on Block 15 and the street townhouses on Blocks 11, 12, and 13 is not suitable to support increased height as there are overlook concerns. The massing and arrangement of the stacked townhouses does not result in a pedestrian focused environment along Condo Road ‘B’.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with this policy.</p>
<p>Residential Greenfield Design</p> <p>Policies: E.3.7.1 and E.3.7.3</p>	<p>New greenfield communities shall be designed with a unique and cohesive character. Buildings, streetscapes, street patterns, landscaping, open spaces, and infrastructure shall be designed to contribute to this character.</p> <p>The configuration of streets, trails, and open spaces shall ensure clear and convenient pedestrian, cycling, and vehicular connections from within the greenfield community to the focal point and adjacent neighbourhoods.</p>	<p>The proposed development is not designed with a unique cohesive character since the street patterns and open spaces are not designed to promote pedestrian activity. The proposed development lacks clear and convenient pedestrian connections and open space is not aligned with the street network. Furthermore, in Staff’s opinion, the streetscapes along Highway No. 8 and Lewis Road do not contribute to a pedestrian character. Condo Road ‘B’ and parking is located adjacent to Lewis Road, neither of which activates the streetscape. Along Highway No. 8, the proposed stacked townhouse dwellings are grade separated</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Residential Greenfield Design</p> <p>Policies: E.3.7.1 and E.3.7.3 (continued)</p>		<p>which restricts access and limits opportunity for an active streetscape.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with these policies.</p>
<p>Division of Land</p> <p>Policy: F.1.14.1.2</p>	<p>Council shall approve only those plans of subdivision that meet the following criteria: conforms to the policies and land use designations of this Plan, implements the City’s staging of development program, can be supplied with adequate services and community facilities, shall not adversely impact upon the transportation system and the natural environment, can be integrated with adjacent lands and roadways, shall not adversely impact municipal finances, and meets all requirements of the <i>Planning Act</i>.</p>	<p>The proposed development does not meet the criteria for the division of land. The proposed development does not comply with the policies and land use designations, it cannot be supplied with adequate services and community facilities, it adversely impacts the natural environment, and it does not meet all requirements of the <i>Planning Act</i>.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with this policy.</p>

Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan		
Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>General Policies</p> <p>Policy: B.7.4.3 d)</p>	<p>When reviewing an application for development within the Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan area, the following matters shall be evaluated: compatibility with adjacent land uses including matters such as shadowing, grading, overlook, noise, lighting, traffic and other nuisance effects, transition in height and density to adjacent and existing residential development, and the policies in Section 7.4.14 – Block Servicing Strategy and all other applicable policies of this Secondary Plan.</p>	<p>The proposed height of the stacked townhouse dwellings located on Block 15 is not compatible with the proposed dwellings on Blocks 11, 12, and 13 as the height and grading differences will result in overlook. In addition, the proposed development does not comply with the policies in Section 7.4.14 – Block Servicing Strategy as outlined below.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with this policy.</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>General Residential Policies</p> <p>Policy: B.7.4.4.2 c)</p>	<p>Where townhouses or multiple dwellings are proposed, a mix of long and short block lengths on either public or private streets shall be encouraged to provide variety to the streetscape. The massing of long townhouse blocks should be broken up through building gaps and/or changes in building façades or the introduction of other dwelling types so a single continuous elevation is not created.</p>	<p>The proposed development does not provide a streetscape with variety. Townhouse blocks are long and repetitive and without pedestrian connections. The streetscape of Condo Road ‘B’ is repetitive as it contains a continuous elevation of garage doors. In addition, the proposed development does not contain any other dwelling type.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with this policy.</p>
<p>Low Density Residential 2 Designation</p> <p>Policy: B.7.4.4.4</p>	<p>In addition to Section E.3.4 - Low Density Residential Policies of Volume 1, the following policy shall apply: notwithstanding Policy E.3.4.4 of Volume 1, the net residential density shall be greater than 20 units per hectare and shall not exceed 40 units per hectare.</p>	<p>The proposed Official Plan Amendment proposes to redesignate the subject lands from the “Low Density Residential 2” designation to the “Low Density Residential 3” and “Medium Density Residential 2” designations. The effect of this amendment would be an overall increase in density for the subject lands.</p>
<p>Low Density Residential 3 Designation</p> <p>Policy: B.7.4.4.5</p>	<p>In addition to the uses permitted in Policy E.3.4.3 of Volume 1, the following additional uses shall be permitted: all forms of townhouse dwellings and existing Places of worship.</p> <p>Notwithstanding Policy E.3.4.4 of Volume 1, for lands designated Low Density Residential 3 the net residential density shall be greater than 40 units per hectare and shall not exceed 60 units per hectare.</p>	<p>A variety of dwelling types are intended to be permitted including street townhouse dwellings, however, the proposed Zoning By-law Amendment includes a modification to the Multiple Residential “RM3” Zone to remove permission for street townhouse dwellings.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with this policy.</p>
<p>Medium Density Residential 2 Designation</p> <p>Policy: B.7.4.4.6</p>	<p>Notwithstanding Policy E.3.5.7 of Volume 1, the net residential density shall be greater than 60 units per hectare and shall not exceed 75 units per hectare.</p> <p>Notwithstanding Policy E.3.5.8 of Volume 1, the maximum height shall be 3.5 storeys.</p>	<p>The Medium Density Residential 2 designation is intended to include all forms of multiple dwellings. The proposed development consists of various forms of townhouse dwellings include stacked townhouses and back-to-back townhouses. These types of dwellings are considered multiple dwellings.</p> <p>On Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan Map B.7.4-1 – Land Use Plan Map the lands located along Barton Street are designated “Medium Density Residential 2”. On Fruitland-Winona Secondary</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Medium Density Residential 2 Designation</p> <p>Policy: B.7.4.4.6 (continued)</p>		<p>Plan Map B.7.4-3 – Transportation Classification Plan Barton Street is identified as “Barton Street Pedestrian Promenade” and “Potential Rapid Transit Route”. The land use designation is intended to support the creation of the pedestrian corridor and rapid transit along Barton Street. The proposal would move a portion of the density to the south of the subject property along Highway No. 8. Moving density from Barton Street will not support creation of a corridor for rapid transit.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with this policy.</p>
<p>Streetscape and Built Form</p> <p>Policies: B.7.4.10.2, B.7.4.10.3, B.7.4.10.4</p>	<p>Architectural variation through the incorporation of varied roof lines, materials, and colours in each building and from building to building, shall be encouraged.</p> <p>Variation in the number of storeys, porch designs, architectural style and building type from building to building shall be encouraged.</p> <p>Continuous rows of repetitive building façades shall be discouraged.</p>	<p>The concept plan does not demonstrate a variation of building types which will result in rows of repetitive building façades. The concept plan illustrates rows of street townhouse dwellings proposed along both Street ‘A’ and Street ‘B’.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with these policies.</p>
<p>Streetscape and Built Form</p> <p>Policy: B.7.4.10.6</p>	<p>The layout of streets, configuration of lots and the siting of buildings shall ensure there is no reverse lotting adjacent to streets; streets and open spaces have an appropriate degree of continuity; opportunities are provided for the creation of views both within the community and adjacent to natural heritage areas; and, pedestrian connections to public streets and other outdoor spaces are encouraged.</p>	<p>The concept plan does not demonstrate that the proposed development provides an appropriate street layout. On Block 15 dwellings located along Condo Road ‘B’ are reverse lotted and are not pedestrian oriented. The amenity area in Block 15 is located above grade resulting in disconnected spaces. The proposed development does not create opportunity for views of the Niagara Escarpment, which is located south of the proposed development. The Concept Plan shows a row of stacked townhouse dwellings without any view corridors aligned to public streets.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with this policy.</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Public Utilities and Communications</p> <p>Policy: B.7.4.10.9</p>	<p>In accordance with Policy B.3.6.3.11 of Volume 1, the use of long stretches of acoustical walls for noise attenuation adjacent to arterial roads shall be discouraged.</p>	<p>A Noise Feasibility Study, prepared by Howe Gastmeier Chapnik Limited dated April 5, 2024, was submitted in support of the development. The Noise Feasibility Study does not recommend use of an acoustical wall for noise mitigation.</p> <p>The proposal complies with this policy.</p>
<p>Active Transportation Network</p> <p>Policy: B.7.4.13.1</p>	<p>Active transportation, including walkability shall be promoted in the design of the Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan area through the provision of transit facilities, transportation demand management, pedestrian facilities, and connections between all major destinations such as schools, parks, and commercial areas.</p>	<p>The proposed development does not promote active transportation nor walkability and does not demonstrate appropriate pedestrian connections throughout the site.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with this policy.</p>
<p>Daylight Triangles</p> <p>Policies: B.7.4.13.8, B.7.4.13.9 e), B.7.4.13.9 f), B.7.4.13.11, and B.7.4.13.12</p>	<p>Daylighting triangles at neighbourhood roundabout intersections shall generally be established at 12.19 metre by 12.19 metre. This dimension may be reduced on a location by location basis as determined by the City once engineering designs have been approved and any surplus lands identified.</p>	<p>The proposed development does not provide an adequate daylight triangle to accommodate a roundabout at the intersection of Lewis Road and Street ‘A’. The intersection has been identified as a potential roundabout location on Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan Map B.7.4-3 - Transportation Classification Plan and a 12.19 metre by 12.19 metre daylight triangle is required. The concept plan illustrates a 9.14 metre by 9.14 metre daylight triangle.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with these policies.</p>
<p>Block Servicing Strategy and Implementation</p> <p>Policies: B.7.4.14.1 c), B.7.4.14.1 n), B.7.4.17.2, and B.7.4.17.3</p>	<p>All development applications shall demonstrate that they comply with the approved Block Servicing Strategy.</p>	<p>The proposed development has not demonstrated that it complies with the approved Block Servicing Strategy. The subject lands are located within Block 3 as identified on Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan Map B.7.4-4 – Block Servicing Strategy Area Delineation.</p> <p>The Block 3 Servicing Strategy was prepared by Urbantech West, A Division of Leighton-Zec West Ltd. dated March 2020. A</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Block Servicing Strategy and Implementation</p> <p>Policies: B.7.4.14.1 c), B.7.4.14.1 n), B.7.4.17.2, and B.7.4.17.3</p> <p>(continued)</p>		<p>concept plan was included in the Block Servicing Strategy. The proposed development significantly deviates from this Block Servicing Strategy concept plan. The road network has been significantly altered and the number of local roads has been reduced resulting in longer distances between intersections which reduces pedestrian connections. This negatively impacts the pedestrian experience and discourages active transportation.</p> <p>On Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan Map B.7.4-1 – Land Use Plan Map the lands located along Barton Street are designated “Medium Density Residential 2”. On Fruitland-Winona Secondary Plan Map B.7.4-3 – Transportation Classification Plan Barton Street is identified as “Barton Street Pedestrian Promenade” and “Potential Rapid Transit Route”. The land use dedication is intended to support the creation of the pedestrian corridor and rapid transit along Barton Street. The proposal would move a portion of the density to the south of the subject lands along Highway No. 8. Moving density from Barton Street will not support creation of a corridor for rapid transit.</p> <p>Lower density residential uses were planned to be located at the centre of the development to provide a mix of housing types. The proposed development removed these uses from the plan.</p> <p>The proposed development deviates from the sanitary and storm design in the Block Servicing Strategy. According to the Block 3 Servicing Strategy services are to outlet to Barton Street, whereas the proposed outlet is to Lewis Road. In addition, the proposed development does not demonstrate that the municipal water system can support the proposed increase in density.</p> <p>The proposed development has not demonstrated that it protects specialty crop areas with the lands south of Highway No. 8 are designated “Specialty Crop” in the Rural Hamilton Official Plan. Air drainage patterns exist between these lands and Lake</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Block Servicing Strategy and Implementation</p> <p>Policies: B.7.4.14.1 c), B.7.4.14.1 n), B.7.4.17.2, and B.7.4.17.3</p> <p>(continued)</p>		<p>Ontario over the subject lands. An Air Drainage Analysis, prepared by WSP and dated April 12, 2024, was submitted with the applications. The scope of the analysis is limited to “Condo Block ‘A’” as shown on the Concept Plan. The study found that modifications to the street layout and building height have the potential to alter existing air drainage patterns. As such, the Air Drainage Analysis has not been approved.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with these policies.</p>
<p>Stormwater Management</p> <p>Policy: B.7.4.16.1 d)</p>	<p>Stormwater management facilities shall be designed to provide visual attraction and passive recreation where possible.</p>	<p>The concept plan does not demonstrate the stormwater management facility has been designed to provide visual attraction and passive recreation. The stormwater management facility located in Block 17 has no street frontage within the proposed development. The only connection to the stormwater management facility is via a 9.0 metre wide servicing block. Furthermore, this servicing block is not aligned with any roads or walkways to provide visual connections.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with this policy.</p>