

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>Management of Land Use, Settlement Area, Housing, Transportation Systems, Long-Term Economic Prosperity</p> <p>Policies: 2.2.2, 2.3.3, 2.3.4 and 2.4.3</p>	<p>Settlement Areas are intended to be the focus of growth and development. Within Settlement Areas, land use patterns shall efficiently use land, infrastructure, and public service facilities, and be transit supportive. Healthy, liveable, and safe communities are, in part, sustained by accommodating a range and mix of residential types and promoting the integration of land use planning, transit supportive development, and by encouraging sense of place through promoting well designed built form.</p>	<p>The proposed development is within a Settlement Area and the Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment will facilitate a development which supports healthy, liveable, and safe communities. Compact development is to occur within designated growth areas and having a mix of uses and densities promotes the efficient use of land, which utilizes infrastructure and public service facilities. The subject lands will introduce residential intensification of a vacant and underutilized institutional site.</p> <p>The proposal is consistent with these policies.</p>

Urban Hamilton Official Plan		
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>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:</p> <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; 	<p>The subject lands are at the southerly limit of the urban boundary and therefore interface with a rural environment, including rural residential to the south. The proposed development incorporates landscape features such as gateway features and the incorporation of dense plantings of mature vegetation including to soften the hardscape and provide natural screening to contribute to the pedestrian experience of the streetscape and will provide a sensitive transition with adjacent low profile development to respect the local context.</p> <p>The proposal complies with these policies.</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Urban Design Policies – General Policies and Principles Policies: B.3.3.2.2 – B.3.3.2.10 (continued)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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, • Designing streets as a transportation network and as a public spaces. 	
<p>Tree Management 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 Inventory and Preservation Plan has been prepared by Kuntz Forestry Consulting Inc. (Kaylee Harper; certified arborist) dated October 2, 2023, in support of the development.</p> <p>A total of 34 trees were inventoried and eight have been proposed to be removed. The decision to retain trees is to be based on condition, aesthetics, age, and species. It is recognized that there are limited opportunities to retain all trees on site. There is a concern with the removal of trees A (Eastern Red Cedar), B (Large tooth Aspen), and C (Large tooth Aspen) as these trees have been identified as being on the neighbouring property. Staff note that the lands are owned by the city (White Church Cemetery) permission will be required to remove these trees. As a result, the Tree Protection Plan has not been final approved. These details will be addressed through future Site Plan Control application.</p> <p>To ensure existing tree cover is maintained, 1 for 1 compensation is required for any tree (10 cm DBH or greater) that is proposed to be removed.</p> <p>The proposal complies with this policy.</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Transportation</p> <p>Policies: C.4.5.2 and C.4.5.12</p>	<p>A Transportation Impact Study shall be required for an Official Plan Amendment and/or a major Zoning By-law Amendment.</p>	<p>A Transportation Impact Study, prepared by Paradigm Transportation Solutions Limited, dated March 2023, was submitted. Transportation Planning staff have approved the Transportation Impact Study and support the proposed development, subject to right-of-way dedications being provided. Technical inconsistencies were identified in the report regarding location of sidewalks and cycling lanes which can be updated and addressed through the future Site Plan Control application.</p> <p>The existing right-of-way at the subject property along White Church Road West varies from approximately 20 metres to 24 metres. Approximately 5 metres are to be dedicated to the right-of-way on White Church Road West for a portion of the property to achieve a minimum overall right-of-way width of 30.480 metres.</p> <p>Staff are of the opinion the proposed development has addressed the requirements and the technical inconsistencies within the report can be addressed through the future Site Plan Control application. Access to the subject lands is limited to Hampton Brook Way and all dedications have been incorporated into the proposed design.</p> <p>The proposal complies with this policy.</p>
<p>Infrastructure</p> <p>Policy: C.5.3.6</p>	<p>All redevelopment within the urban area shall be connected to the City's water and wastewater system.</p>	<p>A Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report, prepared by S. Llewellyn & Associates Limited dated April 2023, and revised January 2025 were submitted. The proposed development has municipal water and wastewater infrastructure available. Development Engineering staff have raised concerns as the proposed density exceeds the capacity within the sanitary pumping station. Engineering staff have indicated that the maximum density is 106 people per hectare whereas 150 people per hectare is proposed. A Holding Provision has been added to</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Infrastructure</p> <p>Policy: C.5.3.6</p>		<p>the draft Zoning By-law Amendment ensuring sufficient capacity is available, including but not limited to any improvements to the existing sanitary sewer to accommodate the proposal.</p> <p>Furthermore, the applicant is required to demonstrate that no long-term dewatering (due to groundwater) will be conveyed to the municipal sewer infrastructure. A Hydrogeological Brief demonstrating soil / groundwater conditions to properly characterize potential dewatering needs will be required. The requirement for a Hydrogeological Brief can be addressed through detailed design through a future Site Plan Control application.</p> <p>Staff are of the opinion the proposal complies with the policy subject to the Holding Provision to ensure residual capacity is available.</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 for the following planning matters under the <i>Planning Act</i>, R.S.O., 1990 c. P.13.</p>	<p>The subject property meets three of the ten criteria used by the City of Hamilton and Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism for determining archaeological potential.</p> <p>A Stage 1, 2 (P1078-0096-2020/P1078-0100-2020) and Stage 3 Archaeological Report (P1106-0009-2021) were submitted on January 6, 2022, to the City of Hamilton and the Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism.</p> <p>The Province has signed off on the Stage 1-2 reports for compliance with licensing requirements in a letter dated June 11, 2023. Municipal heritage planning staff concur with the Stage 3 study's conclusion and are of the opinion that the municipal interest in the archaeology of this portion of the site has been satisfied. Staff request a copy of the letter for the Stage 3 report from the Ministry when available.</p> <p>The proposal complies with this policy.</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Noise</p> <p>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>The City shall ensure that all development or redevelopment with the potential to create conflicts between sensitive land uses and point source or fugitive air emissions such as noise, vibration, odour, dust, and other emissions complies with all applicable federal and provincial legislation, provincial and municipal standards, and provincial guidelines, and shall have regard to municipal guidelines. The City may require proponents of such proposals to submit studies prior to or at the time of application submission, including the following: noise feasibility study; detailed noise study; and any other information and materials identified in Section F.1.19 – Complete Application Requirements and Formal Consultation.</p>	<p>A Noise Assessment, prepared by dBA Acoustical Consultants Inc. dated December 2023, was submitted. The study analyzed vehicular traffic impacting the proposed development to determine if and what mitigation measures would be required.</p> <p>The report recommends mitigation measures to address the impact from traffic noise including requiring air conditioning for the entire building, warning clauses registered on title and/or in purchase and sale and/or lease or rental agreements, and special building components. These measures will be addressed through the future Site Plan Control and Building Permit stages, and the Draft Plan of Condominium stage if condominium tenure is considered.</p> <p>The proposal complies with this policy.</p>
<p>Institutional</p> <p>Policy: E.6.2.2 and E.6.2.6</p>	<p>The intent of the “Institutional” designation is to provide for a wide range of institutional uses which serve Hamilton’s communities.</p>	<p>The “Institutional” designation permits educational facilities, religious facilities, cultural facilities, health care facilities, long term care facilities, and day care facilities, but does not permit the proposed residential land use. Policy E.6.2.6 of Volume 1 identifies that low density residential uses being a single detached, semi-detached dwelling or street townhouse dwelling may be permitted if the institutional use ceases provided the use is compatible with the surrounding uses.</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Institutional</p> <p>Policy: E.6.2.2 and E.6.2.6</p> <p>(continued)</p>		<p>The redesignation is required as block townhouses are considered a medium density form of development and are not permitted within the “Institutional” designation.</p> <p>The proposal for residential on a vacant institutional site complies with the general intent of the polices., subject to the Official Plan Amendment application.</p>
Mount Hope Secondary Plan		
<p>Low Density Residential 2c</p> <p>Policy B.5.4.2.2 b) ii)</p>	<p>The permitted uses within the designation shall be a variety of multiple dwelling unit types including townhouse dwellings and all other forms of horizontal multiple dwellings with a density range from 26 to 40 units per net hectare.</p>	<p>The proposed development consists of townhouse units with a density of 42 units per net hectare. The applicant has requested a change in zoning from “Institutional” to “Low Density Residential 2c” along with a minor increase in density to accommodate the proposed development. The proposed residential uses are compatible with and respect the existing surrounding built form which includes two and two and a half storey single detached and townhouse dwellings. The proposal incorporates a higher density of development situated along the periphery of the neighbourhood while ensuring lower density residential is maintained within the interior of the neighbourhood. The proposed development will complete the streetscapes along Hampton Brook Way and White Church Road West and will improve pedestrian infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposal complies with this policy.</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Institutional Designation</p> <p>Policy B.5.4.5.1 a) and b)</p>	<p>The City recognizes the importance of the Institutional designation which is further recognized within the Mount Hope Secondary Plan as identified below:</p> <p>a) The Institutional designation recognizes existing institutional uses in the general area of the District Commercial designation, including the Mount Hope Elementary School, Mount Hope Post Office, Mount Hope Branch of the Wentworth Libraries, Glanford Community Hall, Glanbrook Fire Station No. 2 and the Mount Hope United Church. This Plan encourages the retention of these existing institutional uses in recognition of the importance of their importance in establishing and maintaining the Mount Hope Urban Settlement Area as a community and as a development focal point.</p> <p>b) Vehicular access to the Institutional lands adjacent to White Church Road shall be encouraged to be from the internal road network.</p>	<p>The subject lands are designated “Institutional” within the Mount Hope Secondary Plan. The “Institutional” designation of the Mount Hope Secondary Plan reverts to the permissions contained within policy E.6.2.2 of Volume 1 which permits educational facilities, religious facilities, cultural facilities, health care facilities, long term care facilities, and day care facilities, but does not permit the proposed residential land use. The intent of the “Institutional” designation is to provide for a wide range of institutional uses which serve Hamilton’s communities, however, policy E.6.2.6 of Volume 1 identifies that low density residential uses may be permitted if the institutional use ceases provided the use is compatible with the surrounding uses.</p> <p>The proposed block townhouses are considered a compatible at grade land use with the existing single detached and townhouse dwellings surrounding the subject lands. The redesignation of the land is required as block townhouses is considered a medium density form of development and not permitted.</p> <p>The Mount Hope Secondary Plan was approved in December 1995 as Official Plan Amendment No. 16 to the former Glanbrook Official Plan. The subject lands were designated “Institutional” at the time of approval recognizing existing institutional uses.</p> <p>The previous landowner, being an institution, deemed the subject lands surplus to their needs and sold the lands. The proposal was circulated to the public, internal departments, external agencies and school boards and no comments were received with regards to further a need of institutional or educational lands or facilities within Mount Hope. The subject lands have since continued to remain vacant, underutilized, and surplus for institutional needs.</p>

Theme and Policy	Summary of Policy or Issue	Staff Response
<p>Institutional Designation Policy B.5.4.5.1 a) and b)</p> <p>(continued)</p>		<p>The proposed development represents an opportunity to redevelop the lands for residential uses which is compatible with the surrounding land uses, helps increase the housing supply, promotes efficient use of land, utilizes existing infrastructure, and represents good planning.</p> <p>Staff are supportive of the change in designation as the proposal is not seeking the removal of an existing institutional use identified in policy B.5.4.5.1 a) but rather developing an underutilized vacant property while implementing a residential use compatible with the existing surrounding built form.</p>
<p>Noise and Other Airport Impacts</p> <p>Policies B.5.4.9.1 a) b) and c)</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>The City shall ensure that all development or redevelopment with the potential to create conflicts between sensitive land uses and point source or fugitive air emissions such as noise, vibration, odour, dust, and other emissions complies with all applicable federal and provincial legislation, provincial and municipal standards, and provincial guidelines, and shall have regard to municipal guidelines.</p>	<p>A Noise Assessment, prepared by dBA Acoustical Consultants Inc. dated December 2023, was submitted which analyzed vehicular traffic impacting the proposed development to determine if and what mitigation measures would be required.</p> <p>The report recommends mitigation measures to address impacts from traffic noise including requiring air conditioning for the entire building, warning clauses registered on title and/or in purchase and sale and/or lease or rental agreements, and special building components. These measures will be addressed through the future Site Plan Control and Building Permit stages, and the Draft Plan of Condominium stage if condominium tenure is considered.</p> <p>The subject lands are at the southerly urban boundary limit within the Mount Hope Secondary Plan. The proposed development is outside the 25 Noise Exposure Contour (NEF) as identified on Appendix D Noise Exposure Forecast Contours and Primary Zoning Regulation Area for the Hamilton International Airport and no further assessment of air traffic noise is required. In addition, the proposal will remain outside the 25 Noise Exposure Contour (NEF) as indicated in the 2025 Noise Exposure Projection for the extension of runways.</p>

		The proposal complies with this policy.
--	--	---