

**CONSULTATION SUMMARY – DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**

<b>Department/Agency</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Staff Response</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alectra Utilities</li> <li>• Corporate Real Estate, Economic Development, Planning and Economic Development</li> <li>• Enbridge</li> <li>• Legislative Approvals and Staging of Development, Growth Management, Planning and Economic Development</li> <li>• Ministry of Transportation</li> <li>• Sun-Canadian Pipeline</li> </ul>	<p>No Comment/No Objection.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<b>Internal Departments</b>		
<p>Healthy Environments, Medical Office of Health, Healthy and Safe Communities</p>	<p>Chronic Disease Prevention does not support the proposed Elfrida urban boundary expansion due to its anticipated negative public health impacts.</p> <p>The expansion would result in the permanent loss of approximately 2,851 acres of Prime Agricultural Land—95.48% of which is prime Class 1–3 soil—contradicting Section 4.3 of the PPS. This loss undermines local food systems and access to healthy, affordable food, especially given the presence of four livestock operations that make the area incompatible with development under minimum distance separation rules.</p> <p>While the Elfrida concept includes a mix of residential, employment, and commercial uses, the proposal lacks clear plans for how these elements will be functionally connected through complete street design, active transportation networks, and transit integration. For example:</p>	<p>The recommendation for a Health Impact Assessment is acknowledged and may be explored if the applications are approved, as part of future Secondary Planning.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Much of the proposed residential land in the Elfrida expansion area is located far from commercial and mixed-use nodes—up to 2 to 3.5 kilometres (approximately a half-hour to fifty-minute walk) in some cases—making walking impractical.</li> <li>• The proposal lacks compact block design, internal connectivity, and integration with broader active transportation networks, limiting opportunities for safe, daily active travel to schools and other uses.</li> <li>• The site is also relatively isolated and surrounded by car-dependent neighbourhoods, reducing the viability of transit or active transportation as primary travel modes. For example, the site is located about 17 kilometres from the nearest emergency room.</li> </ul> <p>As a result, even with the right land uses on paper, Elfrida risks functioning as a car-dependent, low-density extension of existing suburban development patterns. In our view, the Elfrida Urban Boundary Expansion does not fully satisfy the intent of Section 2.1.1 of the PPS, which calls for planning that supports healthy, liveable, and safe communities by promoting efficient land-use and integrated service delivery.</p> <p>Given the potential for significant and long-term implications for population health, it is recommended that a comprehensive Health Impact Assessment (HIA) be conducted as a condition of any approval of the proposed UBE.</p>	
<p>Development Charges, Programs and Policies Team, Corporate Services</p>	<p>From a DC perspective staff would simply note that if there is an Urban Boundary Expansion, any development within the expansion lands would be levied according to current DC Rates using “Urban Area B” as opposed to “Urban Area A.” The city’s 2024 DC Bylaw defines these urban areas for the sake of DC calculation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

<p>Financial Planning Administration and Policy, Corporate Services</p>	<p>The 2024 DC By-law relies on Masterplans and growth projections to 2031. This analysis may need to be revisited when Masterplans and growth projections to 2051 are completed.</p> <p>It is important to note that DC revenue assumptions and operating cost projections, and tax revenue projections are based on full build-out. The City will likely have some carrying costs for financing infrastructure in advance of full build-out.</p>	<p>Future financial planning updates associated with these applications will consider the need to revisit the Financial Impact Assessment when Masterplans and growth projections to 2051 are completed and the DC By-law is updated to ensure projections are accurate.</p> <p>The issue raised with regards to carrying costs will be considered through the evaluation of the applications.</p>
<p>Commercial Districts and Small Business, Economic Development, Planning and Economic Development</p>	<p>Approval of the applications may reduce demand for growth through urban intensification by redirecting the demand and inhibiting the ability to direct new housing and growth to strategic commercial districts and corridors where new housing and residents could support existing businesses that are vital to supporting the revitalization of these areas.</p>	<p>The potential impact on intensification targets and subsequent effects on the City as a whole will be considered in the evaluation of the applications in accordance with policy objectives outlined in the PPS and OP.</p>
<p>Infrastructure Planning, Growth Management, Planning and Economic Development</p>	<p>Based on materials submitted, staff cannot support the proposed Urban Boundary Expansion at this time.</p> <p>The submission lacks sufficient detail to demonstrate that existing or planned infrastructure can support the proposed development, both in terms of existing and planned water and wastewater systems. In alignment with Council’s “no urban expansion growth strategy”, the City’s population growth forecasts are focused on growth within the urban area. In accordance with City and Provincial policies respecting growth, intensification, and utilization of existing infrastructure, capacity in the trunk sewer system and the treatment facility have been reallocated within the existing Urban Boundary. As such, the City’s forthcoming Water, Wastewater, and Stormwater Masterplans do not identify</p>	<p>Staff concur that the applications cannot be supported as submitted. The submission lacks the required technical studies to demonstrate feasibility for water, wastewater, and stormwater servicing. Future consideration will be contingent on completing required studies and aligning with approved growth strategies and infrastructure plans.</p>

	<p>infrastructure needs to support an urban boundary expansion. Consequently, the Elfrida proposal would presume to remove water and wastewater servicing capacity from planning growth within the existing urban boundary.</p> <p>From a stormwater perspective, the absence of a completed Phase 1 Subwatershed Study means the feasibility of the current concept plan cannot be confirmed by staff. To demonstrate feasibility, the strategy for developing the concept plan (i.e., an opportunities and constraints analysis/map) should be completed early in the process to ensure that all factors influencing stormwater management planning have been considered. Significant revisions are needed to inform a viable stormwater management strategy and assess the overall feasibility of the expansion. Given the importance of the concept plan in relation to the proposed intent of the UBE lands to be brought into the urban boundary, this work would establish the overall feasibility from a high-level/conceptual basis.</p>	
<p>Transit Strategic Planning, Transit, Public Works</p>	<p>HSR is supportive of the proposed land uses surrounding the proposed Elfrida Gateway Station and the proposed bus stops and bus routes on the interior roads of the proposed development.</p> <p>The proposed bus stops and bus routes on the exterior roads of the proposed development are not supported by HSR, as HSR does not envision providing bus service on the exterior roads unless the adjacent land use changes to higher density commercial/residential. Additionally, servicing these exterior roads may create additional pressure to develop adjacent to the new transit corridor, continuing outwards pressure on the urban boundary.</p> <p>Staff estimate 9,500 additional annual service hours will be required to divert routes in the area around the Elfrida lands to serve the neighbourhood, as designed. Using a recent Canadian Urban Transit Association operating factor, this represents approximately \$1.1 mil (2025\$) in additional operating costs each year.</p>	<p>Noted. Transit servicing implications, routing needs, and cost estimates will be considered through the evaluation of the applications. If the applications are approved, staff recognize that further coordination will be required during future planning stages to assess transit feasibility and service model options.</p>

	<p>HSR may also be able to provide On-Demand transit service in the area. The cost and service hours for On-Demand are difficult to predict. The expectation is that the cost will be lower than the extensions of fixed route service.</p>	
<p>Transportation Planning Services, Transportation Planning and Parking, Planning and Economic Development Department</p>	<p>Transportation Planning does not support the Urban Boundary Expansion as currently proposed, as the submitted transportation assessments and studies <b><u>did not contain sufficient information to demonstrate:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The existing transportation network has capacity to accommodate the traffic generated by the applications (e.g., traffic associated with buildout of the Elfrida lands may affect the City’s ability to complete several planned key transportation links and corridors as sufficient additional capacity may not be able to be provided within the right-of-way, or provision of such capacity may require the roads to be built to a standard that exceeds current City policies and practices).</li> <li>• The planned future transportation network, both adjacent to the study area, and the broader community/transportation system both upstream and downstream, inclusive of the north-south and east-west escarpment crossings, has capacity to accommodate the traffic generated by the proposal (i.e., the study has not assessed or outlined how the required future transportation network will be provided to ensure sufficient facilities and capacity are provided as development progresses).</li> <li>• The proposed active transportation facilities will support and promote cycling within the urban boundary expansion area and to/from the (future) external network (e.g., the proposed cycling and pedestrian facilities are limited in terms of types and location of provisions suitable for all ages and abilities. Additionally, it is unclear from the provided land use plan</li> </ul>	<p>A revised Transportation Assessment will be required to address existing and planned capacity, connectivity, implementation phasing, and policy alignment. If the applications are approved, the requirements outlined in the full comments will need to be addressed through a future Secondary Planning process.</p>

	<p>where the schools and commercial development are proposed to be located to promote accessibility for all future residents).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The proposed sidewalk network will support and promote walking trips within the urban boundary expansion area and to/from the (future) external network.</li><li>• A network implementation plan that ensures adequate transportation facilities with acceptable levels of service, where required, will be provided at all stages/phases of buildout for all modes of travel and which will promote active and alternative transportation through the urban boundary expansion area and to/from the external network.</li></ul> <p>Additionally:</p> <p>Through the Transportation Master Plan, the City has not planned for sufficient transportation infrastructure to support development of these lands, due to the firm urban boundary strategy.</p> <p>The study document does not provide information regarding how development of the Urban Boundary Expansion Area (UBEA) would align with the City's population and employment forecasts, Transportation Master Plan (TMP), and Strategic Transportation Network Review (STNR).</p> <p>Any future Transportation Assessment submissions shall address the specific issues outlined in the full comments provided, and shall be undertaken using the appropriate standards, policies, and guidelines.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>Heritage and Urban Design, Planning, Planning and Economic Development</p>	<p><b>Cultural Heritage and Archaeological Potential</b></p> <p>The subject property meets five of the 10 criteria used by the City of Hamilton and Ministry of Citizenship and Multiculturalism for determining archaeological potential – meaning the property has archaeological potential.</p> <p>Staff concur with the recommendations of the Stage 1 Archaeological Assessment that the following requirements should be addressed as part of a future Secondary Plan and/or future redevelopment application:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Any future developments within the study area, beyond those portions that have been cleared of any further archaeological concern, must be preceded by a Stage 2 archaeological assessment prior to any approvals.</li> <li>• Sites AhGw-73, AgGw-19, and AgGw-61 have been documented within the limits of the study area and require further archaeological assessment. During Stage 2 Archaeological Assessments in their vicinities, fieldwork methodologies must be adjusted in an effort to relocate the sites and appropriately evaluate cultural heritage value or interest.</li> <li>• The historical Swayze Family cemetery is located within the study area at 370 Regional Road 5. This area will require a Stage 3 Cemetery Investigation subsequent to any Stage 2 Archaeological Assessment in the immediate vicinity of the cemetery (e.g. within 10 metres). The investigation must be carried out in accordance with the requirements of the <i>Funeral, Burial and Cremation Services Act, 2022, S.O. 2002.</i></li> </ul> <p>The urban boundary expansion area is also comprised of and is adjacent to a concentration of 28 Inventoried Properties with cultural heritage value/interest, including Swayze Cemetery.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
---	---	---------------

	<p>Staff concur with the findings of the Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment. If the urban boundary is expanded to include the subject lands, staff require a Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment be completed and submitted with any future Secondary Plan and/or future redevelopment application.</p> <p><b>Urban Design</b></p> <p>Urban Design Staff also reviewed the preliminary Concept Plan drawings and associated document, and noted that, should the urban boundary expansion be implemented, Urban Design staff will require further attention to the following UHOP policies: A.2.4. (Growth Management), B.3.2. (Housing Policies), B.3.3.1 (Urban Design Goals), B.3.3.2 (General Policies and Principles), B.3.5 (Community Facilities/Services Policies), and E.3.7. (Residential Greenfield Design).</p> <p>Additionally, the applicant will need to integrate and demonstrate how the proposal relates to the City-Wide Corridor Planning Principles and Guidelines and Hamilton’s Green Building Standards, and provide an Urban Design Guideline to accompany the Secondary Plan, with a detailed Terms of Reference to be provided by staff if the urban boundary expansion is permitted.</p> <p>At a high level, the following required improvements to the preliminary Concept Plan were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Need for a clearer vision and justification for the Intensification Hub, articulated through a detailed masterplan and design guidelines that outline the street networks, open spaces, built form principals, and streetscaping.</li><li>• More information on the interface between the intensification corridor and the adjacent residential areas is needed, especially with relation to the transition between the built form and the adjacent uses.</li></ul>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A more detailed vision and set of principles between the Natural System areas and the development areas (i.e., clear delineation and separation from development).</li><li>• More coherent parks and open space planning.</li><li>• Additional community-related uses represented through the plan, with clear policies and guidelines directing their integration within the community.</li></ul>	
--	--	--

<p>Waste Policy and Planning, Waste Management, Public Works</p>	<p>Waste Management requirements are not applicable to the Official Plan Amendment applications but must be addressed at later stages of the development process. Applicants will be required to apply the City of Hamilton Waste Requirements for Design of New Developments and Collection, dated 2021. These requirements outline specific design considerations for different development types and ensure safe and efficient waste collection services.</p>	<p>Noted. Waste Management requirements will be addressed at later development stages, should the applications be approved, in accordance with applicable City standards.</p>
<p>Forestry and Horticulture, Environmental Services, Public Works</p>	<p>If the applications are approved and this area is included as part of the urban boundary, Forestry would need to review service levels and impacts to staffing/operating as we currently service areas outside of the urban boundary on an on-demand basis. Staff also anticipate impacts to existing public tree assets, and if approved, a tree management plan would need to be submitted. Staff can only assess canopy cover through the submission of landscape plans, to determine if additional public tree assets will be planted. Horticulture would also need to assess service levels impacts if Horticultural features are proposed within the rights-of-way.</p>	<p>If the applications are approved, a tree management plan and landscape plan will be required through subsequent planning stages. Forestry and Horticulture service implications/impacts to staffing and operations will be considered in future reviews.</p>
<p>Landscape Architectural Services, Environmental Services, Public Works</p>	<p>The City-wide Parks Master Plan highlights that any parkland provisioning for new growth areas outside of the existing built-up urban area would need to be undertaken through the Secondary Planning process. This includes identifying the need (if applicable) for all types of park classes: Neighbourhood Park, Community Park, Parkette, and City-Wide Park.</p> <p>In 2023, City Council made a clear decision to say ‘no’ to urban boundary expansions. The proposed applications run counter to this mandate and as a result, will impact the City's ability to provide parkland (through funding that is required to secure land) and to maintain or enhance existing service levels of these future park spaces. Sprawling outward through the built environment will also require Environmental Services staff to spread existing resources more thinly (with respect to coordinating parkland acquisition, planning, design, and eventually parks operations and maintenance).</p>	<p>Noted. Staff are of the opinion that the applicant should have addressed whether there is sufficient capacity in existing or planned public services facilities – which includes parks – per PPS policy 2.3.2.1.b).</p> <p>Staff concur that the applications run counter to Council’s decision and think an approval of the applications will have negative impacts on the City’s ability to provide parkland and to maintain and enhance existing service levels.</p> <p>If the applications are approved, parkland needs, integration of</p>

	In reviewing the applications, it was unclear if/how the area designated Natural Heritage System will be integrated into future City-owned Open Space lands. Additionally, it is worth noting that the area identified as Potential Linear Greenway is a utility corridor owned by Hydro One and, as such, early coordination efforts will be needed to establish this space as a formalized multi-use trail connection.	natural features, and coordination with external agencies such as Hydro One will be addressed through any future Secondary Planning process.
Parks, Environmental Services, Public Works	Information provided in the concept plan does not allow for informed responses from an environmental services review. Please confirm that a Secondary Planning exercise would follow with more information regarding land use designation details, particularly open space designations and active transportation connectivity.	Noted. Staff confirm that a Secondary Planning process would follow, should the applications be approved. The proponent would be required to provide the detailed land uses and active transportation planning necessary for a fulsome Parks review at that time.
Parks (Cemeteries), Environmental Services, Public Works	There are no plans for cemetery land in this location.	Noted.
Infrastructure Renewal, Engineering Services, Public Works	Upper Centennial Parkway from Rymal to Mud is tentatively scheduled for infrastructure renewal in 2028, including road resurfacing, to be coordinated with a new watermain. Regional Road 20 from Upper Centennial Parkway to the East City Limits is tentatively scheduled for 2027, including road resurfacing.	Noted. Coordination with planned infrastructure projects will be considered in future development staging and servicing strategies.
City Wide Services, Recreation, Healthy and Safe Communities	<p>The Recreation Master Plan (RMP) accounts for planned growth and population density within the current urban boundary. As such, the RMP identifies facility needs and distribution to support this growth within recreation planning areas and does not consider needs to support an urban boundary expansion.</p> <p>The Recreation Master Plan proposes growth related Community Recreation Centres (CRC) in Elfrida, Glanbrook, and Mount Hope. Secondary planning will further identify CRC classification and</p>	<p>Noted. Staff agree that adequate existing or planned capacity for recreation facilities to support the proposed development has not been demonstrated by the proponent.</p> <p>Additionally, it is noted that the proposed development could place</p>

	<p>outdoor sport space needed and where these sites should be located to best serve the community.</p> <p>As the applications do not address the existing and planned capacity as set out in the RMP, the submission lacks detail to demonstrate capacity in existing and planned Recreation facilities to accommodate the proposal. Moreover, the proposed intensification outside the urban boundary increases pressure on planned buildings and may impact placement of facilities and site servicing needs, which will need to be considered.</p> <p>While secondary planning could further identify classification and identify the outdoor sport spaces needed — as well as where they should be located to best serve the community — this has not been sufficiently addressed to ensure adequate existing or planned capacity, as noted above.</p>	<p>pressure on planned facilities, potentially impacting their siting and servicing. These implications will be considered through the evaluation of the applications.</p>
<b>External Agencies</b>		
<p>Mississaugas of the Credit First Nation</p>	<p>Upon our review, we have determined that the project should be proceeded by, at minimum, a Stage 1 archaeological assessment to determine the location’s archaeological potential. The Department of Consultation and Accommodation (DOCA) must be notified of, invited to participate in, and be provided the opportunity to review this archaeological assessment, as well as any environmental assessments. At its discretion, DOCA may request capacity funding from the proponent for its consultation and engagement activities relating to the project.</p>	<p>Staff confirm that a Stage 1 assessment was carried out as part of the Elfrida Secondary Plan Study in 2020, which the proponent has submitted as part of their applications. In lieu of an environmental assessment, however, the proponent elected to submit a preliminary constraints memo and preliminary general vegetation inventory.</p> <p>The proponent will be advised to notify and engage DOCA regarding any subsequent archaeological or environmental assessments. Staff</p>

		<p>further acknowledge that DOCA may request capacity funding from the proponent to support its consultation activities.</p>
<p>Six Nations of the Grand River (SNGR)</p>	<p>We always insist on natural environmental studies being completed prior to such submissions and oppose applications on environmentally sensitive lands when such information is unavailable. Writ large, the sheer size of the land, natural features contained therein, and intensity of proposed development, will result in severe rights impacts. But as things stand, it's impossible for us to determine specific impacts to Aboriginal and treaty rights or suggest forms of avoidance and mitigation. Consequently, we ask that the boundary expansion applications be withdrawn until such a time as the sub-watershed study is available.</p> <p>With respect to that study, we would like to ensure that animals and plants important to SNGR members are adequately considered. So please make sure any animals which may be hunted, and plants important to SNGR members are included.</p>	<p>Noted. The applications cannot be supported as submitted, without the completion of a subwatershed study. The request for completion of natural environmental studies, including a subwatershed study, prior to processing the applications is acknowledged. Staff recognize SNGR's position regarding the potential rights impacts associated with the scale and nature of development. The need to assess the presence of species significant to SNGR members, such as hunted animals and culturally important plants, will be communicated for inclusion in future environmental and ecological assessments. Further engagement with SNGR will be supported as additional information becomes available.</p>
<p>John C. Munro Hamilton International Airport</p>	<p>The assessment shows that the proposed development falls outside of the Airport's OLS; however, the southeastern part of the land lies under the AZR – Approach 30. The Airport considers the City of Hamilton's development review process in place for assessing individual applications suitable for safeguarding the AZR in regard to these lands. Considering NEF, as noted in the Noise Related Impact Study, part of the land falls between the current NEF 25-28 contours. It should also be noted that NEF and NEP contours may change in the future.</p>	<p>The Airport's position regarding the need for noise mitigation in NEF 25+ areas is acknowledged.</p> <p>Based on the City's current mapping, the subject lands are just north of the NEF 28+ contour, and there is no conflict with the NEF policies of the Official Plans.</p>

	<p>If future development is permitted within NEF 25+ areas, these developments should include noise mitigation. In effect, the Airport does not oppose the urban boundary expansion, as long as existing processes are maintained in regard to height development on these lands, and suitable land use, in consultation with the Airport, is applied to protect the Airport’s flight corridors.</p>	<p>Additionally, in October 2023, City Council approved the Airport’s 2023-2043 Master Plan, which includes updated NEF contours that reflect anticipated changes to the Airport. These changes increase the area of land above both 28+ and 30+ NEF contours, with NEF 28 contours mapped further south of the subject lands than they already are.</p> <p>Staff agree that any future land use planning for the affected area may require continued consultation with Airport staff to ensure compatible development. Staff also acknowledge the importance of maintaining existing height and land use review processes to protect flight corridors and airport operations.</p>
<p>Hamilton Conservation Authority</p>	<p>The PPS generally directs development to areas outside of hazardous lands. The subject property contains natural hazards associated with the watercourse, HDF and karst features present within the subject lands.</p> <p>The subject applications defer most analysis to the secondary plan stage and future subwatershed study as further assessment and studies are still being completed. HCA staff are of the opinion that the natural hazards have not been reasonably assessed or delineated at this time, nor have the baseline conditions been established. As such, the applications are not consistent with the natural hazard policies of the PPS at this time.</p>	<p>Staff agree that natural hazards have not been adequately assessed or delineated, and that additional work should have been completed to this effect in advance of the applications. This absence of information will be considered through the applications’ evaluation.</p>

<p>Hamilton-Wentworth Catholic District School Board (HWCDSB)</p>	<p>Based on the current utilization rates, the existing catchment area schools and review area schools do not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the future students that are anticipated from the development of this urban boundary expansion area.</p> <p>The Board’s current Education Development Charges (EDC) by-law background study identifies the need for two elementary schools in the Heritage Green and Binbrook areas by 2029 and 2030, respectively. These recommendations do not take into consideration the additional growth proposed from the Elfrida urban boundary expansion lands.</p> <p>The applications and supporting material do not identify the number of proposed dwelling units and types, which is required by the Board to be able to properly assess the applications for student accommodation purposes and to identify school site needs.</p>	<p>The lack of dwelling unit data within the Planning Justification Report, which limits the Board’s ability to assess future student accommodation needs, is acknowledged. Staff note that the Transportation Assessment submitted by the applicant provides the proposed unit type and mix for the existing concept plan, but that final unit numbers and mix would be determined at the Secondary Plan and development approvals stage.</p> <p>Staff recognize that additional school capacity may be required beyond current EDC by-law forecasts should the expansion proceed. In this case, the proponent will be advised to work with the HWCDSB to provide dwelling unit counts, types, and densities as part of the Secondary Planning process.</p>
<p>Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board (HWDSB)</p>	<p>The applications do not provide a School Accommodation Issues Assessment report, as required in the City of Hamilton’s Draft Framework for Processing &amp; Evaluating Urban Boundary Expansion Applications. The Board is requesting the following data to support their evaluation of existing and anticipated capacity of elementary and secondary schools in the area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dwelling unit types, counts and bedroom counts to the smallest geographic area possible;</li> <li>• Density of the proposed expansion area; and</li> <li>• Development phasing strategy if possible.</li> </ul>	<p>The lack of dwelling unit data within the Planning Justification Report, which limits the Board’s ability to assess future student accommodation needs, is acknowledged. Staff note that the Transportation Assessment submitted by the applicant provides the proposed unit type and mix for the existing concept plan, but that final unit numbers and mix would be</p>

	<p>The board has also provided a list of considerations to be contemplated through the next phase of planning.</p>	<p>determined at the Secondary Plan and development approvals stage.</p> <p>Should the applications be approved, the proponent will be advised to work with the HWDSB to address their list of considerations and provide additional information to support planning for future facilities.</p>
<p>Niagara Peninsula Conservation Authority (NPCA)</p>	<p>NPCA staff note that the 2018 Elfrida Phase 1 subwatershed study is being updated and request a review of the revised report when available. A site visit is also requested to verify regulated features, which may lead to further comments or a technical memo request.</p> <p>Staff support proposed setbacks of 30 metres for wetlands and 15 metres for watercourses and have no objection in principle to the stormwater management approach but will require detailed designs and calculations at a later stage.</p> <p>Staff also note the report references Chapter 5 of the 2024 Provincial Planning Statement but lacks analysis on addressing natural hazards such as watercourses and their flooding and erosion hazards, and karst topography.</p>	<p>NPCA’s request for review of the updated subwatershed study and a site visit to verify regulated features is acknowledged.</p> <p>Planning staff agree with Growth Management staff that the absence of a completed Phase 1 Subwatershed Study means the feasibility of the current concept plan with relation to stormwater management cannot be confirmed at this stage.</p> <p>Staff also agree that additional analysis is required with relation to natural hazards. This will be taken into consideration through the review of the applications.</p>

<p>TransCanada PipeLines Limited (TCPL)</p>	<p>TCPL has two high pressure natural gas pipelines contained within its easement(s) crossing the Subject Lands, within the Hydro Corridor. Initial review yielded the following comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The pipeline Right-of-Way (ROW) must be shown on all future plans and drawings.</li> <li>2. The City and Proponent must engage TCPL early in the Secondary Planning process and subsequent planning approvals for proposed development within 200 m of the pipeline.</li> <li>3. Through the Draft Plan of Subdivision, TCPL’s ROW should be identified on all municipal plans and schedules and should be dedicated to the municipality as passive open space or parkland subject to TCPL’s easement rights.</li> <li>4. Setbacks:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No buildings or structures on the ROW.</li> <li>○ Permanent structures: 7 m setback from ROW.</li> <li>○ Temporary/moveable/accessory structures: 3 m setback.</li> <li>○ Roads, parking, and loading areas: 7 m setback from ROW.</li> </ul> </li> <li>5. Activity Restrictions (require TCPL consent):             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Construction of facilities (e.g., trails, pathways, berms, fences, etc.) on/under ROW.</li> <li>○ Ground disturbance within 30 m of pipeline.</li> <li>○ Driving over ROW outside of public roads.</li> <li>○ Use of explosives within 300 m.</li> <li>○ Storage within Prescribed Area.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>TCPL also provides design guidance for crossings, landscaping, sidewalks/paths, and facilities within the TCPL ROW and Prescribed Area.</p>	<p>Staff recognize the location of the pipelines on the subject lands requires careful consideration. If the applications are approved, Staff agree that early engagement with TCPL through the Secondary Planning phase will be needed.</p> <p>With regards to the activity restrictions outlined by TCPL, staff note that the proponent has included the suggestion that active transportation connections could be accommodated along the hydro corridor. If the applications are approved, staff note that the concept plan could change should TCPL determine that this suggested use is not appropriate.</p>
---	--	--