Planning and Economic Development Committee
MINUTES 05-015
June 28, 2005
7:00 p.m.
Marritt Hall
Ancaster Fairgrounds
625 Garner Road East
Ancaster

Present: Chair T. Whitehead
Mayor L. Di Ianni
1st Vice-Chair M. Pearson, 2nd Vice-Chair D. Mitchell
Councillors: B. Bratina, M. Ferguson, B. Kelly, B. McHattie,
and S. Merulla

Also Present: Councillors: D. Braden, C. Collins, T. Jackson, A. Morelli, A.
Samson

Staff Present: L. Coveyduck, GM, Planning & Economic Development
N. Everson, Executive Director, Economic Development
G. Paparella, Director, Industrial Park & Airport Development
L. Friday, Director, Taxation
S. Robichaud, Manager, G.R.I.D.S.
A. Rawlings – Coordinator, City Clerk’s Office
S. Paparella – Legislative Assistant, City Clerk’s Office

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE REPORTED TO COUNCIL FOR INFORMATION
PURPOSES:

(a) Changes to the Agenda
There were none.

(b) Declarations of Interest
There were none declared.
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Chair Whitehead welcomed everyone to the Special Meeting of the Planning and Economic Development Committee. He explained that the Special Meeting is intended to hear input from the public on the draft Official Plan Amendments for the lands around the Airport.

Chair Whitehead explained that the matter had been previously considered at the Public Meeting, on June 7, 2005, when a large number of people spoke to Committee, at Councillor Mitchell’s ward meeting in Binbrook, and during a further discussion on the matter at the Council meeting on June 15, 2005.

He requested speakers to keep their presentations brief, in line with the 5 minute rule in the Procedural By-law, and not to repeat points already made by other speakers. Chair Whitehead asked speakers who had already addressed Committee on this issue, to limit their remarks to new information, as their previous comments had already been recorded.

He noted that additional written submissions had been received from the following persons:

1) J. Owen Eagles, 565 Glancaster Road, Mount Hope
2) Thomas G. Nugent, 9 Grandview Avenue, Stoney Creek
3) Barbara and Gerald Rosenblum, 1695 Nebo Road, Mount Hope

Guy Paparella and Steve Robichaud provided an overview of the staff report with the aid of a PowerPoint presentation.

Mr. Paparella provided details of the Airport Influence area, and how new, noise sensitive uses would be restricted from locating there, and explained the Special Employment Area policy. Mr. Paparella noted that the proposed amendments would be followed by a detailed Secondary Planning process with extensive public input and that the required infrastructure would involve the private sector. He explained how the changes fit within the Provincial planning context.

Mr. Paparella explained that this would be a lengthy process and that development cannot occur until all the conditions of the Special Policy Area are met. He noted that the Special Policy Area is not for residential purposes, that the intent is to create jobs and to slow out-commuting, that there would be no expropriation and that existing uses within the study area may continue.
Chair Whitehead then asked members of the public to come forward and speak.

Carol Desnoyers, 998 Courtland Drive, Ancaster, addressed Committee and expressed her views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Concerned about change to urban boundaries.
- Extensive social, environmental and economic impacts.
- Need for more comprehensive studies.
- Action premature to completion of G.R.I.D.S.
- Provincial Policy Statement requires that a comprehensive review be included.
- Brownfield and Greyfield renewal should take priority over new development.
- Alternatives have not been identified.
- Loss of heritage – some residents’ families have been in area since 1800’s.
- Council should consider the following:
  (i) Extensive, ongoing debate and public input that is simple to understand;
  (ii) Council delay the initiative until completion of G.R.I.D.S.;
  (iii) That the Director of Planning and Development conduct a separate and comprehensive study; and,
  (iv) Invest and provide one viable, comprehensive alternative.

Dave Roberts, 68 Highway 53, Ancaster, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Concern that no public notices received in spite of his proximity to the area and his previous requests.
- Asked how residents would be protected from future development - what if neighbour sells to developer and you’re are stuck next to something that is annoying.
- Concern about general lack of information from the City.

Syd Hamber, 667 Highvalley, Ancaster, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Many new tax dollars could potentially come into this area. If there is no new commercial or industrial tax dollars coming into Hamilton, the residents will absorb the additional taxes or lose services.
- New infrastructure technology now available, one example is Zenon wastewater treatment system, much smaller than traditional systems.
- Airport sits on one of the great transportation corridors in Ontario.
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Strongly feel that if we analyze this to death we will end up losing the opportunity.

Urged Council to move ahead now.

Mr. Hamber provided a copy of a transportation corridor map for the public record.

Michael Corrado, 2 Hostein Drive, Ancaster, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Commended Council on the initiative
- Hamilton has been Toronto’s little brother too long.
- Many companies have left Hamilton to go to places like Brantford; not due to free trade, but lack of suitable sites.
- Urged Council to move ahead now.

Marian Hossack, 992 Southcote Road South, Ancaster, addressed Committee and expressed her views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- If there are no farms there would be no food, no future.
- Don’t want the green to turn grey.
- People enjoy pastoral scenery, but traffic going by goes so fast, people don’t see anything.
- Asked why we need to build more houses in Ancaster when so many are for sale already, suggested that Council should wait until these are sold and all back taxes are paid.
- Fewer and fewer planes into airport every year.

Ed Johnson, 1595 Fiddlers Green Road, Ancaster addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Many highways in area; many that aren’t any more than 5 km apart, poor planning in past
- If we have industrial complex, it will require arterial roads.
- Past history of airport has shown a lot of losses to Toronto.
- Suggested that Provincial plan for Pickering should be decided before we move forward, due to high costs.
Joe Barletta, 9620 Dickenson Road West, Ancaster, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- He and his family live close to airport and don’t object to airport activities being 24/7.
- Does not object to airport, City has lived up to its obligations regarding Airport.
- Asked what the plans were for his property.

Ted Gamble, 7 Talisman Court, Ancaster, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Has commuted for 17 years.
- Decided 6 months ago to become self employed; 3 current business in Ancaster area and is bringing on a 4th.
- Travels to other cities who are aggressively building and they are bringing in jobs and many tax dollars.
- Never seen Hamilton struggle as much as it is now, but won’t be fixed soon.
- Let’s get on with the plan please and have prudent meetings where items can be addressed.
- This City desperately needs jobs.

Maurice Desnoyer, 251 Carluke Road West, Ancaster, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Read his letter to Beverly Hendry, Ministry of Municipal Affairs, with copy to OMB, which requested that she intervene in this matter.
- Process – requirements of Ontario Planning Act not met.
- Low quality of planning analysis.
- No effort made to define what kind of jobs or cost of jobs.
- No effort made to outline how development might proceed outward from airport to prevent urban sprawl.
- No regard to quality of life.
- Concern about loss of agricultural land – Province has a responsibility regarding continuation of use of agricultural land.
Jim Quinn, 20 Blackwood Crescent, Hamilton, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Questioned the whole aerotropolis concept.
- Opportunities for industry have been missed.
- Numbers of jobs projected don’t add up when compared to other airports.
- Building roads and having airports will not solve job problems; free trade is taking jobs to other countries.
- Peak oil issue represents future problems for citizens and for airport.
- What will happen if land does not develop for airport uses.
- Danger that residential developers will benefit in the future.

Aidan Finn, 491 Book Road, Ancaster, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Concern about major road building in City
- Concern that other business parks will lose their potential customers.
- Many illegitimate businesses in City don’t pay taxes.

Janet Chafe, 111 Claremont Drive, Hamilton, addressed Committee and expressed her views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Concern that boundary expansion will consume 3,000 acres of prime farmland.
- Concern about lack of intelligibility of newspaper advertisement
- Residential areas will be affected by noise.
- Greenhouse gases saved when commuters who currently leave Hamilton to work will stay to work in Hamilton.
- Red Hill Expressway was to create jobs – what happened?
- Additional air pollution caused by increased air traffic
- Concerns about downtown and its future

Pete Zuzek representing COPE, 759 Westover Road, Flamorough, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Concern about format of meeting and information provided
- Transparency – this process has been anything but transparent.
- Not everyone’s vision for the future is growth. This should be given consideration.
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• We need to try harder to make downtown areas more viable.
• This committee is not giving consideration to what Province will ultimately do.
• Respect Greenbelt and do not change zoning.
• We don’t have proof yet that there is a need for a new highway from Niagara (commonly known as the Mid-Pen).

Robert Ward, 493 Butter East Road, Ancaster, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following

• Encouraged Council to move ahead with project
• Go for it!

Janice Currie, 251 Carluke Road West, Ancaster, addressed Committee and expressed her views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following

• Lack of respect to residents with regard to process.
• Plans did not include financial obligations, possible risks.
• Asked if they could continue farming and living on land
• Decisions and changes being made in haste that are irrevocable.
• Many “century” farms in the area.
• Comprehensive and transparent planning process is needed.

Rajeshreearti Sanichara, 4817 Wildrose Street, Mississauga, L5M 5M7, addressed Committee and expressed her views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following

• Has a detailed financial study or Cost Benefit Analysis been done? If so, is it complete and available to the public?
• Does it include infrastructure costs and who will fund?

Keith Birch, 702-24 Tisdale Street South, Hamilton, L8N 2V9, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

• Acting on behalf of clients in Special Area 2, encouraged Committee to move forward with proposal.
• Airports have always been considered an income generator.
• Good for City to proceed with proposal.
Al Bouchard, 9768 Dickenson Road West, Ancaster, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- How many businesses have gone in on Nebo Road? Why are we not filling that space first?
- Taxes have gone up $900 a year, now cannot sell his home, and how will Council address this issue?

Louise Lindley, 678 Miles Road West, R. R. #2 Hannon addressed Committee and expressed her views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Concern that fields, farmland and wildlife are being destroyed.
- Concern for future of the City.

Michael Desnoyers, 998 Courtland Drive, Ancaster, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Critical of meeting and process.

Jack Santa-Barbara, R. R. #2 Lynden, L0R 1T0, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Asked audience how many were in favour of proposal and then asked that the record show that majority of audience is not in favour of proposal.
- All of the GRIDS options include Aerotropolis as a key – no alternatives.
- Peak oil – oil availability will decline in next 5 to 10 years but planning process has ignored consideration of this matter.
- Job trends – this plan does not reflect climate change.
- Technology will not remove the peak oil issue.
- Listen to other areas of City that will be impacted.
- Why can’t we create another strategy in case the worst scenario happens so that we are not left with a white elephant.

Mark Chamberlain, 5 Anslow Court, Dundas addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:
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Hansen Report indicates 300 acres suggested as Brownfield, but no detailed inventory of Brownfield sites is available.

Economic Development is not only a municipal issue, but a Provincial one.

Vision 20/20 and G.R.I.D.S. process – 9 Directions clearly recognizes that our City is not just about jobs, but about people.

Need jobs close to home – that’s downtown.

Success of Aerotropolis directly related to support by Province.

Recommends that decision be deferred until all residents are made aware of proposed changes

Integrity of process should be upheld.

City has brought forward Vision 2020 and GRIDS but does not follow their own processes.

Concern about air pollution.

Wayne Smith, 1199 Glancaster Road, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Family on farm for 6 generations and wishes to remain.
- Why did Council not create jobs in downtown or east end of Hamilton where most development is occurring?
- Try to improve downtown – create jobs downtown and replace businesses that left downtown Hamilton (i.e. Procter and Gamble, Camco, etc.).
- Develop lands around existing highways, and use other Industrial Parks first, before taking farmland.

Ed Vella, 1084 Southcote Road, Ancaster, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Moved into this area for quiet neighbourhood – does not want industrial area in his back yard.
- Why not develop empty buildings in downtown core that are empty due to businesses that have already moved out.

Art Bowes, 45 Floresta Court, Ancaster, addressed Committee and expressed his views on the proposed amendments. These included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Wants everyone to know how difficult final decisions are for Municipal government, since Province always has final say.

Committee discussed the issues raised and had questions posed by the speakers answered by staff.
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Steve Robichaud explained that following the letter received from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs, a meeting had been held between staff and various points had been discussed and clarified. He considered that the meeting had been productive and advised that there had not yet been any written follow up from Ministry staff.

Councillor Merulla explained that the had come to this Special Planning and Economic Development Committee meeting to hear the views of the public, instead of attending his own Ward Meeting, although his own meeting had been planned more than six weeks ago.

Chair Whitehead advised that the Mayor was unwell, and had therefore left the meeting early.

Committee members thanked all those in the audience for attending and for expressing their views.

On a Motion by Councillor Pearson, seconded by Councillor Merulla, Committee received the delegations and the written submissions.

Committee then discussed process issues and requested information on procedure from the Clerk.

Councillor McHattie suggested Committee should reconsider their previous recommendation to Council made on June 7, 2005, in light of the public input received. There was no Motion.

(d) Adjournment
   (Ferguson/ Kelly)
   The Planning and Economic Development Committee adjourned at 9:39 p.m.

   Respectfully submitted,

   Terry Whitehead, Chair
   Planning & Economic Development Committee

Alexandra Rawlings, Co-ordinator
Stephanie Paparella, Legislative Assistant
Planning and Economic Development Committee
June 28, 2005