THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE REPORTED TO COUNCIL:

1. Enterprise Zone Municipal Realty Tax Incentive Grant Program - 132 Main Street West/40 Bay Street South, Hamilton EZ06/06 (PED06417(a)) (Ward 2) (Item 5.1) (Bratina/Pearson)
   (a) That the condition of the approval of Enterprise Zone application EZ06/06 for a Hilton Homewood Suites Hotel at 132 Main Street West/40 Bay Street South as an eligible project under the Enterprise Zone Municipal Realty Tax Incentive Grant Program, as recommended in Report PED06417 and approved by City Council on October 25, 2006, be deleted and replaced with the condition that the applicant provide photographic documentation of the building at 40 Bay Street South to the satisfaction of the Manager of Community Planning and Design prior to demolition.

   (b) That, as per the requirement of the Enterprise Zone Municipal Realty Tax Incentive Grant Program, Council declare the proposed demolition of the
buildings and the proposed redevelopment of the property are in conformity with the Downtown Hamilton, Community Downtowns and Business Improvement Areas Community Improvement Plan, including its goals and objectives.

CARRIED

2. LACAC ((Municipal Heritage Committee report 07-003) respecting 132 Main Street West/40 Bay Street South, Hamilton EZ06/06 (Added Item)

(Pearson /Clark)

That Report 07-003 from LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) respecting the Enterprise Zone Municipal Realty Tax Incentive Grant Program application for 132 Main Street West/40 Bay Street South, Hamilton EZ06/06, and their request that as a condition of grant approval the owners take every step to preserve the heritage features of the existing heritage building and incorporate them into any new building proposed for the site, be received.

CARRIED

3. Demolition Permit – 255 Rymal Road West - (PED07262) (Ward 8) (Item 5.2)

(Pearson /Clark)

That the Director of Building Services be authorized and directed to issue a demolition permit for 255 Rymal Road West in accordance with By-Law 74-290 pursuant to Section 33 of The Planning Act as amended.

CARRIED

4. Committee of Adjustment (Urban) Minor Variance Application HM/A-07:129 for the property known as 468-470 James Street North -Supported by the Planning and Economic Development Department (PED07264) (Ward 2)(Item 5.3)

(Pearson /Clark)

That Report PED07264 respecting Committee of Adjustment Minor Variance Application HM/A-07:129 for the property known as 468-470 James Street North, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED07264, denied by the Committee of Adjustment but supported by the Planning and Economic Development Department, be received for information.

CARRIED
5. Committee of Adjustment (Urban) Minor Variance Application HM/A-07:130 for the Property Known as 175 Young Street - Supported by the Planning and Economic Development Department (PED07265) (Ward 2) (Item 5.4) (Pearson /Clark)

That Report PED07265 respecting Committee of Adjustment Minor Variance Application HM/A-07:130 for the property known as 175 Young Street, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED07265, denied by the Committee of Adjustment but supported by the Planning and Economic Development Department, be received for information.

CARRIED

6. Application for an Amendment to the Glanbrook Official Plan, and for Changes in Zoning for the Lands Located Within Block 80, Plan 62M-1035, and 3206 Regional Road 56, in the Former Township of Glanbrook (Binbrook) (PED07253) (Ward 11) (Item 6.1) (Mitchell/Clark)

(a) That approval be given to Official Plan Amendment Application OPA-07-03, by Losani Homes, Owner, for Official Plan Amendment No. ____, to amend Schedule ‘A’, Land Use Plan, from “Residential” to “Binbrook Community Core”, and Schedule ‘B’, Binbrook Village Secondary Plan, from “Medium Density Residential” to “Community Core”, of the Official Plan for the former Township of Glanbrook, on the lands located within Block 80, Plan 62M-1035, Binbrook, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED07253, on the following basis:

(i) That the draft Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED07253, be adopted by City Council.

(b) That approval be given to Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-07-021, by Losani Homes, Owner, for changes in zoning from the Existing Residential “ER” Zone to the General Commercial “C3-225” Zone (Block 1) and from the Residential Multiple “RM3-202” Zone to the General Commercial “C3-225” Zone (Block 2), to permit development of a mixed-use building on the lands located within Block 80, Plan 62M-1035 and 3206 Regional Road 56, in the former Township of Glanbrook as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED07253, on the following basis:

(i) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED07253, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, and as amended by Committee to include an “H”-Holding provision, said provision to be removed when the Environmental Assessment respecting Highway 56, has been finalized, be enacted by City Council,

(ii) That the amending By-law be added to Schedule ‘H’ of Zoning By-law No. 464.
(iii) That the proposed changes in zoning will be in conformity with the Glanbrook Official Plan upon approval of Official Plan Amendment No._____.

CARRIED

7. Application for a further modification in Zoning for Lands Located at 8 McDonald Court (Flamborough) (PED07263) (Ward 15) (Item 6.4) (Pearson /Bratina)

(a) That Zoning Application ZAR-07-035, Angelika Plath, owner, for a further modification in zoning to the Urban Residential (Single Detached) “R1-6” Zone, to permit two single detached dwellings on separate lots, on lands located at 8 McDonald Court, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED07263, be approved as follows:

(i) That the application conforms with the Flamborough Official Plan and the West Waterdown Secondary Plan.

(ii) That staff be directed to bring an appropriate by-law to Council.

(b) That the Legal Services Division be directed to attend the Ontario Municipal Board hearing respecting Consent Application FL/B-06:176 in support of the decision of the Committee of Adjustment to approve the application.

CARRIED

8. Applications for Amendments to the Flamborough Official Plan and Zoning By-law No. 90-145-Z for Lands Located at 928 Brock Road (Flamborough)(PED07259)(Ward 14) (Item 6.5) (Whitehead/Pasuta)

(a) That Official Plan Amendment Application OPA-07-009, Scott Bennett, owner, to add a Special Policy to the “Rural” designation in the Flamborough Official Plan to permit a commercial trucking operation, on the lands located at 928 Brock Road (Flamborough), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED07259, be denied on the following basis:

(i) That the application does not conform to the Greenbelt Plan, and is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

(ii) That the application does not conform to the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.

(iii) That the proposal does not represent good planning.

(b) That Zoning Application ZAC-07-016, Scott Bennett, owner, for a change in zoning from the Agriculture “A” Zone to a Rural Industrial “M3” Zone to permit a commercial trucking business, a single detached dwelling and agriculture as
permitted uses, on lands located at 928 Brock Road (Flamborough), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED07259, be denied on the following basis:

(i) That the application does not conform to the Greenbelt Plan, and is not consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement.

(ii) That the application does not conform to the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.

(iii) That the application does not represent good planning.

CARRIED

9. Petitions Requesting the Elimination of the Requirement for Sidewalks on Tevere Place in “DiCenzo Gardens, Phase 7”, (Ward 7 with City Wide Implications) (PED07267) (Item 8.1) (Duvall/Whitehead)

That Option 2 from the staff memorandum be approved, as follows, with respect to the sidewalks on Tevere Place, DiCenzo Gardens, Phase 7:

That the City proceed with the installation of the 1.5 metre wide sidewalk only, and that the requirement for the 1.75 metre wide boulevard be eliminated. The additional costs to relocate two (2) street lights and one (1) fire hydrant estimated at $7,000.00 will be the responsibility of the residents. It is recognized that this option does provide a pedestrian link as required by policy but with considerable reduction in safety as well as increased operational impacts.

CARRIED

10. Proposed Settlement of Appeal Respecting 639 Rymal Road West, By-law 07-110 (Clark/Whitehead)

That City Council authorize the finalization of Minutes of Settlement concerning OMB Case No. PL 070394 in accordance with the parameters suggested by legal counsel for the appellant, as follows;

(a) That the City of Hamilton will not oppose the appeal by Thomas Sullivan et al, respecting By-law 07-110;

(a) That Thomas Sullivan et al agree and undertake, which agreement and undertaking shall be binding upon any subsequent purchaser or assignee of the lands, not to make any application for consents or a plan of subdivision for the subject property until after April 11, 2008;
(c) That this settlement will be documented in Minutes of Settlement to be provided to the Board.

CARRIED

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE REPORTED TO COUNCIL FOR INFORMATION:

(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (Item 1)

The Clerk advised of the following changes:

- Added Report from Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) respecting 132 Main Street West/40 Bay Street South (related to Item 5.1 on Agenda)

- Added Submission from Chamberlain Architects respecting 132 Main Street West/40 Bay Street South (PED0641(a)), (related to Item 5.1 on Agenda)

The Agenda for the October 16, 2007 meeting of the Economic Development & Planning Committee was approved, as amended.

(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 2)

None

(c) APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Item 3)

The October 2, 2007 Minutes of the Economic Development and Planning Committee meeting were approved.

(d) Enterprise Zone Municipal Realty Tax Incentive Grant Program - 132 Main Street West/40 Bay Street South, Hamilton EZ06/06 (PED06417(a)) (Ward 2) (Item 5.1)

Chair Mitchell noted that the added report from Hamilton LACAC (Municipal Heritage Committee) and a letter from the architects for the project, Chamberlain Architects, had been distributed this morning.

Ron Marini gave an overview of the matter, and explained the added report and letter.
Committee received the report from LACAC, and the letter from the architects, and approved the staff recommendation.

(e) Application for an Amendment to the Glanbrook Official Plan, and for Changes in Zoning for the Lands Located Within Block 80, Plan 62M-1035, and 3206 Regional Road 56, in the Former Township of Glanbrook (Binbrook) (PED07253) (Ward 11) (Item 6.1)

A Public Meeting was held.

The Chair advised that an additional submission had been received from Michael and Frances Taylor, 64 Windwood Drive.

Chair Mitchell advised the meeting of the following, in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act:

a) If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the Council of the City of Hamilton before the approval authority approves an Official Plan Amendment and passes a zoning by-law, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of the Council of the City of Hamilton to the Ontario Municipal Board.

b) If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting, or make written submissions to the Council of the City of Hamilton in respect of the proposed official plan amendment or zoning by-law, before the approval authority approves and passes the documents, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Ontario Municipal Board unless, in the opinion of the Board, there are reasonable grounds to do so.

Danielle Fama outlined the report to Committee and explained the reasoning leading to the staff recommendation for approval.

Paul Moore, Armstrong Hunter, the applicant’s agent, advised Committee that he supported the staff recommendation.

Mari Thomson-Fram, 4 Magnificent Way, addressed Committee and explained her opposition to the proposal. Her concerns included, but were not limited to, the following:

- prior to purchase of her property in May, 2005, she did her "due diligence" and was advised that subject property would be residential condominiums
- concern that she and other neighbours had made a major investment based on information received from City, and now the approved plan for area is changing
- disappointment that the City is considering a change
- concern that a commercial development could include a restaurant, and other uses, where smells, noise and deliveries could have a negative impact on peaceful enjoyment of her property
- why did the City’s Official Plan change, when neighbours had purchased in good faith, based on information from the City.

Committee discussed the matter in detail, and had additional information supplied by staff. Committee raised concerns including, but not limited to, the following:

- how and why would an Official Plan designation be recommended for change, and should it only be changed at the required 5 year review
- whether staff and the City should defend an existing Official Plan designation, which had been based on good planning
- whether the change was appropriately justified or whether it represented a whim of a developer
- does an Official Plan give certainty to the area residents or is it an advisory document only
- whether Official Plan designations are given the same weight across the City.

Staff provided additional information, including, but not limited to the following:

- planning is a dynamic process and it is any landowner’s right to make an application for land use change
- the subject designation put in place a number of years ago by former Township of Glanbrook, prior to a number of recent changes in Provincial policy, including Places to Grow, the Greenbelt, and the general requirements for intensification and movement towards mixed-use development
- proposal represents good planning, including a mixed use commercial-residential development, on the edge of a residential neighbourhood, no change to maximum height of development.

Chair Mitchell relinquished the Chair to 1st Vice-Chair Whitehead, and addressed Committee, as the Ward Councillor, and as an area resident. Councillor Mitchell explained that he had worked on the plan for many years, as a councillor in Glanbrook, and noted his concerns that the future arrangements for the major road adjacent to this development had not been finalized. He suggested deferring the matter so that staff could advise whether the adjacent intersection of the Highway would be a roundabout or a signalized intersection.

Staff noted that an environmental assessment for this matter was on-going but would not be finished for the next meeting.
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Councillor Mitchell continued to express his concerns respecting the uncertainty of the road design, the traffic issues, and the need for the subject property to be well-designed, as it would set the precedent for future commercial development in Binbrook.

On a Motion (Mitchell/Clark), Committee approved an amendment to require that an “H”-Holding symbol be placed on the subject property, until the result of the Environmental Assessment into the future road design had been completed. Chair Mitchell requested that the record of the meeting would state that the vote was unanimous.

Committee then approved the staff report, as amended.

Chair Mitchell resumed the Chair.

Applications for Approval of a Draft Plan of Subdivision, "Springbrook Meadows West", and for Changes in Zoning for the Properties Located at 352, 372 and the Rear of 388 Springbrook Avenue (Ancaster) (PED07260) (Ward 12) (Item 6.2)

A Public Meeting was held.

Chair Mitchell advised the meeting of the following, in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act;

a) If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the Council of the City of Hamilton before the approval authority gives or refuses to give approval to the draft plan of subdivision and passes the zoning by-law, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of the Council of the City of Hamilton to the Ontario Municipal Board.

b) If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting, or make written submissions to the Council of the City of Hamilton in respect of the proposed plan of subdivision before the approval authority gives or refuses to give approval to the draft plan of subdivision and passes the zoning by-law, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Ontario Municipal Board unless, in the opinion of the Board, there are reasonable grounds to do so.

Greg Macdonald outlined the report to Committee.
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Angelo Cameracci, Urbex Management, addressed Committee in support of the application. Tony DiSilvestro, the owner of the property, requested that a decision be made today, as any delay could mean a loss in construction this season, and push it to next year.

Jerry Shea, 36 Bishop Sherlock Lane, addressed Committee respecting the application, and expressed a number of concerns, including, but not limited to, the following:
- the area residents had been very involved in development of Secondary Plan and agreed integrity of Springbrook Road should be maintained, with new lots to be 15 metres, and smaller lots in roads behind Springbrook
- developer had agreed to this lotting arrangement, but now OMB has agreed to 12 metre lots in the area, with no public consultation, and lots on Springbrook now have smaller frontages. Speaker opposed to this.
- concern about height of new development in Ancaster
- agrees that costs of sewers should be shared but wants ratio decided before further development
- wants location of storm water ponds to be decided
- concerned OMB can make a decision where a matter under appeal has not had a public meeting, and this decision is contrary to previous Council decision
- desires consistency in area and maintenance of integrity
- concerned that a decision could be made while he is away from November 3-24, 2007

Bill van Stalduinen, Redeemer University College, addressed Committee on the proposal. His comments included, but were not limited to the following:
- no problem with development itself but would like fencing along shared lot line, to be erected by developer
- area is a Special Policy Area, fencing is appropriate
- some students live on Springbrook, need safe access to walk to Redeemer, a walkway through subdivision requested
- concern about preservation of trees in area, especially along the existing lot line.

Staff advised that there is no requirement in the Secondary Plan for fencing between the proposed residential and the existing institutional use, no policy for the provision of a sidewalk, and that a tree preservation plan is a requirement of subdivision approval.

Tim McCabe explained that the tree preservation plan provides a detailed assessment, including health and species of trees, but typically, there is less disturbance along rear lot lines.
Committee discussed the matters raised and had additional information supplied by staff. Tony Sergi explained that existing residents pay local improvement costs respecting sewer installation and that the developer pays for the rest. Staff provided background to the OMB hearing respecting Landmart Homes, and noted that the three proposed lots on Springbrook are 15 metres, 13.5 metres and 13.5 metres, respectively.

Committee tabled the matter until the next meeting, November 6, 2007, to allow the Ward Councillor to be present for the final recommendation to Council.

Chair Mitchell confirmed that the Public Meeting had been held and concluded.

(g) Application for a further modification in Zoning for Lands Located at 8 McDonald Court (Flamborough) (PED07263) (Ward 15) (Item 6.4)

A Public Meeting was held.

Chair Mitchell advised that an additional submission had been received from Margaret Scobie, 50 McDonald Court.

Chair Mitchell advised the meeting of the following, in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act;

a) If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the Council of the City of Hamilton before the approval authority passes the zoning by-law, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of the Council of the City of Hamilton to the Ontario Municipal Board.

b) If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting, or make written submissions to the Council of the City of Hamilton in respect of the proposed zoning by-law before the approval authority passes the zoning by-law, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Ontario Municipal Board unless, in the opinion of the Board, there are reasonable grounds to do so.

Chair Mitchell advised that Councillor McCarthy, Ward Councillor, supported the severance and supported the subject rezoning application.

Daniel Barnett outlined the report to Committee, and explained the reasons that staff are recommending refusal of the application, noting it was not in conformity with the Town of Flamborough Official Plan policies. He noted the letters of objection and a petition against the application, signed by 37 residents.
Glen Wellings, the applicant’s agent, addressed Committee in support of the application. He provided the background to the severance application which had preceded the current rezoning and explained that the Committee of Adjustment had approved the severance. Mr. Wellings explained how the proposal was in conformity with the local Official Plan and Secondary Plan policies, and how it would be compatible with the existing neighbourhood. Mr. Wellings noted that while staff had not supported the severance application, they had not appealed the Committee of Adjustment decision to approve the application.

Mr. Wellings distributed two handouts to Committee, a map of the area showing lot lines and a letter of support from the adjacent property owner, Mr. Dominichetti, 12 McDonald Court.

Mr. Wellings noted his client is willing to submit a Site Plan application, including the type of design, locations of driveway, fences and other details, and to involve the neighbourhood.

Susan Akimoto, 7 McDonald Court, addressed Committee in opposition to the application. Her comments included but were not limited to, the following:

- existing mature neighbourhood, this new lot would adversely affect the character and neighbourhood views
- protection of existing lifestyle important, lack of compatibility of proposed lot
- if this application approved, there will be four further applications in area
- difficulty of viewing the notice of the severance application, it was placed in a window of the existing house

Janice Laurin, 48 McDonald Court, addressed Committee in opposition to the application. Her comments included, but were not limited to, the following:

- opposed the subject application and the severance
- why had staff not objected to the decision to approve the severance
- need to maintain existing character of area, new development would not fit in

Committee discussed the matter and had additional information supplied by staff. Staff confirmed that the appeal of the severance had been made by one of the neighbours, and that there is no legal means to require a site plan approval for the proposed lot.

A Motion (Clark/Pasuta) to approve the staff recommendation to deny the application was lost.

Committee then approved the application to rezone the property, to permit the severance to take place, subject to conditions. Councillors Clark, Duvall and Pasuta requested their opposition be recorded.
Applications for Amendments to the Flamborough Official Plan and Zoning By-law No. 90-145-Z for Lands Located at 928 Brock Road (Flamborough)(PED07259)(Ward 14) (Item 6.5)

A Public Meeting was held.

Chair Mitchell advised the meeting of the following, in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act:

a) If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the Council of the City of Hamilton before the approval authority approves the Official Plan Amendment and passes the zoning by-law, the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of the Council of the City of Hamilton to the Ontario Municipal Board.

b) If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting, or make written submissions to the Council of the City of Hamilton in respect of the proposed Official Plan Amendment and zoning by-law amendment, before the approval authority gives or refuses to give approval to these applications, the person or public body may not be added as a party to the hearing of an appeal before the Ontario Municipal Board unless, in the opinion of the Board, there are reasonable grounds to do so.

Kristen West outlined the report to Committee and explained the reasoning behind staff recommendation for denial of the application. She noted that 1 letter of support, 4 letters of objection, and one petition against the application had been received.

Scott Bennett, the applicant, addressed Committee in support of his application. He explained that he had bought the property a year ago, that the land was not suitable for agriculture, due to its poor soil, and that water had to be trucked in for his cows. Mr. Bennett explained he had constructed a new driveway and parking area, that his operation serves the rural area, and that he does not truck hazardous waste.

Ros Vanderboom, 933 Brock Road, addressed Committee in opposition to the subject application. Her comments included, but were not limited to, the following:

- notification sign only erected in September, while application made months ago
- wrong land use to put a truck depot in a rural area
- truck operation is a 24/7 business, noisy and incompatible with the rural area
- truck operation has increased from 2 or 3 trucks in 2006 to 15-20 now on site, with half of site devoted to trucking, continues to grow
- increased traffic on narrow roads a problem
- requested Committee to deny application

Linda Sway, 938 Brock Road, addressed Committee in opposition to the application. She noted points including, but not limited to, the following:

- trucking operation incompatible with quiet, rural area due to noise, vibration, traffic impacts
- applicant’s website says he hauls hazardous materials
- business causes adverse impact on area
- as a property appraiser, her opinion is that business had decreased area property values and will lead to difficulties of selling property in area

Committee discussed the matter and had additional information supplied by staff. Staff confirmed that the business has been operating for approximately a year, and that enforcement of the use had been held, pending the outcome of the subject development applications.

Committee approved the staff recommendation to refuse the applications.

Staff explained that the applicant could appeal the refusal of the applications, but after that time frame has elapsed, staff will move to enforce the zoning. If there is an appeal, enforcement action will be suspended until the appeal is dealt with.

(i) Petitions Requesting the Elimination of the Requirement for Sidewalks on Tanglewood Drive in “Jackson Heights, Phase 2”, Glanbrook and Tevere Place in “DiCenzo Gardens, Phase 7”, Hamilton Subdivisions (Wards 7 & 11 with City Wide Implications) (PED07267) (Item 8.1)

Chair Mitchell noted that the section of the report dealing with Tanglewood Drive, Jackson Heights Phase 2, in Glanbrook, had been dealt with at the meeting of October 2, 2007. The part of the report dealing with Tevere Place, DiCenzo Gardens, had been deferred by Committee, pending the distribution of additional information from the residents of the area.

Chair Mitchell confirmed that this information had now been distributed to all members of Committee.

Councillor Duvall addressed Committee in support of Option 2 of the staff memorandum. He confirmed that the residents of Tevere Place were in favour of this Option, which moved the sidewalk to the curb. He also noted that the residents are willing to pay all costs associated with this proposal.
Committee discussed the issues and recognized the work Councillor Duvall had put into this matter, to bring about a compromise.

Staff advised Committee that they did not support the proposal to move the sidewalk to the curb.

Committee approved Option 2.

Councillors Clark and Pearson requested their opposition be recorded.

(j) **Motions (Item 9)**

None

(k) **Notice of Motions (Item 10)**

None

(l) **News from the General Manager (Item 11.1)**

- Tim McCabe gave an overview of several items of interest, and distributed a copy of an article from the current edition of the Ontario Planning Journal, respecting engaging members of the public in planning matters through the use of the internet. He noted that the use of the internet could be an additional way of getting information out to the public.

- Mr. McCabe noted that the changes in the one hour free parking at the York Boulevard Parkade were set to be implemented by the end of October, as previously approved by Council. This decision had been made in 2005, but implementation had been delayed.

- The bus tour for Committee had been postponed until post-budget, and would now take place in spring 2008.

- The Hamilton Civic Coalition is proposing to start a roundtable for economic well-being, to be similar to the Poverty Roundtable. Mr. McCabe noted that he is a co-convener and that Tim Dobbie is a director.

- Hamilton-Wentworth School Board had met on October 15, 2007 to consider the future use of present building and potential relocation. No decision will be made until at least November 5, 2007. Possible site within Jerome
neighbourhood, in Councillor Duvall’s ward, is not supported by City planning staff.

(m) Two items respecting matters which are presently before the OMB (Item 12)

At 12:50 pm, on a Motion (Pearson/Pasuta), Committee moved into Closed Session to deal with two items presently before the Ontario Municipal Board.

On a Motion (Clark/Whitehead), Committee reconvened in Open Session, at 1:45 pm.

Chair Mitchell advised that Committee had met in Closed Session, to consider advice from legal counsel respecting two matters before the OMB. He explained that appropriate direction had been given to staff on the first item and that there was nothing further to report.

Chair Mitchell advised that the second Closed Session matter respecting 639 Rymal Road West had resulted in a proposal for a settlement of the OMB hearing.

On a Motion (Whitehead/Pasuta), Committee approved a proposal to settle the matter.

Councillor Whitehead then spoke to the need for improvements to the intersection of Rymal Road West and Upper Paradise.

On a Motion (Whitehead/Duvall), Committee requested that a right turn lane at Rymal Road West and Upper Paradise be considered by the Public Works Committee. Councillor Clark requested that his opposition to the Motion be noted.

(n) ADJOURNMENT (Item 13)
(Pearson/Clark)
There being no further business, the Economic Development and Planning Committee adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

David Mitchell, Chair
Economic Development and Planning Committee

Alexandra Rawlings, Co-ordinator
Economic Development and Planning Committee
October 16, 2007

Council – October 24, 2007