SUBJECT: Application to Amend the Hamilton Zoning By-law, for Property Located at 615-647 Rymal Road East to Permit 69 Block Townhouse Units (PED08265) (Ward 7)

RECOMMENDATION:

That amended Zoning Application ZAC-07-094, Rymal Square Developments Inc., Owner, for a change in zoning from the “E/S-1493” (Multiple Dwellings, Lodges, Clubs, etc.) District, Modified, to the “RT-20” (Townhouse-Maisonette) District, Modified, to permit the development of 69 townhouse units on a condominium road, on lands located at 615-647 Rymal Road East, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED08265, be DENIED for the following reasons:

(a) It is not consistent with the intent of the Places to Grow Plan, the Provincial Policy Statement and the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan which encourage an appropriate range of housing types and densities and affordable housing.

(b) It is not consistent with the intent of the Hamilton Official Plan, which encourages a variety of housing styles, types and densities in “Residential” areas to achieve a desired mix of housing.

(c) It conflicts with the approved Butler Neighbourhood Plan, which designates the property “Low Density Apartments” and “Medium Density Apartments”.

(d) The proposal is contrary to City Initiative CI-93-A (By-law 93-161), which is intended to protect designated apartment sites for future development in accordance with approved Neighbourhood Plans.

Tim McCabe
General Manager
Planning and Economic Development Department
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The proposal is for the rezoning of property located at 615 to 647 Rymal Road East to permit the development of 69 townhouse units on a condominium road (see Appendix “B”). The proposal is not consistent with the intent and vision of the Places to Grow Plan, the Provincial Policy Statement, and the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan in terms of encouraging an appropriate range of housing types and densities, and in the promotion of residential intensification.

The proposal does not comply with the intent of the City of Hamilton Official Plan, which encourages a variety of housing styles, types and densities in “Residential” areas to achieve a desired mix of housing, because it would expand the number of townhouse units and result in the over-concentration of townhouses within a neighbourhood, as well as the loss of an apartment block. The proposal would conflict with the Approved Butler Neighbourhood Plan by removing blocks which are designated for “Low Density Apartments” and “Medium Density Apartments”. The proposal would also be contrary to City Initiative CI-93-A, which was intended to protect designated apartment sites for future development.

BACKGROUND:

The subject lands comprise an area of 1.2 hectares, which are currently undeveloped and are located at the northwest corner of Rymal Road East and Upper Sherman Avenue (see Appendix “A”). The subject property and the adjacent lands to the north have been the subject of a number of development proposals, which are outlined as follows:


The subject lands were included in Draft Plan of Subdivision Application 25T-200209 and Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAC-02-58, “Park Town East”, which was submitted in 2002 for the consideration of four residential blocks and a new municipal street.

Blocks “1” and “2” (the abutting lands to the north) were intended to be developed for 52 street townhouses, and Blocks “3” and “4” were intended to be developed for multiple dwellings in the form of 4-storey buildings. The subject lands were included as Blocks “3” and “4” of this proposal.
Staff did not support the applications for the following reasons:

- The proposed changes to Blocks “1” and “2” did not comply with the intent of the Official Plan to encourage a variety of housing styles, types and densities throughout the City;

- The proposed changes to Blocks “1” and “2” were also regarded as being in conflict with the approved Butler Neighbourhood Plan, which designated Block “1” for “Low Density Apartments” and Block “2” for “Medium Density Apartments”; and,

- The proposal conflicted with Council policy through By-law 93-161, which was intended to preserve future apartment sites on lands that are designated and/or zoned for multiple dwellings. As such, lands should not be rezoned to permit townhouses.

The application was denied by the Hearing Sub-Committee, at its’ meeting of November 6, 2002. The application was subsequently tabled at the November 12, 2002, Council meeting to enable further consultation with staff and the Ward Councillor. Alternative approaches were discussed. However, no compromise was reached, and a revised subdivision and rezoning application were submitted.


A revised Draft Plan of Subdivision application and Zoning By-law Amendment application were submitted in 2003 to request the consideration for 44 semi-detached dwelling lots for Blocks “1” and “2”. The proposal for Blocks “3” and “4” was to permit two, 7-storey apartment buildings and two, 8-storey apartment buildings for 208 units (see Appendix “D”).

As the effect of the applications was a reduction in apartment sites, these applications were not supported by staff. In addition, the proposal did not meet the intent of the City of Hamilton Official Plan with respect to Policy C.7.2, as there would not be suitable gradation in building height and density between the proposed 7-storey apartment building being located adjacent to an existing 2-storey townhouse development.

Revised Draft Plan of Subdivision Application 25T-200209 and Rezoning Application ZAC-02-58 were approved by City Council in October, 2003. The zoning for the subject property was approved for apartments, and the abutting lands to the north were rezoned to permit 44 semi-detached dwelling units.
City Initiative CI-93-A and By-law 93-161

City Initiative CI-93-A was undertaken in 1993 to address the concern that a considerable amount of townhouse development was occurring ‘as-of-right’ on lands that were zoned and/or designated for multiple dwellings (e.g. “Low Density Apartments” and “Medium Density Apartments”) in Neighbourhood Plans. This was because the multiple dwelling zoning districts in the Hamilton Zoning By-law (By-law No. 6593) also permitted other residential uses such as single family dwellings, semi-detached dwellings and townhouses.

The development of land for townhouses that was otherwise intended for multiple dwellings undermined the intent of the Official Plan to encourage a variety of housing styles, types and densities throughout the City, and also affected the desired mix of housing. The negative effects that arise through the replacement of multiple dwellings with townhouses include:

- Changes to the nature of neighbourhood planning;
- Altering the density of neighbourhoods; and,
- Limiting the mix of dwelling units available within neighbourhoods.

To maintain the planned housing mix, By-law 93-161 was passed by the former Hamilton City Council on July 27, 1993, which deleted townhouses and street townhouses as a permitted use within the “DE”, “DE-2”, “DE-3”, “E”, “E-1”, “E-2” and “E-3” Districts in the Hamilton Zoning By-law.

Current Proposal

The applicant is requesting a change in zoning from the “E/S-1493” (Multiple Dwellings, Lodges, Clubs, etc.) District, Modified, to the “RT-20” (Townhouse-Maisonette) District, Modified, to permit the development of 69 townhouse units on a condominium road.

The current application has been revised from the February, 2008 proposal, which included Draft Plan of Subdivision Application (25T-200718) to consider the development of 22 lots for semi-detached dwellings (44 residential units) along a new public street, and to permit 1 lot for a single detached dwelling. Draft Plan of Subdivision Application (25T-200718) has now been withdrawn by the owner.

The current proposal for a block townhouse development is identified on a conceptual site plan (see Appendix “B”), which identifies 11 blocks which range in size from 3 to 8 units, 25 parking spaces for visitors, and condominium road access from Rymal Road East and Upper Sherman Avenue.
Details of Submitted Application

Owner: Rymal Square Developments Inc. (c/o The Effort Trust Company)

Location: 615 and 647 Rymal Road East

Property Size:
- Frontage: 185.87 metres along Rymal Road East
- Frontage: 77.36 metres along Upper Sherman Avenue
- Depth: 84.36 metres
- Area: 1.62 hectares

Existing Land Use and Zoning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Lands:</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Block Townhouses</td>
<td>&quot;RT-20/S-1156&quot; (Townhouse - Maisonette) District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Semi-Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>&quot;D/S-1405a&quot; (Urban Protected Residential - One and Two Family Dwellings, etc.) District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Vacant Lands</td>
<td>&quot;G-1/S-996&quot; (Designed Shopping Centre) District and &quot;G-1&quot; (Designed Shopping Centre) District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwelling with Existing Metal Drop-off Business and Vacant Lands</td>
<td>&quot;AA&quot; (Agricultural) District</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ANALYSIS / RATIONALE:

1. The proposed rezoning cannot be supported for the following reasons:

   [Further analysis and rationale as per the document]
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It is not consistent with the intent of the Places to Grow Plan, the Provincial Policy Statement, and the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan in terms of encouraging an appropriate range of housing types and densities;

It does not comply with the intent of the policies of the Hamilton Official Plan to encourage a range of housing types and densities;

It would conflict with the approved Butler Neighbourhood Plan, which designates the property “Low Density Apartments” and “Medium Density Apartments”; and,

The proposal would be contrary to City Initiative CI-93-A (By-law 93-161), which is intended to protect designated apartment sites for future development in accordance with approved Neighbourhood Plans.

2. The Provincial policies, which include Places to Grow and the Provincial Policy Statement, generally encourage a range and mix of housing and densities, the provision of affordable housing, the efficient use of infrastructure and the promotion of a compact urban form. The proposal is not consistent with the intent of these policies for the following reasons:

- The proposal does not contribute to a range of housing forms and densities, as the site is designated for “Low Density” and “Medium Density Apartments” in the approved Butler Neighbourhood Plan; and,

- The proposal does not provide an opportunity for the development of higher density uses.

3. The proposal does not meet the intent of the Hamilton Official Plan and the approved Butler Neighbourhood Plan, which are inter-related documents.

Policy A.2.1.8 directs that a variety of housing styles, types and densities be available in all Residential areas of the City to achieve a desired mix of housing. This policy is also related to the Housing Policies of Section C and the Neighbourhood Plan policies of Section D.

The proposal would not conform to the intent of this policy because it would remove future apartment blocks in favour of an additional townhouse development. The Butler Neighbourhood has a housing mix which currently consists of the following:
The proposed development would further offset the disparity in the housing mix and reduce the land supply for multiple dwellings.

To date, there are no apartment buildings that have been developed in the Butler Neighbourhood, although there are 3 designated sites (including the subject lands) which are undeveloped; and 2 sites which have been developed for lower density residential uses (see Appendix “C”). These include the abutting lands to the north, which have been developed for semi-detached dwelling units along Jonathon Court, and lands at the southeast corner of Upper Wentworth and Elite Drive, which have been developed for 35 townhouse units.

Similarly, the proposed townhouses would result in the development of a lower density use for the site; whereas Policy A.2.1.8 directs that a variety of densities be available to achieve a desired mix of housing. As noted in the preceding table, the current housing mix for Butler Neighbourhood does not include multiple dwellings. Therefore, there is a need for the development of planned higher density uses within this neighbourhood, which the current proposal does not address.

Policy D.2.5 (i)(a) directs that the preference for multiple dwellings in the consideration of Neighbourhood Plans is at the intersection of arterial and collector roads. In this regard, the subject property is appropriately located for the development of multiple dwellings (i.e. intersection of Rymal Road East and Upper Sherman Avenue).

4. The proposal would conflict with City Initiative CI-93-A (By-law 93-161), which was established to address the over-development of townhouses and the loss of multiple dwelling sites on the Hamilton Mountain. The proposal would result in the expansion of townhouses within the neighbourhood and the loss of the subject property for multiple dwellings. In addition, the proposal would result in
changes to the planned neighbourhood density and preferred residential mix, which is contrary to the intent of this City Initiative.

5. The Draft Urban Structure Plan provides policy direction that would support the development of mid-rise apartments on the subject property. The site is located along a recognized secondary corridor and intensification and higher density development is supported on suitably-sized parcels in order to minimize impacts on abutting lower density development.

6. Based on the development concept submitted, the proposed development would require special zoning provisions as outlined below:

1. **Rear Yards**
   
   To permit the rear yards of the townhouse units to be 6.0 metres, rather than 7.5 metres.

2. **Distance Between Buildings**
   
   a) To permit the distance between buildings to be 8.49 metres where there is at least one habitable room window on one exterior wall, whereas 9.0 metres is required.
   
   b) To permit the distance between buildings to be 12 metres where there is at least one habitable room window on 2 exterior walls, whereas 15.0 metres is required.

3. **Parking Adjacent to a Residential District**
   
   To permit the boundary of a parking area having more than 5 vehicles to be 1 metre from an adjoining Residential District, whereas 1.5 metres is required.

Staff does not support the application on the basis of the proposed use. However, if the application is supported by the Economic Development and Planning Committee, a Site-Specific Amending By-law would be required to address the above-noted special zoning provisions.

7. There are no additional road widenings required along Rymal Road East or Upper Sherman Avenue. However, a 9 metre by 9 metre daylight triangle is required at the northwest intersection.
8. The City previously collected a cash payment from the developer under the Subdivision Agreement for Park Town East (Phase 1) for the future urbanization costs associated with Blocks 23, 24, 25 and 26 on Plan 62M-1025 adjacent to Upper Sherman Avenue and Rymal Road East. Also, the City currently holds a security deposit under the Subdivision Agreement for Phase 1 for the estimated cost of future storm and sanitary sewers for development on the above-noted blocks.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:**

Should the proposed application for amendment to the Zoning By-law be denied, the subject lands may be used in accordance with the “E/S-1493” (Multiple Dwellings, Lodges, Clubs, etc.) District, Modified Zone, which permits the development of a multiple dwelling(s).

**FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:**

Financial: N/A.

Staffing: N/A.

Legal: As required by the Planning Act, Council shall hold at least one (1) Public Meeting to consider an application for a Zoning By-law Amendment.

**POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:**

**Places to Grow**

The subject property is within the “Built-up Area” of the Places to Grow Growth Plan, which includes the lands within the limits of the developed urban boundary.

The policies encourage development and redevelopment within the Built-up Area of the City, and encourage the provision of a range and mix of housing which includes affordable housing needs. The direction provided in Places to Grow will be incorporated into the City’s New Official Plan for the Urban Area to ensure that the growth management targets, as mandated by the Province, are met.

The City of Hamilton is required to accommodate 40% of all new residential growth within the Built-up Area starting in 2015 (Policy 2.2.3). In addition, development is required to be designed to support public transit and maximize the use of existing
infrastructure. The development of the subject lands for new multiple dwellings would achieve the growth management objectives of the Growth Plan.

Staff is of the opinion that the proposal to develop the property for townhouses would not be consistent with the intent of Places to Grow because it would not contribute to the provision of a full range of housing.

**Provincial Policy Statement**

The proposal is consistent with Policy 1.1.3.1 that encourages growth to be focused in settlement areas.

Policy 1.1.3.2 directs that land use patterns within settlement areas shall be based on the development of densities and a mix of land uses that use land efficiently, are appropriate for the available or planned infrastructure, and which minimize negative impacts to air quality and promote energy efficiency.

The policies in Section 1.1.3 also encourage a range of uses and opportunities for intensification and the development of a compact urban form.

The PPS further directs in Policy 1.4.1 and 1.4.3 that an appropriate range of housing types and densities be provided. Additional housing policies which deal with the development of housing targets would not be currently applicable, as this information is being developed through the Official Plan review.

Staff is of the opinion that the intent of the PPS would not be fully maintained through the proposed rezoning because it would not contribute to an appropriate housing mix for the surrounding neighbourhood, which currently does not have any apartment units within the existing housing stock.

In addition to the foregoing, the following specific technical requirements would be applicable prior to development:

- The applicant will be required to confirm that any underground septic tanks have been removed in accordance with the Ministry of Environment (MOE) guidelines; and,

- A noise assessment is required through Policy 1.7.1(e) to investigate the noise levels from Rymal Road East due to the proximity of the subject lands to Rymal Road East.
Archaeological requirements were addressed under Draft Plan of Subdivision 25T-89022, and do not apply to this proposal.

**Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan**

The subject property is designated as “Urban Area” in the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan. Policy C-3.1.1 outlines that a wide range of urban uses, defined through Area Municipal Official Plans and based on full municipal services, will be concentrated in the Urban Areas.

Policy C-3.1.1 identifies that a compact higher density urban form with mixed use development in identified Regional and Municipal Centres and along corridors, best meets the environmental, social and economic principles of sustainable development.

Policy C-3.1.1 further states that mixed forms of development within the Urban Area are preferable to widespread, low density development because of reduced per capita servicing costs and efficiencies, cost savings for public transit systems, effective community design, and the development of compact communities to encourage walking and bicycling.

As the policies are broad-based, the application would not require a Regional Official Plan Amendment.

**Hamilton Official Plan**

The subject property is designated “Residential” on Schedule “A”, Land Use Concept in the Hamilton Official Plan.

The policies which are of relevance to this application are:

“A.2.1.1 The primary uses permitted in the areas designated on Schedule “A” as RESIDENTIAL will be for dwellings. Various types of dwellings are included within this designation, while preference will be given to the locating of similar densities of development together.

A.2.1.8 It is the intent of Council that a variety of housing styles, types and densities be available in all RESIDENTIAL areas of the City, and further, that proposals for new development or redevelopment will contribute to the desired mix of housing, where practicable. In this regard, Council will be guided by the Housing Policies of Subsection C.7 and the Neighbourhood Plan Policies of Subsection D.2.
A.2.1.14 In evaluating the merits of any proposal for multiple-family RESIDENTIAL
development, Council will be satisfied that the following considerations are
met:

i) The height, bulk and arrangement of buildings and structures will
achieve harmonious design and integrate with the surrounding
areas; and,

ii) Appropriate open space, including landscaping and buffering, will
be provided to maximize the privacy of residents and minimize the
impact on adjacent lower-density uses.

C.7.2 Varieties of RESIDENTIAL types will not be mixed indiscriminately, but will
be arranged in a gradation so that higher-density developments will
complement those of a lower density, with sufficient spacing to maintain
privacy, amenity and value.

C.7.3 Council will encourage a RESIDENTIAL ENVIRONMENT of an adequate
physical condition that contains a variety of housing forms that will meet the
needs of present and future residents. Accordingly, Council will:

v) Encourage new RESIDENTIAL development that provides a range
of dwelling types at densities and scales that recognize and enhance
the scale and character of the existing residential area by having
regard to natural vegetation, lot frontages and areas, building height,
coverage, mass, setbacks, privacy and overview;

vi) Support new development that provides tenure options and a range
of prices/rents for new dwellings that will be affordable to Hamilton
residents; and,

ix) Support the concept of a RESIDENTIAL community that provides a
diversity of dwelling forms and housing options accessible to all
Hamilton residents.

C.7.4 When reviewing plans of subdivision and Neighbourhood Plans, Council will
consider:

ii) The housing targets established by Council.
D.2.5 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS for the PLANNING UNITS will indicate the location of proposed Arterial, Collector and Local roads, the location of community facilities, such as park areas, open spaces and school sites; the location and extent of lands set aside for Commercial or Institutional purposes; the distribution and mix of housing of varying densities; and the location and basic design of major Engineering Services and public utilities. When preparing NEIGHBOURHOOD PLANS, Council will consider the following:

i) The preferred location for new Residential development or redevelopment will be:

a) for multiple dwellings and high traffic generating uses beyond the Central Policy Area, at nodes created by the intersection of Arterial and Collector roads, with preference given to access by these roads.”

In terms of the above-noted policies:

- The proposal does not contribute to a range of housing types, styles and densities, within the Butler Neighbourhood. It would perpetuate the development of townhouses in an area that currently has a high proportion of townhouse development (i.e. 29%), rather than allow for the development of higher density residential uses, for which the site is intended;

- The resulting housing form would not enhance the character of the neighbourhood as it would create an expanded area of townhouse development along Rymal Road East;

- The proposal would not meet the intent of Policy D.2.5, as it would remove lands that are designated for apartments in the approved Butler Neighbourhood Plan; and,

- The City’s Housing Targets referred to in Policy C.7.4 were established under the Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (GRIDS) for a 25-year growth plan. The Strategy identifies that the housing demand for the City will consist of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single and Semi-Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>41,000 units</td>
<td>(51.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Row Housing</td>
<td>17,000 units</td>
<td>(21.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apartments</td>
<td>22,000 units</td>
<td>(27.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80,000 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This information indicates that apartment units will be an important component of the City’s future housing strategy. As an illustration, the data on Page 7 indicates that the current supply of townhouses in the Butler Neighbourhood would be 29%, and it would increase to 34.4% if the site were developed for townhouses. However, the supply of apartments is currently 0% within the Butler Neighbourhood, and it would remain at this level, which will affect the overall housing mix and supply for future apartments. The proposal to create townhouses rather than apartments on the subject property would, therefore, be contrary to the intent of this strategy and Policy C.7.4.

Butler Neighbourhood Plan

The subject lands are designated “Low Density Apartments” (westerly portion of site) and “Medium Density Apartments” (corner portion) in the approved Butler Neighbourhood Plan (see Appendix “C”). Neighbourhood Plans are Council-endorsed documents which provide guidance for future development.

The proposed block townhouse development does not comply with the approved Neighbourhood Plan.

The approval of the current proposal would require amendments to the Butler Neighbourhood Plan to redesignate the subject lands from the “Low Density Apartments” designation and the “Medium Density Apartments” designation to the “Attached Housing” designation.

RELEVANT CONSULTATION:

Departments/Agencies having no concerns or objections:

- Community Services Division, Culture and Recreation Department.
- Water and Wastewater Division, Public Works Department.
- Environmental Planning Section, Capital Planning and Implementation Division, Public Works Department.
- Hamilton-Wentworth District School Board.
Traffic Engineering and Operations, Public Works Department

The comments from Traffic Engineering relate to technical and design issues, such as concrete curbing related to accesses, minimum access width, driveway radii and the provision of sidewalks. These matters would be reviewed in more detail at the Site Plan Approval stage.

Hamilton Municipal Parking System

While there are no additional concerns with the proposed zoning amendment, the applicant should ensure that all existing and future parking requirements are met on-site. The applicant should ensure that on-site parking spaces and garages are suitably dimensioned to ensure the continued use of these facilities for parking purposes.

Forestry and Horticulture, Operations and Maintenance, Public Works

The Forestry and Horticulture Section has identified potential Municipal urban forestry conflicts. There are two mature oaks of approximately 48 cm d.b.h. located on the road allowance of Upper Sherman Avenue, which are governed under the City’s Tree By-law 06-151, which would appear to be impacted by the proposal.

It is requested that all trees within the development area be identified on a tree inventory table, and that a Tree Management Plan be prepared by a Landscape Architect.

All healthy trees on Municipal property, which are in good condition and which are found to be in conflict with this proposed development and do not meet the City’s criteria for removal, will be subject to a Replacement Fee.

Open Space Development and Park Planning, Capital Planning and Implementation, Public Works Department

Open Space Development and Park Planning has advised that they have no objection to the application, and that parkland dedication should be calculated as Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland Dedication, as appropriate.

Hamilton Street Railway

As pedestrian entrances and street orientation are important in design, the preference by HSR is for the provision of direct short walking distances between dwellings and transit service. HSR supports the inclusion of high quality pedestrian amenities at this
development such as walkways and lighting. Such features are appreciated by customers, especially for those who require personal mobility devices. The development of medium density residential uses within an easy walk of transit service will contribute positively to the long term sustainability of the south-central Mountain.

Horizon Utilities

Horizon Utilities has advised that electrical servicing shall be in accordance with Horizon Utilities Condition of Service and Policies. The requirements include an underground electrical distribution system for servicing; the design and installation of the entire system by an electrical consulting engineer and an approved electrical contractor; easements (if required) to be shown on the design; and a Residential Subdivision Development Agreement to outline detailed costs and requirements for servicing within the subject lands.

Hamilton Conservation Authority

The subject property is within the Upper Ottawa Subwatershed Area of the Red Hill Creek Watershed, and is subject to the requirements of the Harbour Remedial Action Plan. The Harbour Remedial Action Plan is intended to restore the health of the harbour by reducing the sediment and by improving stormwater quality. Enhanced stormwater quality to Level 1 and quantity control to treat pre to post development levels for storms up to the 1:100 year storm event is required.

The proposal will involve a substantial increase in the imperviousness of the site. Therefore, a stormwater management plan addressing stormwater quality to Level 1 standards and quantity control is required for the Conservation Authority’s review and approval. On-site erosion and sediment controls and a lot grading plan would be required at the Site Plan approval stage.

Public Consultation

In accordance with Council’s Public Participation Policy, this application was pre-circulated to all property owners within 120 metres, and a sign was posted on the site. A total of 218 notices were circulated. To date, no letters have been received in response to the pre-circulation.

Notice of the Public Meeting has been given in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act through the circulation to property owners within 120 metres of the subject lands and through the posting of a sign on the property.
CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:

By evaluating the “Triple Bottom Line”, (community, environment, and economic implications) we can make choices that create value across all three bottom lines, moving us closer to our vision for a sustainable community, and Provincial interests.

**Community Well-Being is enhanced.** ☑ Yes  ☐ No
The staff recommendation to deny the rezoning enhances community well-being because the proposal for block townhouses would not provide for an appropriate range of housing types and densities to achieve the desired mix of housing for the Butler Neighbourhood.

**Environmental Well-Being is enhanced.** ☑ Yes  ☐ No
Human health and safety are protected. Retention of the subject lands for multiple dwellings would maximize the number of dwelling units provided in the Butler Neighbourhood, and thereby contribute to the City’s overall housing needs and reduce the amount of land needed to accommodate growth.

**Economic Well-Being is enhanced.** ☑ Yes  ☐ No
Staff’s recommendation to deny the rezoning would enhance economic well-being because the proposal for block townhouses would result in a less desirable overall housing mix. The development of a mix of housing types and densities encourages economic well-being by creating complete communities that can accommodate a range of housing needs.

Does the option you are recommending create value across all three bottom lines?
☑ Yes  ☐ No

Do the options you are recommending make Hamilton a City of choice for high performance public servants?
☐ Yes  ☑ No
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Subject Property

615-647 Rymal Road East

Ward 7 Key Map N.T.S.
## Development Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Lot Area</td>
<td>16241.71 sq. m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscaped Area</td>
<td>6739.61 (41.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Townhouse Units Proposed</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Coverage</td>
<td>5452.22 sq. m (33.56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking and Driveway Coverage</td>
<td>4041.91 sq. m (24.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Required</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking Provided</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Visitors Spaces</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Loading Spaces</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>