(a) That approval be given to Amended Official Plan Amendment Application OPA-07-039, by Chedoke Health Corporation (Owner), to amend Schedule “A” Landuse Plan and Schedule “J-1” Chedmac Planning Area Secondary Plan, in order to redesignate portions of the “Major Institutional” Designation to “Residential” in Schedule “A” Landuse Plan, and to redesignate the “Institutional” Designation to the “Low Density Residential” Designation, the “Medium Density Residential I” Designation, and the “Medium Density Residential II” in Schedule “J-1 Chedmac Planning Area Secondary Plan; and to further permit Single Detached Dwellings at a density of up to 20 units per hectare within the “Low Density Residential” Designation, and to permit townhouse units at a density below 30 units per hectare within the “Medium Density Residential I” Designation, on lands located 555 Sanatorium Road (Hamilton), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED12009, on the following basis:
(i) That the Draft Official Plan Amendment, attached as Appendix “B” to Report PED12009, be adopted by Council.

(ii) That the proposed Official Plan Amendment is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, and conforms to the Places to Grow Plan, and the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.

(b) That approval be given to **Amended Zoning Application ZAC-07-114, by Chedoke Health Corporation (Owner)**, for changes in zoning from the “AA/S-1363c” (Agricultural) District, Modified, and the “AA/S-1363” (Agricultural) District, Modified, to the “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District, for Block 1; from the “AA/S-1363c” (Agricultural) District, Modified, and the “AA/S-1363” (Agricultural) District, Modified, to the “RT-20/S-1654” (Townhouse - Maisonette) District, Modified, with a Special Exception, for Block 2; from the “AA/S-1363” (Agricultural) District, Modified, to the “DE-2/S-1654” (Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified, with a Special Exception, for Block 3; from the “AA/S-1363” (Agricultural) District, Modified, to the Major Institutional (I3) Zone for Block 4; and from the Major Institutional (I3) Zone to the “RT-20/S-1654” (Townhouse - Maisonette) District, Modified, with a Special Exception, for Block 5, as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED12009, for lands located at 555 Sanatorium Road, on the following basis:

(i) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “C” to Report PED12009, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council.

(ii) That the draft By-law, attached as Appendix “D” to Report PED12009, which has been prepared in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, be enacted by City Council.

(iii) That the amending By-law, attached as Appendix “D” to Report PED12009, be added to Schedule “A”, Map No. 1080, of Zoning By-law No. 05-200.

(iv) That the proposed changes in zoning will be in conformity with the Hamilton Official Plan upon approval of Official Plan Amendment No. 6593.

(c) That approval be given to **Amended Subdivision Application 25T-200724, by Chedoke Health Corporation (Owner)**, to establish a draft plan of subdivision on the property located at 555 Sanatorium Road (Hamilton), as shown on Appendix “A” to Report PED12009, subject to the following conditions:
(i) That this approval apply to the Draft Plan of Subdivision Revision, 25T-200724, prepared by A. J Clarke and Associates Ltd., and certified by B.J. Clarke, O.L.S., dated June 9, 2009, showing 14 lots (Lots 1-14) for single detached dwellings, 1 block for townhouses (Block 15), 1 block (Block 16) for a multiple dwelling, 1 block for Institutional uses (Block 17), and creation of Street “A”, attached as Appendix “E” to Report PED12009, subject to the owner entering into separate Standard Form Subdivision Agreements for each identified phase of the development, as approved by City Council, and with the special conditions attached as Appendix “G” to Report PED12009;

(ii) Acknowledgement that there is a City share for upsizing of the existing 200mm watermain on Sanatorium Road.

(iii) That payment of Cash-in-lieu of Parkland be required, pursuant to Section 42 of the Planning Act, prior to the issuance of each permit. The calculation for the Cash-in-Lieu payment shall be based on the value of the lands on the day prior to the day of issuance of each building permit, with the exception of Townhouse Block 15 and Multiple Dwelling Block 16, to which payment shall be based on the value of the land on the day prior to the issuance of the first building permit for each said Block.

With regard to Block 15 (Block Townhouses) and Block 16 (Multiple Dwelling), a parkland dedication, at a ratio of 1.0 ha per 300 dwelling units, will be required.

Additionally, Lots 1-14 (Single Detached residential) will require a parkland dedication of 5%.

Lastly, Block 17 (Institutional) shall be exempt from parkland dedication.

All in accordance with the Financial Policies for Development and the City’s Parkland Dedication By-law, as approved by Council.

(d) That upon finalization of the implementing By-laws, the Chedmac Planning Area Secondary Plan be revised to reflect the changes in road pattern and land use.

(e) That approval be given to Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment No. [blank] to redesignate portions of the existing Chedmac Secondary Plan, and to modify the existing residential designations of the Plan in order to permit 14 single lot units, a townhouse complex, and a multiple dwelling; and that the Amendment be held in abeyance until a final decision has been made regarding the Urban
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The purpose of the applications is for a Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment, and Zoning By-law Amendment in order to permit the development of the lands for 14 lots for single detached dwellings, 1 block for townhouses (approximately 48 units) on a future condominium road, 1 block for a multiple dwelling (approximately 80 units), and the assembly of blocks for Institutional uses (see Appendices “E” and “I”).

The proposal has merit and can be supported since it is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, conforms with the Places to Grow - Growth Plan and the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan, and provides residential and Institutional redevelopment within the Secondary Plan Area, which meets the general intent of the Hamilton Official Plan. The proposed development is also compatible with existing and planned development in the area.

Alternatives for Consideration - See Page 28.

FINANCIAL / STAFFING / LEGAL IMPLICATIONS (for Recommendation(s) only)

Financial - N/A.

Staffing - N/A.

Legal - As required by the Planning Act, Council shall hold at least one (1) Public Meeting to consider applications for a Draft Plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment, and changes in zoning.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND (Chronology of events)

Proposal

The purpose of the applications is for an Official Plan Amendment, a draft plan of subdivision, and a change in zoning. The amendments are required in order to accommodate residential development in the form of single detached dwellings fronting onto Redfern Avenue, a multiple dwelling at the corner of Redfern and Sanatorium Road, and townhouse units accessed by a private road from Redfern Avenue. The applications would also facilitate land assembly in order to permit continued Institutional uses.
It is noted that the proposed single detached units to be located along Redfern Avenue would comply with the standard regulations for the “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District. However, a number of By-law provisions have been modified within the proposed “RT-20” (Townhouse - Maisonette) District and the “DE-2” (Multiple Dwelling) District in order to accommodate the townhouse units and multiple dwelling, respectively.

Specifically, the applications would permit:

- 14 lots for single detached dwellings (Lots 1-14);
- 1 block for townhouses and a private road (Block 15);
- 1 block for a 4-storey multiple dwelling (Block 16);
- 1 block for Street A; and,
- 1 block for Institutional uses (Block 17).

In order to implement the draft plan of subdivision, an Official Plan Amendment is required to amend the Chedmac Planning Area Secondary Plan. The Secondary Plan would be amended in order to redesignate portions of the existing “Institutional” Designation to the “Low Density Residential” Designation, the “Medium Density Residential I” Designation, and the “Medium Density Residential II” Designation. Furthermore, the “Low Density Residential” Designation, as it would apply to Lots 1-14 of the Draft Plan of Subdivision, would be amended in order to permit the creation of single detached dwelling units at a density of up to 20 units per hectare (as opposed to the maximum 18 units per hectare, as currently permitted). In addition, the “Medium Density Residential I” Designation would be amended in order to permit the required densities of the proposed townhouse units to fall below 30 units per hectare (whereas currently the designation would require a minimum of 30 units per hectare).

The Secondary Plan would also be amended to redesignate Block 16 of the Draft Plan of Subdivision to the “Medium Density Residential II” Designation. It is noted that while this Designation is present in the Legend of the Secondary Plan, currently no written Policy exists in the Official Plan detailing its function. Therefore, as a housekeeping amendment, this Official Plan Amendment shall also provide said detail for this Designation, as well as apply it to Block 16. Recommendation (a) provides a detailed description of the required amendments to the Hamilton Official Plan, and Appendix “B” is the draft Official Plan Amendment.

The subject lands are also subject to proposed changes in zoning in order to implement these changes and ensure the development, as proposed, is implemented in accordance with the revised designations of the Secondary Plan. As noted above, no amendments are requested to the standard zoning regulations of Hamilton Zoning By-law 6593 for the single detached units; however, a number of modifications will be required for the amending “RT-20” (Townhouse - Maisonette) District and the “DE-2” (Multiple Dwelling) District, proposed to accommodate the townhouse units and the multiple dwelling,
The nature and merits of these modifications are discussed in detail in the Analysis/Rationale section of this Report (Page 25), which include, but are not limited to, the following:

**Block 15 (Townhouses)**

- A minimum lot width of 10m, whereas a minimum lot width of 23m is required.
- A maximum height of 2-storeys, whereas a maximum height of 3-storeys is permitted.
- A maximum density of 48 residential units.

**Block 16 (Multiple Dwelling)**

- A maximum front yard setback of 2.0m, whereas no maximum is required.
- A maximum easterly side yard setback of 2.0m, whereas no maximum is required.
- A minimum westerly side yard setback of 50m.
- A maximum height of 4-storeys or 13.5m, whereas a maximum height of 8-storeys or 26.0m is permitted.
- A maximum density of 80 residential units.

**Chronology:**

- **December 19, 2007:** Application submitted.
- **January 17, 2008:** Deemed incomplete.
- **February 4, 2008:** File deemed complete and circulated.
- **June 24, 2008:** Public “Open House”.
- **April 7, 2009:** Meeting with applicant.
- **September 15, 2009:** Application revised and re-circulated.
- **August 6, 2011:** Application revised and re-circulated - sign updated.
- **November 7, 2011:** Meeting with Public Works Department and Applicant.
- **January 5, 2012:** Notice of Public Meeting circulated.
Details of Submitted Application:

Location: 555 Sanatorium Road (Hamilton)

Owner/Applicant: Chedoke Health Corporation (Owner)

Agent: Don May

Property Description:

Frontage: 255m (approximately measured along Sanatorium Road)

Flankage: 235m (southerly property line along Chedmac Drive)

Lot Area: 13.8ha.

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></td>
<td>Chedoke Hospital</td>
<td>&quot;AA/S-1363c&quot; (Agricultural) District Modified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;AA/S-1363&quot; (Agricultural) District Modified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Major Institutional (I3) Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surrounding Lands:</th>
<th>Existing Land Use</th>
<th>Existing Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Single Detached Dwellings</td>
<td>Residential &quot;R-4&quot; (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Townhouses and Institutional</td>
<td>&quot;DE&quot; (Low Density Multiple Dwellings) District Major Institutional (I3) Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe

The application has been reviewed with respect to the Provincial Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe (Places to Grow). Staff considers the application to be consistent with the policies that manage growth and direct general residential intensification to the built-up areas, as per the Policies contained in 2.2.2 and 2.2.3.

In particular, it is considered that the application would be consistent with the intent to reduce dependence on the automobile through development of mixed-use, transit supportive, urban environments, as well as encouraging the development of Complete Communities through promoting residential intensification and the continued operation of existing institutional uses within an area well served by public transit, quality open space, and easy access to local stores and services.

Staff notes that the subject lands are located within the City of Hamilton’s built boundary and are consistent with general intensification policies of the Growth Plan. Specifically, staff notes Policy 2.2.3.1, which states that by the year 2015, and for each thereafter, a minimum of 40% of all residential development occurring annually within each upper and single-tier municipality will be within the built-up area.

Consequently, it is considered that the proposal maintains the intent to create vibrant neighbourhoods, which provide both employment and residential uses that are transit supportive.
Provincial Policy Statement

The application is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, in that it focuses growth in Settlement Areas and implements Policies 1.1.3.2 and 1.4.1, which speak to the provision of densities that efficiently uses land and to provide a mix of housing types.

Policy 2.6.1 states that significant built heritage resources and significant cultural heritage landscapes shall be conserved. Staff notes that the subject lands contain buildings identified as being of architectural and/or historical interest, and which are listed within Hamilton’s Heritage Volume II. In support of the application, the applicant submitted a Cultural Heritage Resource Assessment Report, dated May 2006, prepared by Unterman McPhail Associates. Following review of the proposed developments and the supporting information, staff is satisfied that the proposal is consistent with the direction of Policy 2.6.1.

Further, Policy 2.6.2 outlines that development and site alteration may be permitted on lands containing archaeological resources or areas of archaeological potential if significant archaeological resources have been conserved by removal and documentation, or preservation on site. Where significant archaeological resources must be preserved on site, only development and site alteration which maintain the heritage integrity of the site may be permitted. Staff notes the subject lands are located within an area of archaeological potential. Consequently, the applicant submitted a Stage 1-2 Archaeological Assessment, dated September 2007, and prepared by New Directions Archaeology Ltd. Staff is satisfied that the above Study appropriately addresses all outstanding archaeological concerns.

Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan

The subject property is designated “Urban Area” within the Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Official Plan. Policy C-3.1 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. These areas are intended to accommodate approximately 96% of new residential housing units in the Region to the year 2020.

Policy B-9.2 states that the City shall consider the protection and preservation of regionally significant historical and cultural resources, including recognized archaeological sites, in the review of proposals for development and redevelopment. Where possible, these attributes will be incorporated into the overall design in a manner which minimizes adverse impacts and encourages maintenance and protection. As noted above, the subject lands are located within an area of archaeological potential, and staff is satisfied that the appropriate studies have been submitted in order to address these concerns.
In addition, and as noted above, the subject lands contain buildings identified as being of architectural and/or historical interest, and which are listed within Hamilton's Heritage Volume II. The proposed development has been assessed in light of this architectural and/or historical interest, and staff is satisfied that no conflict exists.

**Hamilton Official Plan**

The subject property is designated “Major Institutional” on Schedule “A”, Land Use Plan in the former City of Hamilton Official Plan, and “Institutional” on Schedule “J-1” of the Chedmac Planning Area Secondary Plan. The proposal seeks to consolidate the existing institutional uses (associated with Chedoke Hospital and Hamilton Health Sciences) within a smaller portion of the existing site, and develop the remaining balance of the lands for residential purposes in the form of singles, townhouses, and multiple dwelling units; and, as such, the following policies of the Hamilton Official Plan, among others, are applicable to the subject lands:

“A.2.6.5 Notwithstanding the policies set out above, in areas designated MAJOR INSTITUTIONAL, Residential uses may be permitted provided they are compatible with the surrounding area and are in keeping with the Residential policies set out in Sub-sections A.2.1 and C.7 of this Plan.”

As part of the proposal seeks to consolidate the existing Institutional uses on lands designated “MAJOR INSTITUTIONAL”, it is considered that the continuation of institutional uses conforms with the general policies of the Official Plan. As noted in the above Policy, with regard to the residential component of the proposal, the Plan identifies that residential uses may be accommodated without a formal amendment to the Plan, provided it can be demonstrated that the proposed uses are compatible with the surrounding area as well as the following Residential Policies of the Plan:

“A.2.1.8 It is the intent of Council that a variety of housing styles and 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 Sub-section C.7 and the Neighbourhood Plan Policies of Sub-section D.2.”

Staff considers that the proposed units would provide residential development at a density and type that further contributes to the variety of housing options currently available to residents of the neighbourhood, and that the proposed form is both desirable and suitable. Additional criteria for assessment are contained within the policies detailed below.
“C.7.7.1 In the development of new RESIDENTIAL areas and, as far as practicable, in the infilling or redevelopment of established areas, Council may undertake or require the following in order to achieve high standards of RESIDENTIAL amenity:

i) Provision and maintenance of adequate off-street parking.

ii) Alteration of traffic flows.

iii) Improvement and maintenance of street landscaping.

iv) Acquisition, removal, or improvement of buildings or uses incompatible with a zoning district.

v) Provision of advice and assistance in the improvement and maintenance of private dwellings.

vi) Investigation into, and application of, other methods of encouraging the maintenance and improvements of buildings in RESIDENTIAL areas.

vii) The maintenance of adequate separation distances and the placement of buffering features between RESIDENTIAL and Industrial uses.

viii) Other similar actions or matters as Council may deem appropriate.”

As discussed within the Analysis/Rationale section of the Report (Page 21), staff considers that the proposed development would provide sufficient parking, maintain traffic safety and amenity (based on the site design, the submitted Traffic Impact Study, and City’s own traffic count), and is both in keeping with the character of the area and of sufficient density to ensure the subject lands are efficiently utilized.

“C.7.7.2 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.”

It is considered that the proposed residential developments are appropriately designed and located as to ensure an appropriate gradation of densities. The single detached units to be located along the south side of Redfern Avenue would be designated within the same zoning district that applies to the existing units along the northern portion of Redfern and, as such, would mirror the scale and density of these existing residential units.
With regard to the proposed townhouse units, these would be located directly behind the singles, separating these units from the continued institutional operations located to the south. Consequently, it is considered that the location of Block 16 (Townhouse Block) is ideally suited to accommodate a gradual increase in density that would maintain the character and amenity of the singles while, in addition, providing an appropriate transitional buffer between the low density residential uses along Redfern Avenue and the continued institutional uses to the south. Given these locational merits, and the fact the townhouse units would provide both a built form and density similar to the existing and proposed low density singles, staff is satisfied that the intent of the above policy is maintained. It is noted that the form, scale, and final design of the townhouse units will be further regulated through the amending By-law (see Appendix “C”), as well as through the requirement of Site Plan Approval.

The increase in density that would be associated with the proposed multiple dwelling development would similarly be considered as an appropriate arrangement of densities. The building would occupy the northeast area of the site on a parcel of land with an area of approximately 1.1 ha (not including road allowance). Specifically, the multiple residential building is proposed in the form of 80 apartments, to a maximum of 4-storeys. This block would not be immediately adjacent to any existing single detached residences due to the location of the existing SWM pond to the north, and would be restricted through the amending zoning regulations to a maximum of 4-storeys and, as such, would be of a height similar to that of the adjacent Columbia College Residence.

It is considered that sufficient space will be maintained between the multiple dwelling and the proposed singles to the west as a result of the required storm and sanitary/water easement, in addition to the setbacks recommended for the westerly side yard (50m) contained in the amending By-law (see Appendix “C”).

Consequently, staff considers that the 4-storey building has been appropriately located in order to ensure that the transition between adjacent higher and lower density developments are integrated and amenity is preserved, while maintaining the intent to locate higher density development closer to transportation and transit corridors. A design brief will be required at the Site Plan stage of development. On this basis, and as discussed further below and in the Analysis/Rationale section of this Report (Page 21), it is considered that the proposed multiple dwelling will satisfy the intent of the above policy.

“C.7.7.3 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:
(iii) Support RESIDENTIAL development such as infilling, redevelopment, and the conversion of non-residential structures that makes more efficient use of the existing building stock and/or physical infrastructure 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; (O.P.A No. 128).

(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; “

Considerable attention has been given to the scale, bulk, and massing of the proposed residential development and the subsequent performance standards of the amending By-laws. As discussed above, and reviewed in further detail in the Analysis/Rational section of this Report (Page 21), the proposal is considered to sensitively recognize the existing densities and development patterns of the area, and would thus maintain the character of the area and the intent of the above policies.

Chedmac Planning Area Secondary Plan

The subject lands are designated “Institutional” in the Chedmac Planning Area Secondary Plan. The applicants are proposing a change in designation to a portion of the “Institutional” designation in order to adopt 3 residential designations (being the “Low Density Residential”, “Medium Density Residential I”, and the “Medium Density Residential II”). The remaining balance of lands is to remain within the “Institutional” designation. A copy of the proposed draft Official Plan Amendment is attached as Appendix “B”.

As acknowledged in the review of the Hamilton Official Plan policies, the Hamilton Official Plan would permit residential uses within the MAJOR INSTITUTIONAL designation without a formal amendment to the Plan, subject to the satisfaction of certain criteria. As illustrated above, staff considers the proposed residential development to be generally consistent with the policies which govern the scale, type, and character of the residential environment. Notwithstanding the above, amendments to the Official Plan are, however, proposed following review of the more prescriptive policies and land use designations, as contained in the Chedmac Planning Area Secondary Plan.

With regard to the continued operation of institutional uses, it is noted that the following objectives and policies would support and encourage these continued uses.
“6.1.1 v) To recognize and support Chedoke-McMaster Hospitals as a Community and Regional health facility;”

It is considered that the proposed development would facilitate the co-ordination of the Chedoke-McMaster master plan for redevelopment of the area through the consolidation of uses and the utilization of surplus lands.

“6.1.1 vi) To establish a focus within the interior of the Chedmac Planning Area consisting of recreational and health service facilities;”

While it is recognized that the proposal would result in part of the existing institutionally designated lands changing designation to residential, it is considered that the remaining balance of lands would maintain the focus on health service facilities and ensure the continued success and operation of the Chedoke Hospital within the interior of the Chedmac Planning Area, consistent with the above policy.

“6.1.1 xviii) To provide Chedoke-McMaster Hospital and new development with adequate full municipal services including sanitary sewers, watermains, stormwater drainage facilities and utilities, in a coordinated, comprehensive, and environmentally sound manner.”

As discussed in greater detail in the Analysis/Rationale section of the Report (Page 21), the proposal would assist in achieving the objectives of the Municipal Class EA Study, which would include the realigning of Sanatorium Road as well as facilitating the upgrades required to the existing services within the area.

“6.1.2 ii) c) The development of any new institutional facilities, including those associated with Chedoke-McMaster Hospitals, shall be designed to mitigate any negative impact on adjacent residential development”.

The proposed institutional portion of the development is not considered to exert any significant impact upon the existing residential development as it would be a consolidation of existing uses within a reduced portion of the site, as opposed to an expansion of these uses into adjacent lands. However, the proposal would include the introduction of new residential uses within portions of the subject lands and, as such, the compatibility between these two uses must be considered in light of the above policy. Consequently, given the distances in terms of separation, the scale of uses, and gradation of densities, it is considered that the above policy would be satisfied. The issue of compatibility between these uses, and the neighbourhood in general, is discussed in further detail in the policy analysis for the proposed residential development below and the Analysis/Rationale section (Page 21).
Based on the above, staff considers the proposal to promote the continued operation, and maintain the functionality of the existing Hospital, consistent with the Chedmac Secondary Plan Area.

It is noted that originally the proposal consisted of Institutional uses, residential uses in the form of single detached units and townhouse/semi detached dwellings, and a storm water management pond. The current proposal has, however, eliminated the SWM pond and instead proposes a multi-unit residential building.

The requirement for a SWM pond was initially identified through the Municipal Class EA Study for Sanatorium Road Reconstruction and Stormwater Improvements, prepared by Dillon Consulting Limited. The SWM requirements of the subject lands are to be addressed wholly by the existing SWM pond to the north of the site (at the corner of Redfern and Sanatorium), with the provision of an additional pond, in fact necessary, to accommodate SWM demands from adjacent areas outside of the site. However, further review of these demands have led to the Public Works Department to confirm that the provision of an additional SWM pond is no longer necessary. Consequently, the applicant amended the scheme in order to develop the block previously identified for a pond as a multi-unit residential building (see Appendix “I”).

Given the initial EA Study, the subsequent confirmation received from the Public Works Department that they no longer require the pond, in addition to the servicing information already provided to date by the applicant, staff considers that the deletion of the SWM pond and the provision of additional residential uses to be consistent with the servicing objectives of the Secondary Plan, which states:

“6.1.1 xviii) To provide Chedoke-McMaster Hospitals and new development with adequate full municipal services including sanitary sewers, watermains, stormwater drainage facilities and utilities, in a coordinated, comprehensive, and environmentally sound manner.”

The continued institutional uses and deletion of the SWM pond are considered consistent with the existing Secondary Plan and, by itself, would not require any formal amendment to the Official Plan. In terms of the provision of additional residential land uses within the Secondary Plan, it is noted that it is this component of the proposal that requires formal changes to the Secondary Plan and Zoning By-law and, as such, the following relevant policies have been used in the assessment of these proposed uses.

“6.1.1 i) To create residential areas consisting of a range of housing types and densities to satisfy a range of housing needs;”

The addition of singles, towns, and a multiple dwelling unit would satisfy the objective of the Secondary Plan to provide for, and maintain, a range of housing types and densities.
“6.1.1 iii) To ensure future residential and institutional development considers and is sensitive to surrounding existing residential development;”

It is considered that the proposed type and density of residential development has been appropriately arranged such that it is sensitive to the existing residential development. The singles along Redfern would be developed at a scale and density consistent with the existing dwellings on the north side of Redfern. The townhouse units, on the other hand, would be located behind the singles, and accessed by a private condominium road. Consequently, it is considered that this layout and gradation of densities would provide both an appropriate buffer between the existing institutional uses to the south and the proposed singles along Redfern, as well as preserving the character of the existing built form, as this part of the development would not be readily visible from Redfern Avenue or the public realm and, therefore, would not affect, or significantly contribute to, the established streetscape character of Redfern.

With regard to the proposed multiple dwelling, its location at the intersection of Redfern Avenue and Sanatorium Road benefits from the height and scale of the existing built form within its proximity. The Columbia College residence to the east is 4 storeys, whereas the existing buildings within the Chedoke Hospital Campus, in close proximity to the proposed multiple dwelling, range from 2- to 4-storeys in height. The proposed 4-storey structure would, therefore, not appear incongruent with the scale and form of development within its immediate proximity. In addition, the parcel of land intended to accommodate the 4-storey multiple dwelling, due to the location of an existing SWM pond to the north, will be sufficiently distanced away from the existing grade oriented single detached properties located further west along Redfern Avenue.

Finally, and as detailed in the Analysis/Rationale for Recommendation section (Page 26) of this Report, a design brief will be a requirement of Site Plan Approval in order that the applicant provides details of the building's final design and location, allowing staff a further opportunity to ensure the amenity and character of the area is maintained.

“6.1.1 iv) To integrate the residential areas with Parkland in order to provide a convenient, safe, and visually pleasing living environment;”

The proposed residential areas will be within walking distance to Holbrook Park and the Chedoke Twin Pad Arena, as well as Mountview Park. Furthermore, as a result of the existing SWM pond and the existing landscaped areas within the Hospital grounds, it is considered that sufficient open space exists around and within close proximity to the development in order to satisfy the above policy.

“6.1.2 i)a)(1) Within each residential designation, the Zoning By-law will restrict the use of any site to the dwelling unit within that designation. Such restrictions will be implemented to preserve the character of the neighbourhood and
compatibility of dwelling unit types with surrounding existing and proposed land uses;”  

As discussed in more detail in the Analysis/Rationale section of this Report (Page 21), the amending By-law will ensure the form of the proposed developments preserve the character of the existing and proposed land uses.

It is noted that minor amendments to the density provisions of the “Low Density Residential” and “Medium Density Residential I” designations of the Secondary Plan are proposed; however, they are of a minor scale, in keeping with the intent of the Secondary Plan. The Low Density designation will be amended so that it would permit a maximum 20 u/ph, whereas 18 u/ph is currently required. Given that the implementing Zoning By-law will apply the exact same By-law provisions that govern the existing single detached dwellings to the north, the impact on the existing character will be negligible.

The amendment to the “Medium Density Residential I” designation is to permit a reduction in the required density provision from a minimum 30u/ph to 28u/ph. Given that the townhouses are accessed by a private condominium road and are located between the Hospital lands and the proposed new singles and, as such, not readily visible from the public realm, the change in density will have no discernable impact upon the character of the area.

Finally, a housekeeping amendment will be added to the Official Plan Amendment, in order that the “Medium Density Residential II” designation be added to Schedule “J-1”. This designation currently exists in the Landuse Schedule of the Secondary Plan, but is not currently accounted for in the written policy. Once added, it will designate Block 16 of the Draft Plan in order to accommodate the multiple dwelling.

“6.1.2 i)c) Residential development shall be located to ensure a gradation of residential densities;”

As discussed previously in this Report, staff considers that the location and orientation of the proposed residential development conforms with the above policy, as it would provide for an appropriate gradation of density.

“6.1.2 i)d) Residential development adjacent to existing MAJOR INSTITUTIONAL facilities may be subject to a Noise Study.”

Given the proximity of the proposed townhouses and multiple dwelling to existing institutional uses, the requirement for a Noise Study may be requested. This will be identified and secured through the Site Plan process.
Based on the above, staff considers the proposal to meet the intent of the Secondary Plan and, as such, supports the proposed amendments discussed above.

**New Urban Hamilton Official Plan (NUHOP)**

The Urban Hamilton Official Plan received Ministerial Approval from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing on March 16, 2011 and, therefore, can no longer be modified.

The final decision on the Urban Hamilton Official Plan has been appealed. As such, Council approved Official Plan Amendments made prior to the final decision will be held in abeyance until their incorporation into the Plan can be requested of the Ontario Municipal Board (OMB), or through a future housekeeping amendment.

It is prudent and part of natural justice to identify changes to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan as part of the public notice in the staff Report and notice of adoption.

Consequently, the proposal has also been evaluated against the policies of the Council adopted and Ministerial Approved Urban Official Plan. The site is located within the Institutional Designation of Schedule E-1 Urban Land Use Designations and within the Institutional Designation of Map B.6.3-1 of the Chedmac Secondary Plan Landuse Plan and, as such, the following Policies have been considered:

"Policy 6.2.6 Notwithstanding Policy E.6.2.2, where institutional uses cease on lands designated Institutional, low density residential uses, parks and open space uses, or community facilities/services uses may be permitted without an amendment to this Plan, provided the residential uses are compatible with the surrounding area and are in keeping with the policies of this Plan."

Similar to the Institutional policies of the in-force Hamilton Official Plan, the principle of residential uses within the Institutional designation is, in general, supported. However, unlike the in-force Official Plan, the NUHOP specifically limits this to low density residential uses and, as such, the proposed medium density residential uses would need to be formally recognized in the NUHOP.

It is noted that the Chedmac Secondary Plan, which forms part of the NUHOP, maintains similar polices and objectives of the in-force Chedmac Secondary Plan. As such, the policy review pertaining to this Plan, presented in the previous review, remains relevant to this section. The necessary amendments, as detailed above, will also be made to this Secondary Plan (see Appendix “H”). These amendments are considered to meet the intent of the Secondary Plan, in particular, and the NUHOP, in general, and, as such, are supported.
RELEVANT CONSULTATION

Agencies/Departments Having No Comment or Objections

- Budgets and Finance Division, Corporate Services Department.
- Recreation Division, Community Services Department.
- Parking and By-law Services Division, Hamilton Municipal Parking System.
- Hydro One Networks Inc.

Public Works Department (Traffic Engineering and Operations Section) - Staff provided comments regarding the following Draft Plan Requirement:

As a condition of Subdivision Approval, we will require that the driveway locations on the single detached Lots and Multiple Dwelling Block be located, to the satisfaction of the Senior Project Manager, Traffic Planning and Community Services. The driveway locations to these lots and block must be shown on approved engineering drawings submitted with the registered Subdivision Agreement. This is to be addressed through the Special Conditions of Draft Approval (see Appendix “G” - Condition 14).

The Traffic Study submitted with this application is the same Traffic Study that accompanied the Brow Lands Application (ZAC-07-53). Comments from Traffic staff regarding this Study were forwarded to the applicant in November, 2007.

Following these comments, the applicant provided a revised Addendum Study, dated September, 2011, by IBI Group. Staff has since reviewed the document and conducted their own traffic count of the area, and indicates no concerns with respect to traffic generation and pedestrian amenity.

Public Works Department (Open Space Development Section) - The Recreation Division of the Community Services Department has no issues with this revised Official Plan Amendment, Zoning Amendment, and Draft Plan of Subdivision.

Public Works Department (Forestry and Horticulture Section) - Staff acknowledges that given the location of Street Trees, a Tree Management Plan will be required as a condition of Draft Plan Approval. This is covered in the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

Hamilton Street Railway states the following:

- HSR operates routes #33 Sanatorium and #41A Mohawk past this site, with no planned changes in service.
• Street orientation and pedestrian entrances are important. Direct short walking distances between dwellings and transit service are preferable.

• HSR supports the inclusion of high quality pedestrian amenities at this development like walkways, lighting, etc.

Hamilton Conservation Authority staff notes that a small portion of the subject property is affected by the HCA Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation 161/06 under Ontario Regulation 97/04. The regulated area pertains to the open watercourse and adjacent slope in the northeast quadrant of the property. Written approval is, therefore, required from the HCA for development in this area of the property. This is detailed in Special Condition of Draft Approval No. 15 (see Appendix “G”).

The HCA has reviewed the proposal documents submitted in support of the subject application. The Revised Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by Trow Consulting Engineers Ltd., dated February 21, 2002, is satisfactory; however, additional supporting details are required with regard to sediment and erosion control and stormwater management. A lot grading and drainage plan, including applicable sediment and erosion controls, will be required to be submitted and approved by the HCA.

Staff notes that these conditions are included within the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

Union Gas has advised that the owner shall provide all necessary easements. These conditions are included within the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

Canada Post has advised that mail service to the subdivision will be provided via the Community Mailbox Program, and that conditions of approval should be included pertaining to a statement in offers of purchase and sale about the centralized mail box; and that the developer/owner must agree to install concrete pads for the mail box, identify the pads on engineering drawings, and post the location of the mail box on appropriate maps, information boards, and plans. These conditions are included within the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

Public Consultation

In accordance with Council’s Public Participation Policy, the application was pre-circulated to 279 property owners within 120 metres of the subject property in February, 2008. Following amendments to the proposal - namely the conversion of a previously identified Stormwater Management Pond to a multiple unit - a second notice was circulated to 192 property owners within 120 metres of the subject property in July, 2011. The applicants also hosted a Neighbourhood Information Meeting on June 24,
2008, at which time a number of residents attended, and more recently, have distributed leaflets throughout the neighbourhood detailing the latest proposal (see Appendix “I”).

As a result of the initial pre-circulation, 3 individuals submitted letters expressing concerns with regard to the proposed density of development, potential for flooding/environmental impacts, and traffic/road alignment impacts (see Appendix “F”). In addition, following the pre-circulation of the revised proposal, 1 additional letter of concern was submitted, raising the same issues, as well as an additional issue regarding the impact upon wildlife (see Appendix “F”). These concerns, in addition to other issues raised by the current applications, will be discussed in the following section. Finally, notice of the Public Meeting has been given in accordance with the requirements of the Planning Act.

ANALYSIS / RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION

(include Performance Measurement/Benchmarking Data, if applicable)

1. The proposal has merit and can be supported for the following reasons:

   (i) It is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement, and conforms with and implements the “Urban” designation of the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan.

   (ii) It conforms with the “Growth Plan - Places to Grow” legislation that seeks to provide for appropriate residential intensification and investment in institutional uses.

   (iii) The Official Plan Amendment and Subdivision provides for increased residential development, while maintaining the functionality of the existing institutional uses in accordance with the general policies of the Chedmac Planning Area Secondary Plan.

2. The area in question has been the subject of detailed review in the development of the Chedmac Planning Area Secondary Plan. The Chedmac Planning Area Secondary Plan applies generally to the lands north of Mohawk Road West, to the East of Sanatorium Road, and to the South of Scenic Drive. The Secondary Plan identifies the subject lands as “Institutional”, and attaches a number of policies in order to guide the development of the area. In order to develop the lands as proposed, portions of the subject lands are required to be redesignated.
3. In accordance with the City of Hamilton’s Parkland Dedication and Cash-in-Lieu of Parkland By-law, the application is subject to a parkland dedication, or a Cash-in-Lieu of parkland dedication payment of five percent (5%) of the total land area of the subject property for the residential portion. The Medium Density Residential I Block (Block 15) and Medium Density Residential II Block (Block 16) will, however, be subject to a dedication of 1 ha per 300 units (based on the maximum permitted density for these Blocks). The institutional blocks are exempt from Parkland Dedication. This requirement has been included in Recommendation (c) (iii), and through Condition of the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

4. With respect to services, there is a 300mm watermain within a municipal easement located on the north side of Chedmac Drive and a 300mm watermain on Redfern Avenue. Currently, there is no municipal watermain on Sanatorium Road. There is also an existing 200mm diameter private watermain within the Sanatorium Road right-of-way at this time.

There is a 750mm sanitary sewer on Chedmac Drive and a 250mm sanitary sewer on Redfern Avenue. There is a 525mm to 975mm storm sewer on Redfern Avenue and a 1650mm to 2100mm storm sewer within the municipal easement, which traverses the site from Chedmac Drive to Redfern Avenue.

There are no road allowance widenings required at this time on Redfern Avenue and Chedmac Drive. However, the Municipal Class EA Study for Sanatorium Road Reconstruction and Stormwater Improvements, prepared by Dillon Consulting Limited, has identified some minor land requirements along the west side of Sanatorium Road to establish continuous width of the existing boulevard. This will be secured through Special Condition of Draft Approval No. 5 (see Appendix “G”).

As noted earlier, the removal of the previously proposed SWM pond is not considered to impact the current proposal. The existing SWM pond located on the north side of Redfern has been designed in order to accommodate the stormwater generated by the site, and the suitability of this arrangement, given the proposed development, will be assessed and secured through conditions of Draft Approval (see Appendix “G” - Condition 11).

The applicant is intending to phase the development, with the first phase to secure all the necessary improvements along Sanatorium Road, as identified through the Municipal Class EA Study. The first phase would specifically address those lands contained within Block 17 of the Subdivision Plan, which concern the continued institutional operation of Chedoke Hospital.
5. Hamilton Conservation Authority (HCA) was circulated the application, and notes that the subject property is located within the Chedoke Creek subwatershed, which drains to Cootes Paradise. Given the location and acreage of the lands to be developed (20 ha), stormwater management quantity and quality controls will be required for the proposed development. Water quality controls to "Enhanced" water quality levels are required.

Furthermore, it is noted that a small portion of the subject property is affected by the HCA Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation 161/06 under Ontario Regulation 97/04. The regulated area pertains to the open watercourse and adjacent slope in the northeast quadrant of the property. Written approval is, therefore, required from the HCA for development in this area of the property.

This is included within the list of Special Conditions of Draft Approval (see Appendix "G" - Condition 15).

The HCA has reviewed the documents submitted in support of the subject application. The Revised Geotechnical Investigation, prepared by Trow Consulting Engineers Ltd., dated February 21, 2002, is satisfactory; however, additional supporting details are required with regard to sediment and erosion control and stormwater management. A lot grading and drainage plan, including applicable sediment and erosion controls, will be required to be submitted and approved by the HCA. This will be secured through the conditions within the Standard Form Subdivision Agreement.

6. In support of the application, a Traffic Impact Study, dated June, 2007, by IBI Group, was submitted. Following amendments to the proposal, as well as changes occurring in lands surrounding the subject lands, staff requested that this Study be updated. Consequently, a revised Addendum Study, dated September, 2011, by IBI Group, was submitted. Staff has reviewed the document and conducted their own traffic count of the area, and indicates no concerns with respect to traffic generation and pedestrian amenity.
7. In accordance with Council’s Public Participation Policy, the application was pre-circulated to 279 property owners within 120 metres of the subject property in February, 2008. Following amendments to the proposal - namely the conversion of a previously identified Stormwater Management Pond to a multiple unit - a second notice was circulated to 192 property owners within 120 metres of the subject property in July, 2011. The applicants also hosted a Neighbourhood Information Meeting on June 24, 2008, at which time a number of residents attended, and more recently, have distributed leaflets throughout the neighbourhood detailing the latest proposal.

As a result of the initial pre-circulation, 3 letters expressing concerns with regard to the proposed density of development, potential for flooding/environmental impacts, and traffic impacts were received (see Appendix “E”). In addition, following the pre-circulation of the revised proposal, 1 additional letter of concern was submitted raising the same issues (see Appendix “E”). These concerns, in addition to other issues raised by the current applications, will be discussed in the following section. Finally, a Public Notice sign was erected on the property and further updated regarding the revised proposal on August 18, 2011.

8. The proposal is split both in terms of phasing, as well as in terms of land use. The continued operation of institutional uses, which form the basis of the first phase (Block 17), is recognized and permitted within the existing By-law and Secondary Plan Designations. As such, no formal amendment to the existing By-law provisions or Official Plan is required.

Based on the policy review detailed on Pages 8-18, staff is, therefore, wholly in support of the proposed Draft Plan of Subdivision as it pertains to Block 17 (subject to the Special Conditions of Draft Approval detailed in Appendix “G”), as it would promote the continued operation, and maintain the functionality of the existing Hospital. As identified in the amending By-law (see Appendix “D”), it is noted that additional lands are being brought into By-law 05-200 in order to accommodate and, more accurately, identify the existing boundaries of the Hospital operation. This is considered a minor technical zoning boundary amendment, one that is fully contemplated within the existing Secondary Plan designation.

9. The principle of the residential land use has been reviewed and evaluated through the Policy Implications section of this Report. The following review will, therefore, focus on the merits of the implementing By-laws, as well as discuss the concerns raised as a result of the Public circulation.
Lots 1-14

Lots 1-14 will be for single detached dwellings having direct access to Redfern Avenue. No modifications to the implementing “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District have been requested. Based on the understanding that this would place the units under the same built form and performance standard requirements as that currently governing the existing units on the north side of Redfern Avenue, staff is satisfied the character of the area and amenity of the existing residential housing stock is maintained.

Block 15 Townhouses

Modifications to the implementing “RT-20” (Townhouse - Maisonette) District would consist of one technical change to the minimum width of a lot. Given the configuration of the townhouse block (see Appendix “I”), in that it would be accessed from a 10m wide condominium road, a reduction of minimum width from 23m to 10m would be required. As only a road and no portion of the development would be located within the reduced portion of the site to which the 10m would be applicable, staff is in support of the modification.

Additional modifications will also be recommended. These consist of reducing the maximum permitted height from 3-storeys to 2-storeys, and to limit the overall number of residential units to 48. It is considered that these modifications provide greater control over the built form and density of the proposal in order to ensure the proposal is developed in accordance with the provided concept plan, as well as to ensure the development is in keeping with density of development within the area. Given these modifications, staff is also confident that sufficient parking will be accommodated on site and that no further pressure on the existing parking amenity in the area would be exerted.

Finally, it is noted that the development of the townhouse block would be subject to Site Plan Control and, as such, additional review of the configuration and functionality of the site will take place at that time, as well as additional engineering, design, and traffic matters.

Block 16 Multiple Dwelling

It is noted that only limited design details have been provided with respect to the proposed multiple dwelling. It is anticipated that the units would be designed and marketed towards seniors, given the proximity to the services currently available in the adjacent Chedoke Hospital. However, it is noted that the end users of the building will not be governed by the implementing By-law and, therefore, in terms of this proposal, the principle of the land use being assessed is that of a standard multiple residential dwelling.
Given the absence of a detailed design at this stage, staff recognizes that the lands to accommodate the multiple dwelling will be subject to Site Plan Control. As such, a design brief will be required for Site Plan Approval in order that a review of the detailed design can take place.

In addition to the design brief, staff has recommended a number of modifications in order to provide clarity in terms of the scale and density of the building. This will be achieved through limiting the height to 4-storeys, and permitting a maximum number of 80 residential units. Furthermore, staff will also provide the opportunity for a street oriented building by recommending a maximum side and front yard setback, whereas the existing By-law prescribes minimum setbacks. This shift away from the standard regulations of the By-law is in order to be consistent with 'new urbanism' principles, whereby buildings are encouraged to have greater street presence and, alternatively, locate amenities such as parking to the rear. It is anticipated that these provisions would, therefore, ensure that the bulk and massing of the building will be located as to provide a physical presence along both Sanatorium Road and Redfern Avenue.

Finally, a large westerly minimum side yard will be recommended in order to accommodate the required storm and sanitary/water easement, as well as to generate sufficient spacing between the grade oriented single detached dwellings proposed further west along Redfern Avenue.

No further modifications to the standard Multiple Dwelling “DE-2” District are proposed and, as such, staff is satisfied that given the size of the parcel of land and the further control available through the Site Plan process, that sufficient opportunity exists as to ensure all design, parking, landscaping, and amenity issues can be appropriately addressed.

10. As raised in the responses to the Public Circulation, a number of concerns were received with respect to the proposal. These will be addressed individually below.

Density

Concern over the density of the proposal has been raised, and pertains to the additional residential units that would be constructed. As discussed throughout this Report, staff considers the range of densities proposed would be consistent and complementary to the existing neighbourhood and supported through the Policy framework. Sufficient regard has been given to the gradation of densities as well as the scale, massing, built form, and location of the different range of residential units.
Traffic

In support of the application, a Traffic Impact Study was submitted demonstrating that the existing infrastructure is sufficient in order to accommodate the additional residential units. Following an amendment to the application (introduction of the Multiple Dwelling), a further Addendum was submitted to the original Study. Both Studies were reviewed and supported by staff. In addition, Traffic staff also conducted their own traffic count of the area and indicated no concerns with respect to traffic generation and pedestrian amenity.

Environmental/Flooding Impacts

Staff notes that there are existing concerns with respect to flooding within the Chedmac Planning Area, as well as the adjacent Brow Lands. The area has been subject to detailed review with regard to flooding impacts through the Municipal Class EA Study for Sanatorium Road Reconstruction and Stormwater Improvements, prepared by Dillon Consulting Limited. The Study identified a number of improvements, including some minor land requirements along the west side of Sanatorium Road, to establish a continuous width of the existing boulevard. These requirements would be facilitated by the current proposal through the Subdivision Agreement and, in particular, Special Condition 5 (see Appendix “G”).

Furthermore, the applicant will be required to submit additional details with respect to Servicing and Stormwater Management demonstrating that the proposal would not create any additional adverse impacts with respect to flooding in the area. The approval of the details will be through the Subdivision Agreement and future development applications, which shall be reviewed by both staff and the Hamilton Conservation Authority. Given that the proposal would not only ensure that no further impact upon the existing situation would be created, but also, would assist in achieving some of the improvements identified through the EA Study for the area in general, staff is confident that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on flooding.

Finally, no concerns are anticipated with regard to the impact upon wildlife in the area. No significant wildlife species are known to habitat the area in question.

In conclusion, the proposal will increase the supply of housing in the neighbourhood in a manner that is compatible with existing surrounding residential uses. The proposal represents an appropriate example of infill development that will make efficient use of existing services, while ensuring that the existing character of the neighbourhood is maintained. Furthermore, it is considered that the design and scale of the proposed development shall enhance the existing streetscape, providing visual interest that successfully
transitions and respects the variety of existing scales. Consequently, staff considers the proposal to meet the intent of the Secondary Plan and, as such, supports the proposed amendments discussed above.

**ALTERNATIVES FOR CONSIDERATION:**

(include Financial, Staffing, Legal and Policy Implications and pros and cons for each alternative)

Should the proposed draft plan of Subdivision, Official Plan Amendment and changes in zoning be denied, the subject lands could be developed for uses permitted within the existing Agricultural Districts and Institutional Zone.

**CORPORATE STRATEGIC PLAN** (Linkage to Desired End Results)


**Social Development**

- Everyone has a home they can afford that is well maintained and safe.

**Healthy Community**

- An engaged Citizenry.

**APPENDICES / SCHEDULES**

- Appendix “A”: Location Plan
- Appendix “B”: Draft Official Plan Amendment
- Appendix “C”: Draft Zoning By-law Amendment (By-law 6593)
- Appendix “D”: Draft Zoning By-law Amendment (By-law 05-200)
- Appendix “E”: Draft Plan of Subdivision
- Appendix “F”: Public Comments
- Appendix “G”: Special Conditions of Draft Approval
- Appendix “H”: Draft Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment
- Appendix “I”: Concept Plan
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Appendix "A" to Report PED12009

Location Map

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

File Name/Number: ZAC-07-114
Date: January 13, 2012

Appendix "A" Scale: N.T.S. Planner/Technician: EJ/MB

Subject Property
555 Sanatorium Road

Block 1: Lands to be rezoned from the "AAS-1363" (Agricultural) District, Modified and the "AA-1363" (Agricultural) District, Modified to the "RM" (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District.

Block 2: Lands to be rezoned from the "AAS-1363" (Agricultural) District, Modified and the "AAS-1363" (Agricultural) District, Modified to the "RT-20/3-150" (Townhouse - Mansioette) District, Modified.

Block 3: Lands to be rezoned from the "AAS-1363" (Agricultural) District, Modified to the "DE-25-150" (Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified.

Block 4: Lands to be rezoned from the "AAS-1363" (Agricultural) District, Modified to the Major Institutional (I3) Zone.

Block 5: Lands to be rezoned from Major Institutional (I3) Zone to "RT-20/5-150" (Townhouse-Mansioette) District, Modified.

Block 6: Additional lands of applicant Subject to subdivision application 2ST-200/24.
The following text, together with Schedule “A” (Schedule A - Land Use Concept, City of Hamilton Official Plan) and Schedule “B” (Schedule “J1” - Chedmac Planning Area Secondary Plan, City of Hamilton Official Plan), attached hereto, constitutes Official Plan Amendment No.  to the City of Hamilton Official Plan.

**Purpose and Effect:**

The purpose of the Amendment is to amend Landuse Schedule “A” by redesignating “Major Institutional” lands to “Residential”, and to amend the Chedmac Secondary Plan by redesignating “Institutional” lands to residential land designations in order to permit 14 single detached dwellings, townhouse units, and a multi-storey residential building.

**Location:**

The lands affected by this Amendment are located on the southwest side of the intersection of Sanatorium Road and Redfern Avenue, and are known municipally as 555 Sanatorium Road (Hamilton).

**Basis:**

The basis for permitting this Amendment is as follows; the Amendment:

- Is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement;
- Conforms with the Places to Grow - Growth Plan and the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan;
- Provides residential and Institutional redevelopment within the Secondary Plan Area, which meets the general intent of the Hamilton Official Plan; and,
- The proposed development is compatible with existing and planned development in the area.
Actual Changes:

Schedule Changes

(a) Schedule “A” - Land Use Concept is revised by redesignating the subject lands from “Major Institutional” to “Residential”, as shown on the attached Schedule “A” of this Amendment.

(b) Schedule “J-1” - Chedmac Planning Area Secondary Plan be revised by redesignating the subject lands from “Institutional” to:

- “Low Density Residential”, as shown as Area 8;
- “Medium Density Residential I”, as shown as Area 9; and,
- “Medium Density Residential II”, as shown as Area 10;

as shown on Schedule “B”, attached to this Amendment.

Text Changes

(a) That Section A.6.1.2 i) a) be amended by adding the following Sub-sections:

“A.6.1.2 i) a) (5) Medium Density Residential II development shall consist of stacked townhouses or apartment dwelling units at a gross residential density of 31-100 units per gross hectare.”

(b) That Section A.6.1.2 i) be amended by adding the following Sub-section:

“A.6.1.2 i) a) (6) Notwithstanding Policy A.6.1.2 i) a) (2), lands shown as Area 8 on Schedule J-1 - Chedmac Planning Area Secondary Plan shall be designated as Low Density Residential, and shall consist of single detached units at a maximum gross density of 20 units per gross hectare.”

(c) That Section A.6.1.2 i) be amended by adding the following Sub-section:

“A.6.1.2 i) a) (7) Notwithstanding Policy A.6.1.2 i) a) (4), lands shown as Area 9 on Schedule J-1 - Chedmac Planning Area Secondary Plan shall be designated as Medium Density Residential I, and shall consist of townhouse dwelling units at a maximum gross density of 30 units per gross hectare.”
Implementation:

An implementing Zoning By-law and Site Plan Agreement will give effect to this Amendment.

This is Schedule ‘1’ to By-law No. passed on the day of , 2012.

The
City of Hamilton

R. Bratina
MAYOR

Rose Caterini
CLERK
Appendix "B" to Report PED12009 (Page 5 of 5)
WHEREAS the City of Hamilton Act, 1999, Statutes of Ontario, 1999 Chap. 14, Sch. C. did incorporate, as of January 1, 2001, the municipality “City of Hamilton”;

AND WHEREAS the City of Hamilton is the successor to certain area municipalities, including the former municipality known as the “The Corporation of the City of Hamilton”, and is the successor to the former Regional Municipality, namely, “The Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth”;

AND WHEREAS the City of Hamilton Act, 1999 provides that the Zoning By-laws and Official Plans of the former area municipalities and the Official Plan of the former regional municipality continue in force in the City of Hamilton until subsequently amended or repealed by the Council of the City of Hamilton;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton passed Zoning By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton), on the 25th day of July 1950, which By-law was approved by the Ontario Municipal Board by Order dated the 7th day of December 1951, (File No. P.F.C. 3821);

AND WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton, in adopting Item [redacted] of Report 12- [redacted] (PED12009) of the Planning Committee, at its meeting held on the [redacted] day of [redacted], 2012, recommended that Zoning By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton) be amended as hereinafter provided;

AND WHEREAS this By-law will be in conformity with the Official Plan of the City of Hamilton upon approval of Official Plan Amendment No. [redacted], proposed by the City of Hamilton, but not yet approved in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act.
NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:

1. That Sheet No. W37 of the District Maps, appended to and forming part of By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton), is amended by changing the following:

   (a) That Block 1 be re-zoned from the “AA/S-1363c” (Agricultural) District, Modified, and the “AA/S-1363” (Agricultural) District, Modified, to the “R-4” (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District;

   (b) That Block 2 be re-zoned from the “AA/S-1363c” (Agricultural) District, Modified, and the “AA/S-1363” (Agricultural) District, Modified, to the “RT-20” (Townhouse - Maisonette) District, Modified; and,

   (c) That Block 3 be re-zoned from the “AA/S-1363” (Agricultural) District, Modified, to the “DE-2” (Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified;

   on the lands the extent and boundaries of which are shown on the plan hereto annexed as Schedule “A”.

2. That the “RT-20” (Townhouse - Maisonette) District regulations, as contained in Section 10E of Zoning By-law No. 6593, applicable to Block “2”, as detailed in Section 1 of this By-law, be modified to include the following special requirements:

   (a) That notwithstanding Section 10E.(3) of Zoning By-law No. 6593, no building shall exceed 2-storeys in height.

   (b) That notwithstanding Section 10E.(7)(ii) of Zoning By-law No. 6593, a lot width of not less than 10m shall be provided and maintained.

   (c) That notwithstanding Section 10E.(7) of Zoning By-law No. 6593, not more than 48 units shall be permitted.

3. That no building or structure shall be erected, altered, extended or enlarged, nor shall any building or structure or part thereof be used, nor shall any land be used, except in accordance with the “RT-20” (Townhouse - Maisonette) District provisions, subject to the special requirements referred to in Section 2.

4. That the “DE-2” (Multiple Dwellings) District, regulations, as contained in Section 10B of Zoning By-law No. 6593, applicable to Block “3”, as detailed in Section 1 of this By-law, be modified to include the following special requirements:
(a) That notwithstanding Section 10B.(2)(ii) of Zoning By-law No. 6593, no building shall exceed 4-storey in height or 13.5m.

(b) That notwithstanding Section 10B.(3)(i)(b) of Zoning By-law No. 6593, a maximum front yard setback of 2.0m shall be provided and maintained, except where a visibility triangle is required.

(c) That notwithstanding Section 10B.(3)(ii)(b) of Zoning By-law No. 6593, a maximum easterly side yard setback of 2.0m shall be provided and maintained, except where a visibility triangle is required.

(d) That notwithstanding Section 10B.(3)(ii)(b) of Zoning By-law No. 6593, a minimum westerly side yard setback of 50m shall be provided and maintained.

(e) That notwithstanding Section 10B.(4)(iv) of Zoning By-law No. 6593, no more than 80 units shall be permitted.

5. That no building or structure shall be erected, altered, extended, or enlarged; nor shall any building or structure or part thereof be used; nor shall any land be used, except in accordance with the “DE-2” (Multiple Dwellings) District provisions, subject to the special requirements referred to in Section 4.

6. That By-law No. 6593 (Hamilton) is amended by adding this By-law to Section 19B as Schedule S-1654.

7. That Sheet No. W37 of the District Maps is amended by marking the lands referred to in Section 1 of this By-law as S-1654.

8. That the Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to proceed with the giving of notice of the passing of this By-law, in accordance with the Planning Act.

PASSED and ENACTED this [blank] day of [blank], 2012.

__________________________           ____________________________
R. Bratina                               Rose Caterini
Mayor                                    Clerk

ZAC-07-114/ OPA-07-039 / 25T-200724
This is Schedule "A" to By-Law No. 12-
Passed the ........... day of .................., 2012

Clerk

Mayor

Subject Property
555 Sanatorium Road

Block 1: Lands to be rezoned from the "AAGS-1363" (Agricultural) District, Modified and the "AAGS-1363a" (Agricultural) District, Modified to the "R4" (Small Lot Single Family Dwelling) District.

Block 2: Lands to be rezoned from the "AAGS-1363" (Agricultural) District, Modified and the "AAGS-1363a" (Agricultural) District, Modified to the "RT-20S-1554" (Townhouse-Mansions) District, Modified.

Block 3: Lands to be rezoned from the "AAGS-1363" (Agricultural) District, Modified to the "DE-2/6-1554" (Multiple Dwellings) District, Modified.

Block 6: Refer to By-Law 05-200.

Block & Land to be zoned "RT-20S-1554" (Townhouse-Mansionette) District, Modified.

Block & Additional lands of applicant Subject to subdivision application 261-200724.

Schedule "A"

Map Forming Part of
By-Law No. 12-
to Amend By-law No. 6593
WHEREAS the City of Hamilton has in force several Zoning By-laws which apply to the different areas incorporated into the City by virtue of the City of Hamilton Act, 1999, S.O. 1999, Chap. 14;

AND WHEREAS the City of Hamilton is the lawful successor to the former Municipalities identified in Section 1.7 of By-law 05-200;

AND WHEREAS Zoning By-law 05-200 was enacted on the 25th day of May, 2005;

AND WHEREAS the Council of the City of Hamilton, in adopting Item [redacted] of Report 12-[redacted] of the Planning Committee, at its meeting held on the [redacted] day of [redacted], 2012, recommended that Zoning By-law No. 05-200, be amended as hereinafter provided;

AND WHEREAS this By-law will be in conformity with the Official Plan of the City of Hamilton upon approval of Official Plan Amendment No. [redacted], proposed by the City of Hamilton but not yet approved in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act.
NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:

1. That Map 1080 of Schedule “A” - Zoning Maps of By-law 05-200, be amended by deleting a portion of the lands described as 555 Sanatorium Road, the extent and boundaries of which are shown as Block “1” on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule “A” forming part of this By-law.

2. That Map 1080 of Schedule “A” - Zoning Maps of By-law 05-200 is amended by incorporating additional Major Institutional (I3) Zone boundaries for the applicable lands of Block “2”, the extent and boundaries of which are shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule “A”.

3. That the Clerk is hereby authorized and directed to proceed with the giving of notice of the passing of this By-law, in accordance with the Planning Act.

4. That this By-law No. shall come into force and be deemed to come into force in accordance with Sub-section 34(21) of the Planning Act, either upon the date of passage of this By-law, or as otherwise provided by the said Sub-section.

PASSED and ENACTED this day of , 2012.

__________________________________  ____________________________
R. Bratina                               R. Caterini
Mayor                                    Clerk

ZAC-07-114/ OPA-07-039/ 25T-200724
Appendix “D” to Report PED12009 (Page 3 of 3)

Schedule "A"

Map Forming Part of By-Law No. 12-____

to Amend By-law No. 05-200
Map 1080

Subject Property
555 Sanatorium Road

- **Block 1**: Lands to be removed from Zoning By-Law 05-200.
- **Block 2**: Lands to be zoned Major Institutional (I3) Zone.
- **Blocks 3-6**: Refer to By-Law 6593.

This is Schedule "A" to By-Law No. 12-
Passed the .......... day of ................., 2012

Clerk
Mayor

Scale: N.T.S.
File Name/Number: ZAC-07-114
Date: Jan. 3, 2012
Planner/Technician: EJ / MB

PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT
John, Edward

From: Lorraine Goetz [mailto:]
Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2008 11:10 AM
To: John, Edward
Subject: re: zoning changes at Chedoke property

We are Andrew and Lorraine Goetz. We live at 104 Redfern Avenue. Our objections pertain to Block 2: the high density of dwellings, the type of dwellings is low income housing, and a road access to Redfern Avenue from Blocks 1 and 2.

What will this do to the sewage system. There already has been sewage backup on Hepburn Ave. Also the traffic is already high. In addition we object to low income housing. We did not move to a low income housing neighbourhood; we don't pay the property taxes of a low income housing neighbourhood and we do not want to raise our children in such a place. This area distinguishes itself from other neighbourhoods for the serenity and comfortable living. We want to maintain this status for our well being and to maintain our property value.

We wish to receive the report. Thank you for this opportunity.

Lorraine Goetz
Dear Mr. John,

I currently reside at 104 Redfern Avenue in Hamilton. I would like to submit that the current draft plan for development of the property on Redfern Avenue also include an exit road leading to Sanatorium, in addition to an exit onto Redfern Avenue.

With the development of single detached homes, and condominiums there could potentially be about 100 residents moving in and out of this subdivision. The current plans would result in a very heavy flow of traffic onto Redfern Avenue. The residents of Redfern Avenue are quite concerned about this influx of traffic.

I propose an additional road from the subdivision through the Chedoke property and onto Sanatorium to alleviate the traffic flow onto Redfern Avenue.

Thank you,
Lorraine Goetz

----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

The information in this e-mail is intended solely for the addressee(s) named, and is confidential. Any other distribution, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please reply by e-mail to the sender and delete or destroy all copies of this message.

Les renseignements contenus dans le présent message 'électronique sont confidentiels et concernent exclusivement le(s) destinataire(s) 'électronique(s). Il est strictement interdit de distribuer ou de copier ce message. Si vous avez reçu ce message par erreur, veuillez répondre par courriel 'à l'expéditeur et effacer ou d'effacer toutes les copies du présent message.
John, Edward

From: Clare [clarei@mountaincable.net]
Sent: Monday, February 25, 2008 10:18 AM
To: John, Edward
Subject: RE: file OPA-07-39/ZAC-o7-114/25T200724-- Chedoke site

Hi Edward,

My mailing address is:

Interval House of Hamilton
635 Sanatorium Road
Hamilton, ON
L9C 7S7

Clare Freeman

From: John, Edward [mailto:ejohn@hamilton.ca]
Sent: February 25, 2008 8:41 AM
To: Clare
Subject: RE: file OPA-07-39/ZAC-o7-114/25T200724-- Chedoke site

Hi Clare Freeman,

Thank you for you email. Would you be able to send me your postal address to ensure you receive information regarding this application. As for the flooding concern, the impact of the proposal will be fully assessed by our engineers to ensure any impacts are minimal. This is currently underway.

Regards

Edward John
Planning Officer
T: 9055482424 ext:5803
E: ejohn@hamilton.ca

-----Original Message-----
From: Clare [mailto:clarei@mountaincable.net]
Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2008 2:56 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: file OPA-07-39/ZAC-o7-114/25T200724-- Chedoke site

Hi Edward John

I am the executive director of Interval House of Hamilton. I would like to be kept informed about any public meetings and decisions with respect to this site. In addition, I am concerned about the density issues, water flow and the issue of flooding in this area. I understand that this place includes a storm management facility. Will this facility assist with problems with the flooding at Rice and Sanatorium???

Clare Freeman

11/17/2011
John, Edward

From: Bill C [redacted]
Sent: Sunday, March 02, 2008 4:24 PM
To: John, Edward

Sunday March 2, 2008.

Dear Mr. John,

I would like to have you note my objection to the location and rezoning proposal for Block 2 of the Chedmac Planning Area Secondary Plan. With the other construction in the immediate area, this section should be designated as "low density residential" like Block 1.

Thank you,

Mr. William Clancy

Looking for the perfect gift? Give the gift of Flickr!
John, Edward

From: teresa latimer
Sent: Monday, August 15, 2011 10:22 PM
To: John, Edward
Subject: re: File No: OPA-07-039/ Zac-07-114/ 25T200724

As a resident of Ward 8, I would like to thank you for providing us with information on the development of 555 Sanatorium Road.

I would like to put forth a few items that should be taken into consideration with respect to the development:

As my family & I are located between two current areas being reviewed by the city for urban development; Chedoke Browlands and 555 Sanatorium road, will the overall effects of the 2 developments be considered together with respect to the following impacts to the area:

a) Traffic Impact - Increased traffic and existing road difficulties i.e.) Student buses currently unable to turn left out of Columbia College (taken from the City of Hamilton website)
b) Environmental Impact - displacement of existing wildlife
c) Water/waste-water management issues - flooding at the corner of Sanatorium & Sanatorium (at Idylwild & across from Holbrook baseball diamond) (again website)
d) An (unconfirmed) estimate of over 800 properties in a concentrated area with existing flooding issues. (City website)

In addition to the approx 800 units in the area, that is not including the current construction of Columbia college residence.

By dividing up the 3 separate developments and reviewing each development on its own "appears" to be insignificant. However when combined the big picture identifies significant problems or "challenges" which can be perceived both positive and negative. I am relying on the city to provide the positive aspects of not only developing 555 Sanatorium, but also the Chedoke Browlands, in addition to the present construction of the Columbia College residence.

I would be displeased if the appeal to the city is an increase in property tax revenue. Job creation would be short term at best. I have read meeting minutes with respect to the flooding in this area as well as poor roads in need of repair and lack of sidewalks and it appears that the city is currently aware of the issues in the area but chose not to invest in the area to correct the existing problems. To add over 800 residences will compact this issue and result in greater financial cost to the resident of Hamilton and perhaps more so the ward 8 residents.

Best Regards,
Teresa Latimer
**Special Conditions of Draft Plan Approval for 25T-200724, 555 Sanatorium Road (Hamilton)**

That this approval apply to the Draft Plan of Subdivision, 25T-200724, prepared by A. J Clarke and Associates Ltd., and certified by B. J. Clarke, O.L.S., dated June 9, 2009, showing 14 lots (Lots 1-14) for single detached dwellings, 1 block for townhouses (Block 15), 1 block (Block 16) for a multiple dwelling, 1 block for Institutional uses (Block 17), and creation of Street “A”, as attached as Appendix “E” to Report PED12009, subject to the owner entering into separate Standard Form Subdivision Agreements for each identified phase of the development, as approved by City Council, and with the following special conditions:

1. That, the owner shall agree to identify **Block 17 as Phase 1** and **Lots 1 to 14, inclusive, Block 15 and Block 16 as Phase 2** on the final Plan of subdivision, and to enter into a separate Subdivision Agreement for each phase with the City, to the satisfaction of Senior Director of Growth Management Division. The registration of Phase 1 shall occur prior to, or concurrently with, the registration of Phase 2, in order that the necessary improvements are secured.

2. That, **prior to registration of Phase 1**, the owner shall complete the following works:

   (i) To redirect the sanitary flows from the additional lands of the owner located at 442 Sanatorium Road that currently drains through the draft plan lands to the existing sanitary sewer on West 35th Street. Furthermore, the owner shall abandon the existing private sanitary sewer that crosses the Sanatorium Road right-of-way, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management Division.

   (ii) To complete any necessary works on the existing water services on the hospital lands that may include, but not be limited to, installation of water meter chambers, back flow preventers, etc., to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management Division.

   (iii) To close the existing tunnel on the private lands, both sides, adjacent to the Sanatorium Road right-of-way. Further, the owner agrees to pay the City for the cost for removal of the existing tunnel within the existing right-of-way, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management Division.
(iv) To provide: a) locate on a detailed plan showing any existing communication services, hydro ducts, gas lines, etc., within the existing Sanatorium Road right-of-way that service the hospital lands; and b) a plan showing the preferred location of the private water service lines to the future 300mm watermain prior to completion of the Tender document for reconstruction of Sanatorium Road, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management Division.

3. That, prior to registration of Phase 1, the owner shall pay their proportionate share for the future urbanization of Sanatorium Road and completion of Street ‘A’ based on the City’s “New Roads Servicing Rate” in effect at the time of payment, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management Division.

4. That, prior to registration of Phase 1, Street ‘A’ be dedicated to the City of Hamilton as a public highway, by the owner’s certificate on the final plan of subdivision, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management Division.

5. That, prior to registration of Phase 1, the owner shall dedicate additional lands for road widening purposes required to accommodate the final design, as per the Class EA Study for Sanatorium Road, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management Division.

6. That, prior to registration of Phase 2, the owner shall demonstrate that a private service easement has been registered on the title of the subject lands over the existing private services that traverse Block 16, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management Division.

7. That, prior to registration of Phase 1 the owner shall agree to provide a stormwater drainage easement in favour of the City of Hamilton over Block 17, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management Division.

8. That, prior to registration of Phase 1, the owner shall agree to pay for the costs associated with the removal of the existing 200mm private watermain on Sanatorium Road from Redfern Avenue to Chedmac Drive, and its replacement with a 300mm watermain, including:

   (i) Equivalent cost to replace the existing 200mm watermain for its entire length.

   (ii) 100% of costs for replacement of the existing hydrants and 50% of costs of any additional street hydrants adjacent to the subject lands.
(iii) 50% of the costs of the 300mm dia. watermain on Sanatorium Road adjacent to the subject lands that extend beyond the limit of the existing private service.

(iv) 100% of the costs associated with reconnection of existing hospital water services to the future 300mm watermain on Sanatorium Road.

All to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management Division.

9. That, prior to registration of Phase 1, the owner shall demonstrate that an adequate easement has been established over 442 Sanatorium Road in favour of Interval House for the purpose of providing a sanitary outlet through the said lands to the existing sewers on West 34th Street, in a form and to the satisfaction of the City of Hamilton Legal Services.

10. That, prior to servicing of Phase 2, the owner shall include in the engineering design split drainage for lots that have less than 1.20m sideyard setbacks, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management Division.

11. That, prior to servicing, the owner shall submit a Stormwater Management Report to demonstrate compliance with the SWM Report for Tiffany Pond, and to provide Level 1 quality control of surface runoff from the subject lands, to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management Division.

12. That, prior to servicing of Phase 2, the owner shall include in the engineering design and cost estimate schedules provision to reconstruct pavement structure on Redfern Avenue, full depth, including but not limited to, curb and sidewalk reinstatement, boulevard sodding, etc., to the satisfaction of the Senior Director of Growth Management Division.

**Development Planning**

13. That, prior to servicing of Phase 2, the owner shall agree that an Urban Design brief be submitted and approved for Block 16 of the Draft Plan and included as an Appendix to the Subdivision Agreement, to the satisfaction of the Director of Planning.
Public Works (Traffic)

14. That, prior to servicing of Phase 2, the owner shall provide the driveway locations on Lots 1-16 and Block 16, to the satisfaction of the Senior Project Manager, Traffic Planning and Community Services. The driveway locations to these lots and block must be shown on approved engineering drawings submitted with the registered Subdivision Agreement.

Hamilton Conservation Authority

15. That, prior to servicing, the Developer shall receive written approval for all works affected by the HCA Development, Interference with Wetlands and Alterations to Shorelines and Watercourses Regulation 161/06 under Ontario Regulation 97/04, to the satisfaction of the Hamilton Conservation Authority and the City of Hamilton, Director of Planning.

Cost Sharing

That there is a City share for upsizing of the existing 200mm watermain on Sanatorium Road.

1.0 Purpose:

The purpose of this Amendment is to amend the Chedmac Secondary Plan in order to permit 14 single detached dwellings, townhouse units, and a multi-storey residential building.

2.0 Location:

The lands affected by this Amendment are located on the southwest side of the intersection of Sanatorium Road and Redfern Avenue, and are known as 555 Sanatorium Road, in the former City of Hamilton.

3.0 Basis:

The basis for permitting this Amendment is as follows; the Amendment:

- Is consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement;

- Conforms with the Places to Grow - Growth Plan and the Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan;

- Provides residential and Institutional redevelopment within the Secondary Plan Area, which meets the general intent of the Hamilton Official Plan; and,

- The proposed development is compatible with existing and planned development in the area.
4.0 Changes

4.1 Text Changes:

4.1.1 Volume 2, Chapter B, Section B.6.3 - Chedmac Secondary Plan of Volume 2 is amended as follows:

a) Add the words “Low Density Residential 1” and “Low Density Residential 3f” to Policy B.6.3.2.1 so that the policy reads as follows:

“6.3.2.1 The residential areas are designated Low Density Residential 1, Low Density Residential 1a, Low Density Residential 2c, and Low Density Residential 3f on Map B.6.3-1 - Chedmac - Land Use Plan. The following policies shall apply to each of these land use designations.”

b) Add new Policies B.6.3.2.3 a) to B.6.3.2.3 - Low Density Residential Designations, and subsequently renumber the existing policies, as required. The new policies read as follows:

“6.3.2.3 Low Density Residential Designations

The following policies shall apply to the lands designated Low Density on Map B.6.3-1 - Chedmac - Land Use Plan:

a) Notwithstanding Policies E.3.4.3 and E.3.4.4 of Volume 1, land designated Low Density Residential 1 shall consist of only single detached units at a maximum density of 20 units per hectare.

c) Add a new Sub-section, B.6.3.7 - Site Specific Policies, and add new Policy, B.6.3.7.1 - Site-Specific Policy - Area A to Section B.6.3 - Chedmac Secondary Plan. The new Sub-section reads as follows:

“6.3.7 Site-Specific Policies

Site-Specific Policy - Area A”
6.3.7.1 Notwithstanding Policies E.3.4.3, E.3.4.4, and E.3.4.5 of Volume 1, for the lands designated Low Density Residential 3f, located at 555 Sanatorium Road, and identified as Site-Specific Policy - Area A on Map. B.6.3-1 - Chedmac - Land Use Plan, a 4-storey, low rise apartment building shall be permitted with a maximum density of 60 units per hectare.

4.2 Mapping Changes:

4.2.1 Urban Hamilton Official Plan Volume 1, Schedule E-1 - Urban Land Use Designations is revised by redesignating lands to “Neighbourhoods” from “Institutional”, as shown on Appendix “A”, attached to this Amendment.

4.2.2 Urban Hamilton Official Plan Volume 2, Chapter B.6.3-1 - Hamilton Secondary Plans; Chedmac Secondary Plan - Land Use Plan is amended by:

a) Redesignating subject lands from “Institutional” to “Low Density Residential 1”;

b) Redesignating subject lands from “Institutional” to “Low Density Residential 2c”; and,

c) Redesignating subject lands from “Institutional” to “Low Density Residential 3f”;

as shown on Appendix “B”, attached to this Amendment.

5.0 Implementation:

An implementing Zoning By-law Amendment and site plan will give effect to this Amendment.

This is Schedule “1” to By-law No. passed on the day of , 2012.
CONCEPT PLAN - BLOCK 15, 16 + LOTS 1-14.

14 SINGLE FAMILY DETACHED
40-48, 1-1.5 STOREY TOWNHOMES
80 UNIT, 4 STOREY APARTMENT BLDG.
JULY 2011.