Committee of the Whole
REPORT 06-009

1:30 p.m.
May 18, 2006
Council Chambers
Hamilton City Hall
71 Main Street West, Hamilton

Present: Mayor L. Dilanni
Councillors D. Braden, B. Bratina, P. Bruckler,
C. Collins, T. Jackson, B. Kelly, M. McCarthy, B. McHattie,
D. Mitchell, S. Merulla, B. Morelli, M. Pearson,
T. Whitehead, A. Samson

Absent with regrets: Councillor M. Ferguson – Illness

Also Present: G. Peace, City Manager
L.A. Coveyduck, General Manager, Planning and Economic
Development
J. Rinaldo, General Manager, Finance and Corporate
Services
J. Kay, General Manager/Chief HES
J. Harnum, Acting General Manager, Public Works
M. Gallagher, Co-ordinator

Mayor L. Dilanni called the meeting to order.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE PRESENTS REPORT 06-009 AND RESPECTFULLY
RECOMMENDS:

(CM06015) (Item 4.1)

   (a) That the Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy – Final Report,
   attached as Appendix 1, be endorsed as the City of Hamilton’s growth
   management strategy and incorporated through:

   (i) the urban structure and associated policies into the new Official
       Plan for the City of Hamilton;

   (ii) the Stormwater Master Plan, the Transportation Master Plan and
       the Water and Wastewater Master Plan; and
(iii) the preparation of a new development charges by-law for the City of Hamilton.

(b) That the Province of Ontario be requested to consider and incorporate the City’s position on the growth management strategy in completing a growth management plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe area, and in particular in the development of the Sub-Area Assessment applicable to the City of Hamilton.

(c) That Planning and Economic Development Staff be directed to investigate and report back on any opportunities and the implications of incorporating the lands north of Twenty Road, south of the Hydro corridor, west of Glanbrook Industrial Business Park and east of Upper James and the SE Corner of the Glanbrook Industrial Business Park into the city’s Growth Strategy.

(d) That the Planning and Economic Development Staff present to Committee and Council a plan to establish a “Brownfield Redevelopment office” with the goals and objectives of creating an inventory of infill and redevelopment opportunities, identifying and addressing the barriers associated with infill, adaptive reuse and redevelopment properties (including but not limited to infrastructure or contamination issues) and the eventual marketing of said properties and that the report include a detailed costing of the initiative, as well as alternative sources of funding as part of the 2007 Budget process.

Note: (Due to bulk, Appendix 1 is available in the Clerk’s office)

FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL:

(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA

The Clerk circulated an addendum with additional speakers noted.

(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Braden declared an interest in the discussions on Pleasantview as a family member owns land in that area.

(c) ADOPTION OF MINUTES

3.1 May 8, 2006

The Minutes of the May 8, 2006 meeting were adopted as presented.
(d) PRESENTATIONS

The Mayor provided opening comments to members of council and the public on the GRIDS report.

(i) Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy – Final Report (City Wide) (CM06015)

Steve Robichaud provided an overview of the report. Included in the overview were the following issues which were discussed in detail:

- 5 Growth Options
- Growth Concepts
- Process for public consultation

Members of Council and members of the gallery who spoke at the meeting congratulated Steve Robichaud for his work on this project.

The motion carried on a Recorded Vote as follows:

Yeas: Dilanni, Bruckler, Collins, Jackson, Kelly, Whitehead, Samson, McCarthy, McHattie, Morelli, Pearson, Merulla
Total: 12

Nays: Braden, Bratina, Mitchell
Total: 3

A motion to defer the report pending comments by the Agricultural and Rural Affairs committee was DEFEATED.

(e) DELEGATIONS

(i) John Dolbec and Ed Fothergill, Hamilton Chamber of Commerce (written submission)

(ii) Ed Cooper, REALTORS Association of Hamilton-Burlington (written submission)

(iii) Peter Serrani, Hamilton-Halton Home Builders’ Association (written submission)

(iv) Ed Fothergill, Fothergill Planning and Development Inc. on behalf of owners of lands in the Pleasantview area, former Town of Dundas
Mr. Fothergill addressed the Pleasant View area in Dundas which consists of 250 acres. Mr. Fothergill offered suggestions for ranking Pleasantview lands higher than other lands in the city. This is the only area covered by provincial planning document. An advantage to this area is it can be developed within a contained area and if developed would not lead to further expansion and New interchange at Highway 6 and York road which could service development. Pleasantview allows for housing that can’t be replicated elsewhere in city. Suggest that the GRIDS plan move ahead and include provision for development within the Pleasantview area.

(v) Ed Fothergill, Fothergill Planning and Development Inc. on behalf of owner of property on the east side of Highway 20, north of Highway 53 in the former City of Stoney Creek

Mr. Fothergill address this property which houses an auto recycling operation near Highway 20 and Rymal Road. It is designated as a node in the GRIDS plan and is in support of that part of the plan which shows the node. Feel that it’s an important gateway to city. Opportunity for major land owners to put together a land assembly and are happy to see the lands have been designated in the plan.

(vi) Jack Santa Barbara – out of town

(vii) Jim Quinn – not in attendance

(viii) David Cohen (written submission)

(ix) Cathy Gazzola

Ms. Gazzola is the President of the Durand neighbourhood. Ms. Gazzola advocated for good long term planning and public engagement. Ms. Gazzola questioned where is evidence to justify path the City is taking. Where is evidence that new employment lands are needed for manufacturing industry. Where is evidence that intensification will happen in this community. Where is the evidence that this process will be accountable and transparent and asked Council to take these into consideration when determining recommendation in the report.

(x) Michael Desnoyers

Mr. Desnoyers is a resident of Hamilton and the Chair of Hamiltonians for Progressive Development. He acknowledged effort of staff and for the knowledge and passion in presenting information. Mr. Desnoyers expressed concerns and disappointment with recommendations.
He noted that The GRIDS process has failed to garner public input and does not reflect the 9 guiding principles. The report contains two huge urban boundary expansions exasperating urban sprawl. No alternatives have been presented to growth options. Aerotropolis does not adhere to 7 of the 9 guiding principles but is included in future growth plans. He called it a betrayal of residents and organizations. New information and concerns have been presented to council but not addressed. At the Glanbrook Open House citizens overwhelming expressed their opposition to nodes and corridor and aerotropolis lands. He asked Council to reconsider the GRIDS process and seek creative alternatives.

(xi) Roy Salisbury (not present)

(xii) Robert Korol (withdrawn)

(xiii) Virginia Cameron (written submission)

(xiv) Dan Rodrigues (written submission)

(xv) Terri Johns

Ms. Johns is a land use planner with Starward developments. She represented the property owners on 20 Road West. She appreciated the work of staff over the years and supports the recommendations and asked Committee to move forward with Hamilton’s potential growth

(xvi) Angelo Cameracci (withdrawn)

(xvii) Don McLean (written presentation pending)

(xiii) Kieran Dixon

Mr. Dixon is a Ward 7 resident and a concerned member of downtown professional community. He addressed his concerns including that the report was profoundly uninspired and has been treated as a number crunching exercise for the warehousing of people. It squanders an opportunity for Hamilton because there is no inspiring vision; there was no genuine community involvement in process; Hamilton has an opportunity to say no more sprawl; opportunity to create urban centre for intensification; Nodes explained are not what people think of when people think of a vibrant downtown, it’s a form of bedroom community; ask council to show vision and leadership as opposed to resignation that sprawl is inevitable. Concerned how the 9 directions were handled or applied and how the directions were applied to aerotropolis.

Council – May 24, 2006
(xiv) Sergio Manchia, Planning and Engineering Initiatives

Mr. Manchia expressed his appreciation to staff. Mr. Manchia spoke on behalf of Arstone Holdings Ltd. at 20 Road, Spallacci Group and Twenty Road Development - Twenty Road and Dickenson Road. Mr. Manchia spoke in support of the recommendation. Mr. Manchia advised that large companies don’t have lands for employment lands. It is now up to council to make decision and move forward.

(xv) Mike Bryan, Silvestri Investments Ltd.

Mr. Bryan is a professional planner. He commended staff and council for vision and hard work. He is in support of GRIDS process and main recommendations. He noted concerns asked Council to endorse principles and ask Council to amend by adding the following: Leaving door open to considering changes that are warranted after stakeholder input into the plan as you go through the planning process. Important for consultation process to be continued. Provide more details on the recommendations by the public.

(xvi) Richard Koroscil, President, CEO, Tradeport International

Mr. Koroscil congratulated staff for hard work. The report addresses intensification, economic development and growth in Hamilton. He is encouraged by the inclusion of the airport employment lands. This is an opportunity for significant growth on airport lands and surrounding lands for purposes not only for the airport. It is critical for the city move forward today and implement the plan. Can’t allow other businesses to go by our door to other communities.

(xvii) Syd Hamber, JJ Barnicke Limited

Mr. Hamber acknowledged the apathy of citizens. He noted that staff have done an excellent job getting the word out. He also noted that we need jobs and assessment. Mr. Hamber addressed the residential to industrial/commercial assessment and how the Residential tax payer is already picking up too much, this can be changed. Mr. Hamber also addressed the loss of manufacturing jobs in last 5 years and how intensification costs increase with the needs for improvements to infrastructure in the city. He noted that it is time we controlled our destiny. He requested that council vote in favour of the nodes and corridors option.

(xviii) Jim Kotsopoulos, Planner, Armstrong Hunter and Associates

Mr. Kotsopoulos represents Empire Communities. He spoke in support of the staff direction and hoped that Council would endorse them. Mr. Kotsopoulos addressed the Nash neighbourhood secondary plan went through a very open process in 2005 and city staff identified an option for.
those lands, and requested confirmation on the relationship between the growth options and the Nash secondary plan

(xix) Dr. Tom Nugent (written submission)

(xx) Ray Rocci (withdrawn)

(xxi) Marvin Caplan
Mr. Caplan noted that the Grids program was part of strategy of reviving Vision 2020. Funding for Action 2020/Vision 2020 was stopped. The Community undertook revitalizing vision 2020. GRIDS was to plan for the future growth of the community. Mr. Caplan addressed the intensification issue. This has been 6 long years in the making and encouraged council to support vision 2020 which was the basis of the consultation and encouraged Council to accept as it is because it would mean that Hamilton could continue to reclaim its downtown.

(xxii) Written submission by John Demik

Committee received Mr. De mik’s written submission.

(xxiii) Written submission by Carmen Chiarevalle

Committee received Mr. Chiarevalle’s written submission.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 6:35 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mayor L. DiIanni

M. Gallagher, Co-ordinator, Council, Committee of the Whole
May 18, 2006
RESPONSE TO FINAL GRIDS RECOMMENDATIONS

The Hamilton Chamber of Commerce is the oldest and most broadly based business organization in the City of Hamilton. Our membership includes 1,750 companies and organizations representing 11,150 individuals and 180,000 family members.

I want to first of all congratulate staff and Council on their initiative to consider future options for our community. We at the Chamber believe that the City of Hamilton is poised to become a major growth centre over the next few decades. We have for a number of years predicted this unfolding interest. We are now seeing it beginning to emerge. In order to properly plan and prepare ourselves, we need to consider long-term options so that we can shape our community to respond to our own particular strengths and unique characteristics.

While we feel the Plan could have gone further to prevent urban sprawl by adopting a longer term vision for the City, particularly for those lands between the Greenbelt and the Urban Area, we would very strongly urge Council to approve the Plan today. We simply cannot go anywhere as a community until this Plan is approved. Over the past few years while this study has been underway, too many good things in our community have been stalled, put off, or relocated to other municipalities. A substantial amount of investment has been lost because we have not been ready to move forward as quickly as we might have with a plan of action for the future.

Of the various options considered through this process, we are pleased to see the Nodes and Corridor option as the preferred strategy, which includes a substantial potential for a new employment and economic growth centre near the airport. We believe that the establishment of a strong Airport Employment Centre is absolutely essential to the future well being of our community. This will retain jobs and increase business assessment, thereby decreasing our reliance on the residential base. It will significantly contribute to curbing urban sprawl by allowing for an appropriate level of employment within our own boundaries.

The preferred plan we feel provides a proper balance of those things that are important to our community and to the Chamber, including matters where the Chamber has been a leading voice on issues such as downtown redevelopment and the development of brownfield sites. It is clear from the collective experience of our membership and our role in monitoring the evolution of our community, that there is no one element of the Plan that requires an exclusive focus. It is only by integrating all of the various strengths of our community, which are represented by a variety of important corridors and
nodes including not only the downtown and brownfields, but also our strong commercial centres, the harbour, and our very important parks and open space system. We believe the Plan has properly struck this balance.

Once this Plan is approved and we move forward, it will be important to use this foundation to establish further linkages to ongoing work undertaken by the City, including the preparation of a Transportation Master Plan which we believe must be fully integrated with the Goods Movement Study. Once we put all of these elements together, we begin to establish a true picture of what our community framework will look like in 20-30 years. Essential throughout this entire exercise is the necessity to incorporate external linkages, opportunities and constraints, given the regional importance of the City of Hamilton.

As this process moves forward, we would encourage Council to keep an eye on big picture, long term issues. If we become too restrictive, we encourage urban sprawl to neighbouring communities, which, as we all know, undermines the intent of this Plan. In this regard, the Hamilton Chamber has taken a lead role in putting forward a resolution which was recently adopted by all of the Chamber of Commerce organizations in the Province, to encourage the Province to allow municipalities more flexibility to adopt a broader perspective and a longer time horizon for the preparation of plans such as GRIDS. We will continue to work with the Province and the City to encourage and allow for broader strategic planning exercises that can fully prepare us for the long term future.

The bottom line is that today we need a decision. The years of study and consultation have been helpful and essential. It is now time for Council to provide the leadership that is expected from the community. As we have said many times, every great city relies on strong leadership. The Chamber of Commerce and all of its affiliated members are now looking to you to provide that leadership. We are here to tell you that we need it today.
GRID Presentation

Introduction
Good afternoon Mayor Dianni, councilors, and ladies and gentlemen. My name is Ed Cooper. I'm the Government Relations Chairman from the REALTORS® Association of Hamilton-Burlington. Established in 1921, the association represents over 2,000 residential and commercial real estate brokers and salespersons serving our community. The association also operates the local Multiple Listing Service® which supported over 3 billion dollars worth of transactions in 2005.

A home is just a house, that is, until it is combined with other houses at which point a community is created. An integral part of any piece of real estate is how it dovetails and supports the community it is in, and as REALTORS®, we have a vested and ongoing concern with the vitality of the communities we live and work. One of the most promising initiatives addressing this concern is GRIDS, and I'd like to highlight the economic opportunities and environmental priorities supporting the approval of this process.

Economic Opportunities
It is projected that Hamilton's population will increase significantly in the next 25 years. Therefore, it is imperative that Hamilton develops a productive proposal that will provide economic direction and support to accommodate this population growth.

Where does the Multiple Listing Service® fit into this? According to the most recent study completed by Clayton Research, more than 100,000 jobs were generated by the average annual MLS® resale housing activity in Canada from 2000 to 2002. Clayton Research also estimates that the average housing transaction in Canada generates a total of $19,800 in additional consumer spending. If we multiply that number by the 7,708 resale transactions completed in the New City of Hamilton in 2005, we can see over $150,000,000 was infused into our community last year from the resale of homes.

The approval of GRIDS, combined with the economic spin-off from the resale of homes, would certainly help to build and develop a stronger and more prosperous Hamilton.

In addition, GRIDS will also assist in relieving some of the economically distressed in Hamilton. Currently, our community has a 20 per cent poverty rate, the highest in Ontario. The approval of GRIDS could go a long way to get some of these individuals back on their feet by creating more jobs in our community.

Environmental Factors
Ladies and gentlemen, as discussed, the association favours the GRIDS process, and further, we believe that the Nodes and Corridors approach is most beneficial to the city. It presents the ideal balance between meeting the needs of the community and at the same time, protecting the environment. In addition, the growth will not seriously intrude on green areas or the Greenbelt. The Nodes and Corridors option will also create vibrant transit supportive neighbourhoods, city-wide expanded network of trails, paths, and cycling routes for citizens to enjoy. This approach will entice those who commute to other cities for services to remain in Hamilton and encourage people to use public transit.

Affordable housing is another benefit supporting the environmental reasons to approve GRIDS. Hamilton's average home price of $250,000, which is almost two and a half times less than Oakville, is certainly attracting more people to our city. However, without an initiative such as GRIDS to create employment ready lands and the infrastructure to support it, our residents will continue to commute to out of town jobs, adding additional pollution to the environment.

The challenge for the city though, is to prove that there are other ways for people to not only live but to work in Hamilton. The approval of GRIDS will enable our community to offer more.

RAHB GRIDS presentation paper for Hamilton City Council
May 18, 2006
Conclusion
We at the REALTORS® Association of Hamilton-Burlington would like to commend the city for initiating forward movement with the GRIDS process. Not only do many of us work in this market, but an overwhelming majority of us call it home as well. While we view the approval of GRIDS as a necessity to efficiently serve existing and future Hamiltonians, we also view it as the keystone for ensuring the future success of our community.

In conclusion, we feel that it is vital for you, the elected officials, to endorse GRIDS. If approved, the legacy you can proudly look back on will be that the 2006 Hamilton City Council did our community and its citizens proud by putting in place a blueprint for sustainable future growth.
GRIDS PRESENTATION TO COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

by Peter Serrani, HHHBA President • May 18, 2006

THANK YOU VERY MUCH YOUR WORSHIP, MAYOR DIANNI, AND MEMBERS OF COUNCIL.

THE HAMILTON-HALTON HOME BUILDERS’ ASSOCIATION IS THE VOICE OF THE RESIDENTIAL CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY IN OUR AREA REPRESENTING NEARLY 300 MEMBER COMPANIES INCLUDING BUILDERS, DEVELOPERS, SUPPLIERS, TRADE CONTRACTORS AND INDUSTRY SERVICE PROFESSIONALS.

AS AN ASSOCIATION, OUR MANDATE IS CLEAR – TO SUPPORT THE DREAM OF HOME OWNERSHIP. WE DO THIS BY ADVOCATING FOR CHOICE AND AFFORDABILITY IN HOUSING SO THAT ALL RESIDENTS OF THIS GREAT COMMUNITY MAY REALIZE THAT DREAM.

THE HAMILTON-HALTON HOME BUILDERS’ ASSOCIATION ENCOURAGES COUNCIL TO TAKE A LEADERSHIP ROLE IN THE REVITALIZATION OF OUR CITY. WE ARE NOT HERE TO ADVOCATE FOR ANY ONE PARTICULAR GROWTH OPTION, BUT RATHER TO SEND OUT A CALL TO ACTION.

NOW, MORE THAN EVER, OUR CITY NEEDS TO MOVE FORWARD. THE FIRST STEP IS ALWAYS THE MOST DIFFICULT. IN SHORT, IT IS TO APPROVE THE GRIDS REPORT BEFORE YOU THIS AFTERNOON. OUR CITY’S ABILITY TO MOVE FORWARD IS IN YOUR HANDS TODAY.

IN DOING SO, YOU WILL ALLOW THE OTHER INTERDEPENDENT STUDIES TO ALSO MOVE FORWARD AND BE FINALIZED. THESE INCLUDE THE INFRASTRUCTURE MASTER PLANS AND TRANSPORTATION MASTER PLANS. UNTIL THESE ARE FINALIZED, SECONDARY PLANNING AND NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING WITHIN THE EXISTING URBAN BOUNDARY ARE BEING DELAYED.

THE PROVINCE HAS ESTIMATED THAT HAMILTON’S POPULATION WILL GROW TO BETWEEN 660,000 AND 700,000 PEOPLE IN THE NEXT 25 YEARS. WE ARE CONVINCED WITH THE RIGHT LEADERSHIP, THESE ESTIMATES CAN BE EXCEEDED AND HAMILTON’S FULL POTENTIAL CAN BE REALIZED.

THE CITY OF HAMILTON FACES MANY CHALLENGES INCLUDING A HIGH POVERTY RATE, PRACTICALLY NO EMPLOYMENT GROWTH AND THE OBSTACLES SURROUNDING THE REVITALIZATION OF THE DOWNTOWN CORE.

THESE ARE CHALLENGES WE FACE COLLECTIVELY AS A COMMUNITY. WE MUST FACE HEAD ON. NO AMOUNT OF PROCRASTINATION WILL MAKE THEM GO AWAY.

WE CAN CONTINUE TO DEBATE THE IMPACTS OF PEAK OIL, GLOBAL WARMING AND FLU PANDEMICS, BUT THE FACT OF THE MATTER REMAINS THAT THE NEEDS OF THIS COMMUNITY ARE REAL AND IMMEDIATE.

THE CITY OF HAMILTON IS ON THE LEADING EDGE OF GROWTH MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN THE PROVINCE OF ONTARIO.

IF WE MOVE FORWARD NOW, WE CAN BE FIRST IN LINE FOR FUNDING AND PROGRAMS TO ASSIST IN IMPLEMENTING THE GRIDS PLAN. LET US NOT SQUANDER THE OPPORTUNITY THAT HAS BEEN PLACED BEFORE US.

AS A ECONOMIC ENGINE, OUR INDUSTRY HAS A CLEAR UNDERSTANDING OF THE MANY CHANGES TAKING PLACE IN OUR CITY. WE ALSO UNDERSTAND THAT WHERE THERE IS CHANGE, THERE IS OPPORTUNITY.

OUR BIGGEST CHALLENGE IS TO ENSURE THAT WE DON’T LET THE OPPORTUNITIES PASS US BY.
May 18, 2006—Presentation on GRIDS to City Council
David Cohen
89 Stanley Ave.
Hamilton ON L8P 2L2

First, let me say that I disagree with the provincial government's decision requiring 40% of new residential development in Hamilton over the next 25 years to be located in built-up areas.

I think it should be 100%, and there should be no time limit.

I am confident that more than enough possibilities for reurbanization in our built-up areas exist to sustain this city into the next century and perhaps further.

By the way, we should use the term "reurbanization", rather than intensification, which seems to spook folks around here.

Reurbanization is a European term that describes successive waves of development and redevelopment that take place in cities. It's the way cities evolve.

Hamilton is essentially an 18th-century city – that is, people who were born in the 18th century laid out its original streets.

I'm sure that some of you have seen that wonderful composite photo of King and James taken on a beautiful summer day in 1911 on what people thought was Hamilton's
centennial. It wasn’t, and that’s why the celebration is now called the “False Centennial.”

But the False Centennial points up the fact that this city is nearly 200 years old.

Reurbanization has, of course, been going on for most of that time. But since the end of the Second World War our reurbanization has happened under the doubtful influence of urban renewal on the one hand and suburban sprawl on the other.

The widespread ownership of cars has of course aided and abetted sprawl.

This double whammy, sprawl on the outskirts and urban renewal in the inner city, brought our downtown to its knees and has seen much farmland and green space sacrificed to “growth”.

During the last few years we have been trying to reurbanize. The outstanding example is the refurbishing of the Art Gallery of Hamilton. The brilliant architect Bruce Kuwabara, a local boy, reoriented the AGH to face King Street, giving it a grand entrance and so much more. Another outstanding example is the John Sopinka Courthouse, which some of us in the activist community have had several opportunities to admire in the last couple of years.

This is reurbanization at its best.
What is needed is more – much more reurbanization on a smaller scale: in housing, in retail accommodations, offices, public buildings.

This will cost millions, you say—we can’t afford it.

Nonsense, we can’t afford not to reurbanize.

We are in the midst of a huge demographic shift. Households are shrinking; it’s likely that we’re going to need a much different mix of housing types over the next 30 years.

We need to – I want to say this politely – reorient our developers and architects. Not to mention our planners, politicians, and, of course, land and property owners.

We need to look at our main streets and arterial roads especially and the development along them. Nearly every one of those streets has gaps. The possibilities of infill are infinite in Hamilton.

Many buildings on these same streets are clearly out of place in 2006 – although they probably fit perfectly in 1835. Yes, some have historical value and can’t be torn down.

But they can be reused and enlarged and modernized.
The sorry fate of the Lister Block is a case in point. If there was ever a candidate for reurbanization – or adaptive reuse to use the jargon – this is it.

The tragedy in Hamilton is that the Lister Block is not an isolated case. There are many other Lister Blocks that would have been reurbanized long ago if they had existed in virtually any European city as well as most Canadian ones.
SUBMISSION TO:

Committee of the Whole

May 18, 2006

REGARDING AGENDA ITEM 4.1:

Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy – Final Report (City Wide) (CM06015)

Mr. Chairman, members of council.

I am Michael Desnoyers and I currently reside in the City of Hamilton and appear before you today as Chairman of and representing Hamiltonians for Progressive Development. HPD is a rapidly growing group of creative and passionate citizens who are deeply committed to the future and sustainability of are community. We are actively reaching out to community and professional organizations and neighbourhood associations in an effort to establish a genuine community engagement process.

First and foremost Mr. Chairman we thank you for allowing us the opportunity today to provide input and feedback to the GRIDS recommendations. We would also like to acknowledge the efforts of staff and commend Mr. Robichaud and his team for the knowledge and passion they have exhibited in presenting this information. Any comments or criticisms we may have are directed at the content and process and not the efforts of staff.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I would be remiss if I did not express our deep concern and disappointment with the final recommendations presented to this council. It is clear in our opinion that the GRIDS process has failed in its attempt to seek substantive public input and does not in its entirety reflect the fundamental Nine Guiding Principles that were to govern this planning process. More specifically, this report contains not one but two huge urban boundary expansions in the outer reaches of this city further exasperating suburban sprawl. Regardless of how you refer to it, the proposed expansion to accommodate the Aerotropolis lands surrounding Hamilton International Airport essentially quashes ANY opportunity for public debate because NO alternatives have been presented in ANY of the growth options considered. We fail to see how meaningful discussion and debate regarding the merits of this proposed Industrial park can take place when NO other options have been presented for comparison. The Aerotropolis lands arguably do not adhere to 7 of the 9 guiding principles and yet they continue to be included in future growth plans with NO consideration for alternative approaches. This inclusion is a betrayal of the residents and organizations who worked tirelessly with city staff to create the Nine Directions to Guide Development.
In more recent weeks new information and concerns have been presented to council which in our opinion have not been properly addressed or are only superficially addressed within this report. The impacts of an energy constrained world to our economy and our quality of life is being felt NOW and will only increase. This fact is not in dispute and one only needs to pick up any newspaper on any day to see evidence of this. The concept of PEAK OIL is not a red herring perpetrated by HPD for the benefit of our own ends. I ask this council, what does the world’s most powerful nation, namely the USA, and that nation’s military seem to know that we choose to take so lightly?

In closing Mr. Chairman, it has been suggested both publicly and privately that HPD represents a minority view within this city. In these council chambers on June 7, 2005 nearly 200 people expressed their overwhelming opposition to the Aerotropolis lands. At a public meeting held in Ancaster on June 28, 2005 nearly 400 people attended and expressed their overwhelming opposition to the proposed urban boundary expansion. I attended the Grids open house in Glenbrook last night along with 150 to 200 other individuals where overwhelmingly they expressed their opposition to the recommended Nodes and Corridors GRIDS growth option and the Aerotropolis lands. I am but a single voice but I represent hundreds of others who are opposed to these large Urban Boundary expansions.

We implore upon this council to reconsider the GRIDS process and to engage the creative energies of the residents of this city to create a sustainable vibrant community.

HPD stands ready to assist the city in this regard and fervently hopes that council will listen to the voice of the community and truly seek creative alternatives. This can only happen if staff are permitted creative freedom to explore all options without mandated restraints.

Thank you

Respectfully,

Michael Desnoyers
Co-Chair
Hamiltonians for Progressive Development
P.O. Box 57231 Jackson Station
2 King Street West
Hamilton, ON
L8P 4X1
30 YEAR PLAN

Dear Council:
The members of Council have a weighty task before them, to chart the future direction of development. I heard Dr Richard Gilbert outline the history of oil production and predict the future as a world where oil is no longer cheap, a report based on good research principles. His report stated that air freight will not have a competitive future in an oil constrained world. I would conclude that an aerotropolis is not the correct choice for the future.

And yet none of your options excludes the aerotropolis, it is like a loaded deck. Surely honest planning would examine an option that excludes the aerotropolis. Dr Gilbert was hired to do a report and yet his findings are being ignored, it seems to me. The Spec report on the current relationship between the City and Tradeport revealed a stunning lack of accountability. The hand dealt is one that gives the winning cards to Tradeport and not the citizens of Hamilton. I am dismayed at the attitude of the City, not tracking or evaluating the ongoing benefit to the city or lack of benefit. I cannot support the further investment of taxpayers money into this airport.

Considering the ongoing struggles of the airport and questionable benefit to the taxpayers, is it going to benefit the citizens or a small group of business people?

Climate change, geo-political events and increased cost of importing food leads me to conclude our future lies towards north to the harbour for concentration of industry and to the south for renewal of our local agricultural sector. Green belt legislation is a policy designed to protect Ontario Class A farmland. Our agriculture is vital and provides us with secure food nutrition, reduces the trip from farm to plate and maintains jobs locally. It is the duty of the government to assure its citizens a stable source of food.

When the time comes will we will be prepared or will we suffer because we chose a foolish shortsighted policy? Do not forget that we are part of the problem or part of the solution in achieving Canada's Kyoto targets to reduce green house gases, we must do our part.

To those who are holding the land and not farming it, I say that speculators are not automatically entitled to zoning changes. That is the nature of speculation.

Planning for the future next 30 years must involve sustainability. If fuel prices continue to climb the viable future of aviation to transport goods is in doubt. As gas prices continue to rise, Suburban dwellers who rely on the car may have to abandon the suburbs. Hamilton can help Canada meet its Kyoto targets by good sustainable planning in a context which takes into account the the impending peak oil crisis and global warming.

Virginia Cameron
264 Duke Street Apt 402
Hamilton
L8P 1Y3
May 17, 2006

City of Hamilton Councilors, staff and all who are here to speak and listen to a visionary presentation of the future of the City of Hamilton.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Planning the growth of this City is a task that should not be hurried, belaboured, or denied. Our City is growing in diversity, technologies are developing faster than our generations evolve, and our knowledge of our environment is increasing as we plan our future.

Upon reviewing the GRIDS study, it is apparent that there has been a great deal of ‘top-level’ research and postulations on how we will grow. Assumptions of growth type (including growth distribution, and growth employment) appear predestined and inevitable to occur.

The recommendation to accept Option 5 as the path the growth holds some very risky parameters that could create a cavernous hole in the transit system if changes to the current funding formula are to occur. The parameters on gas tax provisions to the City has already changed, which puts the “significant investment in transit” Key Disadvantage closer to the realization of being realized.

This is a great study, and a starting point towards growth initiatives. The cost is worth every tax dollar that is spent on its’ completion. The current transit trends in the GTA point towards significant funding from all three levels of Government. Our current funding model can supply increased transit support with traditional modes, however the recommendation of the GRIDS model is unsustainable with the current funding models.

While I agree that a decision must be made on the growth strategy for the City of Hamilton, a component of funding, especially for transit, must be included in the recommendation.

Thank you,

Dan Rodrigues
drodrigues@mountainable.net
Mayor and Members of Council

I represent Silvestri Investments Limited. We have followed and participated in the GRIDS process. We commend staff and Council for their vision and hard work.

This planning exercise is a very large and complicated one and many decisions - small and large decisions - have been made which culminate in the recommendation before you today.

Silvestri Investments supports the GRIDS process yet has concerns about some of the recommendations in the final report. We intend to participate in the statutory planning process.

This plan is before you today for Council’s endorsement. We ask Council to endorse the principles behind the major recommendations as we think it is well thought out and a commendable effort. We feel however it is important for Council to amend the recommendations before you today by adding the following to the recommendation …or other such recommendation that endorses the principle that the resulting Official Plan Amendments should be a product of following through with the main recommendations… but also “leaving the door open” to considering changes that are warranted after a detailed review of stakeholder input into the final plan…We don’t think this recommendation properly conveys this sentiment:

Recommendation (C)

“That staff be directed to meet with concerned stakeholders to ensure that those who have expressed concerns are able to provide information addressing those concerns. That staff report back to Council and the community should changes to this the plan be warranted through the process of the preparation of the Official Plan and the Master Plan updates”.

Now that the final recommendations to Council are known, we feel it is very important for the consultation component of the process be continued. The intention is to implement the main recommendations of the GRIDS final proposal.
Now the final recommendations are known, stakeholders can focus more specifically on the detail of the plan and can provide more detailed information for staff consideration. We feel it is important that it is clearly understood that as staff drill down from the 10,000 foot level into more detail during the preparation of the Official Plan Amendment and the updating of the Master Plans, that they should be able to “leave the door open” to changes that are warranted and would make this a better plan... and would allow the stakeholders the satisfaction that their issues have been heard. Receiving detailed submissions would inform staff and allow them to properly consider the opinions of the various stakeholders.

Respectfully Submitted

Michael Bryan MCIP RPP
City Clerk, City of Hamilton
Planning and Development Committee
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ont.
L8P 4Y5

9 Grandview Ave
Stoney Creek, Ont
L8E 5A5

May 17, 2006

To Whom it May Concern,

In previous letters I have petitioned the City to recommend the inclusion of my property Con 2 PT Lot 10 GL GB in the grids plan as future development property. The property has a number of features that distinguish it from others in the area. It does not contain either a creek or woodlot. It was originally planned for a subdivision. It has 15 existing homes built on it and two sixty-six foot right a ways for future development. It has had city water for over to 30 years. There is a pumping station in the vicinity of Upper James and Twenty roads, which can accommodate sewers to it. Recently this station was allowed to handle storm water as it had extra capacity.

This property was not in the Green Belt draft plan that went through public consultation but was later added to the plan before being voted on at Queens Park. Neither myself, the city or many MPP’s were made aware of changes to the final draft and the inclusion of my property before the province voted on this extremely important legislation. No changes were to be made to the final draft, however changes were made and concealed from voting MPPs. This was a flagrant violation of public trust and a misuse of power by those responsible. After serving the community as both a veterinarian and a farmer for over forty years I find my property’s value has been greatly depreciated since it is both in the Greenbelt and National Heritage Area which restricts it’s use.

This property borders the city and city services. Logically it should have been the next area for development. Instead due to political expedience and influence the development moved to Binbrook and Winona taking over hundreds of acres of viable farmland and disrupting the countryside.

This comes at a time when the province is negotiating land rights with the First Nations close by in Caledonia. The protesters have broken the law, burnt tires, thrown items from a bridge, blocked roads and are holding the town hostage. In contrast I feel the province has shown total disregard for my property rights by wrongly including my property in the Greenbelt and imposing harsh restrictions on the use of the property.

Now is the time to right a wrong and take a stand for democracy and good planning. It will also allow me to support the city and the Grids Plan instead of launching an appeal.

Sincerely,

Dr Thomas Nugent
May 15, 2006

City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P 4Y5

Attention: Mayor Larry Di Ianni

Re: GRIDS — Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy

Dear Sir,

There are 5 options that are being considered for GRIDS and the expansion of the City of Hamilton. Option 1 is no expansion at all. Option 2 concentrates the growth expansion in one area, south-east by Hwy 20 and Hwy 56. Options 3 and 4 has expansion near the Hamilton Airport, a substantial area by Hwy 20 and Hwy 56 as well as an area in-between, south of Hwy 53, that would in-fill development. Option 5, places the bulk of the expansion by Hwy 20 and Hwy 56. We do not understand why option 2 is lumped in with options 3 and 4, as distributed development, since it is the most similar to option 5, placing the development in one area.

Option 2 and 5 drastically extends the urban boundary in one specific area, while 3 and 4 addresses infill around the existing boundary to a much greater degree. In fact, options 3 and 4 have areas that are surrounded by development. There is a “hole-in-the donut” that exists. Options 3 and 4, which in-fill the land and close the hole in the donut, are logical extensions of the urban area instead of creating whole new areas.

There are large areas of vacant land in the existing boundary leading up to Hwy 20 and Hwy 56, the major expanded area in options 2 and 5 that still need to be developed. Why put the expansion in this area when there are areas that are completely built-up to the edge of the urban boundary, as options 3 and 4 do.

Expansion should be on existing areas so as not to create a u-shape. If there is expansion by the airport and another large expansion by Hwy 20 and 56, you will end up with a u-shaped development. The only way to bring these two developments together without creating a large hole in between is to develop the land in between as well. Why not develop the portion of land from Hwy 6, eastward to Miles Road and south to Twenty Road? There would still be a small portion of the donut that is not expanded, but as this portion abuts the industrial park to the east that is now being developed, the industrial park could eventually utilize that portion, if needed.

... 2
There should be incremental growth on the existing community fabric. The growth should be an extension of communities that are established and in need of expansion. You should build on the strengths of these communities that essentially have everything in place to support the community. Why develop an entirely new community and have to start from scratch in creating a community identity?

In fact, 3 and 4 have areas that are surrounded by development, they also have the maximum growth impact with the least impact on agricultural land. Options 3 or 4 remove 1240 acres while options 2 or 5 would remove a total 2500 acres of agricultural land. Double the amount.

Agriculturally, options 2 and 5 take up the bulk of prime agricultural land as set out in the residential Growth Consideration Greenbelt Focus. The Provincial Policy Statement states that “growth should be directed away from prime agricultural lands unless there are no other reasonable alternative". Staff Report Option 2 and 5 take away the greatest amount of prime agricultural land, making options 3 and 4 reasonable alternatives.

Also, options 2 and 5 will have a greater potential to impact the Twenty Mile Creek and various watersheds. By choosing options 3 and 4 you reduce this risk. Options 3 and 4 have a lesser environmental impact.

From an employment viewpoint, the Hamilton Employment vision states: “Employment opportunities are distributed among home based businesses, central urban cores and neighborhood gathering places, as well as industrial business parks that are accessible by public transit and a city-wide system of trails. Containing a range of activities and amenities these areas serve the needs of workers, businesses and customers. Agriculture provides many employment opportunities in the rural area” Vision 2020

How do option 2 and 5 accomplish these above objectives? The bulk of the urban expansion in option 5 is not by the existing employment lands or the airport-Hwy 6 employment lands as set out on the employment chart. The bulk of the urban expansion in option 5 uses the most of the prime agriculture land taking away the employment opportunities in the rural area.

Would it not be better to have distributed expansion near existing neighborhoods and business and business parks that are accessible by public transport, near central urban cores and neighborhood gathering places as well as the industrial parks. Options 3 and 4 are more easily accessible to the existing business areas.

If the City of Hamilton has been allotted an additional area to be developed, why place the major bulk of it in one area? Why not take a portion of the allotted amount and spread it around and make everyone happy? Why not take a portion and expand on the existing communities?
Options 3 and 4 would spread the development to a broader area, effecting and benefiting more neighborhoods and people. Options 3 and 4 place the development near the areas that need the land for increased business, while being more easily accessible to the average individual and benefit a greater portion of the community and the city.

Options 3 and 4 can be tied into the existing roads. They can also be tied into the existing transit system. They have areas surrounded by service. The new growth is dispersed to minimize impacts to agricultural land. In options 3 and 4, communities will have walking and cycling. Transit reduces congestion on inner area roads.

We believe that there is a certain amount of sewer capacity available for options 3 and 4. Do we know how much is available and was there a certain amount taken up by Ropa 9? Does the development have to absorb some of the costs of the sewer upgrading? Or does this become the costs of the people owning the property whose designated sewer was used for other purposes?

If there is sewer capacity left from Ropa 9 that is able to service a remaining area of land than why not extend the urban boundary in the center as in options 3 and 4, infilling the land and utilizing that sewer capacity. Why place the entire development in one area. Why not take a portion of the allotted development and spread it around.

Attached, are “9 Directions to Guide Development” as adopted by council. When you compare the various options to the 9 guidelines, options 3 and 4 better fulfill the guidelines while 2 and 5 at times contradicts them. (enclosure)

In conclusion, if Hamilton has been allowed to expand its urban boundary, than why not take a portion of the allotted land and place some of it between Hwy 6, Miles Road and Twenty Road since residential development east of Hwy 6 has already started. Instead of placing the bulk of the land in one area, it should be spread around to benefit the greater number of people and expand on existing services and communities that already exist. The City of Hamilton does not need to create a new identity. There are wonderful existing neighborhood communities that have reached their limit and need to expand. Hamilton should expand in an equitable and even manner that provides easily accessible opportunities to everyone.

Regards,

John Demik
JD/ev

Enclosure
APPENDIX "E" to Report CM004017a
"9 Directions to Guide Development"

1. Encourage a compatible mix of uses in neighbourhoods that provide opportunities to live, work and play.

2. Concentrate new development within existing built-up areas and within a firm urban boundary.

3. Protect rural areas for a viable rural economy, agricultural resources, environmentally sensitive recreation and enjoyment of the rural landscape.

4. Design neighbourhoods to improve access to community life.

5. Retain and attract jobs in Hamilton's strength areas and in targeted new sectors.

6. Expand transportation options that encourage travel by foot, bike and transit and enhance efficient inter-regional transportation connections.

7. Maximize the use of existing buildings, infrastructure and vacant or abandoned land.

8. Protect ecological systems and improve air, land and water quality.

9. Maintain and create attractive public and private spaces and respect the unique character of existing buildings, neighbourhoods and settlements.
9 Directions to Guide Development – as adopted by council

1. **Encourage a compatible mix of uses in neighborhoods that provide opportunities to live, work and play.**
   - Options 3 and 4 would satisfy this guideline. By spreading the expansion to a number of areas you would be providing a mix of uses in a number of neighborhoods. How does a “distinct community” that would be developed in option 5 accommodate various different neighborhoods? In option 5, the opportunities to live, work and play need to be created, while in options 3 and 4 you can expand on the existing opportunities available.

2. **Concentrate new development within existing built-up areas and within a firm urban boundary.**
   - Options 3 and 4 expand the urban boundary at places that have been built-up to the boundaries. They can go no further, they’ve hit the limit. Options 3 and 4 infill lands that have been developed right around them. Development in this area would build up existing areas and create a more unified urban boundary. Option 2 and 5 place a large urban expansion at a location that has open usable land to be developed still within the existing urban boundary. Development has not reached its limit in these areas. Options 3 and 4 are preferred.

3. **Protect rural areas for a viable rural economy, agricultural resources, environmentally sensitive recreation and enjoyment of the rural landscape.**
   - Option 2 and 5 take away the largest portion of prime agricultural land, 2500 acres while options 3 and 4 only use 1240 acres.

4. **Design neighborhoods to improve access to community life.**
   - Option 5 creates it’s own “distinct community”. It would have access to its own community life but would not provide easy access to community life in other areas. Options 3 and 4 would expand existing neighborhoods while still allowing access to various community activities within the entire city.

5. **Retain and attract jobs in Hamilton’s strength areas and in targeted new sectors.**
   - Options 3 and 4 expand the urban boundaries in areas that are near the existing employment lands, the industrial parks, as well as the airport. These options keep the expansion in Hamilton’s strength areas. Option 5 places the expansion away from the existing employment land, possibly taking jobs away from Hamilton’s existing strength areas.
6. **Expand transportation options that encourage travel by foot, bike and transit and enhance efficient inter-regional transportation connections.**
   - Option 5 does not encourage travel by foot, bike and transit. It is the furthest away from everything. The transportation connections would be anything but efficient or inter-regional.

7. **Maximize the use of existing buildings, infrastructure and vacant or abandoned land.**
   - Options 3 and 4 put the development near the existing buildings and infrastructure so that they can be better utilized. There is existing vacant land leading up to Hwy 20 and 56 that is still in the existing urban boundary that can be developed without expanding the boundary in that area. This vacant land should be developed first, before expanding that area. There is no vacant land leading to the existing boundaries in options 3 and 4. The expansion is needed here.

8. **Protect ecological systems and improve air, land and water quality.**
   - Option 2 and 5 have the greatest potential of all the options for impact on downstream flood hazards, wetlands and geologic features in Twenty Mile Creek watersheds with some impacts on other watersheds possible.

9. **Maintain and create attractive public and private spaces and respect the unique character of existing buildings, neighborhoods and settlements.**
   - Again, options 3 and 4 are building on existing areas and neighborhoods, not creating whole new ones as option 5 does.
GROWTH RELATED INTEGRATED DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY - GROWTH REPORT SUMMARY

2) Development and evaluation of growth options - The three growth concepts were translated into five different mapped growth options:

- Option 1: No Expansion - Maintains existing urban boundary, with aggressive new policy for residential intensification (62,000 units)

- Option 2-4: Appropriately Distributed Development - Growth is distributed in three different ways along the existing urban area boundary to make efficient use of existing infrastructure including transit and social services.

- Option 5: Nodes and Corridors - Growth is directed to a series of activity nodes throughout the City of Hamilton based on where people live, work and play.

Options were presented to the public for input in November/December 2005 and evaluated using a Triple Bottom Line (TBL) framework. Option 5 - Nodes and Corridors was identified as preferred.

3) Refinement of the preferred growth option - The Nodes and Corridor option was refined to confirm the level of intensification, determine an appropriate node and corridor structure, and discuss phasing and staging of implementation.

CARMEN CHIARAVALLE

August, 2005
Glanbrook Industrial Park

Advantages of residential development along Twenty Road:

1. Close to existing public services: shopping, library, schools, churches, fire stations, police, hospitals, ambulance.
2. Employment opportunities.
3. Availability of housing in close proximity to Glanbrook Industrial Park.
4. Human health: reduced driving distance for employment less air contaminants from vehicles.
5. Employers consider many locations before choosing a final site. Availability of housing in close proximity to work area would be a top priority.

GRIDS Desired Results

1. This growth option will support the delivery of public services in an equitable manner.
2. This growth option will enhance employment opportunities in Hamilton and ensure they are accessible to all Hamiltonians.
3. Human health will be protected through this growth option.
4. This growth option will help to attract and retain a skilled, innovative, and diverse workforce.
5. This growth option will position Hamilton as a leading centre of economic growth.
6. This growth option will maintain and enhance Hamilton's high quality environmental amenities.
7. This growth option will ensure that Hamiltonians share equally in the benefits of a healthy natural environment.
8. This growth option will enhance economic development in an eco-efficient manner.
9. This growth option will protect ecosystem health.

The asterisks represent the cornerstones for the GRIDS planning.

The full range of employment growth for the next 25 years is comprised of 3 parts: office employment, population-employment. A breakdown of employment, by type, is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Scenario²</th>
<th>Employment Land</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001-31</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>116,000</td>
<td>233,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>133,000</td>
<td>266,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>149,000</td>
<td>296,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49,000</td>
<td>91,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² Hamilton, 2005.

Dillon Consulting Limited
City of Hamilton
1. Concentrated, compact form of growth located in Central Mountain Area.
2. Employment areas are near residential areas to support live/work lifestyles.
   - Twenty Road, Dickinson Road area are in close proximity to employment lands.
3. Compact form facilitates efficient delivery of social services.
4. Minimizes impacts to natural heritage agriculture.
   - Twenty Road area is not prime agricultural land.
5. Efficient use of existing and new infrastructure.
   - Utilize existing city water along these roads.
   - Sewer infrastructure.
   - Industrial for some residential.

**Preferred Growth Option**
The City's preferred growth option features the following:
- A nodes and corridors structure accommodating 80,000 units by 2031;
- A concentrated, compact form of growth that supports complete communities of high density and mixed use that are transit supportive;
- Employment areas are near residential areas to support live/work lifestyle;
- Compact form facilitates efficient delivery of social services;
- Support for existing downtowns and neighbourhoods;
- Minimizes impacts to natural heritage and agriculture;
- Aggressive intensification (i.e. growth within the existing built boundary) that reduces the amount of growth needed on rural lands;
- Efficient use of existing and new infrastructure:
  - 58,400 units within the existing urban boundary (26,500 units of intensification, 31,900 on vacant lands);
  - An additional 21,600 new units through urban boundary expansion in;
    - SCUBE (230 net hectares) to recognize previously approved Council decision for an urban boundary expansion in Stoney Creek;
    - A new community node at the corner of Upper Centennial and Rymal Road (1130 net hectares);
    - Small expansion to round out existing neighbourhoods between the airport employment area and existing residential area (95 net hectares) south of Twenty Road and east of Glancaster Road in the Deferral 11 area of the Regional Official Plan;
  - An additional 1050 gross hectares of employment land in and around Hamilton International Airport within the proposed Airport Special Policy Area.
Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy - Growth Report Summary

Employment Lands - Hemson Consulting’s employment lands study for the City of Hamilton stated that the City has a shortage of employment lands. The shortage of employment lands is currently being addressed through the creation of a Special Policy Area (airport lands) in the south-central part of the City.

To address concerns raised during the GRIDS process, it is recommended that the airport SPA boundary be extended to include the unconstrained areas to north of the current SPA to reduce opportunities for future land use conflict and land fragmentation.

The recommendation for the preferred growth strategy is as follows: Airport Special Policy Area to be amended to include the lands south of Garner Road, east of Fiddler’s Green and west of Glancaster Road.

Key Benefits:
- bring the job market closer to the residential area
- potential opportunities to integrate these areas into the transit system
- eliminate the potential for pressure for residential development in this area

A Secondary Planning process will be initiated for this area.

When will Growth Occur - Phasing and Staging

EMPLOYMENT LANDS:
BRING JOB MARKET CLOSER TO RESIDENTIAL AREA.

TWENTY RD. & DICKINSON RD. AREA
WOULD BE AN IDEAL AREA TO PROVIDE HOUSING
FOR THE CLANBROOK INDUSTRIAL PARK
① LOCATED ON CENTRAL MOUNTAIN IN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO EXISTING SERVICES & INFRASTRUCTURE OF CENTRAL MOUNTAIN
② MINIMIZE IMPACT TO AGRICULTURE → THIS AREA NOT PRIME AGRICULTURE
③ ATTRACT EMPLOYERS → RESIDENTIAL AREA NEAR EMPLOYMENT LANDS
④ HUMAN HEALTH → REDUCED DRIVING DISTANCE LESS POLLUTION
⑤ GREAT COST SAVING - CITY WILL BE SPENDING LARGE AMOUNTS OF MONEY FOR SEWERS FOR INDUSTRIAL PARK THIS SEWER CAN SERVICE, SOME RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT
⑥ HAMILTON'S PREFERRED GROWTH OPTION → DIRECT DEVELOPMENTS TO AREAS WITH FULL SERVICES → THIS AREA WOULD BE IDEAL
⑦ TWENTY & DICKINSON ROADS WOULD BE SERVICED AT SAME TIME AS INDUSTRIAL PARK & WOULD BE A GREAT DRAWING CARD FOR EMPLOYERS TO HAVE HOUSING CLOSE TO WORK AREA.