SUBJECT: Addendum - Official Plan Amendments and New Official Plan - Rural Hamilton (PED06207(a)) (City Wide)

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(a) That the following recommendations contained in Report PED06207 be approved:

   (i) That approval be given to Official Plan Amendment No.____ of the former Region of Hamilton-Wentworth, Official Plan Official Plan Amendment No.____ of the former Town of Ancaster Official Plan; Official Plan Amendment No.____ of the former Town of Dundas Official Plan; Official Plan Amendment No.____ of the former Town of Flamborough Official Plan; Official Plan Amendment No.____ of the former Township of Glanbrook Official Plan, and, Official Plan Amendment No.____ of the former City of Stoney Creek Official Plan, to delete the existing policies and land use designations applicable to the Rural Area, as contained in Appendix “A” to Report PED06207.

   (ii) That approval be given to the adoption of a new Official Plan, to establish new land use designations and policies for Rural Hamilton (lands outside the urban area), as contained in Appendix “B” to Report PED06207.

   (iii) That the General Manager, Planning and Economic Development Department, be hereby authorized and directed to prepare the requisite by-law to amend the Official Plans and to adopt a new Official Plan, in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor, for presentation to Council.

   (iv) That staff be directed to phase-in implementation of the Sustainable Private Water and Wastewater Services policy to permit the development of technical guidelines and reform of program delivery procedures and priorities in the associated Departments;
(v) That staff be directed to investigate and report on home industry issues and options pertaining to rural areas as part of the Agricultural Action Plan project and the update of Official Plan policies governing Industrial Land Use designations.

(vi) That the Ministry of Natural Resources be requested to review and update mapping of Mineral Aggregate Resource Potential Areas to more accurately reflect viable resource areas in relation to major land use issues that preclude or constrain the future development of pits and quarries.

(b) That the maps and schedules in the Rural Hamilton Official Plan be amended to include the following references:

(i) The lands located at No. 10 Lorado Drive, as shown on the attached map marked as Appendix “A” to Report PED06207(a); are subject to a future Consolidated Board hearing matter, and,

(ii) The lands on the west side of Glover Road as well as two scattered sites adjacent to the Winona Urban Community, as shown on the attached map marked as Appendix “B” to Report PED06207(a), are subject to a future Ontario Municipal Board hearing;

(c) That the request to defer consideration of adding two properties located between Brock and Moxley Roads in Greensville for commercial/industrial uses, as shown on the attached map marked as Appendix “C” pending the outcome of the Mid-Spencer Creek/ Greensville Rural Settlement Area Sub-watershed Study, be denied.

(d) That the request to expand the Kirkwall Rural Settlement Area boundary to the west include the portion of the Walker property and the church manse, as shown on the attached map marked as Appendix “D” be denied.

(e) That the Mineral Aggregate policies and map in the proposed Rural Hamilton Official Plan be approved and that the Mineral Aggregate Resources Strategy be included in the capital budget proposal for 2007.

(f) That Appendix “A” of Report PED06207 be deleted and replaced with a new Appendix “A”, attached as “Appendix “F” to Report PED06207(a).

(g) That approval be given to minor wording and Schedule changes for the Rural Hamilton Official Plan, as identified in Appendix “G” of Report PED06207(a).

Lee Ann Coveyduck
General Manager
Planning and Economic Development Department
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

At the June 26, 2006, Planning and Economic Development Committee Meeting, staff were directed to consider a series of matters related to the draft Rural Hamilton Official Plan. These matters include the Winona Urban Boundary, rounding off the Kirkwall Rural Settlement Area, deferral of lands adjacent to the Greensville Rural Settlement Area, deferral of sections of the SCUBE plan area, the status of the Twenty Road Area, and aggregate resource mapping.

Based on additional research and staff analysis, specific recommendations on each matter have been provided in this report. Staff recommends that the Winona and SCUBE area issues be addressed by adding annotations to the Schedules of the Plan. It is recommended that the rounding out of Kirkwall and the deferral of the lands adjacent to Greensville be denied. Also, it is recommended that the proposed aggregate policies and mapping in the draft Plan be adopted and that an Aggregate Resources Strategy Study to update mapping be included in the capital budget proposal for 2007.

Minor modifications to the draft plan are proposed reflecting staff recommendations as well as some late comments received on the draft Plan.

Finally, it is recommended that the draft Rural Hamilton Official Plan as modified be adopted and that the associated Regional and local Official Plan amendments be approved.

BACKGROUND:

The statutory public meeting under the Planning Act for the Rural Hamilton Official Plan was held at the June 26 Planning and Economic Development Committee Meeting. At that meeting the following motion was passed:

“That Report PED06207 be received and that staff be directed to review the following matters, as discussed at the Meeting on June 26, 2006, and to report back to Committee at the first meeting in September;

• to research the previous Council position on the Winona Urban Boundary matter, and provide appropriate information regarding the potential need for and implications of a reconsideration of the matter,

• to consider the potential for rounding off the rural Settlement Area of Kirkwall, to include the Walker property and the existing church manse, both to the west of the settlement,

• to consider the potential for rounding out the Greensville Rural Settlement Area by approximately 17 acres, between Brock and Moxley Roads, for commercial/industrial uses and to defer consideration of this area, pending the outcome of the on-going Public Works servicing study,
to consider deferral of the relevant parts of the SCUBE plan area,

- to consider further the status of the Twenty Road area, and

- to consider further the questions raised by Councillor McCarthy, including MNR mapping and differences between the existing Flamborough Official Plan Policies and those in the proposed Official Plan."

At the June 28 Council meeting the above noted motion was amended by adding the following:

“Updating Aggregate Resources Mapping for the new Official Plan

- That with regard to the importance of the required updating of the Aggregate Resources mapping for the new Official Plan, and its impact on the resulting Official plan policies for the rural area of Hamilton, that staff be directed to proceed expeditiously with this project, and to include the following steps;

  (a) contact Huron County staff to gain information regarding their successful completion of this project for their area, including the involvement of community groups,

  (b) contact the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines for their assistance,

  (c) report back to the Planning and Economic Development Committee with appropriate timelines and costings, as soon as possible.”

This addendum report addresses the motions put forward by Committee and Council.

In addition, throughout the last few months staff have identified minor wording changes and schedule changes as a result of late comments from agencies as well as review of some policy areas.

**ANALYSIS OF ALTERNATIVES:**

1.0 Motions from Committee

1.1. Winona Urban Boundary

Hamilton General Homes submitted an Official Plan Amendment (OPA) application to the former City of Stoney Creek Official Plan, which seeks to re-designate the subject lands from an “Agricultural” designation to a “Winona Urban Community” designation. In addition, the applicant submitted a NEPA application to redesignate the subject lands from “Escarpment Protection Area” to “Minor Urban Centre”.


City Council, at its meeting of March 8, 2004 recommended:

“(a) That the City of Hamilton inform the Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) in respect of NEPA PW-138-01 (Hamilton General Homes Ltd.) that the subject lands are now designated “Urban Area” by the Regional Official Plan, and the development of urban residential uses on such lands are considered appropriate.

(b) That in the event the NEC approves NEPA PW-138-01 (Hamilton General Homes Ltd.) to extend the Minor Urban Centre Designation in the NEP, staff be directed to report on modifications to Official Plan Amendment (OPA) OP-03-12, to redesignate the subject lands from “Agricultural” to “Winona Urban Community” in the Official Plan (OP) of the former City of Stoney Creek to increase the proposed residential density to achieve a more efficient and sustainable use of serviceable urban land resources in the context of appropriate site design issues.”

In addition, staff indicated that once a final decision on the NEPA was made by the Consolidated Board, the City would amend the urban boundary, if required by that decision.

To date, the NEC has not made any decision on the NEPA application.

The applicant appealed both the decision of City Council and the lack of decision of the Niagara Escarpment Commission to the Consolidated Hearings Board. To date, no hearing date has been set.

Subsequent to Council’s decision, there have been letters from the province and the Niagara Escarpment Commission respecting the City’s interpretation of the Urban boundary in the Regional Official Plan.

At the onset of the development of the Rural Official Plan, staff made a decision that no adjustments to the urban boundary would be made because of outstanding provincial initiatives (i.e. Places to Grow) and the ongoing GRIDS study. Urban boundary changes would be undertaken as part of the development of new urban policies and land use designations. Further, since the dispute about the urban boundary in Winona is part of a litigation matter, no action would be taken until the Board decision was rendered.

Recommendation:

That similar to the outstanding OMB hearing for the SCUBE lands, the various maps and schedules in the rural Official Plan be amended to identify the lands that are subject to the Winona Urban Boundary Consolidated Board hearing matter.

1.2. SCUBE Lands Subject to a Future OMB Hearing

On November 25, 2005, the Ontario Municipal Board held a hearing on the Stoney Creek Urban Boundary Expansion (SCUBE) Lands. The Board members agreed to allow land owners, west of Glover Road and two additional land owners in the Winona area (as shown on Appendix “B” to PED06207(a) to proceed to another hearing to argue whether
their lands should be included in the Greenbelt Plan. To date, no hearing date has been set.

Since this is an outstanding matter, it would be appropriate to consider deferring the decision on the Rural Official Plan land use designations only for those lands identified on Appendix “A” until the Ontario Municipal Board has rendered its final decision.

Recommendation:

That similar to the outstanding OMB hearing for the other SCUBE lands, the various maps and schedules in the rural Official Plan be amended to identify the lands that are subject to a future Ontario Municipal Board hearing respecting Greenbelt boundaries.

1.3 Twenty Road Area

In May, 2006, Council endorsed the GRIDS Final Report and as the City of Hamilton’s growth management strategy, and that the strategy be incorporated into the urban structure and associated policies for the City of Hamilton Official Plan review, the infrastructure master plans (i.e. stormwater, transportation and water and wastewater) and the preparation of a new development charges by-law for the City of Hamilton. In addition, Council directed “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 Southeast Corner of the Glanbrook Industrial Business Park into the city’s Growth Strategy”.

Planning and Economic Development Department staff are in the process of finalizing a separate report on the opportunities and implications of adding the lands along Twenty Road and adjacent to the Glanbrook Industrial Business Park and responding to the submissions made by the land owners along Twenty Road.

Recommendation:

No action be taken on this matter.

1.4 Greensville Rural Settlement Area

The Rural Settlement Area of Greensville is generally located at Highway 8 between Weirs Lane and Ofield Road South, within the former Town of Flamborough (See Appendix B). It has an area of 655.10 hectares (1618.79 acres) and an estimated population of 2525. The total number of dwelling units is approximately 925. Development within the settlement is primarily serviced by private wells and private sewage disposal systems with limited residential development on municipal communal water systems.

Historically, there have been issues with all services in Greensville. In July 16, 1990 the Town of Flamborough included special policies in their Official Plan to attempt to alleviate and address these problems. Even through these policies have been in place for several
years, the longstanding servicing issues persist and have proven to be very costly for the City of Hamilton. The City now is responsible for two communal water systems in the RSA. The first communal water system that the City was required to take over by the Ministry of the Environment cost the City approximately of $1.8 million to service 14 units to improve the system, let alone the annual maintenance of the system. A similar expenditure is anticipated to improve and maintain the second communal water system which services approximately 18 dwellings.

These servicing issues were in large part the basis for initiating the sub-watershed study for the area.

The Mid-Spencer Creek/ Greensville Rural Settlement Area Sub-watershed Study is comprised of three stages:

Stage 1 will characterize the sub-watershed through a review of background literature and by conducting studies to address gaps in data. Stage II will provide a detail analysis of the potential impacts of future land uses and develop management strategy to ensure that the critical elements of the sub-watershed are protected and Stage III is the implementation and monitoring phase.

The study is already underway and is based on existing land use and current planned land use. Extension to the RSA is not contemplated. It must be pointed out that of the study may limit further development within the existing RSA let alone the inclusion of additional lands. However, it is too early in the process to prejudge the outcome of the study.

Committee has directed staff to consider the potential for rounding out the Greensville Rural Settlement Area by adding approximately 17 acres, between Brock and Moxley Roads, potentially for commercial/industrial uses, and to exclude this area from the new Official Plan, pending the outcome of the on-going Public Works servicing study.

The subject land is within the proposed Rural designation which provides for resource based industrial and commercial uses and provides an opportunity for a change to an Open Space designation to be considered. It is staff's opinion that the proposed designation is appropriate intermediary between the existing quarry to the north and the RSA to the south. Including the property within the RSA would enable the owner to request any variety of land use designations that would not have been contemplated or fully evaluated as part of the sub-watershed study.

Options

1. Existing Official Plan policies continue to apply until such time as watershed study is complete and the subject land addressed through future amendment.

2. Given the uncertainty surrounding servicing the existing and committed land use in the RSA and the high capital expenditures required by the municipality to improve and maintain the existing systems, coupled with the appropriate proposed Rural
designation of the subject land, it is recommended that the City not permit any additional development, commercial/industrial or otherwise within the RSA of Greensville. As a result, staff cannot support the request to defer consideration of the two properties comprised of 17 acres, between Brock and Moxley Roads, for commercial/industrial uses, pending the outcome of the on-going Public Works servicing study.

Recommendation:

That the request to defer consideration of the two properties comprised of 17 acres, between Brock and Moxley Roads, for commercial/industrial uses, pending the outcome of the on-going Public Works servicing study, be denied.

1.5 Kirkwall Rural Settlement Area Consideration for Rounding Out

A very conservative approach was used to determine potential for minor rounding out of Rural Settlement Areas. The requests to extend Kirkwall to include the Walker property along Concession Road 8 and the Manse have been reviewed and have not met the criteria to permit rounding out.

The Kirkwall Rural Settlement Area (RSA) is generally located at Kirkwall Road and Concession 8 West in the former Township of Flamborough (See Appendix C). It has an area of approximately 28.55 hectares (70.56 acres) and an estimated population of 60. Significant developable area exists within the current RSA limits. While the likelihood of this area to develop may be anecdotally questioned, Flamborough Council included the area within the RSA some years ago and the potential must be considered.

Development within the RSA is serviced by private individual wells and septic systems. Kirkwall was included in the Regional Settlement Capability Study completed in 1976. The Study states that the soils in Kirkwall are generally shallow granular tills, and the shallow overburden depth to bedrock limits the development potential on individual water supply and sewage disposal systems. If Council were to consider permitting an expansion to Kirkwall to include these two areas, the Settlement Capability Study must be updated given the shallow soils and significant changes to practices and standards since the mid seventies. This would need to occur prior to committing to the expansion of the RSA and any future development on these lands.

Options

1. Deny the request and permit no expansion.

2. If the requested expansion is permitted, allow no severances or rezoning until a new Settlement Capability Study is completed. The Settlement Capability Study would be completed by staff at a cost of approximately $100,000 to $150,000, which could later be transferred to development in Kirkwall via a site specific development charge.
3. Require the first proponent to complete the Settlement Capability Study to the satisfaction of the City. The study can be required through a holding zone applied to the new lands brought into the Kirkwall Rural Settlement Area.

**Recommendation:**

That the request to expand the Kirkwall Rural Settlement Area boundary to include the portion of the Walker property and the church manse be denied.

### 1.6 Aggregate Resource Strategy

Concerns have been raised regarding the City of Hamilton’s current mineral aggregate resource mapping. The draft plan proposes to carry forward this mapping in the absence of new data related to the mapping. Improved information would assist in both protecting the resource as well as protecting existing incompatible land uses.

The Aggregate Resources Inventory Paper (ARIP) for Hamilton-Wentworth was completed in 1984 by the Ministry of Natural Resources. This document identifies the primary and secondary sand and gravel, and bedrock resources. Map 5, Mineral Aggregate Areas, the Hamilton-Wentworth Regional Official Plan, does not correspond to the ARIP mapping. It is staff’s understanding that Map 5 was carried forward from the previous Regional Official Plan, and that this map was at one point developed and agreed to by both the municipality and the Ministry of Natural Resources. However, the rationale for the difference between the two maps can no longer be traced by either the City or the Ministry. Adding to the confusion, the age of the data, changes in extractive technology, market trends and the high quality of the aggregate found in Hamilton has lead to questions about the accuracy/relevance of the 1984 ARIP mapping. For example, some areas were originally considered to be ‘secondary’ deposits due to the depth of the resource below the surface and were less likely to be developed due to the cost of reaching the resource. Today, higher aggregate prices, Hamilton’s market proximity and the high quality of Hamilton’s aggregate make extraction of these secondary resources economically viable.

Underscoring the need for accurate mapping are a significant number of land uses incompatible with or sensitive to aggregate extraction that are now scattered throughout Rural Hamilton. The Regional Official Plan mapping discrepancies do not provide these uses with a reasonable indication of where potential aggregate operations could locate. Applications for an aggregate operation can be made almost anywhere in the Rural Area at present so accurate aggregate mapping would provide everyone with realistic information about potential locations of future aggregate uses. This would allow property owners to make informed land use and investment decisions. Further, the current mapping does not consider existing land uses which are incompatible with mineral aggregate extraction. In addition to more accurate mapping of the minerals themselves, a mineral aggregate strategy would examine and map existing incompatible land uses as constraints to extraction as well as provide policies to protect both incompatible land uses and access to the mineral aggregate resource.
As part of their recently approved Places to Grow Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe the Ministry of Public Infrastructure Renewal (MPIR) will do some kind of aggregate assessment for Hamilton as part of the larger aggregate sub-area assessment. The details of this sub-area assessment have not been determined, though the project is scheduled to begin in early 2007. Staff has been in contact with MPIR on this matter and are advocating for value added information, such as mapping of constraints to aggregate extraction, rather than simply a review of the location of the aggregate resource. It is hoped that the sub-area assessment will provide some substantial information that the City can build on in producing an aggregate strategy which will reduce the scope and costs of an internal study.

Staff has also been in contact with the Ministry of Northern Development and Mines (MNDM) who are mandated to map aggregate resources. The Ministry of Natural Resources is responsible for administering aggregate resources. It has been indicated that it is possible that the MNDM could provide us with partial updated aggregate mapping data at some time in the future, particularly with respect to changes in overburden depths over bedrock deposits, though MNDM has made no commitment to update our mapping. MNDM determines its yearly work plan on the basis of need for aggregate mapping and it is hoped that the City of Hamilton’s needs will be sufficient to warrant updated mapping in the near future. Staff will continue these discussions.

Gaining updated mapping data from MNDM would reduce the costs to the City of new aggregate mapping and an aggregate strategy. The City would still have to conduct an aggregate strategy including mapping incompatible land uses (constraints to aggregate extraction) and policies to protect both incompatible land uses and access to the mineral aggregate resource, which is significant and costly, but would be working from up-to-date base maps provided by MNDM. To fully address all the issues of incompatible uses would involve a multi-year study with costs in the order of $500,000 to $900,000. Since the City does not have the staff resources to conduct such a study, either in terms of available staff or skills, it would be necessary to hire consultants to do the work. Staff will bring forward a Terms of Reference for Council’s consideration prior to the 2007 budget.

Staff conducted a review of aggregate studies recently completed by other municipalities to gain insight into the timeline, costs and issues which could be expected if Hamilton were to embark on such a study. The situations of these municipalities differ significantly from that of the City. There were substantial hurdles to overcome in each case. The details of this review are outlined in Appendix E.

Recommendation:

That the Mineral Aggregate policies and map in the proposed Rural Hamilton Official Plan be approved and that the Mineral Aggregate Resources Strategy be included in the capital budget proposal for 2007.

1.7 Comparison of Existing Official Plans to the Rural Hamilton Official Plan

The local Official Plans were developed by a variety of municipalities with differing contexts, goals and objectives. In addition, the existing local Plans were approved at
various points in time and were fully consistent in their content. They had different structures, different approaches and were implemented to different degrees. The local Plans had not been updated for some time and all are out of date with respect to Provincial legislation and policy. In fact all of the Plans predated the previous version of the Provincial Policy Statement issued in 1996.

- Regional Municipality of Hamilton-Wentworth Official Plan – Approved January 5, 1995
- Township of Glanbrook Official Plan – Approved June 16, 1987
- Town of Dundas Official Plan – Approved October 27, 2000
- City of Stoney Creek Official Plan – Approved May 12, 1986
- Town of Ancaster Official Plan – Approved July 6, 1984
- Town of Flamborough Official Plan – Approved September 27, 1988

The legislative basis for much of the Rural policies throughout Rural Hamilton, regardless of the former municipality, changed significantly with the release of the new Provincial Policy Statement and the Greenbelt Plan in 2005. These documents required a wholesale change to the approach to land use planning in Rural Hamilton. Given the extreme changes, it is very difficult to itemize all of the changes for each local Plan, and there is limited utility to the exercise since many of the changes are dictated by the legislation. The municipality must conform to the Greenbelt Plan and must be consistent with the Provincial Policy Statement. Complicating the matter further, the City is now a single tier municipality and as such, upper tier or Regional policies must be addressed in one Official Plan document.

Recommendation:

No action be taken on this matter.

2.0 Official Plan Amendments

At the June 26, 2006 P&ED Committee meeting staff submitted a revised Official Plan Amendment. Staff is recommending that Appendix “A” to Report PED06207 be deleted and a new Appendix which is attached as Appendix “F” to Report PED06207(a), be adopted.

3.0 Rural Hamilton Official Plan

Subsequent to the completion of the Rural Hamilton Official Plan, staff received late comments from various agencies. Changes to the OP policies have been made to address their concerns. In addition, a few minor wording adjustments and numbering changes have been made to the policies. These changes do not change the intent of the policies.

FINANCIAL/STAFFING/LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:

Financial – An aggregate resources strategy would require a minimum budget of $500,000
Staffing – None.

Legal – None.

**POLICIES AFFECTING PROPOSAL:**

The proposed recommendations contained in Report PED06207(a) will result in changes to the Official Plan Amendment and the Rural Hamilton Official Plan.

**CONSULTATION WITH RELEVANT DEPARTMENTS/AGENCIES:**

Consultation was undertaken with Legal Services Division of the Corporate Services Department and Water/Wastewater Division of the Public Works Department.

**CITY STRATEGIC COMMITMENT:**

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

- **Community Well-Being is enhanced.** ☑ Yes ☐ No
  Public services and programs are delivered in an equitable manner, coordinated, efficient, effective and easily accessible to all citizens.

- **Environmental Well-Being is enhanced.** ☑ Yes ☐ No
  Air quality and water quality and quantity are protected.

- **Economic Well-Being is enhanced.** ☑ Yes ☐ No
  Hamilton's high-quality environmental amenities are maintained and enhanced.

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

- **Do the options you are recommending make Hamilton a City of choice for high performance public servants?** ☐ Yes ☑ No
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Mineral Aggregate Study Review

Huron County
Huron County had no existing aggregate mapping (ARIP) for parts of their county and was already in queue for aggregate mapping prepared by the Ministry of Northern Mines and Development. Despite this, a concerted and extended lobbying effort was required to obtain complete aggregate mapping for Huron County. That lobbying alone took approximately two years. The mapping itself took another year, and the development of the Aggregate Strategy took an additional year to produce. The municipality’s cost was roughly $20,000 in consultant fees since the County was not required to pay for the mapping and did most of the work in-house. The study was intentionally kept simple for several reasons: 1) the lack of significant aggregate development, 2) the desire for all stakeholders to be able to understand the process and result, and 3) to keep the workload manageable since it was being done in-house.

Grey County
The production of Grey County’s Mineral Aggregates Master Plan was a comprehensive and expensive process. Consultants were hired to conduct a field reassessment and reinterpretation of existing mineral aggregate data as well as produce the Mineral Aggregates Master Plan. The study addressed a full spectrum of issues and constraints including environmental factors, social factors, economic considerations, cultural heritage, hydrogeology, prime agricultural versus rural lands, haul routes, traffic impact, direct and indirect costs the community, and public health and safety. In spite of the use of existing data, five years of study has cost the County $400,000 and the resulting policies have still not been approved.

Town of Caledon
The Town of Caledon includes a large area of along Oak Ridges Moraine. Its deposits of sand and gravel as well as its proximity to the GTA make the Moraine area much sought after as a source of mineral aggregates. This pressure combined with a complicated existing land use pattern, and provincial request to include an aggregate schedule as part of their Official Plan, the Town of Caledon, in association with the Region of Peel, did an aggregate study in the mid-1990s. Existing mapping similar to Hamilton’s formed the base. Constraints such as environmental features and settlement areas were then identified and removed to form the final Official Plan Schedule. Even using existing mapping, the project took 4 years and $300,000.

Township of Oro-Medonte
The Township of Oro-Medonte conducted an Aggregate Resource Management Study, linked with the Oro Moraine Land Use Strategy, which used existing mapping and identified environmental, hydrogeological or cultural heritage constraints and haulage routes. The impetus for the study was that 80% of Oro-Medonte’s aggregate resources are in the Oro Moraine and extraction has the potential to impact the natural heritage features and functions of the Moraine (vast stands of forest, sensitive groundwater recharge and discharge areas, wetlands and ANSIs). The Township wanted a policy
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framework to give it a role in determining where extraction should or should not occur. The Study took two years and cost approximately $75,000.

City of Kawartha Lakes
The proximity of the City of Kawartha Lakes to the GTA and its extensive aggregate resources means significant pressure for aggregate development. Consequently, the City hired consultants to conduct an Aggregate Resource Policy Study which reviewed and updated its Official Plan and other policies related to aggregate resources. The study used existing mapping to evaluate and prioritize the areas most suitable for aggregate removal as well as those areas which should be protected, based on geological criteria, transportation criteria, environmental criteria, social criteria and economic criteria. Policy development entailed consultation with all stakeholders including residents, the aggregate industry, provincial regulatory bodies, City Council, City staff, adjacent municipalities, and other relevant groups. The study was implemented through Official Plan and other policies at a cost of $50,000.
Recommended Changes to Rural Hamilton Official Plan

a) Text Changes

i. Volume 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. C.1.1</td>
<td>Add a description regarding purpose of the Niagara Escarpment Plan as a second paragraph as follows: “The Niagara Escarpment Plan provides for the protection of the Niagara Escarpment and adjacent lands as a continuous natural environment and to ensure that development within these lands under the jurisdiction of the Niagara Escarpment Plan are compatible with the natural environment.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. C.1.3 d)</td>
<td>Amend policy to the same as C.1.2 a) i) and ii).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. C.2.2.1</td>
<td>Added “except the Niagara Escarpment Commission” following the phrase “or other public agency”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. C.2.4.2</td>
<td>Policy deleted and replaced with “New development or site alteration shall not be permitted within a Key Natural Heritage Feature within the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System or a Key Hydrologic Feature anywhere in the Protected Countryside. However, new development or site alteration proposed adjacent to (within 120 metres of) a Key Natural Heritage Feature within the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System or a Key Hydrologic Feature anywhere in the Protected Countryside requires an Environmental Impact Statement which identifies a Vegetation Protection Zone, according to the requirements in Sections C.2.4.10, C.2.4.11, C.2.4.12, C.2.4.13, and C.2.4.14.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. C.2.6.1 erroneously numbered 2.5.1</td>
<td>Policy deleted as redundant and policies renumbered accordingly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. C.2.10</td>
<td>“Lake Ontario and Hamilton Harbour” changed to “Remedial Action Plans”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. F.1.13.2.1 &amp; F.1.13.2.2 &amp; Policies reordered and renumbered to clarify that minimum lot sizes do not apply to surplus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
farm dwelling severances.

7. F.3.3.2 Delete the Policy and replace with the following revised Policy.

“The City of Hamilton shall establish a municipal heritage committee, under the Ontario Heritage Act, to advise Council on all matters related to cultural heritage and to undertake, subject to Council’s approval, such other activities that will contribute to the Cultural Heritage goals and policies of this Plan.”

ii. Volume 3:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Number</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Special Policy Area B</td>
<td>Special Policy Area B., Policy 2.1 text change to recognize Agriculture designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Special Policy Area C</td>
<td>Special Policy Area C., Policy 3.1 text change to recognize Agriculture designation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. R-7, policy 1.0 and 1.1</td>
<td>“Rural Estate Subdivisions” changed to “Estate Residential Areas”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. R-7, Lots 4, 5 &amp; 6, Concession 4 West, former Town of Flamborough</td>
<td>Site Specific Area inset map changed to reflect accurately the location of Site Specific Area R-7 as described in the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. R-10</td>
<td>“Stonebrook Estates” changed to “Stonebrook Estates Mobile Home Park”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. R-10</td>
<td>1.0 change text to identify designation as Rural not Open Space - new text &quot;Notwithstanding Section D.4.0, Rural Designation of this Plan, on the lands designated Rural&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. R-11</td>
<td>1.0 change designation from Open Space to Rural - new text &quot;Notwithstanding Section D.4.0, Rural Designation of this Plan, on the lands designated Rural&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. R-12</td>
<td>“Waterdown Sportsmen’s Club” changed to “Waterdown Sportsmen’s Club Mobile Home Park”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. R-12</td>
<td>1.0 change designation from Open Space to Rural - new text &quot;Notwithstanding Section D.4.0, Rural Designation of this Plan, on the lands designated Rural&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. R-13</td>
<td>1.0 change designation from Open Space to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agriculture - new text "Notwithstanding Section D.2.0, Agriculture Designation of this Plan, on the lands designated Agriculture"

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>R-14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Olympia Village” changed to “Olympia Village Mobile Home Park”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>R-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.0 change designation from Open Space to Rural - new text &quot;Notwithstanding Section D.4.0, Rural Designation of this Plan, on the lands designated Rural&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Northwest corner of Concession 4 West of Brock Road, former Town of Flamborough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Specific Area R-20 added to carry forward a site specific policy from the former Town of Flamborough Official Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>2200 Rymal Road East; 1, 2, 4 &amp; 5 Portside Street; 51, 101, 151 &amp; 175 Swazye Road, former Township of Glanbrook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Site Specific Area R-21 added to recognized the Swazye Road Industrial Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Schedule/Map Changes

i. All Maps and Schedules (Volume 1 & Volume 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of 10 Lorado Drive</td>
<td>Add a notation: “subject to a Consolidated Board Hearing:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scattered lands in the lower Stoney Creek urban boundary expansion area.</td>
<td>Add notation: “subject to a future OMB Hearing”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ii. Schedule A – Provincial Plans (Volume 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Greensville Rural Settlement Area</td>
<td>Add underlying Niagara Escarpment Plan designation as Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Copetown Rural Settlement Area</td>
<td>Add underlying Niagara Escarpment Plan designation as Rural</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### iii. Schedule D – Land Use designations (Volume 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1161 Concession 4 W (part of) - Olympia Village</td>
<td>From Agriculture to Open Space to reflect Site Specific Policy R -14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Highway 5 (Coreslab)</td>
<td>From Agriculture to Rural to reflect Amendment No. 102 to the Flamborough Official Plan which recognizes this lands as General industrial in the Flamborough Business Park secondary Plan – lands will be subject to a future amendment to include in the urban boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 119 Highway 5 West (part of property fronting on Highway 5 West)</td>
<td>From Agriculture to Rural to reflect the issues related to operating an agricultural use on the site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Highway 5 West (Rock Chapel Golf Course)</td>
<td>Area of Open Space designation decreased to be consistent with zoning. Northern part of the property to be changed from Open Space to Agriculture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 1718 Wilson Street West (Ancaster Fairgrounds)</td>
<td>From Agriculture to Rural to permit the Ancaster Fairgrounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### iv. Volume 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Westover Rural Settlement Area</td>
<td>Include 1281 Concession 6 Road West within the Rural Settlement Area as an existing use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>