Present: Chair M. Pearson
Vice Chairs: Councillors B. Bratina and L. Ferguson
Councillors: B. Clark, S. Duvall, D. Mitchell, R. Pasuta, and Whitehead

Absent with Regrets: Councillor B. McHattie – Vacation

Staff Present: T. McCabe, General Manager, Planning and Economic Development
P. Mallard, T. Sergi, B. Janssen, J. Hickey-Evans, G. Paparella,
and Economic Development Department
A. Rawlings, S. Paparella – City Clerk’s Office

THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING COMMITTEE PRESENTS REPORT 09-013 AND RESPECTFULLY RECOMMENDS:

1. Urban Hamilton Official Plan – Changes and Responses to Comments (PED09164(a)) (City Wide) (Item 8.1)

   (a) 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, Official Plan Amendment No. ___ of the former City of Hamilton and, Official Plan Amendment No. ___ of the former City of Stoney Creek Official Plan, to delete the existing policies and land use designations, as contained in Appendix “A” to Report PED09164(a).

   (b) That approval be given to the adoption of a new Official Plan, to establish new land use designations and policies for Urban Hamilton, as contained in Appendix “B” to Report PED09164 and as amended by Appendix “D” to PED09164(a).
(c) That approval be given to text and Schedule changes for the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, attached as Appendix “D” to Report PED09164(a), and as amended by Committee on June 22, 2009, respecting clarification of parking requirements in Dundas, and to add Upper James/Rymal as a Node, as shown below:

(i) to include new policies to recognize Hamilton’s transportation and logistics sector as an economic and goods movement gateway; to allow for the preparation of a secondary plan for the Bayfront area; to allow a limited range of commercial uses on lands designated Employment Area-Shipping and Navigation;

(ii) to change land use designations to reflect requests for the Employment designations (Nos. 1050 to 1090 Upper Wellington Street and Pier 22);

(iii) to update Schedule B – Natural Heritage System to include minor changes to linkages in a core area;

(iv) to update secondary plan maps to reflect the current status of development applications, update existing land uses and incorporate an additional policy;

(v) to provide clarification to definitions, policies and Schedules; and,

(vi) to correct typographical errors and land ownership (i.e. Hamilton Port Authority).

(vii) to include correction respecting parking in Dundas, being a Modification to site specific policy in Volume 3 - UDOS-2 (Southeast corner of Dundas Street and Cootes Drive, Dundas) specifying that the only permitted use be changed from “automobile parking” to “parking”.

(vii) to establish a Node at Upper James Street and Rymal Road, and include the following policies pursuant thereto;

- to redesignate the Arterial Commercial and the Neighbourhoods Designations within the Node to Mixed Use Medium; and,
- to create an area specific policy to allow for the continuation and expansion of the existing arterial commercial uses within the Node.

(d) 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.
(e) That the items in regard to Community Beach Ponds be identified as complete and be removed from the Economic Development and Planning Committee’s Outstanding Business list.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL:

(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (Item 1)

The Clerk advised of the following changes to the agenda:

(i) Two sets of Minutes in the Agenda were transposed with two dates, June 10th and June 11th, being in the wrong order.

(ii) Added communications circulated this morning:

- Joel D. Farber, Fogler, Rubinoff LLP, respecting Airport Employment Growth District and the New City of Hamilton Official Plan

- John Mackenzie, Director, Strategic Asset Management, Ontario Realty Corporation, respecting Provincial Land Northwest of Second Road and Rymal Road (Eramosa Karst Area)

- Mary Catharine Lawlor, President, Harbour West Neighbours respecting Hamilton’s Proposed New Urban Official Plan


The Clerk noted that Joanne Hickey-Evans, Manager of Policy Planning, will comment on the correspondence, as part of her presentation on the Urban Official Plan.

The June 22, 2009 Agenda, of the Economic Development & Planning Committee, was approved, as amended.

By Motion, the added Items of correspondence were received.
(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

(c) APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item 3)

3.1.1 June 10, 2009

The Minutes of the June 10, 2009 Economic Development and Planning Committee meeting, were approved, as presented.

3.1.2 June 11, 2009

The Minutes of the June 11, 2009 Economic Development and Planning Committee meeting, were approved, as presented.

3.1.3 June 16, 2009

The Minutes of the June 16, 2009 Economic Development and Planning Committee meeting, were approved, as presented.

(d) Urban Hamilton Official Plan – Changes and Responses to Comments (PED09164(a) (City Wide) (Item 8.1)

Joanne Hickey-Evans, Manager of Policy Planning, provided a PowerPoint presentation respecting Hamilton’s proposed Urban Official Plan. Ms. Hickey-Evans’ comments included, but were not limited to, the following:

- The purpose of today’s presentation was to highlight organization of the staff report, then focus on major or newly raised issues, resulting from public consultation.

- Appendix A – the staff report includes the Official Plan Amendments, which are required to delete the existing policies for the Urban Area. Plan includes the deferral of the West Harbour and WHID, these deferrals will be repealed once the Ontario Municipal Board appeals are resolved.

- Appendix B is the New Urban Hamilton Official Plan.

- Appendix C summarizes the public input by meeting date.

- The four additional items of correspondence that were put before Committee today were not captured in Appendix C. The correspondence from Joel Farber
relates to lands outside the urban boundary and the correspondence from John MacKenzie of the Ontario Realty Corporation references the issue of the Eramosa Karst Conservation Area and the designation of the feeder area.

- There are 3 major issues raised in public responses related to growth management:

  (a) Request for additional Node at the intersection of Rymal and Upper James, since it is located at an intersection of a primary and secondary corridor.

  - Staff consider that the intersection of two corridors does not automatically mean an area will become a Node, since other factors must be considered.

  - The potential for increased density exists in the area on the east side of Upper James, lands are arterial commercial, land uses that cater to the automobile borne trade, have large lots which is uncharacteristic of many of the commercial arterial areas. However, density along Rymal, and in the neighbourhoods adjacent, very low density and some of the development is relatively new, especially as you move eastward.

  - Staff identified other community nodes, which serve as focal points to the former municipalities and other areas, which have existing policies that support mixed use or other areas where there is redevelopment potential for more residential. Creating too many nodes has the potential to undermine the targeted intensification at other nodes.

(b) Request to delete the Elfrida node from the text of the Plan.

- GRIDS identified two nodes for future growth, based on an integrated planning process that considered the triple bottom line in the decision making process. The Province supported adding the description of the two areas in text.

- Other requesters wanted the Twenty Road area either as an additional area of expansion or instead of Elfrida Node. Again, staff recommends no changes to the respecting the Elfrida Node, and no addition of Twenty Road as an urban boundary expansion.

c) Clarification respecting employment land conversions

- Although staff did not support the employment land conversions, Committee and Council in their deliberations considered other factors that influenced them in their decision making process regarding the Municipally Initiated Comprehensive Review for employment lands.

Council – June 29, 2009
Staff advised that there are three conversions not four. The Penady site was not designated industrial in the local OP's and therefore, was not considered as a conversion. There were a number of reasons for adding the sites:

- There was not an immediate need for expansion to the urban boundary; they would not undermine the viability and operation of the existing employment area, the need for additional arterial commercial uses, there are opportunities for increased assessment and jobs in the near term.

- Request respecting Hester and Upper Wellington - Based on meetings with the landowners of the three properties, known as 1050-1090 Upper Wellington, they wish to be designated Employment. Therefore, the comprehensive redevelopment policy is no longer applicable and will be removed. The land owners on Hester Street and properties on Upper Wellington on the north side are satisfied with the neighbourhood’s designation and the recognition through a site specific policy to allow both the existing and limited employment and commercial uses.

Two new policies have been added to the employment designations.

- Industrial Land – to allow for the development of a Secondary Plan for lands or portions within the Bayfront area. Through the Secondary Plan, the boundaries of the area, the permitted uses, the design criteria and other strategies for redevelopment would be identified.

- With respect to shipping and navigation, the Official Plan policies do address the matter of urban design requiring them to adhere to the applicable policies of the urban design section. In terms of additional uses, within this designation, their letters patent only allow them to have limited retail and restaurant uses, which serve the local tourism industry and the users of the Port. Pier 22 has now been identified as shipping and navigation.

- In response to transportation and logistics, which is commonly referred to as goods movement, new Official Plan policies have been added to the strong economy and transportation sections of the OP to recognize the importance, as individual transportation uses as well as their combined efforts, which make Hamilton an important economic gateway.

- Secondary Plans and Site Specific Policies
  - There are some changes proposed to the secondary plans to recognize recent Council approvals as well as to ensure the approved Plan is in place. Staff identified
that there were two areas where the changes were inadvertently made, prior to the public process being completed.

- The North End Neighbours requested the deferral of the West Harbour pending resolution of the appeals. Staff had already proposed a deferral for this area pending the resolution of OMB appeals.

- NEN also requested addition of 30 kmh limit, within the North End and inclusion of policies respecting children. Speed limits are operational issues and so they are not appropriate for inclusion in the OP. The future vision for the OP is to have communities that would be supportive of all age groups, in financial and physical terms, and this includes children.

- Two policies were suggested to make redevelopment easier, staff are in agreement with both and have made the appropriate revisions;
  - The first was to include a specific policy encouraging the adaptive reuse of the existing building stock; and,
  - The second policy is to allow for increases in density over 200 persons per hectare for smaller sites along arterial roads, provided the other policies of the Plan can be met. In some circumstances, small sites can easily exceed the 200 units per ha, even though their built form may be of a medium density height.

- There are a few proposed Schedule Changes:

  Schedule “A” - Provincial plans, one area in Waterdown south, identified by the Niagara Escarpment Plan as the Waterdown policy area. This special policy allows for the revision of the designations, based on the sub-watershed study. However, NEC staff has indicated that the Greenbelt Act eliminated this policy. It is staff’s suggestion the designations of this area be deferred until such time as the issue can be resolved.

- Schedule B – Natural Heritage System, additional information was received and some small changes to linkages and removing a stream outside a core area have been undertaken. Appendix D-3 of Report PED09146(a) identifies the specific location.

- Staff Report identifies a series of changes to the OP, the detail of which is contained in Appendix D to Report PED09146(a), with the exception of the small one in Dundas to remove the word automobile.
Committee discussed the staff report and had additional information supplied by staff.

Questions and comments raised included, but were not limited to, the following:

Councillor Bratina – following approval of new “OP”, is there any possibility of tweaking it?

Staff response:
– will have 5 year review
- staff can interpret policies
- opportunities exist when OP received back from Ministry
- policies may be enhanced through future Official Plan Amendments and Secondary Plans

Councillor Ferguson – are owners at Hester/Upper Wellington satisfied with revisions?

Staff response:
- their request for maintaining existing industrial/employment is included in final document.
Staff has spoken to them and will send an email to confirm.

Councillor Ferguson – likes the staff approach on the conversion of the industrial sites to commercial.

Councillor Mitchell – Issue of Twenty Road lands, can they be included, like Elfrida. Many things being built in that area, would be courteous to landowners in the area, how and why was it not included, thinks both areas should be treated in similar way.

Staff response:
- designations are based on GRIDS, Council chose Elfrida as future Urban Boundary Expansion, and not Twenty road area, staff following Council direction
- Later, in Five Year Review of OP, can look at Twenty Road; when we can justify an urban boundary expansion, it will be looked at
- Elfrida was included in Rural OP, but removed by Province, and City did not object
- No peer review of Elfrida versus Twenty Road, since process was part of GRIDS.

Councillor Mitchell – like staff approach on Penady development, has Province accepted this Council direction?

Staff response:
- Penady is part of future discussions with Province. Provincial staff did not have complete information on employment lands conversions when they commented on these in letter of June 3, 2009
- As approval authority for OP, staff works closely with Provincial staff
- Province did not have any changes on City’s proposed growth management policies, they were silent on these matters.

Councillor Clark – recalled that Elfrida Node originally on map in Rural OP, Province did not consider it appropriate, and suggested it be placed in text of Urban OP. Will Twenty Road be in next 5 year Review?

Staff response: 
- yes, City did as Province suggested, Elfrida represents a geographic intention of the next growth area. When expansion is needed, staff will do all the required detailed studies, and will need full information for Elfrida and Twenty Road.

Councillor Clark –
- comfortable with balance of OP
- questioned ORC information at recent public information centres respecting Karst lands, ORC misrepresented City position on lands, and referenced the old studies
- where are we with ORC - are we staying with the current mapping in OP?

Staff response: 
- staff not recommending any changes based on ORC comments - no change to mapping of Karst areas

Councillor Clark – thanked staff and Hamilton Conservation Authority for good decision, ORC input frustrating, apparently too many people at ORC commenting on our OP. Prefers all Karst land to be included but OK with staff position.

Councillor Ferguson suggested the matter of adding Twenty Road could be referred to Council.

Councillor Clark commented that the Committee had agreed to a process of public meetings, then Committee deliberation and recommendation to Council.

Councillor Mitchell expressed concerns that Node needed at Elfrida and at Twenty Road, if removing lands from Karst area, they can be added at Twenty Road. He requested Committee to include Twenty Road.

The following Motion( Mitchell/Pasuta) was placed on the floor:

That Twenty Road be included as a future urban boundary expansion area in the New Urban Official Plan.
Committee discussed the Motion.

Staff advised that if the area was added to the OP, it would provide more expansion area than is needed, would also weaken City case for Elfrida.

Councillor Clark noted that as 40 hectares taken out of Eramosa Karst area, this could be used for housing elsewhere. However, noted that Elfrida expansion may not be needed for 10, 15 or even 20 years, and that when expansion is needed, a comprehensive review must take place, all boundaries around Elfrida may shift and Twenty Road area may be needed.

Mr. McCabe responded that the land area could be added to the Elfrida area, would become part of the comprehensive planning area. In addition, depending on development within Urban Area, possible that might not need to change plan at the Five Year Review stage.

At 12:45 p.m., Committee recessed for lunch.

At 1:15 p.m., Committee resumed.

Mr. McCabe explained that a comprehensive review will be needed in 2016, Elfrida not needed now, but was a Council decision to include it, through the Rural Official Plan process. A benefit of including Elfrida as a text reference provides some continuity as to future, minimizes speculation.

Councillor Clark asked if we could take Elfrida out of Plan, as an alternative to putting Twenty Road in, that is, exclude both.

Mr. McCabe noted that was the request of Susan Rogers and Twenty Road owners, staff preference is to include Elfrida, but second choice is omit both.

Councillor Mitchell repeated his concern to leave Elfrida in, decision already taken, and add Twenty Road.

Councillor Bratina asked why inclusion of Elfrida and other issues, being discussed was not made clear during GRIDS process.

Councillor Clark asked are there legal ramifications if we take out Elfrida?

Mr. McCabe – don’t know legal ramifications, but Elfrida inclusion reflects Council decision, addition of Twenty Road adds confusion, don’t need both.
Councillor Clark – staff position defendable, keep Elfrida and look at Twenty Road in Five Year Review of OP.

Mr. McCabe clarified that Urban Boundary Expansion is growth management while Nodes relate to urban structure, part of Nodes and Corridors concept. Explained Upper James/Rymal could be designated as a Node.

The Chair then called the question on the amendment;

That Twenty Road be included as a future urban boundary expansion area in the new Urban Official Plan.

The Motion was DEFEATED on a Recorded Vote, as follows:

Yeas: Mitchell, Pasuta, Duvall, Bratina
Total: 4
Nays: Clark, Ferguson, Pearson, Whitehead
Total: 4
Absent: McHattie
Total: 1

Councillor Whitehead, seconded by Councillor Duvall, moved a Motion to add Upper James and Rymal as a Node in the Urban Official Plan, as outlined on page 6 of the staff report.

Tim McCabe advised that within the proposed Node, all the existing car dealerships must remain legal.

Committee discussed the Motion, and then approved it.

Councillor Duvall asked if an extension of Upper Wentworth to Twenty Road was envisaged.

Staff did not have this information.

Committee then approved the staff recommendation, as amended.

Staff confirmed that the Committee recommendation will proceed to Special Council on June 29, 2009 for debate and approval. This will meet the Provincial requirements. The by-law to approve the Official Plan will then be included on the Bill List of Council for July 9, 2009.

Councillor Whitehead requested an update on the Monster Homes By-law, and parkland policies, with regard to inequities in some areas.
Mr. McCabe explained that the Monster Homes issue would be included in the new Comprehensive By-law, which staff is now finalizing.

Ms. Hickey-Evans confirmed that the new Urban Official Plan includes appropriate parkland policies, respecting types and standards.

Councillor Whitehead continued to express concerns about the issue and it was agreed that he would discuss the issue with staff, after the meeting.

Chair Pearson noted that this had been the most perfect process so far for a major project. The Chair thanked staff for the huge amount of work undertaken, and thanked her Council colleagues for their diligent attendance and work at this special series of Committee meetings.

Councillor Ferguson thanked Chair Pearson for her leadership in the Official Plan process.

Councillor Clark advised that hunting of animals, including deer, rabbits and turkeys in the Eramosa Karst area is now happening. He said hunters are using crossbows and pointed out the danger to all the users of the area, particularly as crossbows go right through an animal, and keep on going.

Councillor Clark agreed to raise the question at Council.

Chair Pearson confirmed that there would be no meeting of Committee on June 23, 2009 as Committee had finished their deliberations on the new Urban Official Plan.

(e) ADJOURNMENT (Item 13)

On a Motion, the Economic Development and Planning Committee adjourned at 2:07 p.m.
SPECIAL OFFICIAL PLAN MEETING OF JUNE 16, 2009 (09-013C):

Present: Chair M. Pearson
Vice Chairs Councillors: B. Bratina, L. Ferguson
Councillors: S. Duvall, D. Mitchell, R. Pasuta, and Whitehead

Absent with Regrets: Councillors B. Clark and B. McHattie

Staff Present: T. McCabe, General Manager – Planning and Economic Development
P. Mallard, T. Sergi, B. Janssen, J. Hickey-Evans, S. Cellini,
C. Newbold – Planning and Development
M. Kovacevic - Legal
A. Rawlings, Co-ordinator, I. Bediou - City Clerk’s Office

FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL:

(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (Item 1)

The Committee Clerk advised that there were no changes to the agenda; however, she noted that additional correspondence was received after the close of day yesterday, as follows. These will be entered into the public record and copies will be distributed to Committee members and staff:

IBI Group:
Re: 310-380 Francis Avenue
Re: Lots 3 and 4, Concession 1, Stoney Creek
Re: N/W Corner White Church Road & Hampton Brook Way, Mount Hope
Re: Lime Kiln
Re: 440 Victoria Avenue North
Re: condo conversion of rental housing units

Julianne Burgess respecting infill development

Nick Kopelaar

Bill Curren – Hamilton-Burlington Society of Architects

The Agenda for the June 16, 2009, meeting of the Economic Development & Planning Committee was approved, as presented.

(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 2)

There were no declarations of interest.
(c) APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Item 3)

None.

(d) Proposed Urban Hamilton Official Plan (City Wide) (PED09164) (Item 6.1)

Chair Pearson introduced the subject of the meeting – a special Public Meeting, the third of three, to consider public input into the new Urban Official Plan. She outlined the process for the Public Meetings.

Chair Pearson advised the meeting of the following, in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act,

a) If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the Council of the City of Hamilton before the approval authority gives or refuses to give approval to the Official Plan or the Official Plan Amendments the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of the Council of the City of Hamilton to the Ontario Municipal Board.

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

(e) Staff presentations respecting the proposed Hamilton Official Plan (Item 6.1.1)

Bill Janssen addressed Committee and briefly outlined the changes in Provincial Legislation, including the new Planning and Green Belt Acts, and Places to Grow Policy, which need to be reflected in the new Official Plan. He also outlined what targets the City must meet as set out by the Province. Based on this direction, the plan was prepared in a phased-in approach. Bill Janssen also outlined the numerous public consultations undertaken to date.

Joanne Hickey-Evans provided further details on key elements of the plan. She acknowledged that the Official Plan was a corporate effort and she recognized the hard work and dedication of the team involved in the project.

Joanne Hickey Evans made a PowerPoint presentation which included but was not limited to the following topics:

Council – June 29, 2009
(f) Public delegations respecting the proposed Hamilton Official Plan (Item 6.1.2)

The Chair advised that additional communications had been received from the following, and copies distributed:

Ken Daken, Land Use Planning Consultant
Hans Jensen, 222 Greencedar Drive, Hamilton

(i) Metropolitan Consulting Inc.:

Re: Paletta International – Highbury Meadows Parcel, sw of Upper Centennial Pkwy and Highland Rd., Stoney Creek; and, Paletta International Ltd. – 1061 Garner Road East, Ancaster; and, Parkside Hills Inc. and Silverwood Homes

(ii) George Zajac, IBI Group:

Re: Tobyn Park Homes – 390 Highland Road West and
Re: Landmart Homes
Chair Pearson advised that the following persons had registered as Speakers for the meeting and that these people would be heard first, followed by speakers from the floor:

Peter Turkstra  
Carl Turkstra  
Doctor Nugent  
Maria Gatzios, 20 Road Owners  
Mark Chamberlain and Don May on behalf of the Hamilton Jobs Prosperity Collaborative (JPC)  
Charlie Mattina, Beasley Neighbourhood  
Ken Dakin, representing First Dundas Leasing Limited  
Joanna Champman  
Hans Jensen  
Gary Santucci  

Peter Turkstra addressed Committee with regard to the matter. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

- Regarding the Turkstra location at 1050 Upper Wellington, their head office and lumber yard;
- He is the President of Turkstra lumber;
- There is a thriving community nearby;
- There are 40 people employed on Upper Wellington;
- Provides a very valuable resource;
- It is traditional lumber yard – with delivery;
- Last year he expressed disapproval with the change of the zoning from “employment land” to a non-employment use;
- Wanted confirmation in writing that the change would not affect the business;
- The operators reserve their right to appeal to the OMB;
- The proposed change could affect the future sale of their property;
- The zoning should be specific to each property, the properties should not be lumped together;
- Requested that “building or contracting supply establishment” be included in the description of uses in the OP and that any future development not be tied in with the neighbouring operations of Day and Campbell and Mr. Kelly;
- Will submit a letter to the Clerk.
Carl Turkstra addressed Committee with regard to the matter. He read from a prepared statement and provided a copy to the Clerk. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

- He is the Chairman of Turkstra Lumber;
- He is speaking in regard to the Waterdown Yard;
- Turkstra Limber is an important Hamilton resource;
- The company is a good corporate citizen;
- Not a nuisance use i.e. no noise, pollution, odour;
- The problem is that their operation is not recognized as a permitted use in the Official Plan;
- Requested that “building or contracting supply establishment” be included in the description of uses in the Official Plan.

Dr. Tom Nugent addressed Committee with regard to the matter. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

- interested in the Hamilton growth plan;
- basically he is very appreciative of the work of the Planning staff;
- one exception in the plan that needs improvement – the Twenty Road area has not been dealt with fairly;
- it is a strategic location and a main trunk line to sewers is scheduled for the area;
- It is an area that has the potential to expand into an urban centre;
- realizes that the Province has put constraints on the City;
- the Twenty Road area has equal potential as the Elfrida area and asked that both should be dealt with equally (either targeted for development or not);
- requested that Council unanimously present this proposal to the Province by identifying the Twenty Road area for future urban expansion;
- Council’s request would have more weight than if he appeals this on his own.

Susan Rogers, Counsel for the Twenty Road East landowners addressed Committee with regard to the matter. Her points included, but were not limited to the following:

- the landowners on Twenty Road East have been active in the Urban and Rural Officials Plans and she is representing them regarding their appeal on the Rural Official Plan;
- She advised that there are fundamental flaws in the analysis of the GRIDS process;
- She indicated that Maria Gatzios, the Planner retained by the landowners, and the next speaker, has made a previous deputation before this Committee;
- Clients have attended meetings and submitted numerous written submissions
- Seems their submissions have fallen on deaf ears;
- She believes that the staff responses are not sufficient;
The issue is the identification of a future urban expansion area, which contradicts Provincial policies;

Failure of staff to note Upper James as a node in the Official Plan document.

Maria Gatzios, a Planner representing the Twenty Road East Landowners addressed Committee with regard to the matter. Her points included, but were not limited to the following:

- Spoke in November at the Open House;
- Landowners are interested in protecting their development rights;
- At this time, there is no justification for expansion of the urban boundary and therefore, there should be no lands identified for this purpose;
- The Ministry has determined that Elfrida should not be a special policy area;
- To carry this Elfrida Special Policy area forward is to prejudice a future process;
- Do not predetermine which area will be the urban expansion area;
- The Province mandates a special process;
- When expansion is needed, the appropriate study will identify the appropriate area or areas for the expansion;
- She also noted the lack of a node at Upper James and Rymal Road and indicated that this area is worthy of identification as a node.

Tim Dobbie addressed Committee on behalf of Mark Chamberlain, of the Hamilton Jobs Prosperity Collaborative (JPC), as he was unable to attend. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

- The focus of the Jobs Prosperity Collaborative is jobs;
- He made a slide presentation and a copy was distributed;
- The Collaborative endorses the New City Official Plan;
- When Hamilton has a current Official Plan, this will attract jobs;
- It is an important legal document and will bring certainty and predictability;
- The Jobs Prosperity Collaborative has engaged a planner – Don May;
- The Official Plan is an important step towards making Hamilton a good place to be.

Don May, on behalf of the Hamilton Jobs Prosperity Collaborative (JPC), addressed Committee with regard to the matter. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

- The Official Plan has two functions – public expenditure and planning framework for land use;
- Affects public works – new infrastructure and maintaining existing infrastructure;
- This will be the urban structure plan for the next 20 years;
- The next step is the zoning by-law which will also be important;
- Business requires an initial response to their proposal;
• There are 2 goals – need to pre-zone employment and business properties and need to create a partnership between the private and public sectors;
• basically there should be an approved site for any type of business in Hamilton;
• shovel ready lands are required;
• a public and private collaborative is required;
• future steps – more work on integrated intermodal transportation plan, working collaboratives and healthy environment and recreation activities;
• in addition to the Official Plan and Zoning By-law, the City requires sufficient staff to deal with zoning issues and an efficient application process;
• He noted that there have been improvements already made in this regard.

Isabelle Sardella, of the Beasley Neighbourhood Association, addressed Committee with regard to the matter. Her points included, but were not limited to the following:

• The Beasley Neighbourhood is one of the City’s most challenged neighbourhoods;
• Four workshops have been held with the assistance of Kyle Slote, from the University of Waterloo, whom she introduced as the next speaker.

Kyle Slote, from the University of Waterloo School of Architecture, representing the Beasley Neighbourhood Association, addressed Committee with regard to the matter and made a PowerPoint presentation and copies of his prepared statement were distributed. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

• Held workshops to determine what the neighbourhood needs;
• Showed map of Beasley;
• the amenities in the area show a large concentration of services for the needy;
• the presence of these services perpetuate the need as well as being reflective of the need;
• the built fabric of Beasley shows there is great potential for intensification to fill in “holes” and that would be beneficial of the neighbourhood;
• always was a working class neighbourhood;
• positive outcome of workshop – connections – social, environmental and economic parameters;
• the residents wanted more recreational opportunities;
• the residents wanted more community based businesses;
• the residents view the park and community centre as a chance for recreational outlet and were concerned with preserving them;
• want more pedestrian friendly streets and more transit options and the potential for light rail;
• the neighbourhood has the potential to become a model sustainable neighbourhood;
• The Beasley Neighbourhood Association endorses the overall goals of the Official Plan.
Ken Dakin, representing First Dundas Leasing Limited was not in attendance.

Joanna Chapman addressed Committee with regard to the matter. Copies of her letter were distributed. Her points included, but were not limited to the following:

- The Official Plan does not carry forward the Town of Dundas’ Open green space designation for 201 King Street East, Dundas;
- has some concerns with the process;
- a broad brush approach across the city is not beneficial, need to include the different needs and characters of the former area municipalities;
- the plan should be much easier for ordinary people to understand;
- should be responsive to community needs and not developers’ needs;
- the details are impossible to compare with what currently exists in the former municipalities, requested simple charts to highlight differences;
- the Official Plan seems to favour developers and does not protect open green space.

Hans Jensen addressed Committee with regard to the matter. He provided a handout which was distributed. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

- He is from the recycling generation;
- The consumer generation is fighting him;
- Wood burning pollutes more than cars;
- People are starving;
- We need to cut down forests to produce food;
- The future belongs to trains and ships, not cars;
- The city should purchase the homes with flooded basements and convert the properties to industrial land;
- Special Interest Groups of people make demands but do not indicate how much the demands will costs tax payers;
- We are used to cheap imports, but these will not be available forever – we should have our own industrial land to produce goods;
- We need industrial growth;
- Global warming is finished – it is a 100 year cycle, it is now getting colder.

Gary Santucci owner of the The Pearl Company addressed Committee with regard to the matter. He made a PowerPoint presentation. Barbara Milne, co owner assisted with the presentation. Their points included, but were not limited to the following:

- The possibilities are looking great for the arts and culture sector with the new Official Plan;
Hamilton’s Pearl Company, located at 16 Steven Street, is their place of business and their home;
Explained what the Pearl Company is and the various awards they have received;
Operate art gallery, music festivals; the TLC project – after school and weekend project for neighbourhood children and teens;
The zoning of their property threatens their existence;
Have been dealing with Planning staff, looking at a change of zoning;
They are facing an onerous and costly zoning application process;
They have been charged with an unlawful use of the premises;
They intend to defend themselves;
The City needs to find a way to encourage the reuse of vacant properties;
They are looking for a policy for an adaptive reuse of older buildings;
They request that the definitions be expanded to include private entrepreneurs, i.e. publicly owned and privately owned cultural facilities;
The Official Plan could accommodate and recognize all the uses on their property.

Lawrence Kaempffer addressed Committee with regard to the matter. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

- Lives in Dundas and works in Hamilton;
- Lives on a residential property that abuts a commercial property;
- Attended one of the public meetings;
- Saw confusing diagrams of commercial uses abutting his property;
- Some of the proposed changes to the commercial property abutting his residence could affect him;
- The reference documents include the OP of the former Town of Dundas;
- However, not clear what the changes are;
- Would be clearer if staff would provide a one page comparison of what is in existence now and what the new proposed changes are and why they are being recommended;
- The details are not clear.

Dr. Lynda Lukasik of Environment Hamilton addressed Committee with regard to the matter. Her points included, but were not limited to the following:

- Residential intensification target should allow for and encourage a higher target;
- The section of urban boundary expansion should be removed, i.e. Airport lands and Elfrida;
- Employment growth district – requirements for expansion have not been met;
- Concerns with conversions of employment lands;
- Brown fields sites should be #1 priority of economic growth;
- Failure to recognize conversion to condominium;
Council policy should be to purchase surplus school lands, then have full public consultation to ensure future use;
Air quality targets should be based on 1990 emission levels;
Will submit written comments to the Clerk.

Joe Minor of Environment Hamilton addressed Committee with regard to the matter. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

- He asked when the final draft is forwarded to the Province will it be shared with the public and will he be able to provide further input to the Province at that time? – Staff explained the process;
- His concerns: climate change and peak oil;
- The Environment is affecting the economy;
- We need to deal with the underlying issues;
- The Official Plan is an extremely large document and difficult for lay people to understand;
- Concern that the Plan is prepared in two halves, the urban official plan and the rural official plan;
- future urban boundary expansions are identified;
- the City should protect prime agricultural land;
- we will need that land to grow food;
- the Official Plan should be used to resolve areas that are under contention – it lists four industrial business parks;
- Opposes the proposed change in designation of four industrial areas to commercial;
- this will likely be challenged at the OMB;
- this appears to be an arbitrary and unsupported change;
- the proposed air quality targets do not match the current Provincial government and previous Federal targets; they should actually meet and exceed the Provincial and Federal targets;
- brownfield targets are not aggressive enough;
- pursue brownfield development rather than greenfield development;
- affordable housing targets are good;
- better ability to convert rental units to condos;
- he agrees with Dr. Lukasik’s statements;
- should include a policy of no net increase in pavement – i.e. include a provision to convert pavement to green space to offset road expansions;
- pavement is bad for the community;
- the airport – no qualification to noise abatement on the OP statement that the airport operate 24 hours, 7 days a week;
- residents cannot sleep;
- pedestrian access is not ambitious enough;
- do not micromanage properties;
- also do no change existing restrictions without advertised public meetings;
• supported Joanna Chapman’s request respecting the proposed Dundas storage facility; the town of Dundas parkland dedication should be maintained.

Peter Hutton representing the Hamilton Transit User Group and Promoters of Light Rail addressed Committee with regard to the matter. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

• The concept of introducing a light rail has an integral relationship with the Official Plan as the roads that may have light rail need to be identified;
• Promotion of Pedestrian and child friendly neighbourhoods;
• Concerned with long intervals between bus transfers which is not user friendly.

Bill Baxter representing Sylvestri Group. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

• The Twenty Road lands should have been included in the urban boundary expansion;
• The Elfrida Growth node is being included for future urban boundary expansion;
• We object to these draft official plan policies;
• They are not consistent with Provincial approach to take a comprehensive review when an expansion is required;
• Doesn’t provide for fair and reasonable growth options;
• We are not opposed to the urban boundary expansion in the Elfrida area, but need fairness;
• Provided copy of his prepared statement to the Clerk.

Steven Barber representing a group that purchased the Gibson Street School on Barton Street addressed Committee with regard to the matter. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

• With respect to the airport, he supports any policy to expand the airport even though he can hear the airplanes where he lives;
• He is supportive of Hamilton’s efforts to attract business;
• His project involves a brownfield site;
• Requests that staff re evaluate what they put in the Official Plan and adopt what Gary Santucci proposed with respect to encouraging the reuse of existing sites when it is beneficial to the community;
• Support redevelopers and adaptive reuses as usually they cannot absorb the costs;
• Waive fees where appropriate when the community’s needs are met.

Chair Pearson asked if there were further persons who wished to address Committee.

No further speakers came forward.
Chair Pearson thanked staff for the tremendous amount of work which they completed and she then thanked the residents who made submissions and the presenters at all three meetings.

The presentations were received by Committee.

(g) Motions (Item 9)

None.

(h) Notices of Motion (Item 10)

None.

(i) General Information (Item 11)

Tim MacCabe indicated that he will try to provide the staff report summarizing the public meetings to the Committee members by this Friday in order that they can review it over the weekend prior to Monday’s meeting.

Staff responded to various questions posed by the Committee with respect to what the staff report will include, the process of the Plan following Council approval, and the consultation with Aboriginal groups.

(j) Private and Confidential (Item 12)

None

(k) ADJOURNMENT (Item 13)

Councillor Pearson advised that the Public Meetings respecting the new Urban Official Plan had now been completed. She noted that Committee would meet again on June 22, and, if needed, on June 23, 2009, to deliberate on the new Urban Official Plan.

Chair Pearson confirmed that all were welcome to attend the meetings to listen to the discussion, but that there would be no further delegations from the public.

There being no further business, the Economic Development and Planning Committee adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Council – June 29, 2009
SPECIAL OFFICIAL PLAN MEETING OF JUNE 11, 2009 (09-013B):

Present: Chair M. Pearson
Vice Chair Councillor: B. Bratina,
Jackson

Absent with Regrets: Councillors L. Ferguson, B. McHattie,

Staff Present: T. McCabe, General Manager – Planning and Economic Development
P. Mallard, B. Janssen, J. Hickey-Evans, A. Fletcher, K. Maxwell, L.
King – Planning and Economic Development
A. Rawlings, M. Meyer - City Clerk's Office

(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (Item 1)

The Committee Clerk advised that there were no changes to the agenda:

(Clark/Bratina)
The Agenda for the June 11, 2009, meeting of the Economic Development &
Planning Committee was approved, as presented.

(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

(c) APPROVAL OF MINUTES (Item 3)

None.

(d) Proposed Urban Hamilton Official Plan (City Wide) (PED09164) (Item 6.1)

Chair Pearson introduced the subject of the meeting – a special Public Meeting, the
second of three, to consider public input into the new Urban Official Plan. The Chair
outlined the process for the Public Meetings.

Chair Pearson advised the meeting of the following, in accordance with the
provisions of the Planning Act:

a) If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting
or make written submissions to the Council of the City of Hamilton before the
approval authority gives or refuses to give approval to the Official Plan or the

Council – June 29, 2009
Official Plan Amendments the person or public body is not entitled to appeal the decision of the Council of the City of Hamilton to the Ontario Municipal Board.

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

Bill Janssen explained some of the history and background to the new Urban Official Plan;

- The Province is playing a more active role in planning and development
- Protect natural lands, natural and agricultural resources, ensure new jobs, housing,
- Population growth target, employment growth target, development density target, and requirement of 40% new development to be provided by intensification
- Consultation program included public information centres, stakeholder meetings, EDP Committee, individual meetings with owners, posters, mailing lists,
- Consultation with Province and aboriginal groups
- Official Plan aims to provide greater direction on urban design, refocused approach from car-oriented policies to other forms of movement, addressed goods movement and transit,
- Also provides more opportunity for more housing through Intensification

Joanne Hickey Evans provided an overview of the Plan;

- The new Urban Official Plan replaces the existing regional and six area municipal plans
- Provincial directions – the Province has taken a greater role in municipal planning through the Provincial Policy Statement and by strengthening the language of the Planning Act.
- Official plan format:
  Volume 1 consists of the parent plan;
  Volume 2 consists of secondary plans; and
  Volume 3 consists of area and site specific policies
- Goal of the Official Plan is to create complete, compact communities where people can live, shop, work, play and learn.
• Broad Goals of the Plan: to support investment to contribute to the City’s economic base and prosperity, to focus on urban design to make communities attractive and sustainable; establish a transportation system that is integrated with land uses; provide housing for all residents; and to protect and enhance natural heritage and cultural heritage resources.

• Urban Structure Map

• Land use designations: neighbourhoods, commercial/mixed use, employment (Industrial), open Space, utility, and institutional

• Neighbourhoods:
  o Three categories of residential uses: low density residential, medium density residential, and high density residential

• Commercial and Mixed Use:
  o Three Mixed Use Designations: downtown mixed use, mixed use – high density, and mixed use – medium density
  o Two Commercial Designations: district commercial and arterial commercial
  o Pedestrian predominant streets consist buildings close to the property line, ground floor commercial, enhanced pedestrian amenities.

• Employment Areas
  o Four designations: Industrial Land Designation, Business Park Designation, Airport Business Park Designation, and Shipping and Navigation Designation

• Utility

• Institutional

• Open Space

• Land Use Designations Map

• Supporting Policies are a series of policies that apply to development or redevelopment within various land uses. They address: Strong Economy; Urban Design; Residential Intensification; Housing; Community Facilities and Services; Transportation; Infrastructure; Cultural Heritage; Natural Heritage Systems; and Health, Safety and Energy.

• Secondary Plans: What are they and why were they updated

• Area and Site Specific Policies: What are they and why were they updated

• Summary of Issues: Growth Management Issues, Land Use Designations, Supporting Policies, Natural Heritage System, Transportation, Arts and Culture, and Existing Land Processes

• Next Steps: Committee and Council approval; Forward to Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing for Approval; Once both Urban and Rural OPs are final and binding, they will be combined into one document; Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw

There were no questions from the Committee.

The Chair advised that additional communications had been received, as follows:

• John Ariens, IBI Group, respecting Mount Mary Retreat Centre in Ancaster
Susan Rogers, on behalf of 20 Road East landowners
Karl Gonnisen, Metropolitan Consulting Inc., respecting Parkside Hills Inc. and Silverwood Homes

On a Motion Committee received the communications.

Chair Pearson advised that the following persons had registered as Speakers for the meeting and that these people would be heard first, followed by speakers from the floor:
- Mark Ferguson, McMaster Institute for Transportation and Logistics
- Sheri Selway, North End Neighbours

Mark Ferguson, McMaster Institute for Transportation and Logistics (MITL) addressed Committee with regard to the matter, with the assistance of a PowerPoint presentation. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

- A Sustainable Strategy for Developing Hamilton as a Gateway
- Brief Overview of MITL and Gateway Investigation
- A Gateway as an Economic Enabler, and a Key to Holistic Urban Development
- Hamilton’s Considerable Assets: Infrastructure, People, Geographic Location
- Key Benefits of Holistic Gateway Development: Economic, Environmental, Social
- Critical Message
  - The Economic, environmental and social benefits are all achievable
  - One set of benefits is not achieved to the exclusion of the others
- Lessons from Other Gateways
  - Several Gateway Cities were studied worldwide consisting of:
    - Major seaports
    - Inland ports
- The best Gateways in the world: emphasize being uncongested; effective at building consensus and partnerships; good at self-promotion; have developed effective transport-focused organization; embrace containerization
- Creating a Transport-Focused Gateway Organization
- Analysis of Gateway Development Impacts and The Sequence of the Analysis
- 15 Canadian Economic Regions Modelled, 3 of them in Ontario
- Assumed Gateway Employment Growth by Scenario up to 2031
- Hamilton Gateway Induced Spillover GDP Growth by Region (2031)
- In Comparing Sprawl to Compact-LRT Scenarios (2031):
  - Auto commuting levels reduced under Compact-LRT
  - Emission level reductions under Compact-LRT
- Graph showing NOx Emissions by Scenario (in Kg)
- Modal Split of Work Trips (Gateway Compact Scenario)
- Recommendations:
  - Hamilton should strive to be compact with future core-oriented residential development
  - LRT and other public transit should be keenly pursued
- Phased Airport Employment Growth District development but avoid residential in vicinity
- Enhanced containerization and short-term shipping at port
- Formation of transportation-focused Gateway organization
- Sense of urgency required
- Emphasis on nurturing and growing human capital

Councillor Bratina asked whether Mr. Ferguson whether he felt that the Lift bridge should stay up throughout the winter, to enable larger vessels to pass through. Mr. Ferguson agreed that it should.

Sheri Selway, North End Neighbours addressed Committee with regard to the matter, with the assistance of a PowerPoint presentation. Her points included, but were not limited to the following:
- Building a Child and Family Friendly Neighbourhood into Hamilton's New Official Plan
- Who the North End Neighbours are
- Would like a child and family friendly neighbourhood
- Photos of North End Neighbourhood
  - Streets designated as "collector"
  - Noisy speeding traffic destroys lifestyle
  - City impacted by "traffic blight"
- Overview of existing conditions – socio-economic and cultural
  - Variety of housing and incomes
- Data provided for 2006 respecting number of cars per hour and speeds shows too many cars at too high of a speed
  - Cannot survive as family neighbourhood if city views it as a transportation corridor
  - Welcome people to come but not via car

Adam Onufer, North End Neighbours, continued the presentation. His points included, but were not limited to the following:
- Lives near Burlington Street West
- Wants to make community better
- Wants lower traffic levels and reduced speed limits
- Doesn’t want Burlington Street to be a main artery
- Wants deterrents so people do not cut through the North End

Kevin Piper, North End Neighbours, continued the presentation. His points included, but were not limited to the following:
The North End Neighbours presented a brief video showing interviews with various residents. The points raised on the video included, but were not limited to the following:

- It is difficult to get to parks because of major streets - a lot of cars on the road
- Need commuter traffic reduced
- Slower traffic will improve safety
- Children would like to go to local parks but have to cross Burlington street in order to do so – cannot cross the street during rush hour
- Traffic problems include noise; difficulty crossing road to access park, recreation centre, and library; majority of cars and trucks travel at 60 km/hr; very heavy traffic
- The City should make neighbourhoods such as this an attractive place to live – want 30/ km/h speed limit

Stephen Park, North End Neighbours, continued the presentation. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

- September 2002 staff proposed areas of change
- The West Harbour was to change. The switch yard was to be relocated. The North End neighbourhood was left as an area that would not change – but with change occurring all around.
- Setting Sail – a fight to deal with conflict between the “Corridor to the Gore” concept and the concept of a family neighbourhood.
- 2005 staff recommendation to Council was appealed to the OMB
- North End Neighbours was presented with a proposal from a consultant
- Left OMB appeal to try to work to a consensual solution
- Staff identified that traffic concerns were mentioned
- IBI identified key issues
  - Speeding
  - Pedestrian safety
  - Future traffic increases
- North End Neighbours researched and studied all that was available to City Planners and Traffic Engineers
- Study included the designation of the neighbourhood as child friendly, 30km/hr speed limits, changes to make John St two-way, and a couple of street closures.
- Group of volunteers researched, visited other cities, met with neighbours, – the neighbourhood was engaged in the process
• Proposed OP takes us back to 2003 as if none of that work makes any difference
• Streets designated as collectors and minor arterials.
• Standards that should be used to evaluate the Official Plan: to be the best place in Canada to raise child and to engage citizens

Herman Turkstra, North End Neighbours, continued the presentation. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

• The Official Plan has no text that incorporates the vision statement of City of Hamilton respecting “the best place to raise a child”
• North East Neighbours research has shown that traffic forms the nature of communities – e.g., no children in Victorian homes on Main Street because the road has been turned over to cars
• No policies explicitly for children and families
• No provision for monitoring the impact of policies on children
• No effective engagement of the residents at community level
• No community-based development of the OP concepts as in the case of Vision 20/20
• What do the experts say?
  o Experts support a forward looking traffic strategy for the North End as a pilot project that can be tested and then applied to other communities in the City.
  o Hamilton Roundtable for Poverty Reduction, Toronto Hospital for Sick Kids, and Kids on the Move – child-friendly neighbourhoods important
• Kathryn O’Brien advised that the North End is the perfect place to develop child-friendly neighbourhood and implement an across-the-board 30k/h speed limit
• Dan Burden said that should implement friendly neighbourhood and implement an across-the-board 30k/h speed limit
• For every one victim of violence, three are killed in the road. Impact is directly related to speed.
• In US, UK, Netherlands, Germany and Italy, parents are reacting to the stress of high speed vehicles in neighbourhoods

Sheri Selway, North End Neighbours, continued the presentation. Her points included, but were not limited to the following:

• Designate North End as Child and Family Friendly Neighbourhood Pilot Project
• Assign uniform speed limit of 30km/h
• Defer entirely the North End portion of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan Schedule C Functional Road Classification, as it applies to the North End
• Defer the entire West Harbour Secondary Plan
• Hire a mediator and resolve the differences with the community
Jean Michel Patten addressed Committee with regard to the matter. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

- Moved to Hamilton in 1977
- Met North End through boating community and then moved there
- Concerned about increasing amount of traffic and speed of traffic
- Concerned about increasing accidents

Greg Reader addressed Committee with regard to the matter. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

- Chair of the School Council at Bennetto School on John Street North
- John St is an 8.5 metre wide street with two schools, the North Hamilton Health Centre, and a community centre. Used to be two lanes going in one direction with the east lane used for parking, but became a three lane street. The east lane is 2.5 m wide for parking and two other lanes are 3 m wide. The west lane goes right up against sidewalk. The danger factor for that area with high density of children walking is real.
- Airport employment growth district – in section 4.1.2 it says we need 1800 hectares if 50 jobs/h. Do statistics show that we will have that level of population growth and do we need that amount designated for employment growth?

Manfred Rudolph, Rudolph Law, representing the property owner at 70 Garner Rd, addressed Committee with regard to the matter. His points included, but were not limited to the following:

- He wishes to preserve his position with respect to the development potential of remnant land
- Wants appropriate designation of his client’s lands once the expropriation claim has been dealt with
- Lands are in the Airport Employment Growth District
- Should be a future urban growth district – lands should be appropriately designated in future, and objects to policies in the plan that prohibit that.
- Need appropriate definition of woodland in the rural plan

Dr. Tom Nugent addressed Committee with regard to the matter. His/her points included, but were not limited to the following:

- Represents the average taxpayer
- Hamilton used to be the driving engine of the area
- Have to set up atmosphere of transparency and accountability
- Can’t dictate where a person should live
- Twenty Rd E Area stands on its own merits
  - A tremendous cost to local taxpayer for services – new library and YMCA
  - in two years it is to get $19 million of sewers
It is at the hub of transportation corridors
- LRT ridership will be improved if houses are built there.
- Can’t believe the City is looking at intensification in the North End
- Shouldn’t pass Twenty Road area over
- Prime agricultural land is east of there in an area being promoted by Planning and Economic Development Department to be included in the urban growth area
- The process itself is not transparent – In 2006, enough Councillors were concerned that they turned it back to the General Manager of Planning and Economic Development to bring back in fall – no public notification or letter to major stakeholders
- It wouldn’t be difficult for staff to add the Twenty Road East area to the Official Plan for future urban expansion
- Requesting that Council vote unanimously to add Twenty Road East into the plan.

Chair Pearson asked if there were further persons who wished to address Committee.

There were none.

Tim McCabe advised that staff would like to come back to the decision meeting with a report including all of the Committee’s requests and staff’s response. He suggested that Committee give consideration to any specific items in the Plan that they have concerns about, and to pass this information along to staff, for consideration in the final staff report.

Councillor Whitehead advised that there should be a strategy to prioritize secondary plans so that some areas don’t have three secondary plans completed while other areas are told that there are not enough resources. He also asked staff about the monster home issue.

Tim McCabe advised that the issue of monster homes is not in the Official Plan, but he will report back on that. He also advised that he will bring forward a report on secondary plans and their prioritization.

Councillor Mitchell asked whether Twenty Road East can be added to the Official Plan as easily as Dr. Nugent suggested. Tim McCabe advised that he will be reporting back on that on June 22, 2009.

Councillor Clark requested that all of Council be invited to the decision-making meetings.

Councillor Mitchell advised that he and Councillor Ferguson are serving on a community Liaison committee for the Airport Employment Growth District, and that a
resolution may be coming from that Committee that certain areas, such as Glancerster Road, remain residential. Tim McCabe informed Committee that it is not part of this Official Plan.

The presentations were received.

(g) Motions (Item 9)

None.

(h) Notices of Motion (Item 10)

None.

(i) General Information (Item 11)

None.

(j) Private and Confidential (Item 12)

None.

(k) ADJOURNMENT (Item 13)

Councillor Pearson advised that the next public meeting would be held on June 16, 2009 at 12:30 p.m., following the regular Economic Development and Planning Committee meeting.

There being no further business, the Economic Development and Planning Committee adjourned at 8:45 p.m.
SPECIAL OFFICIAL PLAN MEETING OF JUNE 10, 2009 (09-013A):

Present: Chair M. Pearson
Vice Chairs Councillors: B. Bratina, L. Ferguson,
Councillors: B. Clark, B. McHattie, D. Mitchell, R. Pasuta,
C. Collins

Absent with Regrets: Councillors S. Duvall, T. Whitehead

Staff Present: T. McCabe, General Manager – Planning and Economic Development
P. Mallard, T. Sergi, B. Janssen, M. Hazell, J. Hickey-Evans,
B. Khes, C. Plosz
A. Rawlings, Co-ordinator, C. Biggs - City Clerk’s Office

FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL:

(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (Item 1)

The Committee Clerk advised that there were no changes to the agenda:

The agenda for the June 10, 2009, meeting of the Economic Development and Planning Committee was approved, as presented.

(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 2)

There were no declarations of interest.

(c) APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING (Item 3)

None.

(d) Proposed Urban Hamilton Official Plan (City Wide) (PED09164) (Item 6.1)

Chair Pearson introduced the subject of the meeting – a special Public Meeting, the first of three, to consider public input into the new Urban Official Plan. The Chair outlined the process for the Public Meetings.

Chair Pearson advised the meeting of the following, in accordance with the provisions of the Planning Act,

(a) If a person or public body does not make oral submissions at a public meeting or make written submissions to the Council of the City of Hamilton before the approval authority gives or refuses to give approval to the Official Plan or the Official Plan Amendments, the person or public body is
not entitled to appeal the decision of the Council of the City of Hamilton to the Ontario Municipal Board.

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

(e) Staff Presentations respecting the Proposed Hamilton Official Plan (Item 6.1.1)

Tim McCabe provided the following comments in his introductory remarks:

- The start of the process today with the Official Plan should be considered as a real milestone for the City, a Plan that includes the entire Urban Area of the amalgamated City.
- Once the Official Plan is approved, the Regional OPA and the area OPs will be repealed.
- The new OP will shape and focus the new City and is the first step to creating a new and modern zoning by-law to implement policies and urban design; will shape the future physical form of the City; will effectively protect cultural and natural heritage resources.
- Through implementation, will provide certainty and clarity in investment and will eliminate red tape, all toward fulfilling the strategic goal of growing the economy.

Mr. McCabe thanked all staff from the Strategic Planning group under the leadership of Bill Janssen and Joanne Hickey-Evans, and many other staff from various divisions of the Planning and Economic Development Department, as well as other City Departments. The OP is truly a corporate project and corporate document with staff from Housing and Community Services providing their assistance to writing some of the policies.

Mr. McCabe also thanked many members of the public and community groups for their time through consultation sessions. June 2009 was the target set by the Province for the completion of the OP, and that target has been met. The OP is now in the hands of the Committee, and staff is requesting their support.

Bill Janssen stated that the Presentation will outline major elements of the Urban Official Plan and the consultation resulting. Mr. Janssen also acknowledged the contribution of staff and the various departments, stakeholders/agencies, the public-at-large and members of Council who provided input, with the belief that all of the
input has shaped the plan to be a better guide to shape future development of the City.

Mr. Janssen indicated that there will be a series of three public meetings and an overview of the Official Plan will be done at each meeting. Also, he advised that information panels providing additional information are set up in Room 202 for members of the public. Comments provided at the public meetings will be reviewed by staff and a report responding to the issues raised will be presented to the Economic Development and Planning Committee.

Mr. Janssen stated that he is extremely proud of the work done by staff, and that from the input received to date; staff has developed a flexible progressive plan that meets provincial requirements.

Joanne Hickey-Evans presented a power point presentation on the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, which included the following:

- The New Urban Plan replaces the existing seven Official Plans (OP).
- Provincial Directions – Provincial Government sets broad base guidelines for urban growth and development; City’s OP will conform to “Places to Grow” and be consistent with the 2005 Provincial Policy Statement.
- Format of the OP – three volumes: Volume 1 is the Parent Plan, including land use designations and policies, supporting policies and implementation; Volume 2 is Secondary Plans; Volume 3 is area and site specific policies.
- Goal of the OP is to establish compact, complete communities where we can live, shop, work, play and learn.
- Broad goals of the OP to support and promote investment that contributes toward the growth of the City’s economy and prosperity; establish and implement urban design principles to make neighbourhoods and business areas ore attractive, lively and safe; establish an integrated transportation network that connects an supports various uses of land; require a variety of housing types and tenure for the City’s residents; promote residential intensification in appropriate locations to support public transit, community facilities and shopping areas, but is sensitive to existing neighbourhoods; achieve a healthy ecosystem through the protection and enhancement of natural areas; conserve cultural heritage resources.
- Urban structure map.
- Land use designations – Neighbourhoods, Commercial and Mixed Use, Employment (Industrial); Open Space; Utility; Institutional.
- Supporting Policies – to provide policy direction on matters that affect how land uses are developed or redeveloped.
- Strong Economy – a strong economic base not only provides jobs, but stimulates demand for housing and population growth.
- Urban design – Policies that direct and promote design that impacts the public realm.
- Residential Intensification – what is it and where, implementation, design criteria.
- Housing – promotes a mix and full range of physical housing types, as well as a full range of tenures (i.e., rent/own), supports and affordability.
- Community facilities and services, including community and recreation centres, arenas, parks, health care and social service facilities, day care and seniors’ centres, emergency medical, fire and police services, cultural facilities, places of worship, museums, schools, universities and colleges, libraries.
- Transportation – addresses different modes of transportation (transit, walking, cycling, cars, rail, truck, port, and airport) and the integration with land uses.
- Infrastructure – policies for providing necessary services, including water/waste water, storm water and waste management.
- Cultural Heritage – conservation of cultural heritage resources (A, B and C’s): archaeology, built heritage, cultural heritage landscapes.
- Natural Heritage System – protect and restore natural heritage features i.e., wetlands, woodlands, streams, valleys, meadows and natural functions as a permanent environmental resource.
- Health, safety and energy – includes policies on contaminated sites, noise, vibration and other emission, air quality and climate change, hazard lands and energy.
- Secondary Plans and Area and Site Specific Policies – what are they and why were they updated.
- Summary of issues – growth management issues; land use designations; supporting policies; existing official plan processes.
- Next steps.

The Committee was advised that maps included in the presentation are as accurate as possible, based on the information available to date. Also, individual development applications have not been included in the OP. With respect to outstanding OMB appeals, some areas of the OP have been deferred until such time as those issues have been resolved.

Following the presentation, the Committee was given the opportunity to ask questions.

Councillor McHattie congratulated the Planning Department on the completion of the draft OP and advised that the stakeholders and Province are generally very supportive of the document. He commented that he is particularly supportive with respect to the design aspects and the cultural heritage policies; the Arts section is innovative and is very responsive to the arts sector in Hamilton; extended thanks to Al Fletcher et al and hope to move quickly on ideas such as the CIP.

Councillor McHattie asked if there is a Secondary Plan for the Burlington Street area, being the older industrial area. Staff responded that there was not at this time.
Asked if there is any intent, given some of the changes that are and/or may be occurring in that area, staff responded that this is not in the work plan.

Councillor McHattie referred to a piece of correspondence from Mr. Campbell respecting the Dundurn area and his request for media mixed use, and asked that it be noted, and that he will discuss with staff further off-line.

Councillor Collins indicated that during consultation with staff, he enquired with respect to the status of east port and its designation, and whether it should be a navigation destination as it relates with land use in shipping and navigation around the harbour i.e., current use versus future use and whether or not to look at introducing office buildings and some other commercial operations within those districts. Staff responded that the history of shipping and navigation designation dates back to the 1908’s at which time there was an agreement between the City and the Port authority. Given the significant amount of issues in the agreement, it was decided not to change that designation and that plan. The Port Authority has been circulated with the draft OP; however, comments have not yet been received for that area. Staff indicated that they are having on-going discussions with the Port Authority, and will report back to the June 22/23 meeting of the Committee with respect to additional new uses for the east port area.

Councillor Collins asked if there was an opportunity to take a portion of those lands that are brownfield/vacant along Burlington Street and look to creating a business park like atmosphere in the lower City. Staff responded that the industrial designation along Burlington Street came about as a result of the historic function of it being a heavier industrial area. If the City chooses to go down that route, work will be required to study what kind of policies should be put in place and what the actual area is in trying to provide different areas for differing uses. This will be a future step which is bigger than what is in the plan today; however, this does not preclude from changing the designation in the future.

Councillor Mitchell congratulated all staff for their work on the OP. He asked in terms of the numbers of people that attended at the public meetings. Staff responded that the number totaled approximately 1,000.

Councillor Mitchell expressed concern with respect to combining the rural and urban plans and requested clarification. Staff responded that many of the sections in implementation are replicated in both plans e.g., certain policies apply city wide rural roads vs. urban roads. These would be shown separately.

Councillor Mitchell also expressed concern with respect to the SCUBE programs and how are they incorporated. Staff responded that in terms of secondary plans, they will be incorporated as amendments to the OP; however, in terms of which plan would be chosen, the answer is not yet known. From “Places to Grow” document, there is a minimum requirement of 50 persons and jobs per hectare; in some areas where the density is lower, the density has to be made up to the entire number reaches 50.
Councillor Mitchell questioned why the Province is sending comments on individual applications when it has no say. Staff responded that overall, the Province is very supportive of the OP; however, they have expressed concern with respect to the employment conversion study. Staff will stand by Council’s decision with respect to the conversion study.

Councillor Mitchell also expressed concern respecting development in Binbrook and the fact that it is a town in the middle of the Green Belt. He indicated that the same density numbers should not be used as there is no urban transit, no major employment in town, and concerned why there could not be site specific plans. Staff responded that the Binbrook secondary plan is incorporated in Volume 2 of the OP and is likely lower than the density targets set by the Province. Densities will be made up in other areas to meet the target across the Green Belt.

With respect to nodes and corridors, Councillor Mitchell advised that he has received a request from the community to have a node in the Mount Hope area or Ryckman’s Corners as there is no node connecting the downtown to the airport. Staff responded that this issue has been addressed in the staff report.

Councillor Clark thanked all staff for their efforts in compiling the OP, being a very complex and comprehensive process. He expressed concern respecting the Eramosa Karst and is not thrilled that the feeder area is not being preserved. Although he has been arguing that there should be no development on that property, meetings with staff and the Conservation Authority have clarified that a defensible position is required despite the desire to preserve.

Councillor Clark requested clarification in terms of process following Council’s approval of the OP. Tim McCabe responded that the OP will be sent to the Ministry who then has their own circulation process. Comments will be sent back to the Minister, who will then issue his decision, which may include changes and modifications. Should this occur, a report will come back to Council advising accordingly and seeking direction.

With respect to timelines, Mr. McCabe indicated that he is waiting to hear back on this issue.

(f) Public delegations respecting the proposed Hamilton Official Plan (Item 6.1.2)

The written submissions received from the following, were received:

(aa) Robert Taylor, Assistant Deputy Minister, Municipal Services Division, Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and Brad Graham, Assistant Deputy Minister, Ontario Growth Secretariat, Ministry of Energy and Infrastructure
Chair Pearson advised that the following persons had registered as Speakers for the meeting and that these people would be heard first, followed by speakers from the floor.

- CHAMBER OF COMMERCE-RUTH LEIBERSBACH
- HHHBA-DOUG DUKE
- LARRY KELLY, DAN CAMPBELL, HESTOR ST
- KATHLEEN SMITH, 158 HESTOR
- NICK KOPELAAR
- TED VERHEY

(i) Richard Koroscil, President-Elect, on behalf of the Hamilton Chamber of Commerce

Mr. Koroscil addressed the Committee with regard to the matter. His points included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Thanked staff for all of their effort put into this project and advised that staff have gone out of their way to make themselves available to respond to questions and provide clarification.
- Indicated that the Chamber submitted written comments in April and acknowledged that staff has made changes based on those recommendations and comments
Based on the staff presentation, one of the objectives should be to add more flexibility to the plan to help achieve its goals and objectives.

The Chamber supports the overall direction of the OP as outlined.

With respect to Direction 5, Mr. Koroscil suggested that the wording be changed to “retain and attract jobs in ALL areas”, as the current wording could be interpreted as too exclusive.

The City must convince investors that investing in Hamilton is preferable to any of the surrounding communities in the GTA or national/international communities. Also suggested that Section B.3.1.5 be amended to recognize brownfields.

On behalf of the Chamber and its 2100 members, Mr. Koroscil thanked the City and staff for the opportunity to actively participate in the OP process.

Asked if the Chamber would be interested in designating office space on Eastport Drive, Mr. Koroscil responded that it would depend on the use, preferably a use which would be related to the Port.

A copy of Mr. Koroscil’s comments was submitted to the Committee Clerk for the public record.

(ii) Steve Spicer, President of the Hamilton Halton Homebuilders Association

Mr. Spicer addressed the Committee with regard to the matter. His points included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Mr. Spicer commented that the Official Plan is extremely large and very complex, and there was a concerted effort on behalf of the HHHBA’s member companies and volunteers to digest and discuss the plan, make comments and reports and meet with staff to address and resolve most issues.

- However, there are two outstanding issues. The first one is green sprawl, which is the issue of lands which are marginally significant to the environment i.e., farm swales and roadside ditches, which significantly reduce densities and increase servicing costs to accommodate growth.

- The second concern is the competing and conflicting policies of the plan; unclear how these conflicts between policies can be resolved.

A copy of Mr. Spicer’s comments was submitted to the Committee Clerk for the public record.

(ii) Dan Campbell, Day and Campbell
Mr. Campbell addressed the Committee with regard to the matter. His points included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Expressed concerns a year ago with regard to specific on the OP
- Gave credit to staff for the tremendous undertaking; however, still feel that the OP as proposed has error in it
- Had been reassured by staff that he could meet with staff and problems would be resolved and concerns alleviated; however, it has taken 11 months for meeting to take place
- Have more concerns now than prior to that meeting; 11th hour and really have had not much time to speak to staff with concerns, nor have any concerns been alleviated;
- Specific concern is on the Hester/Upper Wellington lands and more specifically, area known as 1050 to 1090 Upper Wellington; have been assured by staff that if proposed master plan goes through, will have more options for property than very before
- Find this to be incredulous as it makes specific mention of the addresses of Day and Campbell, Turkstra Lumber and Kelly Auto Services; holding provision placed on these businesses
- Do not understand why these 3 businesses are the only ones earmarked for these conditions; ruins entire real estate value of properties; words and provisions supersede master plan; conditions on properties superseded by statements
- Find it extremely unreasonable to place conditions on properties and not dealt with in the same manner as other industrial areas; have not had much time to express concerns and come to some resolve with staff
- Would respectfully ask Council members to not accept the official plan as proposed or to have the specific area of 1050 to 1090 either deferred or deleted from master plan until such time as more input can be provided
- Would like to meet with councillors prior to voting on the official plan; have lost control of their property; provision is devastating; no opportunity for expansion

A copy of Mr. Campbell’s comments was submitted to the Committee Clerk for the public record.

(iii) Larry Kelly, Kelly Auto Services

Mr. Kelly addressed the Committee with regard to the matter. His points included, but were not limited to, the following:

Council – June 29, 2009
• His business is in the vicinity of 1090 Upper Wellington
• Takes away from value of properties, which is of great concern
• Would like some answers in terms of what can be done; does not want OP to go through in its present state
• Feels that their fate is in someone else’s hands

The following registered speakers were not in attendance to address the Committee:

Kathleen Smith, 158 Hester
Nick Kopelaar
Ted Verhey

Chair Pearson requested if there was anyone else present wishing to address the Committee respecting the Official Plan.

The following addressed the Committee:

(iii) Manfred Rudolph, on behalf of Mr. Pickles, a property owner on Mountsberg Road

Mr. Rudolph addressed the Committee with regard to the matter. His points included, but were not limited to, the following:

• Speaking on behalf of the a property owner on Mountsberg Road and have appeal submitted; solution to Mr. Pickles’ problem is macro change
• Have not had opportunity to speak with staff to resolve issue
• Heritage listed property that exists on large rural holding in Flamborough; however, the home, which is an 1820’s building, does not fit the economic value of the lot; situation has resulted in pressure for the owner to demolish a heritage resource and construct a home fitting of the economic area
• Have a number of people across the city with wood lot properties; question is to understand what the plan is saying in Section 17 on Pg. 22 – forest cover – what is definition of planning unit.
• Will provide staff with a list of clients with wood lots

Staff responded that planning unit is a way of breaking up forest cover within the City as some areas have a greater percentage of forest cover than others; broken down by urban and rural; also separated according to watersheds and calculation of percent forest cover for those areas.
Dr. Tom Nugent addressed the Committee with regard to the matter. His points included, but were not limited to, the following:

- Represents the average taxpayer
- Hamilton used to be the driving engine of the area, now seen as a poor place to have a business
- Have to set up atmosphere of transparency and accountability
- Twenty Rd E Area stands on its own merits, but was omitted from GRIDS
  - A tremendous cost to local taxpayer for services – new library and YMCA
  - In two years it is to get $19 million of sewers
  - It is at the hub of transportation corridors
- LRT ridership will be improved if houses are built there.
- Can't believe the City is looking at intensification in the North End
- Shouldn't pass Twenty Road area over
- The GRIDS process itself was not transparent – In 2006, enough Councillors were concerned that they turned it back to the General Manager of Planning and Economic Development to bring back in fall – but no public notification or letter to major stakeholders
- Twenty Road East area should be added to the Official Plan for future urban expansion.

Chair Pearson asked if there were further persons who wished to address Committee. There were none.

On a Motion, (Mitchell/Bratina) the presentations were received.

(g) Motions (Item 9)

None.

(h) Notices of Motion (Item 10)

None.

(i) General Information (Item 11)

None.

(j) Private and Confidential (Item 12)

None.

(k) ADJOURNMENT (Item 13)
Chair Pearson confirmed that the next Public Meeting for the new Urban Official Plan will take place on Thursday, June 11, 2009, at 6.00pm.

There being no further business, the Economic Development and Planning Committee adjourned at 11:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maria Pearson, Chair
Economic Development and Planning Committee

Alexandra Rawlings, Co-ordinator
Economic Development and Planning Committee

June 22, 2009