THE GENERAL ISSUES COMMITTEE PRESENTS REPORT 12-029 AND RESPECTFULLY RECOMMENDS:

1. Declaration of Surplus and Sale of Vacant Land at 110 Woodview Crescent, Ancaster, to Rhona Harvey and Janet Kennelly (PED12186) (Ward 12) (Item 5.2)

   (a) That the land municipally known as 110 Woodview Crescent, legally described as Part Lot 62, Plan 1076, and designated as Part 1 on Plan 62R-1632, comprising an area of 344 square metres (3,702 square feet) on the south limit of Woodview Crescent, Ancaster, identified as PIN 17424-0062(LT) and Roll No. 251814023014650, as shown on Appendix “A” attached to Report PED12186, be declared surplus to the requirements of the City of Hamilton in accordance with the “Procedural By-law for the Sale of Land”, being By-law No. 04-299;

   (b) That an Offer to Purchase executed on August 20, 2012, by Rhona Harvey and Janet Kennelly, being the adjoining property owners at 118 Fallingbrook Drive, scheduled to close on December 12, 2012, be approved and completed, subject to the conditions described in recommendation (e) and that the sale proceeds of $10,000 be credited to Account No. 47702-3560150200 (Property Purchases and Sales);
(c) That the deposit cheque in the amount of $1,000, being the required 10% of the purchase price, be held by the General Manager of Finance and Corporate Services, pending acceptance of this transaction;

(d) That the sale price of $10,000 does not include the Harmonized Sales Tax (HST); should the HST be applicable and collected by the City, that the HST amount be credited to Account No. 22828 009000 (HST Payable);

(e) That the following conditions be included in the Offer to Purchase of 110 Woodview Crescent;

(i) The Purchaser acknowledges and agrees that the lands being sold pursuant to this Offer shall be registered in the same name and title of the current land holdings municipally known as 118 Fallingbrook Drive, Ancaster, Roll No. 251814023014600, Property Identification Number (PIN) 17424-0061 (LT);

(f) That the City Clerk be authorized and directed to execute and issue a Certificate of Compliance for this transaction in the form prescribed pursuant to Section 268 of the Municipal Act, incorporating the following, if required:

(i) That the subject lands be declared surplus by inclusion in Report PED12186 to Council;

(ii) An internal appraisal of the fair market value of the real property intended to be sold was completed on March 27, 2012; and,

(iii) That, in accordance with the approved methods of giving Notice to the Public in the Real Property Sales Procedural By-law No. 04-299, Section 12(a) (6), sufficient notice to the public is given by way of Report PED12186 to City Council.

2. Infrastructure Ontario (IO) Surplus Land – Projects 8232 and 82133, 191-193 Mill Street South, Part Blocks 29 and 35, Plan 355 and Parts 4, 5, 8, 9, 10 and 18, Plan 62R-18447, former Town of Waterdown, now City of Hamilton (PED12187) (Ward 15) (Item 5.3)

(a) That the Real Estate Section of the Economic Development Division of the Planning and Economic Development Department be authorized and directed to advise Infrastructure Ontario that the City of Hamilton has no interest in acquiring their land located at 191-193 Mill Street South, in the former Town of Waterdown, now City of Hamilton, as shown on Appendix “A”, attached to Report PED12187;
(b) That the Real Estate Section of the Economic Development Division of the Planning and Economic Development Department be authorized and directed to advise Infrastructure Ontario of the City of Hamilton's requirements to the development of the site as identified in Appendix "B", attached to Report PED12187.

3. Infrastructure Ontario (IO) Surplus Land – Project 8134, 8 Renwood Place, Part Blocks 28 and 29, Plan 355 and Part 11, Plan 62R-18447, former Town of Waterdown, now City of Hamilton (PED12188) (Ward 15) (Item 5.4)

(a) That the Real Estate Section of the Economic Development Division of the Planning and Economic Development Department be authorized and directed to advise Infrastructure Ontario that the City of Hamilton has no interest in acquiring their land located at 8 Renwood Place, in the former Town of Waterdown, now City of Hamilton, as shown on Appendix “A”, attached to Report PED12188;

(b) That the Real Estate Section of the Economic Development Division of the Planning and Economic Development Department be authorized and directed to advise Infrastructure Ontario of the City of Hamilton’s requirements to the development of the site as identified in Appendix "B", attached to Report PED12188.

4. Extension of ERASE Redevelopment Grant Agreement (ERG-07-02) with Clappison Five Six Properties Inc. (John Krpan), 30-42 Dundas Street east, Flamborough (PED12191) (Ward 15) (Item 5.5)

That the ERASE Redevelopment Grant Agreement between the City of Hamilton and Clappison Five Six Properties Inc. (John Krpan) for the redevelopment of the property at 30-42 Dundas Street East, Flamborough, ON, approved by Council on September 26, 2007, in approving Item 3 of Economic Development and Planning Committee Report 07-016, be amended by extending the commencement of construction for an additional three (3) years, ending September 18, 2015.

5. Hamilton Downtown Property Improvement Grant Program – 162 Ferguson Avenue North – HDPIGP 12/07 (PED12195) (Ward 2) (Item 5.6)

(a) That a grant in the estimated amount of $68,032.21 under the Hamilton Downtown Property Improvement Grant Program (HDPIGP) for Costa’s Wine Country Inc. (Joe and Erika Costa), owner of the property at 162 Ferguson Avenue North, be authorized and approved in accordance with the terms and conditions of the Program;
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(b) That the Mayor and City Clerk be authorized and directed to execute the Grant Agreement attached as Appendix “A” to Report PED12195, in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor.

6. City Re-purchase of 1020 Beach Boulevard, Hamilton, from Kerrin Ann Simon (PED12192) (Ward 5) (Item 5.7)

(a) That the City Solicitor be authorized and directed to re-purchase 1020 Beach Boulevard, described as Parts 7 and 8 on Plan 62R-15481, subject to an easement over Parts 2, 4, 6, 8, and 10, as in Instrument Number HL109625, being all of PIN 17568-0142(LT), as shown on Appendix “A” attached to Report PED12192, pursuant to the restrictive covenants contained in the conveyance to Kerrin Ann Simon registered as Instrument No. VM255639;

(b) That, as a condition of the re-purchase, the City Solicitor be directed to deduct all outstanding municipal property taxes and local improvement charges from the purchase price;

(c) That the re-purchase price of $32,625 for the lands be charged to Account No. 59259-3561250201 (Beach Properties Sales and Maintenance). The funding for this purchase is to be transferred from the Beach Park Development Reserve No. 108037;

(d) That the Mayor and the City Clerk be authorized and directed to execute the necessary documents in a form satisfactory to the City Solicitor.

7. Enbridge Pipelines Incorporated – Line 9 Reversal Project (PED12160/LS12022) (Item 6.2(b))

That Report PED12160/LS1202 respecting Enbridge Pipelines Incorporated – Line 9 Reversal Project, be received.

8. Proposed Use Concept Plan – Auchmar Estates (PED12193) (Ward 8) (Outstanding Business Item) (Item 6.3(b))

That the Proposed Use Concept Profile for the Auchmar Estate, attached hereto as Appendix “A” to Report PED12193, be received.
9. **Tax and Rate Operating Budget Variance Report to July 31, 2012 (FCS12079) (City Wide) (Item 8.1)**

(a) That FCS12079 “Tax and Rate Operating Budget Variance Report to July 31, 2012”, be received for information;

(b) That, in accordance with the “Budget Control Policy”, the 2012 budget restatements, transferring budget from one cost category to another with no impact on the levy, as outlined in Appendix “C” to Report FCS12079, be approved.

10. **Task Force on Cleanliness and Security in the Downtown Core Report 12-002 – September 27, 2012 (Item 8.2)**

(a) **August 2012 Walkabout (Item 5.1)**

That staff be directed to investigate how other municipalities enforce littering, both in general and in specific to cigarette butts, and report back to the Task Force on Cleanliness and Security in the Downtown Core with options for increased enforcement in these areas.

(b) **2013 Budget Discussion (Added Item 5.5)**

That a representative of the Hamilton Police Service be invited to attend an upcoming Task Force meeting to provide details on their 2013 work plan for the Downtown area.

11. **Gaming Facility Proposal Sub-Committee Report 12-001 – October 9, 2012 (Added Item 8.3)**

(a) **Appointment of Chair and Vice Chair**

(i) That Mayor R. Bratina be appointed Chair of the Gaming Facility Proposal Sub-Committee;

(ii) That Councillor R. Pasuta be appointed Vice Chair of the Gaming Facility Proposal Sub-Committee.
(b) Methods of Obtaining Public Input regarding potential Gaming Facility in the City of Hamilton (FCS12086)

That Option 2 – Telephone Poll by a Pollster, as outlined in Report FCS12086 attached hereto as Appendix “B”, be approved as the method to obtain public input regarding a potential gaming facility in the City of Hamilton, accompanied by an educational component prior to polling through forums, town hall meetings, etc.

(c) Terms of Reference

That the Terms of Reference for the Gaming Facility Proposal Sub-Committee, as amended, attached hereto as Appendix “C”, be approved.

12. Representation on the Hamilton Chamber of Commerce Light Rail Transit Task Force (Item 9.1)

Whereas, the City of Hamilton has committed substantial staffing and financial resources in the preparation of a Light Rail Transit (LRT) Plan, to be completed and ready for submission to Metrolinx by late December 2012/January 2013, and;

Whereas, the next step for Metrolinx is that they are legislated to report back to the Province by June, 2013 with an Investment Strategy to support the implementation of the Big Move transportation plan; and,

Whereas, Hamilton City Council is on record as desiring 100% capital funding from the Province of Ontario for LRT, and;

Whereas, notwithstanding City Council’s funding position, Metrolinx has asked GTAH municipalities to participate with them in consideration of alternative funding mechanisms to build LRT (i.e., Tax Incentive Financing, Development Charges, Tolls, etc.); and,

Whereas, on October 13, 2011, John Howe, Vice President, Investment Strategy and Project Evaluation, at Metrolinx stated to Council that the (LRT) project “has such potential and prospect” and that Metrolinx is very “bullish” on Hamilton, yet the City has not yet been aggressive on a government relations project to secure LRT funding for Hamilton, and;

Whereas, the Chamber of Commerce has an LRT Task Force which includes all of the relevant Hamilton partners, including McMaster University, Hamilton and Halton Homebuilders Association, Hamilton Realtors’ Association and others.
Therefore be it resolved:

(a) That the City of Hamilton join the Chamber of Commerce Light Rail Transit (LRT) Task Force and jointly implement a government relations project to encourage Senior levels of Government (Provincial and Federal) to fund LRT in Hamilton,

(b) That the Mayor, or his designate, and Councillors J. Farr, L. Ferguson and B. Mcchattie, represent the City of Hamilton on the Chamber of Commerce’s LRT Task Force, supported by the City Manager;

(c) That the LRT Task Force report back to the General Issues Committee on deliberations of the Chamber Task Force and the results of the government relations project on a regular basis;


Whereas, the Annual Boxing Day 10-Mile race has been running for 91 years in Hamilton, and;

Whereas, the Hamilton Harriers Running/Walking Club, comprised of volunteers, does a great job of organizing the race, and;

Whereas, City staff have recently indicated that the Race is causing undue wait times for vehicles at Longwood Road and Main Street, and;

Whereas, a change in the routing may cost up to $5,000 more, monies which are not budgeted for in 2012, and;

Whereas, monies not spent on running the race are donated to the YMCA’s Strong Kids Program, with $5,000 being donated from the proceeds of the 2011 Race, and;

Whereas, there is insufficient time to change the routing for the December 26, 2012 race.

Therefore Be It Resolved:

(a) That the City endorse the existing race route for 2012, assisting via the regular SEAT application process;

(b) That meetings occur to discuss possible changes or options for the race route for the 2013 event
(c) That due to the need to mitigate transit service issues associated with maintaining the existing race route, that the unforeseen costs in the amount of $1,455.30 be approved and funded as follows:

(i) Firstly, from the Corporate budget surplus;
(ii) Secondly, from the Tax Stabilization Reserve.

14. Collective Bargaining Agreement between the City of Hamilton (Macassa and Wentworth Lodges) and the Ontario Nurses Association (Item 12.3)

That the Collective Agreement between the City of Hamilton (Macassa and Wentworth Lodges) and the Ontario Nurses’ Association (ONA) covering the term April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2015, be ratified.

FOR THE INFORMATION OF COUNCIL:

CEREMONIAL PRESENTATION

Business Appreciation Awards – Wards 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 11, 13 and 15

The Annual Business Appreciation Award Program, approved by City Council in March, 2012, officially acknowledges the commitment and contribution of both a small and large business in each of the City’s fifteen Wards. Businesses in eight of the City’s Wards were recognized today, and again in May, businesses in the remaining seven Wards will be recognized.

Each business received a Certificate of Appreciation from the City of Hamilton, signed by Mayor Bratina and the respective Ward Councillor. In addition, the company profiles will be posted on the City’s “Invest in Hamilton” website and the recipients’ photos will be published in The Spectator.

The following businesses were recognized:

Ward 1
- Large Business – Kraft/Cadbury
- Small Business – Sopers

Ward 2
- Large Business – Bank of Nova Scotia
- Small Business – Marchese Health Care
Ward 5
- Large Business – Red Hill Toyota
- Small Business – Hutch’s

Ward 6
- Large Business – Carstar
- Small Business – Gramma Willies

Ward 7
- Large Business – Lime Ridge Mall/Cadillac Fairview
  - Small Business – Peter Martin Appliances

Ward 11
- Large Business – Highland Packers
- Small Business – Harvey Armstrong Ltd.

Ward 13
- Large Business – El-Met Parts
- Small Business – The Keeping Room

Ward 15
- Large Business – Liburdi Engineering
- Small Business – Dyment Farms

(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (Item 1)

The Committee Clerk advised of the following changes to the agenda:

ADDED DELEGATION REQUESTS

(i) Don McLean respecting Enbridge Pipelines (Added Item 4.3)

(ii) Lynda Lukasik, Environment Hamilton, respecting Enbridge Pipelines (Added Item 4.4)

CORRESPONDENCE

(iii) Correspondence from Michael Fischer, President, Hamilton Naturalists’ Club, respecting Enbridge Inc. Pipeline Flow Reversal Project (Added Item 6.2(c))

(iv) Correspondence from C. Grant Head respecting Auchmar Estate (Added Item 6.3(c))
(v) Correspondence from John Kajaste respecting Auchmar Estate (Added Item 6.3(d))

ADDED DELEGATION

(vi) Robin McKee respecting Auchmar Estate (Added Item 6.3(a)(v)

ADDED DISCUSSION REPORT

(vii) Gaming Facility Proposal Sub-Committee Report 12-001 – October 9, 2012 (Added Item 8.3)

MOTION

(viii) REVISED Motion respecting Representation on the Hamilton Chamber of Commerce Light Rail Transit Task Force (Item 9.1)

NOTICE OF MOTION

(ix) REVISED Notice of Motion respecting Boxing Day 10-Mile Race – December 26, 2012

The agenda was approved, as amended.

(b) DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (Item 2)

None.

(c) APPROVAL OF PREVIOUS MINUTES

The September 24, 25 and 28 and October 3, 2012 Minutes of the General Issues Committee meetings were approved, as presented.

(d) DELEGATION REQUESTS

(i) On a motion, the delegation request from Russell A. Perry, Commodore, Royal Hamilton Yacht Club, respecting the agreement between the City of Hamilton and the Hamilton Port Authority, was approved.

(ii) On a motion, the delegation request from Lou Castellani, Municipal Property Assessment Corporation (MPAC), to provide an overview of what MPAC is about, together with some local statics, was approved.

(iii) On a motion, the delegation requests from Don McLean and Lynda Lukasik were approved, and that the Rules of Order were suspended in order to allow their deputations to be provided at today’s meeting.
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(e) CONSENT ITEMS

(i) Minutes of Various Sub-Committees (for information purposes only):

On a motion, the following Minutes were received:

(aa) Hamilton Association of Business Improvement Areas (H.A.B.I.A.) – July 10, 2012 (Item 5.1.1)

(f) PUBLIC DELEGATIONS

(i) Ryan Moran, Hamilton HIVE – Hamilton Chamber of Commerce, to provide an update on the activities and progress of the Hamilton HIVE (Item 6.1)

Ryan Moran of Hamilton HIVE, appeared before the Committee to provide information on what HIVE has done to date and to speak about the upcoming HIVE X Conference. Mr. Moran indicated that he would like to come back before the Committee to present the results from HIVE X 2012.

A copy of the power point presentation was submitted to the Clerk for the public record and is available for viewing on the City of Hamilton website.

On a motion, the presentation from Ryan Moran, Hamilton HIVE – Hamilton Chamber of Commerce providing an update on the activities and progress of the Hamilton HIVE, was received.

(ii) Enbridge Pipelines Inc. Flow Reversal Project (Item 6.2(a))

(aa) John McGreal

Mr. McGreal appeared before the Committee to express his concerns with respect to Enbridge’s flow reversal project and indicated that the City should be asking the same four questions which he had submitted to Enbridge. Mr. McGreal also made reference to the oil spill on Fletcher Road several years ago.

(bb) Wes Elliott and Ruby Montour, Houdenosaunee

This delegation was not in attendance.
(cc) Ken Stone, Hamilton 350 Committee/Environment Hamilton

Mr. Stone advised that although he is a member of the organizations indicated, he is here to address the Committee today on his own behalf. Mr. Stone appeared before the Committee to express his concerns with respect to the Enbridge flow reversal project.

A copy of Mr. Stone’s comments are attached hereto as Appendix “D” for the public record.

(dd) Janet Chafe, HEAT

Ms. Chafe appeared before the Committee to express concerns with respect to the Enbridge flow reversal project. In the contents of her presentation, Ms. Chafe stated that the City demand a $5 million bond from Enbridge in the event that there is a problem with the pipeline. She indicated that Council is paid to represent the people of the City.

(ee) Maggie Hughes

Ms. Hughes showed a video showing the extent of damage from an oil pipeline break in Battlecreek Michigan, and the continuing effects on the community and the environment.

Ms. Hughes also addressed the Committee to express concerns respecting the Enbridge flow reversal project. A copy of Ms. Hughes comments are attached hereto as Appendix “E” for the public record.

(ff) Danielle Boisseau

This delegation was not in attendance.

(gg) Elysia Petrone

Ms. Petrone appeared before the Committee to respecting the Enbridge flow reversal project and expressed her disappointment with the staff report. She questioned the absence of Enbridge from the meeting and spoke to the detrimental effects of the pipeline on the environment.
(hh) Diane Fields

Ms. Fields appeared before the Committee to express concerns with respect to the Enbridge flow reversal project and the health implications of a spill, effect on climate change, risk of a leak and the detrimental effects on the environment.

(ii) Don McLean

Mr. McLean provided a power point presentation to the Committee and stated that when addressing the question of the tarsands coming through the community, the dangers that could be faced by the community as a result of climate change and what it is doing on a global scale. A copy of the presentation is attached hereto as Appendix “F” for the public record.

(jj) Lynda Lukasik, Environment Hamilton

Ms. Lukasik appeared before the Committee to express concerns with respect to the Enbridge flow reversal project. She urged the Committee to think about what they can do to represent the concerns expressed by the speakers today, and to monitor the Environmental Bill of Rights Registry for timelines to send in concerns to the Ministry of the Environment.

On a motion:

(aa) The delegations who addressed the Committee respecting Enbridge Pipelines Inc. were received.

(bb) The written submissions from Michael Fischer, President, Hamilton Naturalists’ Club, respecting Enbridge Inc. Pipeline Flow Reversal Project, were received.

(iii) Enbridge Pipelines Incorporated – Line 9 Reversal Project (PED12160/ LS12022) (Item 6.2(b))

Guy Paparella, Director of Growth Planning, and Lia Magi, Solicitor, Commercial/Development Policy Section, were in attendance to respond to questions of the Committee. Mr. Paparella advised that the City does not have a lot of expertise in this area within the City and therefore, it is difficult to raise concerns with respect to what the controls the City has as a municipality.

Chief Simonds responded to questions of the Committee with respect to emergency preparedness and compliance in the event of an emergency situation relative to Enbridge.
(iv) Auchmar Estate (Item 6.3(a))

(aa) Fred Napoli

Mr. Napoli appeared before the Committee respecting Auchmar Estate and requested that the Committee consider giving a non-profit corporation, The Friends of Auchmar, the property for $1.

(bb) Bill King

Mr. King appeared before the Committee respecting Auchmar Estate and indicated the importance that Auchmar be given a use, either through the City or private sector. Auchmar has environmental amenities, interesting historical features and has historical interest. Auchmar should be looked at as an opportunity to add to the cultural amenity of the City.

(cc) Dr. Diane Gower Dent, “Friends of Auchmar”

Dr. Diane Gower Dent, Chair, appeared before the Committee on behalf of Friends of Auchmar. A copy of Dr. Dent’s comments are attached hereto as Appendix “G” for the public record.

(dd) Brock Browett

Mr. Browett appeared before the Committee respecting Auchmar Estates and presented a proposal for its future which included a joint venture with Mohawk and McMaster students to take part in the restoration of the building and grounds of Auchmar.

A copy of Mr. Browett’s proposal is attached hereto as Appendix “H” for the public record.

(ee) Robin McKee

Mr. McKee appeared before the Committee respecting Auchmar Estate and noted that Auchmar is the only historical venue on Hamilton Mountain that should be preserved. If Auchmar is not restored and put to good use, it will be lost.

On a motion:

(aa) The delegations who appeared before the Committee respecting Auchmar Estate, were received;

(b) The written submissions from C. Grant Head and John Kajaste respecting Auchmar Estate, were received.
(v) Proposed Use Concept Plan – Auchmar Estates (PED12193) (Ward 8) (Outstanding Business Item) (Item 6.3(b))

On a motion, staff was provided with the following direction:

(aa) That staff be directed to proceed with the development of a comprehensive operational plan, based on the Proposed Use Concept Profile for the Auchmar Estate, attached as Appendix A to Report PED12193, in consultation with community and other stakeholder groups and report back to the General Issues Committee;

(bb) That in addition to completion of the operational plan referred to in sub-section (b), that staff be directed to issue an Expression of Interest (EOI) for the potential private use and/or sale of the Auchmar Estate and report back to the General Issues Committee (GIC) regarding interests received.

The Committee recessed and reconvened at 1:35 p.m.

(g) STAFF PRESENTATIONS

(i) Graffiti Presentation (Item 7.1)

Kelly Barnett, Community Liaison Co-ordinator, Municipal Law Enforcement, and Angela Storey, Manager, Business Support Services, Public Works, provided a power point presentation to the Committee which addressed the following:

- Who deals with graffiti
- City Graffiti Working Group
- By-law compliance
- Centralized reporting;
- Public Education Awareness
- Graffiti Stats Collected
- 2010 Continued Efforts
- Youth Diversion Program
- Problem Oriented Policing (POP)
- Neighbourhood Development Strategy
- Graffiti Clean up Costs
- By-law compliance and eradication
- Public Works costs
- Parks, Roads – Operations and Maintenance
- Traffic Operations
- Corporate Buildings
- Water/wastewater Facilities
• Volunteer efforts
• MLE Enforcement
• What are the issues/what could be explored
• Photos of Living Walls/Art Murals

The presentation respecting Graffiti was received.

On a motion, staff was directed to develop a comprehensive multi-departmental and collaborative Graffiti Management Strategy which supports Council’s strategic direction to improve the City’s image, support Neighbourhood Action Plans and to be the best place in Canada to raise a child, and report back to the General Issues Committee as part of the 2013 budget deliberations.

(h) MOTIONS

(i) Representation on the Hamilton Chamber of Commerce Light Rail Transit Task Force (Item 9.1)

On a motion, the following was added as sub-section (d):

(d) That Councillors J. Farr, L. Ferguson and B. McHattie be appointed to represent the City on the Chamber of Commerce’s LRT Task Force.

(i) NOTICES OF MOTION

Councillor B. McHattie introduced the following revised Notice of Motion:

Boxing Day 10-Mile Race – December 26, 2012 (Item 10.1)

Whereas, the Annual Boxing Day 10-Mile race has been running for 91 years in Hamilton, and;

Whereas, the Hamilton Harriers Running/Walking Club, comprised of volunteers, does a great job of organizing the race, and;

Whereas, City staff have recently indicated that the Race is causing undue wait times for vehicles at Longwood Road and Main Street, and;

Whereas, a change in the routing may cost up to $5,000 more, monies which are not budgeted for in 2012, and;

Whereas, monies not spent on running the race are donated to the YMCA’s Strong Kids Program, with $5,000 being donated from the proceeds of the 2011 Race, and;
Whereas, there is insufficient time to change the routing for the December 26, 2012 race.

Therefore Be It Resolved:

(a) That the City endorse the existing race route for 2012, assisting via the regular SEAT application process;

(b) That meetings occur to discuss possible changes or options for the race route for the 2013 event;

(c) That due to the need to mitigate transit service issues associated with maintaining the existing race route, that the unforeseen costs in the amount of $1,455.30 be approved and funded as follows:

   (i) Firstly, from the Corporate budget surplus;
   (ii) Secondly, from the Tax Stabilization Reserve.

On a motion, the Rules of Order were waived to allow for the introduction of a Motion respecting Boxing Day 10-Mile Race – December 26, 2012.

See Item13 for the disposition of this item.

(j) GENERAL INFORMATION/OTHER BUSINESS (Item 11.1)

On a motion, the revised due dates for the following items on the Outstanding Business List were approved:

Corporate Services

Item C: Anti-Racism Final Report Recommendations
Due Date: November 7, 2012
Revised Due Date: December 5, 2012

Planning

Item D: H.A.B.I.A. Terms of Reference and Strategic Plan
Due Date: October 17, 2012
Revised Due Date: November 21, 2012

Item M: Donation of Statue of Mahatma Ghandi
Due Date: October 17 2012
Revised Due Date: December 5, 2012
Item Q: Study of a CIP for Creative Industries and Review of City Policies and By-laws
Due Date: October 17, 2012
Revised Due Date: Q1 2013

Public Works

Item A: North End Traffic Management Study
Due Date: Q2 2013
Revised Due Date: Q4 2013

Item B: Waterdown Aldershot East-West Transportation Corridor – Noise and Lighting Mitigation
Due Date: December 5, 2012
Revised Due Date: Q1 2014

On a motion, the following items were removed from the Outstanding Business List:

Item C: Auchmar Estate (Item 6.2)
Item N: Supermarket Development Incentives
Item R: Enbridge Pipeline Inc. Flow Reversal (Item 6.1)

(k) PRIVATE & CONFIDENTIAL

12.1 Minutes of Closed Session Meetings – September 25 and October 3, 2012

On a motion, the Minutes of the Closed Session Meetings of the General Issues Committee held on September 25 and October 3, 2012 were approved. These Minutes will remain confidential and restricted from public disclosure in accordance with the exemptions provided in the Municipal Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act.

On a motion, the Committee moved into closed session pursuant to sub-section 8.1(d) of the City of Hamilton’s Procedural By-law and Section 239.2(d) of the Municipal Act as the subject matter pertain to labour relations or employee negotiations respecting Collective Bargaining Agreement – Ontario Nurses Association (Wentworth and Macassa Lodges).

The Committee reconvened in Open Session at 3:27 p.m.

See Item 14 for the disposition of this item.
On a motion, the City Manager was directed to report back to the General Issues Committee with respect to the last three collective agreements for the Canadian Union of Public Employees Local 5167, the Firefighters and Paramedics.

(I) ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the Committee adjourned at 3:29 p.m.

Respectfully submitted

Councillor B. McHattie
Deputy Mayor

Carolyn Biggs
Legislative Co-ordinator
Office of the City Clerk
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Executive Summary

The Auchmar Estate is the former residence of the Honourable Isaac Buchanan, a prominent Hamilton merchant and politician. The estate has both historical and architectural importance and is among Hamilton's cultural assets. A heritage conservation easement placed on the site by the Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT) at the request of the City protects interior and exterior features and its architectural value by limiting the property's use and modification.

After several owners and usages, the City of Hamilton acquired the 3.8 hectare Auchmar Estate ("Auchmar") in 1999 and it has been unoccupied since 2001. Although some improvements and stabilization efforts have been completed, the buildings are vulnerable to ongoing vandalism and deterioration.

Several private sector proposed uses have been explored for the buildings and grounds but they do not meet the requirements of the heritage conservation easement. There is public support to preserve the estate for mixed public and private use and there is an expectation by the community of open public access to the grounds.

The Use Concept Profile: Auchmar is a preliminary concept description which outlines three proposed primary uses for Auchmar:

1) Community use
2) Private rental use
3) Public sector use

It also provides project goals, assumptions, constraints, and other examples of other models.

Background

Auchmar was built as a residence for the Honourable Isaac Buchanan, a prominent merchant and politician. Buchanan's contributions to local, provincial, and national history include: founding of the regiment that is now the Royal Hamilton Light Infantry; establishing the Toronto and Hamilton Boards of Trade; the first presidency of the Hamilton Club; rescuing the city of Hamilton from bankruptcy after the economic collapse of 1857; and leadership in the Hamilton Educational Movement, which pressed for improvements in the city's school system.

In 1852 Buchanan purchased 986 acres on Hamilton Mountain, which became known as Claremont Lodge. On this site be built a villa called Auchmar, named after his
family's ancestral home in Scotland. The Buchanans lived at Auchmar until 1874. The
property was sold to Alfred Trigge in 1881. Since that time is has been owned and used
by various organizations. During WWII it was utilized by the Royal Canadian Air Force
as a convalescent home. It was sold to the Sisters of Social Service in 1945. It was
purchased by the City of Hamilton in 1999.

The estate comprises a 3.8 hectare (9.5 acre) site currently owned by the City of
Hamilton. The lands are distinguished by a mid-nineteenth century, Ontario Gothic
manor house, a coach house, a dovecote, substantial stone garden walls and the
remains of a formal picturesque landscape.

In addition to its historical importance, Auchmar itself is celebrated for its architectural
significance. Auchmar’s historical value as well as both its interior and exterior
architectural value is noted in the heritage conservation easement placed on the site by
the Ontario Heritage Trust (OHT).

The residence has been unoccupied since 1999 and the structure and stone walls show
deterioration. The City of Hamilton has invested funds to minimally stabilize the building
from further deterioration and to secure the building from vandals. In addition, brush and
weeds have been cleared from the grounds to ensure public safety. The grounds are
open to the public for passive use such as walking. Portions of the residence have been
open for public tours as part of the annual Doors Open event.

The Business Concept

The business concept proposes the retention of the estate within the public realm;
restoration of the residence, and the adaptation of its use to function as a multi-purpose
community/private rental facility; development of the grounds; and adaptive reuse of the
stables for City of Hamilton use.

This preliminary concept description outlines three proposed primary uses for Auchmar:

1) **Community Use** – use of the residence by community groups for meetings,
functions or programs organized and delivered by the community; passive
use of the residence or grounds for viewing and enjoyment.

Potential uses could include but are not limited to:

a) Enjoyment of Auchmar on an informal, non-programmed basis for small
group, family and individual activities, including heritage appreciation, and
passive/casual recreational and play activities such as walking, sitting,
outdoor painting, sketching and photography;

b) Opportunities for community groups to hold open meetings, annual
meetings and training activities;
c) Leisure programs compatible with the unique nature of the facility and grounds delivered by community groups and businesses;

d) Cultural, environmental and heritage programming such as interpretive programs, guided tours, gardening seminars and workshops developed and delivered through community partnerships;

e) Small-scale special events in partnership with community groups such as Doors Open;

f) Small office space for not-for-profit organizations; and,

g) Opportunities for open access to the facility for casual, non-programmed enjoyment of the building and grounds.

2) Private Rental Use — rental by individuals, groups or businesses for social events, meetings and activities.

Potential uses could include but are not limited to:

a) Social and special occasions such as wedding ceremonies, small receptions and private parties or gatherings;

b) Wedding, fashion, art and nature photography; and,

c) Use by business for training and organizational development activities, conferences and meetings.

3) Public Sector Use — use of the building and grounds by the public sector and City of Hamilton.

Potential uses include but are not limited to:

a) Citizenship ceremonies, hearings, and retreat meetings;

b) Public engagement activities;

c) Welcoming centre for dignitaries; and,

d) Educational demonstrations and projects related to the restoration of the buildings, structures and grounds.
Building and Grounds Development Related to Use

Auchmar will be a multi-use facility with three primary uses: community, private and public.

The Residence
This use mix will involve both the main and second floor of the residence for daily rentals and the upper level will be a combination of daily event rental and longer term office use.

The Grounds
The stone walled grounds will be fully accessible to the community. Restoration of garden features¹ will be completed in partnership with community groups. Private park rental for wedding photography and rental/social use will be limited to designated areas. Future community gardens are planned.

Coach House
The stables will be adapted for reuse.

The Dovecote
Stabilization and restoration as an architectural feature. Areas immediate adjacent to be used for Community Gardens.

¹ See Vegetation Assessment of Wall and Kitchen Garden, Orchard & Cottage Setting, 2009 and Landscape Improvements Report, 2010 by Wendy Shearer Landscape Architect
Chapel and Dormitory
This cinder block addition was built in 1963. It is not considered to have heritage value and it detracts from the integrity of the site. It is recommended that this unsympathetic addition be demolished.

Project Goals
The preservation and reuse of Auchmar as proposed will enable the City of Hamilton to:

a) Preserve, adapt and utilize a significant built and natural heritage asset within the public realm;

b) Ensure that the operation and use are complementary to the natural and built resources;

c) Develop partnerships with other service providers to support the development and operation of Auchmar;

d) Provide a combination of uses and revenue streams;

e) Ensure community involvement and participation in the development and operation of Auchmar;

f) Partner with community groups and other organizations or individuals in the funding and preservation efforts;

g) Provide green space in the Ward 8 neighbourhood; and,

h) Meet the easement requirements of the Ontario Heritage Trust,

Project Assumptions
The following project assumptions apply:

- Auchmar is a heritage asset worth preserving for future generations;
- Auchmar should remain within the public realm;
- A level of public access is desirable;
- That a sustainable revenue stream be developed;
- Community fundraising is feasible; and,
- Project has Council approval and support.
**Project Constraints**

The following projects constraints would apply:

- There are limited City of Hamilton capital resources available to support the Project;
- There is limited operational funding available to support the ongoing operation of the Estate;
- Ontario Heritage Trust Easement Agreement; and,
- The entire property is zoned “C” District (Urban Protected Residential) in the City of Hamilton Zoning By-law No. 6593 and designated Major Institutional in the City of Hamilton Official Plan and will likely need amendments to both the Official Plan and Zoning By-law.

**Strategic Alignment**

The Auchmar Project is in alignment with identified City of Hamilton priorities as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Goals/Objectives</th>
<th>Relationship to Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Strategic Plan 2012-2015</td>
<td>Strategic Priority #1 - A Prosperous &amp; Healthy Community</td>
<td>- enhances Hamilton as a great place to live, work, play and learn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- contributes to development of sense of place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- provides green space for recreational and cultural pursuits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strategic Priority #2 – Valued &amp; Sustainable Services</td>
<td>- residents and community groups have expressed support for retention of Auchmar and public access to grounds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Plan

| Urban Hamilton Official Plan (Adopted by Council July 9, 2009) | Cultural Heritage Resources Policies (3.4), Policy Goals (3.4.1) and General Cultural Heritage Policies (3.4.2) | -implementation will utilize partnerships among various public and private agencies and organizations (3.4.1)  
-will encourage a City-wide culture of conservation by promoting cultural heritage (3.4.1.2)  
-adaptive reuse will contribute to achieving sustainable, healthy, and prosperous communities (3.4.1.2)  
-rehabilitation, renovation, and restoration of built heritage resources in order that they remain in active use (3.4.1.4)  
-will promote public and private awareness, appreciation, and enjoyment of Hamilton's cultural heritage through public programs or heritage interpretation activities, heritage tourism, and guidance on appropriate conservation practices (3.4.1.5) |
| Cultural Policy | Vision  
Our Hamilton is a unique destination of culture and natural beauty. Our proud history is visible, our neighbourhoods are colourful, our services accessible. Hamilton welcomes you for a day, a weekend, or a lifetime of discovery. | -contributes to the Vision  
aligned with definition of culture and the Policy's guiding principles |

### Overall Heritage Value

Auchmar has significant historical significance in the following three areas:

1. Historical Value
2. Architectural Value – Interior and Exterior
3. Contextual Value
**Historical Value:**

Highlights of Isaac Buchanan's role in the economic, political cultural life of Hamilton and area include:

- Developed the largest wholesale business in the city and then worked with his partners to develop one of the largest and most profitable businesses of its type in Upper and Lower Canada.
- In terms of Provincial politics, Buchanan served from 1841-43 as the Toronto representative in the first Legislative Assembly of the newly formed Province of Canada. After permanently moving to Hamilton in 1851, Buchanan served in the Assembly as a representative for Hamilton from 1857-1865.
- In 1864 Buchanan became aligned with the Conservative government and served as the President of the Executive Council in the short-lived Macdonald-Tache administration.
- As a promoter of Hamilton's commercial future, Buchanan was instrumental in bringing the Great Western Railway to Hamilton in 1854.
- Buchanan is also remembered as an abolitionist, offering his estate to be used for Black Canadian's Emancipation Day celebrations as early as 1859.

**Dates of Significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of Property by Sir Isaac Buchanan</td>
<td>1851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of Auchmar</td>
<td>1855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auchmar Sold by Buchanan</td>
<td>1874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auchmar used as a convalescence home by the Royal Canadian Air Force</td>
<td>1943-1945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auchmar owned by the Sisters of Social Service</td>
<td>1945-1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional wing added to the building</td>
<td>1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auchmar acquired by the City of Hamilton</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part IV designation by the City of Hamilton</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Heritage Trust heritage conservation easement registered</td>
<td>2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Architectural Value:

Exterior

- Architecturally significant as one of Hamilton's most impressive 19th century estates and for its exemplification of Gothic Revival style architecture.
- The focal point of the property is the 'Manor House', a long, 'H' shaped villa completed in 1855.
- Like the home of a Scottish laird, which Buchanan may have hoped to emulate, the house features a roughcast stucco finish, clustered chimneys, and various Gothic details such as pointed arch windows and label mouldings.

Interior

- The interior is similarly styled in the Gothic taste with the ballroom displaying a highly decorative, plaster, strap work ceiling and corridors featuring vaulted ceilings with plaster ribbing.
- Interior woodwork repeats the Gothic motif with slender shafts and foliated plaster capitals lining the corridor walls and the pointed arch incorporated into doorway frames and door panels.
- The unique plan of the house features a narrow, 24-metre central corridor with stair halls at each end.
- The pine detailing includes the slender, engaged shafts lining the corridors.
Contextual value:

- Elevated placement upon the plateau (‘The Mountain’) overlooking the City of Hamilton.
- High, random-coursed limestone wall with buttresses and pointed arched openings encircling the property and garden.
- Entrance off Fennel Avenue with limestone gateposts and curved walls.
- Vestiges of the terraced landscaping on the north side of the manor house.
- Dovecote of limestone construction with lancet windows, pyramidal roof, and central, peaked gables.
- One and a half storey, limestone construction coach house with cross gable roof.
- Vestiges of a pine tree-lined driveway.
- Informal, picturesque arrangement of mature plantings.
- Vestiges of quince and apple orchards.
Other Models

Other examples of this adaptive reuse model include Paletta Mansion in Burlington, George Brown House in Toronto, and in London, Grosvenor Lodge and the Elsie Perrin Williams Estate.

**Paletta Lakefront Park and Mansion**

The property is owned and operated by the City of Burlington. The main house and formal gardens are available for rental functions and civic programs. The stable, now identified as the Orientation Centre, houses story boards which provides visitors with a history of the park and its evolution. The gatehouse is rented to a community organization. The property also features the Dofasco Shoreacres Creek Discovery Trail.

The mansion stands on a 14 acre lakefront property. The limestone mansion is an 11,000 square foot house designed by Stewart Thomson McPhie, in association with Lyon Sommerville. It was built in 1930 as a summer home for Edythe Merriam MacKay, daughter of renowned industrialist Cyrus Albert Birge. The site features three other buildings: a gatehouse built circa 1912: a children's playhouse and stables.

Restoration began on the mansion in April 2000 and was completed in December 2000.

**George Brown House**

George Brown House is owned and operated by the Ontario Heritage Trust. The house is used as a rental facility with tenant offices on the upper two floors. George Brown House has four private rooms available for rent and a capacity of 8 to 50 guests.

George Brown House, a 9,000-square-foot Second Empire-style house, was built for George Brown between 1874 and 1876. Brown was a Father of Confederation, founder of the Globe newspaper (now the Globe and Mail) and a leading Liberal politician.

The home was a residence until 1916 at which time three-storey school for the blind was built at the back of the house. This house was used as office space for the Canadian National Institute for the Blind from 1920 to 1956. A school for developmentally-challenged children followed until it was demolished in 1984.

The house was declared a National Historic Site in 1976 and was threatened with demolition in the mid 1980's. The Ontario Heritage Trust purchased and restored the property and reopened it in 1989.
The Victorian library was re-created by the federal government and now houses 2,000 of George Brown's personal books. A Victorian-inspired garden was planted in the summer of 2000 – the first project funded by a donation to the Trust's Heritage Garden Conservancy Fund. A partnership with the University of Toronto Faculty of Architecture, Landscape and Design, maintains the gardens.

**Grosvenor Lodge**

Grosvenor Lodge is a City of London owned historic estate. It is managed by the Heritage London Foundation. The Lodge houses the London Regional Center for Heritage and the Environment. The Lodge is available for rentals and has a capacity of 50 people for a sit down dinner and 100 for a cocktail style reception.

Grosvenor Lodge was built in 1853 by Samuel Peters. The Lodge was the Peter's family home for three generations, until granddaughter Leila's death in 1974. It was sold to the University of Western Ontario in 1972 on the condition that it be preserved as a heritage site. It was designated by the City the same year. In 1981 the London Library Board took it over and it opened as the Lawson Museum and Heritage Centre. It has been managed by the Foundation since 1992.

**Elsie Perrin Williams Estate**

The Estate is City of London owned and is operated by the Heritage London Foundation. The Spanish style residence is located on 68 acres of park land. The grounds are open year round to the public and include a walking trail. The house and grounds are available for rentals. The ground floor capacity is 80 seated or 120
Project Budget

Should Council confirm the use concept, the operational plan will address:

- Capital financial projections;
- Operational financial projections;
- Community/Corporate fundraising strategies; and,
- Implementation schedule.

Further community consultation with the public, potential partners and users will also be completed.
Architectural Drawings

Ground Floor

Second Floor

Council Direction:
At its meeting held on September 26, 2012 Council directed staff to report to the Gaming Facility Proposal Sub-committee outlining methods of obtaining public input regarding a possible gaming facility to be considered within the limits of the City of Hamilton.

Information:
The OLG has advised that Council has until December 2012 to respond by motion regarding its' interest in hosting a gaming facility in the community. If Council is in favour of supporting a gaming site in Hamilton, the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation Act requires the municipal council to advise OLG, in writing, of the steps taken by Council in seeking public input.

Once a methodology is selected for public consultation, staff will work with Members of Council and appropriate external third party agents (if applicable) to develop a question(s).
A proposed timeline is summarized as follows:

- **October 9** – Gaming Facility Proposal Sub-committee meeting – makes recommendation on public input method(s)
- **October 17** – GIC approval of process and recommendation to Council regarding question(s) to the public
- **October 24** – Council approval
- **November** – implement direction of Council
- **December 5** – GIC – consideration of result of public consultation and discussion of motion to OLG
- **December 12** – last scheduled Council meeting of 2012

Outlined below are methods of obtaining public input:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Time to Implement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Public Meeting(s) or Town hall meetings</td>
<td>Facility rental if not using City Hall</td>
<td>Availability of facility</td>
<td>Delegations register to speak at the meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advertising per day: $5,000. (half page) in Spectator (AYS) and Brabant papers</td>
<td>1 week lead time for insertion into AYS/Brabant</td>
<td>Requires quorum of GIC members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- 8,000. (half page) in Spectator for stand alone ad</td>
<td>3 day lead time for stand alone ad in Spectator</td>
<td>Town hall meetings in individual wards:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- more dates required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- more facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Telephone Poll by a Pollster</td>
<td>$5,000 - $15,000</td>
<td>1.5-2 weeks for planning</td>
<td>Considered statistically valid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- low range is small sample size, not broken down by geography</td>
<td>1 week for calls and analysis</td>
<td>Issues to consider:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- top range allows for geographic diversity, larger sample size, detailed questioning and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td>How much geographic diversity do you want? (e.g. broken down by ward?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How large a sample size do you want? How many questions do you want to ask?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Time to Implement</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Automated calling i.e. &quot;Robo-calls&quot;</td>
<td>$5,000 - $7,000 entire city</td>
<td>1 week for planning</td>
<td>Issues to consider:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;1 week for calls and analysis</td>
<td>How much geographic diversity do you want?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e.g. broken down by ward?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How large a sample size do you want?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Virtual Town Hall Meetings</td>
<td>$5,000 - $7,500 for the virtual town hall</td>
<td>2 weeks to plan the questions and to advertise and promote the meeting.</td>
<td>Anywhere from 50,000-150,000 residents can be included in such a call.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Virtual Town Hall Meeting is a live teleconference. The difference is that a Virtual Town Hall automatically calls out to people and invites them to participate. The invitees can either accept or reject the phone invitation. If an invitee accepts, he or she is immediately placed in the Virtual Town Hall Meeting and can begin listening to the virtual event from anywhere.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 day for actual meeting</td>
<td>During the event if you wish to conduct any polling or research, this technology is designed to be able to ask questions and have participants answer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 day for analysis</td>
<td>Afterwards, a detailed report will be provided containing the overall summary for each poll question asked and information on which individuals participated and what their response is.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Time to Implement</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5. Internet Question          | $2,900+HST for using 3rd party vendor (Fluid Survey) to host a COH branded site | 1-2 weeks from signing (including initial set-up) 1 -2 weeks for notice to citizens | Question(s) posted on City’s website  No mail out to citizens Tracking by I.P. address or computer browser  This provides the City with a 1 year subscription to the Fluid Survey (a Canadian company) so any additional surveys will have no additional cost  
  
|                               | Use media release notice to public        |                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 6. Mail-out Question - using number of households | Approx. $325,000 - postage/supplies       | 1 month after Council decides Question | No M.E.A. requirements  Cost of mail out with return responses to 279,246 households  
  
| 7. Mail-Out Question - per the Municipal Elections Act (M.E.A.) | Approx. $400,000 - requires mail out to 360,000 electors with return response | 3 – 4 months | Requires prescribed process under the M.E.A. to be followed (i.e. Bylaw for question and use of mail voting)  
  
  
Option not feasible due to time constraints  

*Vision: To be the best place in Canada to raise a child, promote innovation, engage citizens and provide diverse economic opportunities.  
Values: Honesty, Accountability, Innovation, Leadership, Respect, Excellence, Teamwork*
### Methods of Obtaining Public Input regarding potential Gaming Facility in the City of Hamilton (FCS12086) (City Wide)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Time to Implement</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8. Internet Question - per M.E.A. | Approx. $550,000  
- contract Internet elections software Provider  
- postage/supplies | 3 – 4 months  
(includes RFP to hire internet elections software provider) | Requires prescribed process under the M.E.A. to be followed (i.e. Bylaw for question and use of Internet voting)  
Cost of mail out to 360,000 electors providing P.I.N. access for tracking electors  
*Option not feasible due to time constraints* |
| 9. Question on a Ballot using the M.E.A. – not in a scheduled municipal election | $1.2 million  
- polling locations to be arranged  
- 1,000+ staff to be hired  
- tabulators to be calibrated and secured | 6-7 months | Requires prescribed process under the M.E.A. to be followed (i.e. Bylaw for question)  
*Option not feasible due to time constraints* |
| 10. Question on a Ballot at the next scheduled Municipal Election | No additional cost of adding question to the ballot | Next scheduled election is October 27th, 2014 | Requires prescribed process under the M.E.A. to be followed (i.e. Bylaw for question)  
*Option not feasible due to time constraints* |

**What have other municipalities done for public input?**

- **City of Kingston** - public meeting, Online Survey, Telephone survey and written submissions
- **City of Ottawa** – public meeting
- **Town of Milton** - Committee meeting where staff report was considered, public zoning process

---

*Vision: To be the best place in Canada to raise a child, promote innovation, engage citizens and provide diverse economic opportunities.*  
*Values: Honesty, Accountability, Innovation, Leadership, Respect, Excellence, Teamwork*
GAMING FACILITY PROPOSAL SUB-COMMITTEE
TERMS OF REFERENCE

Purpose:

- To consider conditions respecting Hamilton's position relative to the Request for Proposal for the Establishment of a Gaming Facility to be issued by the Ontario Lottery and Gaming Corporation, and report back to the General Issues Committee.

- To advise the General Issues Committee on matters related to gaming in Hamilton, including, but not limited to, legal issues, conditions the City would require from a proponent through the Request for Proposal (RFP) process, methods of obtaining public input, and any other relevant matters.

Composition:

Five members of Council, including:

Mayor R. Bratina
Councillor R. Pasuta
Councillor S. Merulla
Councillor J. Partridge
Councillor T. Whitehead

Duration:

December, 2012

Meeting Schedule:

At the Call of the Chair

Contacts:

Norm Schleehahn
Manager, Business Development
(905)546-2424 Ext. 2669
norm.schleehahn@hamilton.ca

Carolyn Biggs
Legislative Co-ordinator
(905)546-2424 Ext. 2604
carolyn.biggs@hamilton.ca

As amended by the Gaming Facility Proposal Sub-Committee on October 9, 2012
Members of the General Issues Committee of Hamilton City Council,

Please take action to prevent an environmental catastrophe from happening in Hamilton. That catastrophe would be the rupture of the Enbridge pipeline which would pour diluted bitumen into the Beverley Swamp and/or one of the many creeks that flow into Lake Ontario.

Enbridge plans to reverse the flow of its Line 9 pipeline through Hamilton from west to east using exactly the same type of 37-year-old steel pipe that ruptured last year in Kalamazoo, Michigan, causing a billion-dollar disaster that is still not fully cleaned up. It took Enbridge a full 17 hours even to turn off the flow of that pipeline after that rupture.

Crude oil is not corrosive but diluted bitumen is. Crude oil requires less pipeline pressure to move through a pipeline than diluted bitumen. And diluted bitumen, when bursting from a break in an outdated pipe under greater pressure than it was built for, does not float on water. Rather, it would sink to the bottom where it is hard to remove and also releases solvents into the atmosphere which would cause respiratory problems and perhaps deaths among people and wildlife nearby.

In short, the proposal to ship dilbit through Enbridge Line 9 is a disaster waiting to happen.

I ask you to take three immediate steps to prevent this environmental catastrophe.

First, because the Harper government of Canada has recklessly cancelled the environmental assessment of this project, I request that you direct your legal staff to initiate a legal challenge, right up to the Supreme Court of Canada, if necessary, in order to force this project to undergo an environmental assessment. Harper is the voice of the oil industry in Canada. Line 9 through Hamilton represents the last hope of the consortium of oil companies, which exploit the Tar Sands, to ship out their environmentally-disastrous product to world markets. The proposed Keystone pipeline to ship out Tar Sands bitumen through the US for refinement in Texas has been nixed for now by Obama. The proposed Northern Gateway pipeline to transfer Tar Sands bitumen to the Canadian west coast and be shipped to Asian markets by supertanker has been nixed by British Columbia. So now, Enbridge wants to ship its dilbit through Hamilton to be refined in Maine.

Typically, we Canadians are, according to Harper and Enbridge's plan, to remain in our classic colonial role as drawers of water and hewers of wood for our imperial masters to the South. Have we learned nothing in 500 years? Why are we not processing the resource riches we mine in this country?

Please do not get me wrong. I am not arguing that Canadians should exploit the Tar Sands bitumen. On the contrary, the Tar Sands development, to my mind, is the biggest single environmental disaster on the face of the earth. It's so large, apparently, that the devastation of the uprooted forests and lakes can clearly be seen from space. And this is before the dykes break and the gigantic holding ponds spill into the Athabaska River.
At this moment, native people living downstream in Fort Chippewan are slowing dying from cancers caused by pollution leaking from the Tar Sands development. Because they are of First Nations, their health is typically of little concern to either the oil companies or the Harper government. Moreover, Canada's economy is being skewed because the Tar Sands bitumen has turned the Canadian dollar into a petrodollar artificially raising the value of the Canadian dollar in relation to the US dollar and killing the manufacturing industries in Hamilton, in particular, and central Canada, in general, because our manufactured goods are becoming over-priced on world markets. It is an insult to Canadians that Tar Sands bitumen, which is exploited mainly by US corporations, is shipped mainly to the US, which, according to NAFTA, it receives at less than world prices and will continue to receive, even if Canada itself experiences a scarcity of energy resources. The native people, on whose lands the bitumen is mined, receive no royalties at all from the extraction of this resource. And the final insult is the fact that the Harper government continues to subsidize the Tar Sands consortium with tax dollars extracted from all Canadians.

In my opinion, the Tar Sands development should be shut down. This mining operation is environmentally unsustainable and represents an obsolete 1950's paradigm of the use of fossil fuels to power a completely outdated system of private transportation using cars. It is single largest site in the world producing CO2, a greenhouse gas, which is ultimately affecting climate change, causing the melting of the polar ice, the gasification of methane frozen in the polar seabed and in the tundra, global warming, increasingly severe weather patterns (which we have already suffered in Hamilton), and may bring about the end of human civilization in the very near future.

Until the Tar Sands devastation can be completely shut down, I would also argue that the Hamilton city council should take two further steps. The first is to pass a bylaw to prevent any energy pipeline, older than 30 years, from operating in Hamilton. The result of that bylaw would hopefully be that, until the Tar Sands development is terminated, a new pipeline, with steel made in Hamilton, would be built. A second step would be for the City of Hamilton to join with other Canadian city councils, trade unions, citizen's groups, and political parties to form a coalition to demand that the Tar Sands bitumen be refined in Canada by Canadian workers, using improved technologies to prevent any air or water pollution. In this way, if we can't close down the Tar Sands in the immediate future, we can at least create some employment for Canadians.

In summary, the following are my three recommendations:

1) the City of Hamilton initiate a legal challenge of the exemption of the Line 9 Enbridge pipeline from an environmental assessment;
2) the City pass a bylaw preventing any pipeline over thirty years of age from being used to transport energy resources;
3) the City work with other municipalities and interested parties to pressure the federal government to create clean refining capacity for Tar Sands bitumen in Southern Ontario.

Thank you for your attention,

Ken Stone.
Enbridge points to Hamilton City GIC Council  
Wednesday October 16 2012

Re: the damage left in Michigan.

Bitumen is so thick — about the consistency of peanut butter — that it doesn’t flow from a well like the crude oil found in most of the nation’s pipelines.

Instead the tarry resin is either steamed or strip-mined from sandy soil. Then it is thinned [by about 30 percent] with large quantities of liquid chemicals so it can be pumped through pipelines.

These dilutents usually include benzene, a known human carcinogen. At this point it becomes diluted bitumen, or dilbit.

The spill from a pipeline into a tributary of the Kalamazoo River was the first major spill of dilbit in U.S. waters, so “cleanup experts at the scene were unprepared for the challenge”:

Instead of remaining on top of the water, as most conventional crude oil does, the bitumen gradually sank to the river’s bottom, where normal cleanup techniques and equipment were of little use.

The situation was made even more difficult because the EPA and other responders didn’t know they were dealing with tar-sands oil until more than a week after the spill.

That’s because pipeline operators aren’t required to disclose what specific kind of crude they’re pumping — even after an accident.

Canada-based Enbridge, the company that owns and operates the pipeline, didn’t volunteer the information after the spill; in fact, when company officials, including CEO Patrick Daniel, were asked directly whether the pipeline was carrying tar-sands oil, they repeatedly denied it.

As later came to light, they were making a minor technical distinction, but for all practical purposes, their pipeline was carrying what’s commonly called tar-sands oil.
Pipeline companies also aren’t required to disclose what chemicals they mix with bitumen to make it thin enough to flow down a pipeline — that’s considered a trade secret.

This is particularly scary because these diluents evaporate into the air after a spill, and any people unlucky enough to be nearby breathe in the mysterious mixture.

In this case, Enbridge’s chemical brew made a lot of people sick:

A survey of four riverside communities that the Michigan Department of Community Health conducted within a month of the spill found that almost 60 percent of the 550 people interviewed experienced headaches, breathing difficulties, coughs, vomiting, anxiety or other health problems. What is not clear, was the number of deaths due to the location and intensity of the Spill. Clean up did not start till 3 days after the rupture.

- The rupture was caused by a sharp rise in internal pressure during a regular shutdown that opened an area of the pipeline where there were "corrosion fatigue cracks" that built up under polyethylene tape that had become detached from the pipeline.

- U.S. government rules didn’t provide clear requirements on when to repair pipeline defects, while the PHMSA did not require the company to excavate and repair cracks in the Michigan pipeline first detected in 2005.

- The NTSB criticized Enbridge’s pipeline "integrity management program" as well as its Edmonton operations centre staff, who misinterpreted alarms during the spill so badly that they twice started up the pipeline flow.

- Those two startups caused 81 per cent of the total release.

And to close, the Texas gentleman seen in the video, did lose his land to the pipeline, being told he had no choice.

Closing statement if there is time.

Enbridge has repeatedly shown that it chooses cost savings to human health. At this time I have counted over 600 pipeline spills, most not reported because of the area they are in.
If “as they promote” the pipelines actually take care of themselves, there is no real way to monitor when and where there is a leak.

1) The video material was largely provided by John Bolenbaugh, a Battle Creek Enbridge employee who was told along with other Pit leaders, that because of time restraints, they were not continuing to “clean up” the Oil, but to spread it thinly along the banks and in the wooded area. Since Mr. Bolenbaugh lived in that area, he refused, and turned whistle-blower by making video. Say what you will considering Mr. Bolenbaugh's personal involvement, the camera and other witnesses do show the clear picture.

There is another Court Case concerning an Engineer whistle-blower from North Dakota. This past employee was terminated for pointing out that Enbridge's choice to use a lessor quality steel product to save costs, gave him cause for safety concerns. That case is still in progress.

M.H-Hughes
General Issues Committee

October 17 2012
Climate Change is Happening

- 95 percent of mountain glaciers melting (source of freshwater for 1 billion people)
- Collapse of ice shelves in Antarctica
- Slippage of Greenland glaciers into sea
- Extreme weather events multiplying
- Steep rise in natural disasters
Source: Met Office: the National Weather Service for the UK
The Drought Monitor focuses on broad-scale conditions. Local conditions may vary. See accompanying text summary for forecast statements.

http://droughtmonitor.unl.edu/
## Capital Works Planned for Next 5 Years

**July 26th, 2009 – Storm Event**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WWTP Pump House</td>
<td>$75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm infrastructure</td>
<td>$56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection, Maintenance &amp; Investigation</td>
<td>$53.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Time Control</td>
<td>$10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backwater Valves</td>
<td>$ 3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accelerated Capital</td>
<td>$20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenilworth Underpass</td>
<td>$ 4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Strip</td>
<td>$ 2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$223.7</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Presentation to Committee of the Whole – July 30, 2009*
Where is global warming going?

Ocean 93.4%

- Atmosphere 2.3%
- Continents 2.1%
- Glaciers and ice caps 0.8%
- Arctic sea ice 0.8%
- Greenland Ice Sheet 0.2%
- Antarctic Ice Sheet 0.2%
For the no policy scenario, the MIT researchers concluded that there is now a nine percent chance (about one in 11 odds) that the global average surface temperature would increase by more than 7°C (12.6°F) by the end of this century, compared with only a less than one percent chance (one in 100 odds) that warming would be limited to below 3°C (5.4°F).
Pattern of warming by 2090s, A1FI
Mean of "high-end" MOHC simulations
(14 simulations, mean global warming 5.4°C)
SELF-ROASTING

SPECIES

just add oil
Next Few Decades

- Much more extreme weather
- Permanent Dust Bowl conditions over the U.S. Southwest and many other heavily populated and/or heavily farmed regions on Earth
- Sea level rise of some 1 foot by 2050, then 4 to 6 feet (or more) by 2100, rising some 6 to 12 inches (or more) each decade thereafter
- Massive species loss on land and sea — perhaps 50% or more of all biodiversity.
- Unexpected impacts — the fearsome "unknown unknowns"
- Food insecurity — the increasing difficulty of feeding 7 billion to 9 billion people in a world with an ever-worsening climate.
- Myriad direct health impacts
- these will all be happening simultaneously and getting worse decade after decade. Equally tragic, a 2009 NOAA-led study found the worst impacts would be "largely irreversible"
To: The Clerk, Mr. Mayor and Members of Council  
From: The Friends of Auchmar, Chair, Dr. Diane Gower Dent  
Subject: Re: Auchmar Estate, October 17, 2012 General Issues Committee meeting  

Mr. Mayor, Members of Council and fellow citizens  

Thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak to you in support of the Auchmar Estate. This submission is prepared on behalf of the Board of the Friends of Auchmar of which I am currently Chair.

As background I would like to thank past members of Hamilton City Council and current members who supported the preservation of many of Hamilton’s architectural landmarks.

During the 1970’s, 80’s and 90’s your fellow councillors specifically, William McCulloch, Vince Agro, Dennis Carson and Robert Morrow worked with the citizens of Hamilton to save Sandyford Place on Duke Street, now condominiums, Central Public School, the Carnegie Library now the Unified Family Court, the Pigottt and Sun Life buildings now condominiums, the Pigott Building stained glass windows, now restored and re-installed, the TH&B Station, the CN Station, now LIUNA, the Historic Core at McMaster University, Hamilton’s Main Post Office now the John Sopinka Court House, the Bank of Montreal, now the Gowlings Building, and most recently the Lister Building. Many of these landmarks went through several transitions before an economic use was found. I sincerely hope that many of you understand the significance of safeguarding Hamilton’s historic landmark sites—in particular I am now referring to the Auchmar Estate—the manor house, dovecote, stables, walled gardens and the unique cultural landscape.

In modern usage, a landmark includes anything that is easily recognizable, such as a monument, building, or other structure. It is the term used to designate places that might be of interest to tourists due to notable physical features or historical significance. As members of city council you will hold different perspectives when it comes to choosing to preserve or destroy Hamilton’s history, however the Friends of Auchmar hope to convince you that:

~ The entire Auchmar Estate is indispensable to the integrity of the culture of Hamilton.
~ Auchmar is the container of human activity—such as this example when on August 1, 1859, Buchanan hosted a picnic at Auchmar in recognition of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the passage of the British Emancipation Act.
~ To some extent, preserving Auchmar means respecting previous generations.
~ One architectural historian asks, if Ancient Rome had not been preserved till now, how could we know precisely about Ancient Rome’s history?
~ Do we not have the responsibility to preserve Auchmar for the next generations so that they may have the opportunity to know about their predecessors?
~ While it is true that we can transmit the civilization of our ancestors’ by picture or in text form, which is vague and not authentic, we could also preserve the genuine buildings and lands of the Auchmar Estate which will be tangible to the next generation.
July 1997 Alexandra Langs and Jane O’Flynn, members of the Hamilton Garden Club, requested a meeting with me when I was Chair, Municipal Heritage Committee (LACAC) to discuss a request that the LACAC work with the Garden Club and to preserve Auchmar.

September 1998, the Garden Club President Brenda Yates, sent a letter to the City of Hamilton requesting that Auchmar be preserved and remain in public ownership.

Summer 1999, Ward 8 Councillor Frank D’Amico, met and toured Auchmar with Monica Buchanan Starkey (great granddaughter or great niece of Isaac Buchanan), Jane O’Flynn, Hamilton Garden Club, Hank Wroblewski, City of Hamilton and me to discuss preservation.

About 1999, Auchmar was purchased by DeSantis Homes for approximately 3 million dollars.

In the summer of 1999 at a meeting between Mr. De Santis and me, a swap between Auchmar and serviced city lands on the east mountain was discussed.

The following morning the lawyer to Mr. De Santis telephoned me. I suggested a meeting with Councillor William McCulloch. They met and interest in that swap was confirmed.

In 1999, the City of Hamilton took ownership of the Auchmar Estate.

In 1999, the entire nine (9) acre Auchmar Estate was designated by Hamilton City Council under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. That same year, the Ontario Heritage Foundation (now the Ontario Heritage Trust) placed a binding provincial easement on Auchmar.

In 2000, the Auchmar Millenium Fund Organization was founded by Dr. Richard and Mrs. Eileen Butson. Funds from subscribers were used to erect a plaque to commemorate the life of Isaac Buchanan, his contribution to Hamilton and to celebrate the construction of Auchmar.

From 2000 until the present, the Friends of Auchmar and an interim board of directors have organized meetings with MP David Sweet, MPP Andrea Horvath, and then MPP Sophia Aggelonitis to confirm government interest in and support for the preservation of Auchmar. Meetings have also taken place with Tim McCabe, Anna Bradford, Neil Everson, several councillors, city staff, the Ontario Heritage Trust and interested citizens to discuss preservation issues and provide tours of the Auchmar manor house and grounds. These group meetings provide an example of how private and public interests can achieve great results with cooperation and compromise and thus serve the public interest.

In June 2003, City of Hamilton invited Expressions of Interest. None received.

In 2008, Heritage Hamilton Foundation under the direction of Dr. and Mrs. Grant Head, founders of and current directors of HHF proposed the creation of the Auchmar Challenge Fund which offers a $25,000.00 matching grant. Approval from Tim McCabe for HHF to proceed with fundraising was received in April 2012.

In June 2012, The Friends of Auchmar was officially established and a board of directors elected. A membership drive is now in place and a website soon to be unveiled.

At the June 2012 meeting and throughout this process, Ward 8 Councillor Terry Whitehead promised support and interest in the preservation of the Auchmar Estate.

In October 2012, the Ontario Historical Society approved The Friends of Auchmar Incorporation and By-Laws, which now await consent by the Province of Ontario.

October 30, 2012 The Friends of Auchmar, will hold the first Annual General Meeting. The guest speaker is Carolyn Samko, Senior Project Manager, Heritage Facilities and Capital Planning, Tourism & Culture Division of Economic Development.
One architectural historian writes - Only via the real trip to the Blue Mosque, Istanbul's imperial Mosque, are our next generations capable of acquainting an impressive view of the Turkish culture.

The problem is how to preserve?

How to be responsible for the economic return?

The Friends of Auchmar and the hundreds of Hamilton citizens who tour the Auchmar Estate at Doors Open contend that the cultural value of the Auchmar estate is unique and worth preserving even on economic grounds. The Friends of Auchmar and many Hamilton citizens are willing to work with the City of Hamilton to make the restoration of Auchmar a reality. Funds have already been raised and more promised. Citizens care about the preservation of Auchmar because Auchmar is a unique historic site. It was the home of the Honourable Isaac Buchanan and also a significant monument to the economic, cultural and architectural history of Hamilton and Canada.

Who was the Honourable Issac Buchanan?
The Honourable Isaac Buchanan was the builder and owner of the Auchmar estate. Buchanan;

- sat as a member of the Parliament of United Canada for Toronto between 1841 and 1843
- sat as a member for Hamilton between 1857 and 1865
- served as President of the Council in the Macdonald-Taché ministry between March and June 1865
- was the founder of Hamilton and Toronto Boards of Trade (forerunners to modern chambers of commerce)
- was the founder of the Thirteenth Battalion, a regiment which became the Royal Hamilton Light Infantry (RHLI)
- became a writer on the subjects of currency and trade and is generally credited as being a formative influence on John A. Macdonald's National Policy required to build a strong national economy and achieve Canadian national Independence.
- was an international merchant
- was the first president of the Hamilton Club

Auchmar after the death of the Honourable Issac Buchanan

- After Buchanan's death Auchmar was sold to Captain Trigge.
- In 1900 James Buchanan, son of Isaac Buchanan, purchased Auchmar and was the owner until 1926.
- In 1926 Auchmar was purchased by A.Y. Young
- In 1943 the Young Family rented Auchmar to the Royal Canadian Air Force and was converted to a convalescent hospital for WW11 veterans. It has been reported that the Young family had planned to move back into Auchmar after the war, but when they saw the surgical scrub-down it had been subjected to they changed their minds.
- In 1945 the Hungarian Sisters of Social Service purchased Auchmar for $32,500.
- It is reported that in 1949 the City of Hamilton bought a large portion of the Auchmar land for $1. As a result, the Auchmar estate is now comprised of nine acres compared to an original 190.
**Description and Location of the Auchmar Estate**

The name Auchmar was taken from the Auchmar estate on Loch Lomand, Scotland, owned by Buchanan's family. The Auchmar Manor House in Hamilton is the centre piece of Clairmont Park, the estate of the Honourable Isaac Buchanan (1810–1883), one of Hamilton’s most influential citizens. Auchmar was built in 1852 and is located at the northeast corner of Fennel and West 5th. The estate consists of the manor house and several remaining outbuildings; the dovecote and stables, along with the stone orchard walls. The current Auchmar occupies about 10 acres of land which includes most of the original estate features and landscaped grounds. However, the tiny Gatekeeper’s Lodge, which resembles Auchmar House architecturally, became detached from the remainder of Clairmont Park and is privately owned. (It is located on the mountain brow at 71 Claremont Drive.) The Auchmar Manor House, the buildings and lands of the Buchanan estate is a unique, heritage asset owned by the citizens of Hamilton and is recognized by the Ontario Heritage Trust as having significant historical value. The Auchmar Manor House is recognized as an outstanding example of the domestic Gothic Revival architecture with its arched windows, eleven chimneys, gables and French Doors and with its surrounding extensive acreage. Auchmar is therefore not only important, but is significant, but unique as a cultural landscape. The estate is a very rare example of a mid-Victorian estate in Ontario which survives as the result of the careful effort to preserve the essential estate features.

To conclude I would like to make 2 requests;

1. That the city work toward creating a clear cut policy on heritage preservation for the City of Hamilton.

2. The Friends of Auchmar is a diverse group. We will study the information received today and work with the city to finding a viable revenue stream. We will continue in discussions with you and monitor the city’s progress. We ask that members of Hamilton City Council and city staff continue to collaborate with The Friends of Auchmar and citizens of Hamilton to keep Auchmar in public ownership and create a plan for restoration to be completed within the next five years.

Thank you.

Respectfully Submitted,
Diane G. Dent
Chair, Friends of Auchmar
Auchmar Estate Sustainability Proposal

Prepared For: City of Hamilton & All Involved Parties
Prepared By: Brock Browett
Browett Holdings
1175 Limeridge Rd E
Hamilton, On
289-921-6667
b.browett@hotmail.com
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Objective
The city of Hamilton is faced with an ever mounting repair bill to restore ever crumbling Auchmar estate and its land. Due to current global economics effecting Canada all the way to the municipal level it is a matter of contention among city council who is responsible for the $4 million repair bill. The objective is to repair, restore, and landscape the Auchmar estate to its original status or as close to as possible.

Goals
The goal of the proposal is to minimize repair costs, and maximize revenue while maintaining the historical significance of the building and land. As well as provide a feasible plan to maintain the property to the standard of the historical society for years to come.

Solution
The problem faced has multiple issues all requiring different areas of expertise, so the solution should be a multi-faceted solution as well. First lets look at the issue of the repair bill. The $4 million bill is made up of landscape and structural repairs. Historically the government is over charged by many construction companies simply because the government has the funds, where as private investors typically pay less because they can scrutinize and maximize money. So we have to look at who is the cheapest workers available. The answer that comes to mind is students, and Auchmar is fortunate enough to have students right across the street. Students are at the leading edge of their chosen field as they are being taught the most up-to-date information which will make up for lack of experience. As well students compete for excellent grade levels rather than being financially motivated. This allows for the best work at the cheapest rate. The idea is to create a joint venture between the city, Mohawk college, and McMaster; as McMaster and Mohawk have many joint programs. The Auchmar estate would become class projects for a multitude of classes. Engineers and architectural students can come up with ideas to restore the structure of the building to current codes using the most modern and creative technology. Agriculture students can create plans and preform the actual labour to landscape the large property which
consists of an apple orchard. History students can ensure that all work is done in accordance with the standard set out by the Ontario Heritage Committee. Environmental students can provide solutions to green energy to take Auchmar Estate off the electrical grid and provide free energy as well put energy back into the system. The apprenticeship programs for Mohawks plumbing, carpenters, electrical, and other trades can provide the needed labour to complete the projects under the supervision of the students listed above. Business students can create business plans to run charity events (i.e., festivals, concerts, art shows, etc) on the grounds vast land with the revenue either going back into the estate or other city funded charities and projects.

Now that we have created a solution to repair and restore the Auchmar estate we have to create a revenue solution. Right now as it stands to the best of my knowledge Auchmar has little to no revenue stream. So far my plan has listed two avenues of revenue, energy and large events. This would create some revenue, but not nearly close to the potential of the estate. This second half of my proposal would provide a significant revenue source on a consistent and monthly basis. The idea is to have students live in the Auchmar estate, similar to a student residence. Any concern about the viability of student housing is addressed via a scholarship plan. Students would apply for a scholarship fund to access housing at Auchmar. Highly motivated, mature and responsible students only would live at the estate. Students interested in living at the Auchmar Estate would uphold the philosophy at the centre of this proposal which is the restoration and preservation of a Hamilton landmark. The idea is not to allow just any student who wants to live in the house. The idea is once the house is livable create a scholarship that students compete for to live in the house. The cost to live in the house would be $1000 a month per room per student, of course this is a significant amount of money for any student, so my thought here is the Mohawk scholarship covers half of the students monthly rent. The competing students would have to prove themselves worthy of living in the estate as well adhere to a strict code of conduct and be heavily involved in the community and maintaining the Auchmar estate. The students would have to be well rounded with good academic marks, lots of previous community involvement, volunteer work, athletics, clean criminal record, proof of maintaining a steady job. The latter are only some aspects of the criteria a student must meet to live in the house. Once in the house the student will be required to become an expert on the Auchmar Estate and be able to do any guided tours to the public and provide appropriate facts about the estate. They would also have to organize charity events at the estate for the city. It could go as far as having students from specific courses like environmental engineers, agriculture etc so that they can be
responsible for various on-going maintenance and projects at the estate, IE solar panels, apple orchard ETC.

Disclaimer
This is a preliminary proposal and if council and other parties are interested I would like to spearhead this project and go forth and speak with Mohawk and McMaster and get them on board as well.