Economic Development and Planning Committee
MINUTES 09-013A
Wednesday, June 10, 2009
9:30 am
Albion Room, Hamilton Convention Centre
1 Summer’s Lane, Hamilton

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

(a) CHANGES TO THE AGENDA (Item 1)

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

(Clark/Ferguson)
The agenda for the June 10, 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)
Council – June 29, 2009
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 are attractive, lively and safe; establish an integrated transportation network that connects and 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, 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 ongoing 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 totalled 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)

(Ferguson/Bratina)
That the written submissions received from the following, be 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

(bb) Ruth Leibersbach, on behalf of the Hamilton Chamber of Commerce

(cc) Paletta International

(dd) David Pentland, 293 Woodworth Drive, Ancaster

(ee) E. J. Fothergill, President, Fothergill Planning & Development

(ff) Steven A. Zakem, Solicitor, on behalf of Upper Centennial Developments Limited, respecting Highland Road West/Mud Street West

(gg) Rita Giulietti, Communications Co-ordinator, Friends of the Eramosa Karst

(hh) Hamish Campbell, Dundurn Street, Hamilton

(ii) Peter Ormond, Concerned Citizen, respecting Aerotropolis

(jj) A. Milliken Heisey, Solicitor, on behalf of Canadian National Railway

CARRIED
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:

• 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 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.

(iv) Dr. Tom Nugent

Dr. 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

Council – June 29, 2009
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 10, 2009
Economic Development and Planning Committee
MINUTES 09-013B
Thursday, June 11, 2009
6.00 pm
Albion Room, Hamilton Convention Centre
1 Summer’s Lane, Hamilton

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

Council – June 29, 2009
(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 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:
  - Three categories of residential uses: low density residential, medium density residential, and high density residential
- Commercial and Mixed Use:
  - Three Mixed Use Designations: downtown mixed use, mixed use – high density, and mixed use – medium density
  - Two Commercial Designations: district commercial and arterial commercial
  - Pedestrian predominant streets consist buildings close to the property line, ground floor commercial, enhanced pedestrian amenities.
- Employment Areas
  - 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 Gonnsen, Metropolitan Consulting Inc., respecting Parkside Hills Inc. and Silverwood Homes

On a Motion (Whitehead/Duvall) 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
Economic Development & Planning
Committee

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{o One set of benefits is not achieved to the exclusion of the others} \\
&\text{Lessons from Other Gateways} \\
&\text{o Several Gateway Cities were studied worldwide consisting of:} \\
&\quad \quad \text{Major seaports} \\
&\quad \quad \text{Inland ports} \\
&\text{The best Gateways in the world: emphasize being uncongested; effective at} \\
&\quad \quad \text{building consensus and partnerships; good at self-promotion; have developed} \\
&\quad \quad \text{effective transport-focused organization; embrace containerization} \\
&\text{Creating a Transport-Focused Gateway Organization} \\
&\text{Analysis of Gateway Development Impacts and The Sequence of the} \\
&\quad \text{Analysis} \\
&\text{15 Canadian Economic Regions Modelled, 3 of them in Ontario} \\
&\text{Assumed Gateway Employment Growth by Scenario up to 2031} \\
&\text{Hamilton Gateway Induced Spillover GDP Growth by Region (2031)} \\
&\text{In Comparing Sprawl to Compact-LRT Scenarios (2031):} \\
&\text{o Auto commuting levels reduced under Compact-LRT} \\
&\text{o Emission level reductions under Compact-LRT} \\
&\text{Graph showing NOx Emissions by Scenario (in Kg)} \\
&\text{Modal Split of Work Trips (Gateway Compact Scenario)} \\
&\text{Recommendations:} \\
&\text{o Hamilton should strive to be compact with future core-oriented} \\
&\quad \text{residential development} \\
&\text{o LRT and other public transit should be keenly pursued} \\
&\text{o Phased Airport Employment Growth District development but avoid} \\
&\quad \text{residential in vicinity} \\
&\text{o Enhanced containerization and short-term shipping at port} \\
&\text{o Formation of transportation-focused Gateway organization} \\
&\text{o Sense of urgency required} \\
&\text{o Emphasis on nurturing and growing human capital} \\
\end{align*} \]

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:

\[ \begin{align*}
&\text{Building a Child and Family Friendly Neighbourhood into Hamilton’s New} \\
&\quad \text{Official Plan} \\
&\text{Who the North End Neighbours are} \\
&\text{Would like a child and family friendly neighbourhood} \\
&\text{Photos of North End Neighbourhood} \\
&\text{o Streets designated as “collector”} \\
\end{align*} \]
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:

- Has lived in North End for five years
- Has business in North End
- Lives there to have access to the City
- All parks are across major streets

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?
- 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.
- 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
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- 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 Glancaster Road, remain residential. Tim McCabe informed Committee that it is not part of this Official Plan.

(Duvall/Clark)
That the presentations be received.

CARRIED
(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.

(Mitchell/Duvall)
There being no further business, the Economic Development and Planning Committee adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maria Pearson, Chair
Economic Development and Planning Committee

Alexandra Rawlings, Co-ordinator
Economic Development and Planning Committee
June 10, 2009
(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
That the Agenda for the June 16, 2009, meeting of the Economic Development & Planning Committee be approved, as presented.

CARRIED

(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
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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:

- The Official Plan Format
- The Goal of the Official Plan
- The Urban structure map indicating the various nodes and corridors
- Land Use Designations
- Neighbourhoods
- Commercial and mixed use
- Employment areas
- Industrial areas
- Residential intensification
- Transportation
- Natural Heritage System
- Health, Safety and Energy
- Volume 2 – existing secondary plans
- Volume 3 – area and site specific policies
- Summary of issues
  - the major issues from the public consultations and changes made by staff as a result
  - the processes that will continue – there will be changes to the plan as we move forward.
- The next steps – final target – the Comprehensive Zoning By-law.

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

George Zajac, IBI Group
Re: Tobyn Park Homes – 390 Highland Road West
and
Re: Landmart Homes

Tim Hortons, Oakville, ON L6K 2Y1

Dr. Tom Nugent, 9 Grandview Avenue

Anthony Cappucinello

(Mitchell/Pasuta)
That the additional communications be received.

CARRIED

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’s 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 Kaempferrer 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 targets 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;
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- 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 reuseers 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.

(Whitehead/Mitchell)
That the presentations be received. CARRIED
(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.

(Mitchell/Pasuta)

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

CARRIED
Respectfully submitted,

Maria Pearson, Chair
Economic Development and Planning Committee

Alexandra Rawlings, Co-ordinator
Economic Development and Planning Committee
June 16, 2009