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
(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

Council – June 29, 2009
Joanne Hickey Evans provided an overview of the Plan;

- The new Urban Official Plan replaces the existing regional and six area municipal plans
- Provincial directions – the Province has taken a greater role in municipal planning through the Provincial Policy Statement and by strengthening the language of the Planning Act.
- Official plan format:
  Volume 1 consists of the parent plan;
  Volume 2 consists of secondary plans; and
  Volume 3 consists of area and site specific policies
- Goal of the Official Plan is to create complete, compact communities where people can live, shop, work, play and learn.
- Broad Goals of the Plan: to support investment to contribute to the City’s economic base and prosperity, to focus on urban design to make communities attractive and sustainable; establish a transportation system that is integrated with land uses; provide housing for all residents; and to protect and enhance natural heritage and cultural heritage resources.
- Urban Structure Map
- Land use designations: neighbourhoods, commercial/mixed use, employment (Industrial), open Space, utility, and institutional
- Neighbourhoods:
  o Three categories of residential uses: low density residential, medium density residential, and high density residential
- Commercial and Mixed Use:
  o Three Mixed Use Designations: downtown mixed use, mixed use – high density, and mixed use – medium density
  o Two Commercial Designations: district commercial and arterial commercial
  o Pedestrian predominant streets consist buildings close to the property line, ground floor commercial, enhanced pedestrian amenities.
- Employment Areas
  o Four designations: Industrial Land Designation, Business Park Designation, Airport Business Park Designation, and Shipping and Navigation Designation
- Utility
- Institutional
- Open Space
- Land Use Designations Map
- Supporting Policies are a series of policies that apply to development or redevelopment within various land uses. They address: Strong Economy; Urban Design; Residential Intensification; Housing; Community Facilities and
Services; Transportation; Infrastructure; Cultural Heritage; Natural Heritage Systems; and Health, Safety and Energy.

- Secondary Plans: What are they and why were they updated
- Area and Site Specific Policies: What are they and why were they updated
- Summary of Issues: Growth Management Issues, Land Use Designations, Supporting Policies, Natural Heritage System, Transportation, Arts and Culture, and Existing Land Processes
- Next Steps: Committee and Council approval; Forward to Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing for Approval; Once both Urban and Rural OPs are final and binding, they will be combined into one document; Comprehensive Zoning Bylaw

There were no questions from the Committee.

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

- John Ariens, IBI Group, respecting Mount Mary Retreat Centre in Ancaster
- Susan Rogers, on behalf of 20 Road East landowners
- Karl 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
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One set of benefits is not achieved to the exclusion of the others

- Lessons from Other Gateways
  - Several Gateway Cities were studied worldwide consisting of:
    - Major seaports
    - Inland ports
  - The best Gateways in the world: emphasize being uncongested; effective at building consensus and partnerships; good at self-promotion; have developed effective transport-focused organization; embrace containerization
- Creating a Transport-Focused Gateway Organization
- Analysis of Gateway Development Impacts and The Sequence of the Analysis
- 15 Canadian Economic Regions Modelled, 3 of them in Ontario
- Assumed Gateway Employment Growth by Scenario up to 2031
- Hamilton Gateway Induced Spillover GDP Growth by Region (2031)
- In Comparing Sprawl to Compact-LRT Scenarios (2031):
  - Auto commuting levels reduced under Compact-LRT
  - Emission level reductions under Compact-LRT
- Graph showing NOx Emissions by Scenario (in Kg)
- Modal Split of Work Trips (Gateway Compact Scenario)

Recommendations:
- Hamilton should strive to be compact with future core-oriented residential development
- LRT and other public transit should be keenly pursued
- Phased Airport Employment Growth District development but avoid residential in vicinity
- Enhanced containerization and short-term shipping at port
- Formation of transportation-focused Gateway organization
- Sense of urgency required
- Emphasis on nurturing and growing human capital

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

Sheri Selway, North End Neighbours addressed Committee with regard to the matter, with the assistance of a PowerPoint presentation. Her points included, but were not limited to the following:
- Building a Child and Family Friendly Neighbourhood into Hamilton’s New Official Plan
- Who the North End Neighbours are
- Would like a child and family friendly neighbourhood
- Photos of North End Neighbourhood
  - Streets designated as “collector”
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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.
west lane goes right up against sidewalk. The danger factor for that area with high density of children walking is real.

- Airport employment growth district – in section 4.1.2 it says we need 1800 hectares if 50 jobs/h. Do statistics show that we will have that level of population growth and do we need that amount designated for employment growth?

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

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

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

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

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

There were none.

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

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

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

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

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

Councillor Mitchell advised that he and Councillor Ferguson are serving on a community Liaison committee for the Airport Employment Growth District, and that a resolution may be coming from that Committee that certain areas, such as 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