

Wednesday August 12<sup>th</sup>, 2020

City of Hamilton  
71 Main Street West, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Hamilton, Ontario, L8P 4Y5  
Attention: Planning and Economic Development

Attn: **Heather Travis**  
Senior Project Manager, Growth Management Strategy  
Planning & Economic Development Department

---

Re: **UPPER WEST SIDE – URBAN BOUNDARY EXPANSION APPLICATIONS (CENTRAL)  
SUBMISSION PACKAGE  
FC-20-028/029/034**

---

Dear Ms. Travis,

On behalf of the Upper West Side Landowners Group (UWSLG), Corbett Land Strategies Inc., (CLS) is pleased to submit the applications to the City of Hamilton for the purposes of Urban Boundary Expansion. As per policy 2.2.8.5 of the Provincial Growth Plan (2019), the UWSLG is submitting Official Plan Amendment applications to permit privately initiated urban boundary expansion areas under 40 hectares which can occur outside, or in advance of the Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR) process.

The Upper West Side community lands which are bounded by Twenty Road West to the north, Upper James to the east, Dickenson Rd to the south and Glancaster Rd to the west, contain both employment lands located within the Airport Employment Growth District (AEGD) and two small rural areas that are located outside of the existing Urban Boundary. The rural areas are characterized as “whitebelt” areas and are not designated within the AEGD Secondary Plan.

CLS has divided the rural areas into three major Urban Expansion Areas identified as the East, Central and West precincts. This cover letter represents the Central Urban Boundary Expansion area. The division of land is based on land ownership and all properties are found south of Twenty Road West. The East area is proposing 26.61 hectares to be added to the Urban Boundary Area, the Central area is proposing 32.57 hectares and the West Area is proposing 27.38 hectares. These areas are all designated as “Rural” within both the Rural and Urban Hamilton Official Plans. The East and Central areas are zoned as “A2 Rural” and the West is zoned as “P4 Open Space”. Please note, the West precinct was previously used as a golf course which has been inactive for several years.

The combined proposed development areas have the capacity to accommodate residential development comprised of approximately 2,450 various residential units. The anticipated density is approximately 71 persons and jobs per hectare. These expansion areas will also support the existing natural heritage system and construct a collector road network and stormwater infrastructure. If approved, the proposed applications for Urban Boundary Expansion will result in a community which will:

- Be a complete community supported by residential, employment, commercial and public facilities such as parks, schools and recreational facilities;
- Be an infill development as it is completely surrounded by urban boundary;
- Deliver infrastructure (i.e. Garth Street Extension, servicing to AEGD lands);
- Avoid developing on prime agricultural land;
- Deliver and support employment planned for the AEGD
- Deliver infrastructure and financing through the implementation of a Landowner Cost Sharing Agreement;
- Deliver on Provincial planning priorities: housing & land supply;
- Deliver \$157.5 million in one-time Development Charges;
- Deliver \$55.7 million in annual revenue (\$33.5M in taxes/ \$17.7M in water and wastewater/ \$4.5M in non-tax);
- Deliver \$15.4 million in one-time building permit revenue;
- Incorporate extensive sustainable development features;
- Provide opportunities for affordable housing land grant opportunities;
- Act as a post-COVID-19 economic stimulus project; and,
- Allow for an ease in implementation.

CLS has formally received comments on the proposed expansion areas with City Staff through the Formal Consultation Application, received on April 15<sup>th</sup>, 2020 (FC-20-028/029/034). During the Formal Consultation meeting, the City identified multiple studies/ assessments that are required to complete the applications set forth. CLS has completed a large majority of the studies and has attached a transmittal document (Appendix A) to identify the submitted assessments/ reports. A response document has been prepared and attached to this letter (Appendix B)

In accordance with Staff Report, PED19146, specific Official Plan Amendment application fees have been assigned for Urban Boundary Expansions. Staff have advised that these fees have been established due to the complexity of the applications but are not inclusive of the peer review fees which have been identified to be separate. As you are aware, section 69(1) of the Planning Act specifies that the fees shall be designed to meet only the cost to the municipality in respect of the processing of the application. The cost of these fees are excessive, especially in context of the additional fee being levied for a peer review. In accordance with s.69(3) of the Planning Act, the UWSLG submits payment for the application fees under protest. A written notice of appeal to the Local Planning Appeal Tribunal will be submitted by our legal counsel within the prescribed 30 day period.

Through the contents of this submission, the UWSLG has responded to the specific criteria for Urban Boundary Expansion Applications and believes the enclosed materials represents the City interests in accommodating future growth. We believe the expansion request is appropriate and we look forward to working with the City through the review of the application. If there are any concerns or questions, please feel free to contact the undersigned.

Thank you,

*Nick Wood*

---

**Nick Wood**

Manager, Development Planning  
Corbett Land Strategies Inc.  
[nick@corbettlandstrategies.ca](mailto:nick@corbettlandstrategies.ca)  
416-420-5544

COPIES:           Upper West Side Land Owners Group  
                      John Farber, Legal Counsel, Fogal Rubinoff

## APPENDIX A: Transmittal

The following documentation comprises the Urban Boundary Expansion applications submission:

CATEGORY	TYPE	DRAWING NAME	No. of PAGES	NO. OF COPIES
Official Plan Amendment – Urban Boundary Expansion <b>East</b> application with signatures	FORM	2020 08 11_Upper West Side UBE OPA East Application_Signed	28	
Official Plan Amendment – Urban Boundary Expansion <b>East</b> application without signatures	FORM	2020 07 30_Upper West Side UBE OPA East Application_Unsigned	28	
Official Plan Amendment – Urban Boundary Expansion <b>Central</b> application with signatures	FORM	2020 08 11_Upper West Side UBE OPA Central Application_Signed	28	
Official Plan Amendment – Urban Boundary Expansion <b>Central</b> application without signatures	FORM	2020 07 30_Upper West Side UBE OPA Central Application_Unsigned	28	
Official Plan Amendment – Urban Boundary Expansion <b>West</b> application with signatures	FORM	2020 08 11_Upper West Side UBE OPA West Application_Signed	28	
Official Plan Amendment – Urban Boundary Expansion <b>West</b> application without signatures	FORM	2020 07 30_Upper West Side UBE OPA West Application_Unsigned	28	
Community Plan	DRAWING	Concept Community Plan (ALL AREAS)	1	
Survey Plan - East	DRAWING	Survey_UBE East (1)	1	
Survey Plan - East	DRAWING	Survey_UBE East (2)	1	
Survey Plan - East	DRAWING	Survey_UBE East (3)	1	
Survey Plan - Central	DRAWING	Survey_UBE Central (1)	1	
Survey Plan - Central	DRAWING	Survey_UBE Central (2)	1	
Survey Plan - West	DRAWING	Survey_UBE West	1	
Formal Consultation (April 2020)	DOCUMENT	UWS_Formal Consultation Document Apr.2020_Signed	15	
City of Hamilton Evaluation Framework	DOCUMENT	2020 08 11_UWS_UBE Application_Evaluation Framework_All UBE Areas	2	
Formal Consultant Comment Response Matrix	DOCUMENT	2020 07 24_UBE Comment Summary	29	
Planning Justification Report	REPORT	UWS_Planning Justification Report	149	
Urban Design Brief	REPORT	UWS_Urban Design Brief	99	
Public Consultation Strategy	REPORT	See Planning Justification Report	N/A	
Draft Official Plan Amendment	DOCUMENT	See Planning Justification Report	N/A	
Environmental Impact Assessment (EIS)/ Tree Protection Plan (TPP)/ Linkage Assessment	REPORT	UWS_EIS, LA, TPP	271	
Karst Assessment	MEMO	UWS_Karst Assessment Letter	1	
Hydrogeological Study (Central and East)	REPORT	UWS_Hydrogeological (July 2018)	128	

CATEGORY	TYPE	DRAWING NAME	No. of PAGES	NO. OF COPIES
Functional Servicing and Stormwater Management Report	REPORT	UWS – Functional Servicing Report	19	
CIVIL Drawing No.200	DRAWING	FSR – Predevelopment Storm Drainage (200)	1	
CIVIL Drawing No.300	DRAWING	FSR – Grading Plan (Part 1) (300)	1	
CIVIL Drawing No.301	DRAWING	FSR – Grading Plan (Part 2) (301)	1	
CIVIL Drawing 303 - 305	DRAWING	FSR – Proposed ROWs (303-305)	3	
CIVIL Drawing No.500	DRAWING	FSR – Contributing Storm Drainage to Ponds (500)	1	
CIVIL Drawing No.800	DRAWING	FSR – Sanitary Drainage Plan (800)	1	
CIVIL Drawing No.801	DRAWING	FSR – AEGD WWSMP (801)	1	
CIVIL Drawing No.900	DRAWING	FSR – Water Distribution Plan (900)	1	
Sanitary Sewer Design Sheet	DOCUMENT	FSR – Sanitary Sewer Design Sheet	2	
Financial Impact Analysis	REPORT	UWS_Financial Impact Assessment	36	
Parks Issues Assessment	REPORT	UWS_Parks and Community Infrastructure	42	
Agricultural Impact Assessment	REPORT	UWS Agricultural Impact Assessment	41	
Noise Impact Study	REPORT	UWS_Noise Feasibility Study	38	
Transportation Impact Study, Transit Assessment & Transportation Demand Management Report	REPORT	UWS_Transportation Study	28	
Lands Needs Assessment	MEMO	UWS_Land Needs Assessment	14	
Energy and Environmental Assessment Report	REPORT	UWS_Energy & Environmental Assessment Report	46	
Fluvial Geomorphological Assessment	REPORT	UWS_Fluvial Geomorphological Assessment	93	
Geotechnical Investigation & Hydrogeological Assessment	REPORT	UWS_UBE West_Geotech and HydroGeo	44	

**APPENDIX B: Formal Consultant Comment Response Matrix**

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
<p>City of Hamilton - Natural Heritage (Melissa Kiddie)</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>1. EIS/LA: Based on policies within the RHOP and UHOP, when development has the potential to negatively impact a Core Area’s natural features or ecological functions an EIS is required. The EIS inventories and describes the existing Core Areas and ecological functions of the site within the surrounding landscape; assesses the potential negative impacts and provides recommendations to accommodate or enhance existing natural features and functions. Where new development or site alteration is proposed within a Linkage, a Linkage Assessment is to be prepared. Where an EIS is being prepared, the Linkage Assessment can be included as part of the EIS. As part of the Urban Boundary Expansion (UBE) Formal Consultation materials, an EIS/LA has been prepared by Natural Resource Solutions Inc. (NRSI) (February 2020). Natural Heritage Planning staff has not completed a full review of this report. As a result, the EIS has not been approved.</p>	<p>NRSI</p>	<p>Noted. The February 2020 EIS and LA have been revised to include all UBE lands. Following the completion of field surveys, it is anticipated that the June 2020 EIS and LA, as well as the February 2020 TPP, will be updated with the results of the full suite of seasonal field surveys and will address agency comments in response to the pre-consultation comments as well as those received in response to the first submission of the Terms of Reference for the UBE EIS, LA, and TPP.</p>	<p>June 2020 EIS and LA (partial response)</p>
	<p>2</p>	<p>The following considerations have been provided. a) EIS/LA Terms of Reference (ToR): As outlined within the City’s Council adopted EIS Guidelines (revised March 2015), a Terms of Reference (ToR) outlining the contents and scope of the EIS is to be prepared to the satisfaction of the City and the relevant Conservation Authority (in this case, NPCA). This was identified at the previous Formal Consultation (FC-19-126; Nov. 27, 2019). To date, a ToR has not been submitted or approved for this work. It is important to have an approved ToR prior to completing field work so that the right surveys are completed in the appropriate timeframes. A ToR should be submitted as soon as</p>	<p>NRSI</p>	<p>A ToR for the EIS/LA/TPP was submitted to the City and NPCA on May 14, 2020 for review and comment. Comments were received from the City and NPCA on June 2 and June 4, 2020 (respectively). The ToR and responding comments are appended to the June 2020 EIS and LA report. A revised ToR will be submitted in the coming weeks.</p>	<p>UBE EIS, LA, and TPP Terms of Reference (May 14, 2020)</p>
	<p>3</p>	<p>While a complete review of the EIS has not occurred, there are concerns with the following field studies (it is important to note, this is not an exhaustive list): i. Wetland Boundaries: It has been identified that the wetland boundaries were surveyed in consultation with NPCA and City staff on August 8, 2019. The surveyed boundaries need to be clearly shown on all figures. ii. Terrestrial Crayfish: It has been identified that there is potential Significant Wildlife Habitat as it relates to terrestrial crayfish; however, surveys related to this species are missing. iii. Winter Wildlife Surveys: It has been identified that winter wildlife surveys were completed as per the City’s Linkage Assessment Guidelines. These Guidelines do not provide specific guidance on completing surveys. The specific protocol/description of work needs to be provided. iv. Bat Assessment: It has been identified that bat habitat assessment (leaf-off) was completed as per the City’s Tree Protection Guidelines (revised October 2010). These Guidelines do not provide specific guidance on bats. In addition, leaf-on inventories appear to be missing. v. Marsh Bird Inventory: Marsh birds were only sampled once (June 17, 2019). Based on the Marsh Monitoring program, sampling is to occur twice between May 20 and July 5.</p>	<p>NRSI</p>	<p>These comments regarding field studies will be addressed as part of the ToR review process. The future revised EIS will be updated to include clarifying details on all field surveys.</p>	<p>Future revised EIS, LA, and TPP (date TBD)</p>

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	4	<p>In addition, a separate ToR has been submitted for 9511 Twenty Road West (March 2, 2018) for an EIS in support of Planning Act applications UHOPA- 18-016; ZAC-18-040; and 25T-201807. Natural Heritage Planning staff provided comments on March 14, 2018. Due to further clarifications, revisions were required and the ToR was not approved. A revised ToR was submitted January 6, 2020. Based on Natural Heritage Planning comments (January 28, 2020), the ToR was not approved. To date, a re-submission of the ToR has not been provided.</p>	NRSI	<p>Comments on the January 6, 2020 version of the TOR for the EIS, LA, and TPP specific to the development applications submitted for the Draft Plan of Subdivision at 9511 Twenty Road West will be addressed separately from the UBE application process. NRSI will re-submit the TOR for these separate natural heritage studies in the coming weeks.</p>	<p><b>Garth Street Draft Plan Revised TOR (date TBD)</b></p>
	5	<p>b) Linkage Assessment: Linkages have not been clearly identified in mapping provided within the 2020 NRSI UBE EIS. Based on the UHOP, a Linkage has been identified within the hydro corridor located on 9511 Twenty Road West and on adjacent properties (2060 Upper James Street). Within the 2020 UBE EIS it has been identified that the Conceptual Block Plan incorporates an NHS that will be designed to provide movement and propagation opportunities for wildlife. There is concern that Linkages have not been identified within the NHS and that impacts to Linkages on the adjacent properties have not been considered</p>	NRSI	<p>Map 5 of the revised June 2020 EIS and LA identifies all linkages shown on Schedule B and AEGD Secondary Plan Map B.8-2 of the RHOP/UHOP. The Linkage Assessment section in the EIS provides an analysis of these Linkages, and determines that based on their current function and quality, replication of the ecological functions of the Linkages can be provided in the block-wide NHS. Impacts to all Linkages within the overall UBE study area, including those on adjacent properties, are considered.</p>	<p><b>June 2020 EIS and LA</b></p>
	6	<p>c) Non-ecological Elements (i.e. stormwater management, Low Impact Development): EIS inventories and characterizes the existing Core Areas and ecological functions of a site. As part of the development proposal, impact assessment and mitigation measures, it is important to discuss the non-ecological elements (i.e. stormwater management). This connection appears to be missing within the EIS.</p>	NRSI	<p>High-level details of non-ecological elements, including general descriptions of the stormwater management strategy, are provided in the June 2020 EIS and LA; however, the exact locations of SWM and LID facilities is not available at this development stage; the conceptual nature of the UBE community plan precludes the fulsome analysis of all indirect impacts, including from the SWM approach, in this version of the EIS and LA. Once additional details become available at Draft Plan of Subdivision or Site Plan stages, these analysis can be completed. The June 2020 EIS notes the necessity of completing additional studies and analyses of impacts at these future stages.</p>	<p><b>June 2020 EIS and LA</b></p>



Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	7	d) 555 Glancaster Road: The EIS focuses on the UBE areas identified as “Central Block” (9751-9625 Twenty Road West), “East A” (9445 Twenty Road West) and “East B” (9285 Twenty Road West). Inventories related to 555 Glancaster Road have not been included. It is important to include this area within the EIS since it is located adjacent to Core Areas within the UHOP and the proposed Natural Open Space (as outlined within the UBE Plan) extends onto this property.	NRSI	A field program has been initiated for the lands at 555 Glancaster Road, as detailed in the May 14, 2020 TOR. The June 2020 EIS and LA now includes background information and a high-level analysis for the natural features and functions in the western UBE block on this property. Once field surveys are complete in 2020, a revised EIS will be re-submitted containing the full results and analysis for these lands.	June 2020 EIS and LA (partial response)
	8	e) Integration with Current Planning Act application: Currently, Planning Act applications (UHOPA-18-016; ZAC-18-040; 25T-201807) have been submitted for 9511 Twenty Road West with the intent to develop a new industrial subdivision. An EIS (Upper West Side Draft Plan of Industrial Subdivision) was prepared by NRSI June 2018. Due to the absence of an approved ToR and a number of inventories that were missing, a comprehensive review of the EIS could not be provided. As a result, the EIS was not approved (September 26, 2018). To date, a revised EIS has not been re-submitted. Since the mapping shown within the 2020 NRSI EIS only characterizes the northern portion of the property, it is unclear how the proposed UBE will transition with the current proposal on 9511 Twenty Road West.	NRSI	See response to Comment #4 regarding the TOR for the application at 9511 Twenty Road West. Updates to field surveys are being completed concurrently with the 2020 field program to address missing inventories and ensure there is comprehensive data to inform both the UBE EIS as well as the Draft Plan studies. All surveys relevant to the lands within the UBE blocks are included in the May 14, 2020 UBE TOR.	UBE EIS, LA, and TPP Terms of Reference (May 14, 2020)
	9	f) Environmentally Significant Impact Evaluation Group (ESAIEG) Review: As per policies within the RHOP and UHOP, the City’s ESAIEG will review the EIS and provide objective, technical advice to City staff on the impacts of the proposed land use changes within or adjacent to natural areas. At this time, the EIS has not been thoroughly reviewed and there may be missing information. Once Natural Heritage Planning staff initially reviews the EIS, the EIS will be reviewed by ESAIEG. At this time, it is unknown when this meeting will occur. The 2020 review fee is \$390.00.	NRSI	Noted.	n/a

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	10	<p>2. Tree Protection Plan (TPP): Through aerial photograph interpretation, trees have been identified within all of the subject properties. As per policies within the RHOP and UHOP, the City recognizes the importance of trees and woodlands to the health and quality of life in the community and encourages the protection and restoration of trees. Based on the Concept Plan, it appears that some of these trees will be removed to facilitate development. Since the City recognizes that trees are important to the quality of life in a community, a TPP is required. The TPP is to be prepared by a recognized tree management professional (i.e. certified arborist, registered professional forester or landscape architect) and is to be prepared in accordance with the City's Tree Protection Guidelines (revised October 2010).</p>	NRSI	<p>A TPP for the Central and East UBE Blocks has been prepared, and will be updated to include tree inventory data and analyses for the West Block upon completion of 2020 field surveys. The revised TPP will contain only high-level analyses at the UBE application stage, since specific details of final developments (prepared at future stages) affecting the ability to retain on-site trees is required. Preliminary analyses will enumerate the number, species, and condition of trees within the UBE blocks, and the locations of trees will be mapped.</p>	<p>February 2020 Central and East Blocks TPP (and revised version provided following the completion of 2020 field surveys)</p>
	11	<p>A TPP prepared by NRSI has been included within the February 2020 EIS/LA. Since a comprehensive review has not yet been undertaken, the TPP has not been approved. Natural Heritage Planning staff offers the following considerations.</p> <p>a) A TPP review fee is to be submitted to the City. At this time, it is unclear if this fee has been provided. The 2020 review fee is \$625.00.</p> <p>b) The tree inventory has been completed for "Central Block" (9751 and 9625 Twenty Road), "East A" (9445 Twenty Road) and "East B" (9285 Twenty Road). The property at 555 Glanaster Road has not been included. Since there are trees on the property, it is important that the tree inventory include this property.</p> <p>c) The decision to retain trees is to be based on vigour, condition, aesthetics, age and species.</p> <p>d) Compensation: To ensure that existing tree cover is maintained, 1 for 1 compensation is required for any private tree (10 cm DBH or greater) that is proposed to be removed. Additional compensation may be required for public trees. Compensation is required for all trees (regardless if they are native/non-native). The exceptions include dead trees or invasive species (i.e. European Buckthorn).</p> <p>It has been identified that compensation trees may be planted within the Natural Heritage System. It is important to note that additional plantings beside these trees may be required within these areas.</p>	NRSI	<p>Noted. Please see response to Comment #10.</p>	<p>Revised TPP provided following the completion of 2020 field surveys</p>

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	12	3. Karst Assessment: The City of Hamilton does not have specific guidelines for the completion of a karst assessment. It is unclear if aerial photographs were reviewed to identify potential sinking streams and springs.	NRSI	No bedrock outcrops were observed at the site and bedrock was not encountered in any of the 33 boreholes advanced throughout the property. As such, given the relative overburden thickness, as assessment of karst features is not considered to be applicable at the site. A Letter prepared and signed by the conducting consultant (EPX) has been enclosed for your review.	Karst Assessment Letter dated September 15, 2019
NPCA (Sarah Mastroianni)	13	properties as well as areas mapped as Provincially Significant Wetland (all associated with the Upper Twenty Mile Creek subwatershed), an EIS is required to address the various channels traversing the subject property, as well as, verification of the PSW limits.  The below EIS scoping is done with the assumption that development will be proposed either within the natural heritage features themselves, or within 30 metres of the features. Should the proposed development and site alteration have a defined footprint or is planned to be outside of the regulated buffers, the NPCA should be contacted as it	NRSI/ Geomorphix	Noted.	n/a
	14	In addition to that outlined in the City of Hamilton EIS Guidelines, the following must be included within the EIS:  Any relevant information gathered from existing studies conducted within the last 5 years. Should recent studies exist, the NPCA should be notified as it may be possible that those studies can cover off some of the requirements below.	NRSI	Noted. The UBE TOR process will provide the opportunity to determine these requirements and if there is existing relevant data.	n/a
	15	Assessment of the channel form and function using OSAP methodology (screening level) or the Headwaters Assessment Protocols developed by TRCA, including quantification of the contribution area supporting the channel base flow and wetland features (drainage areas).	NRSI/ Geomorphix	NRSI and GEOMorphix are assessing all HDFs as per standard OSAP and TRCA guidelines and methodologies.	UBE EIS, LA, and TPP Terms of Reference (May 14, 2020)
	16	Amphibian (Marsh Monitoring) survey for the property, predominantly in the wetlands and watercourse. Marsh Monitoring surveys conducted within the past five years can be used in the place of new surveys.	NRSI	Anuran call surveys targeting all candidate breeding habitat for anuran species are being completed in 2020, or have been completed previously in 2018. The submitted TOR for the UBE provides additional details and survey dates.	UBE EIS, LA, and TPP Terms of Reference (May 14, 2020)

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	17	Ministry of Natural Resources and Forestry (MNRF) must be contacted to determine any additional Species at Risk surveys required as they pertain to the wetland and watercourse features. MNRF correspondence and any species-specific setbacks or other mitigation required by MNRF must be included in the EIS.	NRSI	Noted. An initial SAR screening memo was submitted to the MECP on May 1, 2020 to initiate discussions about SAR and their habitats within the overall UWS lands. This initial correspondence is included as an appendix to the June 2020 EIA and LA.	June 2020 EIS and LA (partial response)
	18	A detailed list and discussion of all ecological and hydrological functions of each natural heritage feature on site and within adjacent lands.	NRSI	Noted. This is included in the June 2020 EIS and will be expanded upon the completion of 2020 field surveys.	June 2020 EIS and LA
	19	Buffers must be proposed for all natural heritage features which are appropriate to protect the functions of the features.	NRSI	Noted. Buffers (VPZs) are recommended and discussed in the June 2020 EIS and LA.	June 2020 EIS and LA
	20	The plan must clearly indicate the NPCA minimum 30 metre buffer for Provincially Significant Wetlands, with any proposed changes justified based on site specific conditions such as future mature tree height of species present, potential use of adjacent land as habitat for species within the wetland, requirement for adequate hydrologic inputs, MNRF required Species at Risk setbacks, etc.	NRSI	Noted. The community plan shown in the June 2020 EIS and LA (Map 6) includes the NHS that incorporates the 30m PSW buffers. At future development stages, buffer widths will be re-assessed based on the results of all field surveys and the proposed development plans.	June 2020 EIS and LA
	21	Corridors and linkages must be considered and mapped for the site.	NRSI	Noted. A comprehensive Linkage Assessment is included as part of the June 2020 EIS, and the NHS for the UBE blocks considers the maintenance and restoration of wildlife movement corridors.	June 2020 EIS and LA
	22	The proposed development envelope (which include buildings, driveway/access, all grading, servicing, accessory structures, and all amenity space) must be delineated. Any wetland area beyond the building envelope will be expected to be maintained in a natural state.	NRSI	Noted. Specific development envelopes are not proposed as part of the higher-level UBE application process. Building envelopes specific development plans will be assessed at future stages.	n/a
	23	Impact assessment of the natural heritage features identified and their functions from an ecological and hydrological perspective.	NRSI	A high-level impact assessment is provided in the June 2020 EIS and LA. Refinements and updates will be made to the impact assessment following the collection of all 2020 field data, as well as at future development stages as more specific plan details become available.	June 2020 EIS and LA
	24	Relevant, reasonable, and implementable mitigation measures to reduce negative impacts.	NRSI	General mitigation measures are provided as part of the June 2020 EIS and LA. Refinements and updates will be made to the mitigation measures recommended following the collection of all 2020 field data, as well as at future development stages as more specific plan details become available.	June 2020 EIS and LA

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	25	A final assessment of whether the proposal, combined with any design changes and mitigation measures will result in any residual negative impact on the natural heritage feature or its ecological and hydrological functions.	NRSI	A final but high-level statement about the potential for impacts based on the community framework plan will be provided as part of the future revised UBE EIS and LA, once all 2020 field data is available to inform the impact assessment. Conclusions made as part of the UBE EIS and LA will remain general, to be refined at future development stages.	Future revised EIS, LA, and TPP (date TBD)
	26	A revised Terms of Reference will be required to be completed by the environmental consultant and circulated to the NPCA for review and approval prior to the commencement of the EIS.	NRSI	Noted. This has been initiated as of May 14, 2020. Please see response to Comment #2 above.	UBE EIS, LA, and TPP Terms of Reference (May 14, 2020)
	27	From an Engineering perspective:  The NPCA will require a SWM report indicating that both quality controls (Normal) and quantity controls (post to pre for up to the 100 year storm) are provided. The NPCA will also require floodplain mapping on any watercourse with an upstream drainage area greater than 125ha.	Urbantech	Acknowledged. A detailed SWM report will be provided in support of Secondary Plan / Draft Plan approval. This report will demonstrate how the AEGD SWM objectives will be achieved and how the City's drainage criteria are met. As shown on Drawing 200, the largest catchment, including external drainage areas, is approximately 93 ha. Therefore, no floodplain mapping is proposed at this time. However, the City did request) confirmation that the drainage features can convey the range of design storms. This will be assessed at the Draft Plan stage.	FSR
	28	NPCA review fees are below and apply to each separate application:  OPA \$2770 Review of EIS: \$2205 Review of Stormwater Report or Functional Servicing Report: \$1755 Further fees may be required as other applications/studies may be required through the process.	CLS	Noted	
City of Hamilton - Urban Forestry (Sam Brush)	29	There are no municipal tree assets on site; therefore, no Tree Management Plan is required. Landscape Plan required as per subdivision agreement.	CLS	Noted	

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
<p><b>City of Hamilton - Cultural Heritage (Miranda Brunton)</b></p>	<p><b>30</b></p>	<p>The subject property meets five (5) of the ten criteria used by the City of Hamilton and Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport for determining archaeological potential:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Within 250 metres of known archaeological sites;</li> <li>2) Within 300 metres of a primary watercourse or permanent waterbody, 200 metres of a secondary watercourse or seasonal waterbody, or 300 metres of a prehistoric watercourse or permanent waterbody;</li> <li>3) Local knowledge associates areas with historic events/activities/occupations;</li> <li>4) In an area of elevated topography; and,</li> <li>5) Along historic transportation routes.</li> </ol> <p>These criteria define the property as having archaeological potential. Accordingly, Section 2 (d) of the Planning Act and Section 2.6.2 of the Provincial Policy Statement apply and Staff require that an Archaeological Assessment be completed and submitted with any future application.</p>	<p><b>AMICK</b></p>	<p>Cultural Heritage resources have been identified through screening report. Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment is currently being completed and will be submitted shortly.</p>	
	<p><b>31</b></p>	<p>Additionally, a portion of the subject properties are located within the boundaries of the Airport Employment Growth district, as outlined below, a Stage 2 archaeological assessment is required for these lands:</p> <p>8.13.2 Prior to development approvals, a Stage 2 archaeological assessment shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City and the Province. No grading or other disturbance shall take place on any site within the Airport Employment Growth District prior to the issuance of a letter of clearance from the Province. The Stage 2 archaeological assessment shall be undertaken in accordance with Policy F.3.2.4 – Archaeological Assessments of Volume 1. The City may also require a higher standard of conservation, care and protection for archaeological resources based on prevailing conditions and circumstances within the City and the results of any dialogue with First Nations and their interests.</p>	<p><b>AMICK</b></p>	<p>Noted. Stage 2 work to be completed as part of Secondary Plan stage.</p>	
	<p><b>32</b></p>	<p>Built Heritage:</p> <p>A variety of properties subject to this application are included in the City’s Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest, as illustrated by the yellow high lighted areas below. As identified in the Cultural Heritage Screening Report, there are additional properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest.</p>	<p><b>Golder</b></p>	<p>Cultural Heritage resources have been identified through screening report. Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment is currently being completed and will be submitted shortly.</p>	

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	33	<p>Accordingly, the following sections of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan, Volume 1, apply:</p> <p>B.3.4.1.3 “Ensure that all new development, site alterations, building alterations, and additions are contextually appropriate and maintain the integrity of all on-site or adjacent cultural heritage resources.”</p> <p>B.3.4.2.1(g) “Ensure the conservation and protection of cultural heritage resources in planning and development matters subject to the Planning Act either through appropriate planning and design measures or as conditions of development approvals.” and,</p> <p>B.3.4.2.1(h) “Conserve the character of areas of cultural heritage significance, including designated heritage conservation districts and cultural heritage landscapes, by encouraging those land uses, development and site alteration activities that protect, maintain and enhance these areas within the City.”</p>	Golder	Cultural Heritage resources have been identified through screening report. Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment is currently being completed and will be submitted shortly.	
	34	<p>Also, a portion of the subject area fall within the Airport Employment Growth District Secondary Plan, as such the following apply:</p> <p>8.12.1 There are buildings, structures and cultural heritage landscapes of varying degrees of heritage interest and value in the Secondary Plan area which are both included and not included in Hamilton’s Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest and prior to approval of development applications a cultural heritage conservation plan statement shall be prepared in accordance with Section B.3.4.2.11 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. The retention and conservation of buildings of architectural or historical merit on their original sites and the promotion of the integration of these resources into new development proposals in their original use or an appropriate adaptive re-use shall be encouraged.</p> <p>8.12.3 Prior to development approvals, for those cultural heritage resources that require a cultural heritage impact assessment as determined by the culture heritage conservation plan statement noted in policy 8.12.1 above, a Stage 2 heritage assessment in shall be completed to the satisfaction of the City and the Province. No disturbance to the building, site or its surroundings shall take place within the Airport Employment Growth District until the study is reviewed and cleared. The Stage 2 heritage assessment shall be undertaken in accordance with Policy F.3.2.3 – Cultural Heritage Impact Assessments of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan.</p>	Golder	Cultural Heritage resources have been identified through screening report. Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment is currently being completed and will be submitted shortly.	

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	35	Staff have briefly reviewed the Cultural Heritage Screening Report and cannot fully comment on the content or recommendations of the report. Notwithstanding, Staff would require the applicant to submit a cultural heritage impact assessment for any future developments.	Golder	Noted	
City of Hamilton - Development Engineering (Zivko Panovski)	36	The subject lands are bounded by existing Hydro Corridor, adjacent to the Twenty Road West right-of-way, to the north and lands within the AEGD Secondary Plan to the south. The City has completed a number of studies for the lands within the original boundary of the Secondary Plan, and included a blanket holding provision on all lands to ensure adequate services are available to provide for an orderly development. For the information of the proponent a population density of 39 employee/ha (prestige business) and 23 employee/ha (light industrial) for the subject lands was assigned in the original Master Plans completed in 2010 for the subject lands as part of the overall servicing strategy of the AEGD lands.	Urbantech	<p>The population densities referenced in the AEGD / Master Servicing Plan for these lands are approximately 37.5 people per hectare. This is in contrast to the City's typical values of 125 to 750 people per hectare for industrial land use. With respect to planned or available capacities in these sewers for the subject lands, it is understood that the flow capacity is based on the lower population density, and on the gross area contributing to each sanitary outlet. It is understood that through refinement of the sanitary drainage plans and development limits, the actual sanitary catchment areas will decrease but the total allowable flow will remain constant, translating into a higher population density that would be more in line with the City's standards.</p> <p>Sanitary design sheets have been completed for the Twenty Road Sewage Pumping Station (identified to have capacity for approximately 200 ha at approximately 37.5 people / ha in the Master Plan) and for the Dickenson Road Trunk sewer (identified to have capacity for the balance of the AEGD area which is approximately 190 ha at approximately 37.5 people / ha based on the Cole Engineering design). These estimates translate to a contributing population of approximately 7500 at the Twenty Road Sewage Pumping Station and a contributing population of approximately 7125 at the Dickenson Road Trunk (at Upper James Street). The corresponding allowable flows</p>	FSR
	37	The City has completed the Transportation Master Plan Implementation Update and Water & Wastewater Servicing Master Plan Update in December 2016 as well AEGD Subwatershed Study & Stormwater Master Pan (SWMP) Implementation Document in April of 2017 to assess the impact on the Master Servicing strategy as result of the change in the boundary of the original Secondary plan. There is no change in the servicing strategy for the subject lands from the original proposal based on the above noted updates. However, the servicing of the subject lands is deferred after 2031-year planning horizon based on the Mater Servicing Studies Updates.	Urbantech	It is the position of the applicant that the servicing of a portion of the subject lands (while subject to further planning studies and Draft Plan approval), should be able to advance ahead of 2031 based on the capacity of the Twenty Road West Pumping station , which is noted in the current Master Servicing Plan to have immediate / available capacity for a portion of the subject lands.	



Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	38	<p>The cover letter prepared by Corbett Land Strategies Inc., dated February 28, 2020, included in the submission package, indicate proposal for a mix residential development for the subject land. The estimated population for the subject lands provided on Pg. 5A, based on 3.41 ppu for single/semi, 2.44 ppu for townhomes and 1.66 ppu for apartments does not comply with the current City’s Development Guidelines from the servicing point of view. A total population of more than 10,000 persons is expected within the subject lands in accordance with our criteria based on the breakdown of the unit type provided in this section. The estimated population density exceeds the original assumption taken into consideration under the Master Servicing strategy significantly. Our office has no clear understanding of the impact of the expected density on the existing or the planned works from water and wastewater servicing perspective at this time. The Upper West Side, Water, Wastewater Servicing and Stormwater Management Overview Report, dated February 2020, by Urbantech included in the submission package does not address these issues.</p>	Urbantech	<p>Noted - please refer to the response to Comment 36 for the response which addresses this comment.</p>	FSR
	39	<p>We offer the following additional info from wastewater servicing perspective for the subject lands. According to the submitted Sanitary Drainage Plan, wastewater flows from the subject lands will generally be directed to the existing Twenty Road Pumping Station. The City’s original plan for servicing of the Central and West areas was to direct wastewater flows south to the future Dickenson Road trunk sewer, reducing flows to the pumping station. The servicing strategy proposed is not consistent with the City’s infrastructure Master Planning. See below for further comment from Hamilton Water staff. In addition, we would like to advise the proponent that prior to commencement of the sanitary sewer extension and urbanization works within the existing Twenty Road West right-of-way a Class EA study shall be completed. No such study has been initiated to our understanding to this date.</p>	Urbantech/ RJB (EA)	<p>The Master Servicing Plan sanitary drainage boundary has been overlaid on Figure 800 / Figure 801 (Sanitary Drainage). As shown on this plan, the northern portion of the subject lands is indicated in the Master Servicing Plan to drain to the Twenty Road Pumping Station. It is unclear what the purpose of the proposed sanitary extension on Twenty Road West would be for if the City does not expect the subject lands to drain to the Twenty Road Pumping Station. It is the intent of the proponent to support the sewer extension / road EA provided that drainage from the UBE lands can be directed into the proposed sewer.</p>	FSR
	40	<p>The water, wastewater servicing and stormwater management strategies for these three areas have been included in the Upper West Side Master Drainage Plan &amp; Servicing Study by landowners group. However, the Upper West Side Master Drainage Plan &amp; Servicing Study is not completed yet. The approval agencies provided comments on the 1st draft of this report. But landowner group did not submit the 2nd submission of the report to show how all comments from different agencies have been addressed. Therefore, the contents of the water, wastewater servicing and stormwater management overview report dated Feb, 2020 prepared by Urbantech are premature.</p>	Urbantech	<p>Acknowledged.</p>	FSR

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	41	<p>Also , note that the proposed land uses for these three areas include residential uses, natural heritage features, SWM and a collector road, but the overview report dated Feb 2020 did not demonstrate the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Concept plan including local road networks with land use</li> <li>ii) A standalone SWM plans &amp; strategies for residential development on these land in accordance with DC bylaw. The current SWM strategies for these land outlined in Upper West Side study is industrial development perceptive.</li> <li>iii) Phasing and implementation plans from available and future servicing perspective</li> <li>iv) The servicing capacities and allocation policies for projected growth in the existing urban boundary and urban boundary expansion.</li> <li>v) Boundary Road ( Twenty Rd, Glancaster Rd ) improvements works</li> <li>vi) Front Ending Cost polices and agreement</li> </ul>	Urbantech	<p>i) It is our understanding that for the purposes of the UBE application, a high-level plan demonstrating serviceability is sufficient. ii) SWM Plans and strategies will be provided through the Secondary Plan / Draft Plan approval process. iii) Phasing and implementation plans will be provided at the Draft Plan stage. As it relates to the UBE application, there are / will be servicing solutions (i.e. Dickenson Road trunk sewer, etc.) to service the lands. The timing and corresponding phasing of the development is not being contemplated at the time of the UBE application. iv) - to vi) These items will be completed in support of the Secondary Plan / Draft Plan approval but should not impact the UBE application.</p>	FSR

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	42	<p>We recommend not to consider Urban Boundary Expansion for these white belt areas along Twenty Road West until the Upper West Side Master Drainage Plan &amp; Servicing Study initiated by landowners group is complete and approved by all agencies.</p> <p>Hamilton Water staff have offered the following comments for the subject lands, related to sanitary servicing: The proponent’s proposed change to the servicing strategy deviates from the City’s infrastructure Master Plan, and will increase the ultimate service area and wastewater load for the Twenty Road Pump Station, with associated cost and energy use impacts. The servicing of the subject lands should be subsequent to development of the urban AEGD lands to the south, consistent with infrastructure master planning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The existing sanitary infrastructure, particularly the Twenty Road Pump Station, does not have adequate capacity to service the subject lands.</li> <li>- Although not preferred, there may be adequate sanitary servicing of the subject lands by Twenty Road Pumping Station once planned capacity upgrades are completed. This would need to be confirmed through an update to the master servicing strategy for the area. The updated analysis would determine whether the servicing of the lands would be contingent on the completion of the planned Dickenson Road East diversion trunk.</li> </ul>	Urbantech	<p>The population densities referenced in the AEGD / Master Servicing Plan for these lands are approximately 37.5 people per hectare. This is in contrast to the City’s typical values of 125 to 750 people per hectare for industrial land use. With respect to planned or available capacities in these sewers for the subject lands, it is understood that the flow capacity is based on the lower population density, and on the gross area contributing to each sanitary outlet. It is understood that through refinement of the sanitary drainage plans and development limits, the actual sanitary catchment areas will decrease but the total allowable flow will remain constant, translating into a higher population density that would be more in line with the City’s standards. Refer to Section 5 in the updated FSR for details. It is recognized that further coordination with the City will be required prior to Draft Plan approval to determine how to best accommodate or phase the proposed flows shown in the preceding table. For example, a portion of the industrial lands tributary to the Twenty Road West Pumping station could be directed to the future Dickinson Road trunk. Furthermore, there may be opportunities to optimize available capacity in the existing system refine the design of the future trunk sewer. We understand that an update to the Master Servicing Plan may be required to support the proposed development and alterations to the sanitary drainage strategy.</p>	FSR
	43	<p>Our office recommends that the Planning staff declare the proposed expansion of the Hamilton Urban Boundary as premature based on the above noted comments from the servicing point of view. Furthermore, a new update of the Water and Wastewater Servicing Master Plan may be required upon completion of the studies and projects identified in this document to support the Urban Boundary expansion.</p>	Urbantech	<p>It is our opinion that the majority of the servicing related comments are based on uncertainties due to timing. The UBE is focused on the eventual serviceability of the subject lands, rather than the immediate servicing requirements. The subject lands can be phased to accommodate the completion of external infrastructure or additional studies.</p>	FSR
	44	<p>Phasing and implementation plans from available and future servicing perspective needs to be provided.</p>	Urbantech	<p>These are not required at this time - refer to the response to Comment 43 above. Phasing and implementation strategies will be provided at the Secondary Plan / Draft Plan stage.</p>	FSR
	45	<p>Servicing Capacities and allocation policies for project growth in the existing urban boundary and urban boundary expansion need to be provided.</p>	Urbantech	<p>This requirement has been identified as a requirement for future studies</p>	FSR

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	46	Boundary Road improvement works need to be incorporated.	Urbantech	Additional text has been added to Section 3.2 of the UBE FSR (Roads) as requested.	FSR
	47	Front ending cost policies and agreement need to be provided .	Urbantech	This requirement has been identified as a requirement for future studies	FSR
	48	Proposed servicing deviates from City's infrastructure Master Plan as it will increase the ultimate service area and wastewater load for the Twenty Road pump station with associated cost and energy use impacts.	Urbantech	Refer to the response to Comment 37.	FSR
	49	The existing sanitary infrastructure, particularly the Twenty Road Pump Station does not have adequate capacity to service the subject lands.	Urbantech	Refer to the response to Comment 37.	FSR
	50	Although not preferred, there may be adequate sanitary servicing once planned capacity upgrades are completed. This would need to be confirmed through an update to the Master Servicing Strategy for the area.	Urbantech	Acknowledged. Please refer to the response to Comments 36 and 37.	FSR
<b>Growth Management (George Zajac)</b>	51	In review, the subject lands are not identified nor designated as an Employment Area, but are adjacent to the Airport Employment Growth District Secondary Plan Area.	CLS	Noted	
<b>Growth Planning (Alvin Chan)</b>	52	1. It should be determined if the subject proposal is premature until the new Growth Related Integrated Development Strategy (GRIDS 2) and the Municipal Comprehensive Review are completed;	CLS	In accordance with Growth Plan policies, urban boundary expansions can be considered in advance/outside of an MCR. Please see Planning Justification Report for further details.	Planning Justification Report
	53	2. It should be determined if the subject proposal will impact the Airport Employment Growth District Master Plans;	CLS	It is the position of the applicant that the proposed UBE request will not impact the AEGD and will be conducive to opening up greater access for future employees to little in close proximity to the AEGD.	Planning Justification Report
	54	3. It should be determined if the existing and proposed Environmental Assessments will be affected by the subject proposal;	RJB (EA)	The proposed UBE has been designed to be informed by the completion of the EA's and will not preclude their ongoing works. The proposed expansion areas can be allowed in advance of the onoin EA's as the approved road network (AEGD) can accommodate the proposed expansion.	Planning Justification Report
	55	4. It should be determined if the subject proposal will impact the adjacent application (9511 Twenty Road West - 25T201807);	CLS	The proposed UBE applications have been designed in conjunction with the Plan of Subdivision application to ensure the delivery of the extension of Garth Street. The UBE applications will not preclude the Plan of Subdivision application.	Planning Justification Report
	56	6. It should be noted that the subject proposal is adjacent to a Hydro One Easement along Twenty Road;	CLS	A future Secondary Use Application will be filed with Hydro One following completion of the UBE applications.	Planning Justification Report
	57	7. It should be determined if lots to the west of the subject lands and east of Glancaster Road are legally established and if they will affect the subject proposal; and,		The proposed UBE application have been designed with consideration of the existing lots of record.	Planning Justification Report
	58	8. The owner and agent should be made aware that the municipal address for this development will be finalized when a Site Plan application is submitted.	CLS	Noted.	

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
HWCDSD (John Volek)	59	In conformity with the Growth Plan and Policies for Settlement Area Boundary Expansions, the proponents shall include as part of their analysis confirmation of sufficient capacity in existing and planned public service facilities and infrastructure, specifically, the need and availability for lands to accommodate future school sites.	CLS	The applicant will be advancing the design and location of public service facilities, specifically the need and availability for lands to accommodate future school sites, following completion of the Urban Boundary Expansion applications. The applicant will be commencing further discussions with the HWCDSD in advance of this to receive comments and directions on preferred land uses.	Parks and Community Issues Assessment
	60	The school board has no objection to the present applications to expand the Urban Boundary provided the required background studies and concept planning are completed to address the need and availability for future school sites.	CLS	Noted.	
	61	For the information of the City and the proponents, please note that the Board owns a 10 acre parcel of land located on Twenty Road, abutting the lands proposed for development. The Board reserves the right to make submissions on future Planning applications which could potentially affect their land, including the establishment of the internal road pattern for the area and the provision of infrastructure.	CLS	Noted. See comment #59.	Parks and Community Issues Assessment
Hydro One (Joan Zhao)	62	Please be advised that Hydro One Networks Inc. ("HONI") has completed a preliminary review of the proposed plan of the above noted site plan application. As the subject property is abutting and/or encroaching onto a HONI high voltage transmission corridor (the "transmission corridor"), HONI does not approve of the proposed site plan application at this time, pending review and approval of the required information.	CLS	The applicant will be advancing a Secondary Use Application following completion of the UBE application. The applicant anticipates commencing further discussions with Hydro One in advance of this to receive comments and directions on preferred land uses.	
	63	Please be advised that the transmission corridor lands affected by the proposed development and identified as such herein are subject to a statutory right in favour of HONI pursuant to Section 114.5(1) of The Electricity Act, 1998, as amended. The owner of these lands is Her Majesty, The Queen In Right of Ontario, as represented by The Minister of Infrastructure ("MOI"). Ontario Infrastructure & Lands Corporation ("OILC") as agent for the Province, must review and approve all secondary land uses such as roads that are proposed on these lands. HONI is currently acting as a service provider to OILC, and undertakes this review on their behalf.	CLS	Noted	
	64	The comments detailed herein do not constitute an endorsement of any element of the site plan design or road layout, nor do they grant any permission to access, use, proceed with works on, or in any way alter the transmission corridor lands, without the express written permission of HONI.	CLS	Noted	
	65	The following should be included in the Site Plan Agreement: 1. Any proposed secondary land use on the transmission corridor is processed through the Provincial Secondary Land Use Program (PSLUP). The developer must contact Joan Zhao, Senior Real Estate Coordinator at 905-946-6230 to discuss all aspects of the site plan design, ensure all of HONI's technical requirements are met to its satisfaction, and acquire the applicable agreements.	CLS	Noted	

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	66	2. Prior to HONI providing its final approval, the developer must make arrangements satisfactory to HONI for lot grading and drainage. Digital PDF copies of the lot grading and drainage plans (true scale), showing existing and proposed final grades, must be submitted to HONI for review and approval. The drawings must identify the transmission corridor, location of towers within the corridor and any proposed uses within the transmission corridor. Drainage must be controlled and directed away from the transmission corridor.	CLS	Noted	
	67	3. Any development in conjunction with the site plan must not block vehicular access to any HONI facilities located on the transmission corridor. During construction, there must be no storage of materials or mounding of earth, snow or other debris on the transmission corridor.	CLS	Noted	
	68	4. At the developer's expense, temporary fencing must be placed along the transmission corridor prior to construction, and permanent fencing must be erected along the common property line after construction is completed.	CLS	Noted	
	69	5. The costs of any relocations or revisions to HONI facilities which are necessary to accommodate this site plan will be borne by the developer. The developer will be responsible for restoration of any damage to the transmission corridor or HONI facilities thereon resulting from construction of the site plan.	CLS	Noted	
	70	In addition, HONI requires the following be conveyed to the developer as a precaution: 6. The transmission lines abutting the subject lands operate at either 500,000, 230,000 or 115,000 volts. Section 188 of Regulation 213/91 pursuant to the Occupational Health and Safety Act, require that no object be brought closer than 6 metres (20 feet) to an energized 500 kV conductor. The distance for 230 kV conductors is 4.5 metres (15 feet), and for 115 kV conductors it is 3 metres (10 feet). It is the developer's responsibility to be aware, and to make all personnel on site aware, that all equipment and personnel must come no closer than the distance specified in the Act. They should also be aware that the conductors can raise and lower without warning, depending on the electrical demand placed on the line.	CLS	Noted	
	71	Our preliminary review only considers issues affecting HONI's transmission facilities and transmission corridor lands. For any proposals affecting distribution facilities (low voltage), the developer should consult the local distribution supplier.	CLS	Noted	

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
Hamilton Transit (Andy McLaughlin)	72	<p>HSR has the following comments with respect to the formal consultation applications related to the 3 “Whitebelt” blocks:</p> <p>While previous AEGD TMP’s and SP’s have identified a series of new/extended conventional transit routes operating on select streets, the implementation of HSR conventional fixed routes would require:                      that the subject lands be incorporated into the Urban Transit Area (UTA)                      further study to confirm the land use density/mix is able to generate sufficient transit customers to meet/maintain route productivity service standards                      transit operating budget approval, on an annual basis</p>	RJB	<p>The 2016 TMP, which carries forward the transit network recommendations in the 2011 TMP, shows proposed transit routes throughout the AEGDSP. Transit service was identified on Twenty Road West and the east-east corridor road through the block west of Garth Street extension. Since the 2016 TMP did not include the lands of the West, Central and East Expansion Area, but transit service was identified on those two roads, it appears that development would approve the availability of transit customers generated by the land uses proposed. Therefore, the Expansion Areas should provide additional transit customers to further support the proposed transit routes.</p>	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	72	<p>Lands within the UTA are subject to transit rates, collected thru property tax, based on a community’s share of the HSR system net operating costs and a property’s assessed value</p>	RJB	<p>Acknowledged.</p>	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	73	<p>Where route extensions/new routes are not sustainable, consideration can be given to the expansion of the existing Trans-Cab service zone, again requiring expansion of the UTA and operating budget approval</p>	RJB	<p>Acknowledged. This option will be evaluated during Integrated EA.</p>	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	74	<p>With respect to the Transportation Study documents prepared for the East and Central Whitebelt’s, please be advised that:                      there is no fixed timeline for the introduction of full A Line BRT service                      all streets will require construction to urban standards, including accessible concrete sidewalks on both sides and the provision of adequate pedestrian illumination                      all traffic calming measures and roundabouts being contemplated on arterial and collector roads must be able to accommodate a 12.3m standard transit bus                      Section 12.0 Transit Assessment requires updating to reflect existing HSR service levels</p>	RJB	<p>Acknowledged. Details regarding roadway geometry, sidewalk location, traffic calming measure and roundabouts will be further refined as the various applications proceed on the lands. The Transit Assessment section has been updated to reflect the HSR service levels at the time this Transportation Study was Submitted. It is understood that HSR will change transit levels from time to time; therefore, the transit service identified was collected prior to publishing the report.</p>	UBE CTS (July 2020)

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	75	Given financial constraints related to transit operations, it is challenging to implement attractive transit service at the commencement of urban development in former rural areas. Ideally, improvements in land use density/mix deep within existing urban areas helps transit to better contribute to the achievement of City-wide modal split targets, while maintaining acceptable net operating costs. We remain hopeful that Council’s current examination of Area Rating will result in positive outcomes to guide the future provision of conventional transit services within Hamilton.	RJB	An evaluation of the lands will be undertaken through the process to determine supportable levels of development.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
Recreation (Sarah Cellini)	76	Recreation supports the inclusion of parkland, in a size and shape appropriate for recreation amenities, as part of the East and Central urban boundary expansion applications. Recreation would like to review the West application “Parks and Community Infrastructure Assessment”, once available.	CLS	A Parks and Community Infrastructure Assessment has been submitted for review. Further assesment and determination of specific facilities and their locations will occur at the Secondary Plan stage.	Parks and Community Issues Assessment
	77	With respect to the community facilities within recreation’s scope (i.e. recreation centres) noted in the “Parks and Community Infrastructure Assessment”, Recreation is undertaking a Recreation Master Plan (RMP) which will identify future recommendations with respect to indoor (and outdoor) recreation amenities comprehensively and will provide direction for recreation needs in the future once the RMP is completed.	CLS	The applicant will incorporate the results of the RMP process at the time of the Secondary Plan preparation.	Parks and Community Issues Assessment
	78	Recreation also requests participation as part of a future secondary plan associated with these applications.	CLS	The applicant welcomes Recreations participation in the future Secondary Plan preparation process.	Parks and Community Issues Assessment
Transportation Planning (Matthew Radelli)	79	Transportation Planning recommends the application not proceed to formal application until the road network is revised to the satisfaction of the Manager of Transportation Planning. Transportation Planning does not support the proposed amendment to the Official Plan with the road network proposed with under FC-20-029.	RJB	To allow the environmental assessment to properly work, the road network will be developed as part of the Integrated EA. In our opinion, inclusion of these Whitebelt lands are supportable from a transportation perspective and the details of the road network can be developed through the Integrated EA.	UBE CTS (July 2020)



Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	80	Transportation Planning notes that the general expansion of the Urban Boundary contradicts sustainability initiatives within the Transportation Planning department. The difficulty of providing sustainable modes of transportation within areas currently outside of the Urban Boundary promotes reliance on passenger vehicles and is unfavorable when considering vehicular congestion reduction and overall climate change initiatives.	RJB	We are confused by this statement when the lands were originally included the AEGDSP and only removed through negotiations through the Ontario Municipal Board ("OMB") process. These lands are completely surrounded by the Urban Boundary and are more like holes in the boundary. When the AEGDSP identified transit along the edges expansion are boundaries, yet having no development and therefore not transit ridership, it is difficult to fathom how inclusion of the Expansion Areas would not be supportable of sustainable modes of transportation. Inclusion provides the ability to have been connectivity and be more supportive of alternative modes of transportation other than the automobile.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	81	A preliminary Transportation Study provided by the Applicant for the adjacent central and eastern lands dated February 2020 notes that the adjacent lands are subject to an Integrated Municipal Environmental Assessment (integrated EA). The study also notes that the arterial and collector road network within the Block will be addressed within the integrated EA.	RJB	Acknowledged.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	82	City of Hamilton staff is actively reviewing the Airport Employment Growth District (AEGD) Road Network which has been previously revised in the Airport Employment Growth District Transportation Master Plan (AEGD-TMP) Implementation Update, dated December 2017. As part of this review, the City of Hamilton is exploring potential reconfiguration, designation and alignment of the previously recommended road network within the AEGD lands. The applicant shall coordinate amendments made to the AEGD road network as a result of the ongoing AEGD-TMP update process, with Transportation Planning, before proceeding to formal application.	RJB	Acknowledged and we look forward to working with and sharing information with the City. The Integrated EA will form how the road network is developed with the block.	UBE CTS (July 2020)

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	83	<p>It is to be noted that the proposed road network with the subject Formal Consultation does not conform to the Airport Employment Growth District Transportation Master Plan (AEGD TMP) Implementation Update (Airport Employment Growth District Secondary Plan Road Classification Map B.8-3), dated December 2017 and the approved road network for the Airport Employment Growth District, as shown in Figure 26 of the AEGD TMP. To ensure adequate access and traffic circulation is provided, that the local network is efficiently and safely connected to the arterial system, and that consistency is maintained for all development parcels throughout the subject block, it is recommended that the applicant complies with the UHOP and AEGD Secondary Plan and adopt the approved road network. The following discrepancies are noted between the proposed road network and the AEGD:</p> <p>a. The location of Street B (Collector 6N) has been shifted northerly, which does not serve the intended purpose of provision of accessibility and connectivity for all modes of transportation and all development lands within the subject block. The proposed location of Street B reduces transit accessibility for development lands located between Dickenson Road and Street B. Provided that Street B identifies as a transit route through a transit feasibility study.</p> <p>b. Given the developments under review for parcels located along the north side of Dickenson Road and the presence of natural constraints, Street F cannot be constructed as proposed.</p> <p>c. AEGD TMP identifies the need for the north-south collector (collector 6E) at mid-point between Garth Street and Upper James St., which extends from Dickenson Road to Twenty Road West. The purpose of the Collector 6E corridor is to provide access to development lands while maintaining route redundancy in the network for increased efficiency and serve as a transit route. Street C, with the proposed configuration, will not serve the intended purposes.</p>	RJB	<p>The collector and arterial road network within the block will be determined through the Integrated EA process, which includes consideration of environmental impacts. Studies being undertaken are further defining environmental features and sensitivities within the block.</p>	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	84	<p>Proposed Official Plan Amendment - Does not support the UBE prior to the MCR without including the following: provisions of complete community design, inclusion of active transportation facilities, evaluation of transportation infrastructure (including more macro modelling to assess travel patterns, operations of roadways), Complete feasibility review for connectivity and opportunities considering public transit as well as BLAST corridors.</p>	RJB	<p>The additional provisions listed above, if applicable, will be further evaluated and detailed during the various application stages.</p>	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	85	<p>Transportation Impact Study - TIS required. No ToR will be required prior to road network revisions. Scope of Work to be submitted to City prior to commencing work.</p>	RJB	<p>The Integrated EA has already been initiated for the block, which will define the future road network within the block. Consultation occurred with the City for the Integrated EA.</p>	UBE CTS (July 2020)

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	86	Transportation Impact Study - Provide transit assessment for future facilities, provide project transit ridership.	RJB	The 2016 TMP, which carries forward the transit network recommendations in the 2011 TMP, shows HSR Bus Route 34 proposed along Glancaster Road and Bus Route 35 proposed along Twenty Road West. Since the 2016 TMP did not include the lands of the West, Central and East Extension Area, it appears a transit assessment and projected transit ridership should have already been satisfied even without the Expansion Areas. Therefore, the Expansion Areas should meet or exceed the project transit ridership along Glancaster Road and Twenty Road West.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	87	Transportation Demand Management - Provide TDM. All measures to be illustrated on all site plans submitted.	RJB	A detailed TDM report will be submitted during the various stages which will recommend TDM measures and initiatives specific to the Expansion Areas. Detail will become more refined as applications become more defined.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	88	Right-of-way Dedications - Existing ROW dedication for TRW of 1.0 m (to be taken from the south side only). Glancaster to be 27.0 m. To be confirmed by surveyor.	RJB	Acknowledged. These would be identified with Plan of Subdivision or Site Plan applications.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	89	Airport Employment Growth District Right-of-way Dedications -AEGD ROW dedications are being reviewed through the AEGD TMP review.	RJB	Acknowledged and we look forward to working with the City to develop a supportable road network within the block, which will be defined by the Integrated EA. This approach is being undertaken as permitted rather than an individual environmental assessment as it provides for efficiencies in development of the plan.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	90	Airport Employment Growth District Right-of-way Dedications - ROW widths to match AEGD TMP (in-effect).	RJB	The roadway right-of-ways will be confirmed through the Integrated EA.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	91	Future Right-Of-Way Dedications - All proposed local roads shall be 20.117m (row).	RJB	Noted. It will be provided on the Plans of Subdivision at the appropriate stage; however, at this stage the local road networks are typically not detailed out.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	92	Future Right-Of-Way Dedications - All collector roads shall be 26.213 m (row)	RJB	The roadway right-of-ways will be confirmed through the Integrated EA.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	93	Future Right-Of-Way Dedications - All local road deads shall terminate with a cul-de-sac with a 18.0m radius and 13.0 m minimum pavement radius.	RJB	Noted and this would be addressed at a Plan of Subdivision stage.	UBE CTS (July 2020)

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	94	Future Daylighting Triangle Dedications - Daylight triangles for intersections with a local road are to be 4.57 m x 4.57m	RJB	Noted and this would be addressed at a Plan of Subdivision stage.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	95	Future Daylighting Triangle Dedications - Daylight triangles for intersections with a collector road are to 9.14m x 9.14m.	RJB	Noted and this would be addressed at a Plan of Subdivision stage.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	96	Future Daylighting Triangle Dedications - Daylight triangles for intersections with an arterial road are to be 12.19m x 12.19m.	RJB	Noted and this would be addressed at a Plan of Subdivision stage.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
Urban Design (Ana Cruceru)	97	Please refer to the City's Urban Design Policies (UHOP, Vol. 1, Section B.3.3)	NAK	Please refer to p. 9 of the Urban Design Brief (UDB) which addresses UHOP, Vol. 1, Section B.3.3.	Urban Design Brief
	98	Urban Design report is to provide a fulsome analysis of the site's relevant policy and physical context as well as a range of urban design and architectural objectives to be attained by the new community will be required for review at the time of a formal application.	NAK	Noted. Section 2.2 and 2.3 of the UDB provide a thorough analysis of the site's relevant policy and physical context. Section 4.0 provides the details of the urban design and architectural objectives.	Urban Design Brief
	99	Staff to review the Environmental and Energy Assessment Report and Urban Design Brief.	CLS/NAK	Noted.	Energy and Environmental Assessment Report
Planning (Heather Travis)	100	Planning - Some of the landowners identified on the Formal Consultation application appear to be the same as the parties to the AEGD Minutes of Settlement signed in 2015 (LPAT Files PL101300, PL090114, and PL110331). It is the position of the City that depending on the form of the proposed OPA application, those landowners should not be part of such application, as to do so may be "indirectly" going after the priority status of both the Elfrida lands and the Twenty Road East lands as the first non-employment lands to be added to the urban boundary, as identified in the Minutes of Settlement.	CLS	With the introduction of the growth plan policy, urban boundary expansion applications are permitted in advance and outside a Municipal Comprehensive Review. The landowners in question are participating in the ongoing MCR.	Planning Justification Report
	101	Planning - The City is in the process of completing GRIDS2 and the Municipal Comprehensive Review (MCR), including the identification of the preferred growth option for the City to 2041. It is anticipated that the Land Needs Assessment will be completed and released publicly at an upcoming Committee meeting (date tbd), and the evaluation of growth options will be completed by December 2020. Staff strongly encourage the applicants to participate in the City's MCR process which will allow for comprehensive evaluation of growth options within the City in a timely manner, and avoid the need for individual applications by property owners.	CLS	The applicant intends to continue to participate in the MCR/GRIDS 2 process, at the same time as proceeding with the UBE applications.	Planning Justification Report
	102	Planning - Planning Justification Report (PJR) shall include a community concept plan demonstrating proposed density in persons and jobs per hectare, housing mix, jobs, and complete community design and connectivity with adjacent neighbourhoods.	CLS	The proposed development will achieve a density of 71 people and jobs per hectare. Please see enclosed PJR report for further details on density, housing mix, jobs and complete community design and connectivity with adjacent neighbourhoods.	Planning Justification Report

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	103	Planning - New sensitive land uses are not permitted above the 28 NEF contour, as per policy C.4.8.8 of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. Proposed concept plan and land uses should comply with this policy.	HGC	In accordance with the PPS, sensitive uses are permitted in the lands above the NEF 30 contour.	Noise Impact Study
	104	Planning - Application to expand urban boundary will be evaluated against criteria identified in the Provincial Growth Plan (policies 2.2.8.3 and 2.2.8.5) and the City's evaluation framework (provided separately to the applicant).	CLS	Noted. Planning Justification Report sets out qualifications which satisfy Growth Plan criteria. Please also see submitted Response Matrix to City of Hamilton UBE Evaluation Framework, enclosed within the Planning Justification Report.	Planning Justification Report
	105	Planning - Applicant to clarify how this proposed application will impact the adjacent active application for the development of an industrial subdivision (25T201807) and if revisions to the existing application will be forthcoming.	CLS	The proposed UBE applications have been designed in conjunction with the Plan of Subdivision application to ensure the delivery of the extension of Garth Street. The UBE applications will not preclude the Plan of Subdivision application.	Planning Justification Report
	106	Planning - Application for conversion of a portion of the adjacent employment lands to a non-employment designation through the MCR remains under review.	CLS	Coordination between proposed UBE and Employment Conversion Request has been addressed in Planning Justification Report.	Planning Justification Report
	107	Planning - Peer reviews of all submitted studies and reports may be required. All peer reviews shall be completed at the expense of the applicant.	CLS	Noted.	
	108	Planning - Public consultation strategy should indicate how all landowners in the proposed consolidate areas have been contacted and if they consent to the application. The strategy should also outline the future plans for public consultation.	CLS	Please see enclosed Planning Justification Report for section on Public Consultation Strategy.	Planning Justification Report
	109	Servicing - Applicant shall refer to and be consistent with the following studies: AEGD Phase 2 Water/Wastewater Servicing Master Plan Update, AEGF Subwatershed Study & SWM Plan Implementation.	Urbantech	Acknowledged - the appropriate references have been made.	FSR

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	110	<p>Servicing - According to the submitted Sanitary Drainage Plan, wastewater flows from the subject lands will generally be directed to the existing Twenty Road Pumping Station. The City's original plan for servicing of the Central and West areas was to direct wastewater flows south to the future Dickenson Road trunk sewer, reducing flows to the pumping station. The servicing strategy proposed is not consistent with the City's infrastructure Master Planning.</p> <p>The proponent's proposed change to the servicing strategy will increase the ultimate service area and wastewater load for the Twenty Road Pump Station, with associated cost and energy use impacts. The servicing of the subject lands should be subsequent Formal Consultation Document (Revised July 20169 ) to development of the urban AEGD lands to the south, consistent with infrastructure master planning.</p> <p>The existing sanitary infrastructure, particularly the Twenty Road Pump Station, does not have adequate capacity to service the subject lands. Although not preferred, there may be adequate sanitary servicing of the subject lands by Twenty Road Pumping Station once planned capacity upgrades are completed. This would need to be confirmed through an update to the master servicing strategy for the area. The updated analysis would determine whether the servicing of the lands would be contingent on the completion of the planned Dickenson Road East diversion trunk.</p>	Urbantech	Please refer to the response to Comment 37 for details.	FSR
	111	<p>Servicing - A comprehensive wastewater servicing study is required for the entire gravity drainage catchment of the Twenty Road Pumping Station, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Characterization and hydraulic analysis of interim conditions, without the Dickenson Road diversion trunk in place. This condition should assume English Church Pump Station operating at 100% capacity allocation, and include development of existing urban lands within the Twenty Road PS gravity catchment to 2031;</li> <li>• Characterization and hydraulic analysis of anticipated 2041 conditions, with the proposed Dickenson Road diversion trunk in service;</li> <li>• Functional design of any new sewers external to the subject lands that are required to convey wastewater to the City's existing sewer network, including life cycle cost analysis. Proposed sewer capacities must include future external drainage contributions from other undeveloped lands, to the natural drainage boundary.</li> </ul> <p>For the urban boundary expansion applications to be considered, the proponents must demonstrate that the Upper James trunk sewer and Twenty Road Pump Station have sufficient spare capacity for the subject lands as well as anticipated development to 2041 within the existing urban lands in the Twenty Road PS catchment.</p>	Urbantech	We acknowledge that further study and coordination regarding sanitary servicing of the subject lands is required to optimize the existing and future sanitary infrastructure. Refer to Section 7 for details.	FSR

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	112	<p>Servicing - A comprehensive water servicing study is required, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Watermain hydraulic analysis will be required for the whole of Pressure Zone #6, using anticipated 2041 development conditions;</li> <li>• Functional design of watermains external to the subject lands that are required to convey water from the City’s existing watermain network, including life cycle cost analysis.</li> </ul> <p>For the urban boundary expansion applications to be considered, the proponents must demonstrate that the existing water infrastructure network (including watermains, pump stations, and storage) has sufficient spare capacity for the subject lands, as well as anticipated development to 2041 within the existing urban lands in the Pressure Zone #6 boundary.</p>	Urbantech	Ackknnowledged - a hydraulic analysis will be conducted as part of the Draft Plan submission as indicated in Section 7.	FSR
	113	<p>Servicing - The water, wastewater servicing and stormwater management strategies for these three areas have been included in the Upper West Side Master Drainage Plan &amp; Servicing Study by the landowners’ group. However, the Upper West Side Master Drainage Plan &amp; Servicing Study is not completed yet. The approval agencies provided comments on the 1st draft of this report. The landowner group did not submit the 2nd submission of the report to show how all comments from different agencies have been addressed. Therefore, the contents of the Water, Wastewater Servicing and Stormwater Management Overview report dated Feb, 2020 prepared by Urbantech are premature.</p>	Urbantech	Acknowledged	FSR
	114	<p>Servicing - The February 2020 Urbantech report did not demonstrate the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Concept plan including local road networks with land use</li> <li>ii) Standalone SWM plans &amp; strategies for residential development on these lands in accordance with the DC bylaw. The current SWM strategies for these lands outlined in the Upper West Side study is for industrial development.</li> <li>iii) Phasing and implementation plans from available and future servicing perspective.</li> <li>iv) The servicing capacities and allocation policies for projected growth in the existing urban boundary and urban boundary expansion.</li> <li>v) Boundary Road (Twenty Rd, Glancaster Rd) improvement works.</li> <li>vi) Front Ending Cost polices and agreement</li> </ol>	Urbantech	The items listed in this comment are all noted as required for future studies in Section 7.	FSR
	115	<p>Servicing - Prior to commencement of the sanitary sewer extension and urbanization works within the existing Twenty Road West right-of-way a Class EA study shall be completed. No such study has been initiated to date.</p>	Urbantech	Acknowledged; these works are not currently proposed as part of the UBE application. It is understood that additional studies are required to support the sewer extension and urbanization works.	FSR
	116	<p>Servicing - Should the Official Plan Amendment(s) for urban boundary expansion be approved, Hamilton Water has additional submission requirements for the subsequent stages of approval, such as functional servicing reports for the proposed infrastructure within the subject lands, well surveys, water balance analysis, detailed watermain hydraulic analysis and Form 1 approval, wastewater generation report, etc.</p>	Urbantech	Acknowledged.	FSR

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	117	Transportation - The road network shall be revised to the satisfaction of the Manager of Transportation Planning. The applications should not proceed to the formal application stage until the road network has been revised to staff's satisfaction. The applicant is strongly encouraged to contact Transportation Planning and Planning staff to arrange a meeting to discuss the road network changes.	RJB	The applicant is currently advancing completion of the Integrated EA to establish the proposed Collector Road network as well as the extension of Garth Street. A meeting was recently convened with the City to provide an update and advise on timelines. The EA will assess and determine the ultimate road network and be completed to the satisfaction of the Manager of Transportation Planning.	Planning Justification Report
	118	Transportation - City of Hamilton staff is actively reviewing the Airport Employment Growth District (AEGD) Road Network which has been previously revised in the Airport Employment Formal Consultation Document (Revised July 201611 ) Growth District Transportation Master Plan (AEGD-TMP) Implementation Update, dated December 2017. As part of this review, the City of Hamilton is exploring potential reconfiguration, designation and alignment of the previously recommended road network within the AEGD lands. The applicant shall coordinate amendments made to the AEGD road network as a result of the ongoing AEGD-TMP update process, with Transportation Planning, before proceeding to formal application.	RJB	Acknowledged and we look forward to working with and sharing information with the City. The Integrated EA will form how the road network is developed with the block.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	119	Transportation - It is to be noted that the proposed road network with the subject Formal Consultation does not conform to the Airport Employment Growth District Transportation Master Plan (AEGD TMP) Implementation Update (Airport Employment Growth District Secondary Plan Road Classification Map B.8-3), dated December 2017 and the approved road network for the Airport Employment Growth District, as shown in Figure 26 of the AEGD TMP. To ensure adequate access and traffic circulation is provided, that the local network is efficiently and safely connected to the arterial system, and that consistency is maintained for all development parcels throughout the subject block, it is recommended that the applicant complies with the UHOP and AEGD Secondary Plan and adopt the approved road network. Issues with the location and alignments of Street B, Street C, and Street F have been identified.	RJB	The collector and arterial road network within the block will be determined through the Integrated EA process, which includes consideration of environmental impacts. Studies being undertaken are further defining environmental features and sensitivities within the block.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	120	Transportation - Staff require the inclusion of additional provisions related to Transportation concerns including: provisions to include complete community design incorporating mixed-use neighbourhoods meeting minimum density requirements; inclusion of a higher degree of active transportation facilities and connectivity between communities (e.g. protected cycling facilities on all roadways, separate from pedestrian facilities); evaluation of infrastructure capacity from a Transportation perspective relating to roadway capacity and the need for future improvements through a robust Transportation Impact Study; and, feasibility review for connectivity and opportunities considering public transit as well as future BLAST corridors.	RJB	The additional provisions listed above, if applicable, will be further evaluated and detailed during the various application stages.	UBE CTS (July 2020)



Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	121	Transportation - A revised Transportation Impact Study (TIS) will be required, but will not be accepted until a revised road network has been shown which is supported by staff. The transportation consultant shall submit a scope of work to staff for approval prior to commencing the study.	RJB	The Integrated EA has already been initiated for the block, which will define the future road network within the block. Consultation occurred with the City for the Integrated EA.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	122	Transportation - Hamilton Street Railway (HSR) does not currently operate along Glanaster Road or Twenty Road West. The Applicant shall provide a transit assessment regarding the implementation of future transit facilities, provide details on the projected transit ridership according to similar areas within the City of Hamilton and proposed routing as supplementary material within the TIS report.	RJB	The 2016 TMP, which carries forward the transit network recommendations in the 2011 TMP, shows HSR Bus Route 34 proposed along Glanaster Road and Bus Route 35 proposed along Twenty Road West. Since the 2016 TMP did not include the lands of the West, Central and East Extension Area, it appears a transit assessment and projected transit ridership should have already been satisfied even without the Expansion Areas. Therefore, the Expansion Areas should meet or exceed the project transit ridership along Glanaster Road and Twenty Road West.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	123	Transportation - A Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Report is required in accordance with City's TDM guidelines. The TDM report can present TDM measures and their projected efforts to reduce future operational deficiencies as identified in the conclusions of the TIS.	RJB	A detailed TDM report will be submitted during the various stages which will recommend TDM measures and initiatives specific to the Expansion Areas. Detail will become more refined as applications become more defined.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	124	Transportation - Additional transportation-related studies may be requested in future once the proposed road network has been established to the City's satisfaction.	RJB	Noted.	
	125	Transportation - Right-of-way dedications and daylighting requirements shall be provided in accordance with detailed comments provided by Transportation Planning staff dated April 15, 2020.	RJB	Noted and this would be addressed at a Plan of Subdivision stage.	UBE CTS (July 2020)
	126	Natural Heritage - Based on policies within the RHOP and UHOP, when development has the potential to negatively impact a Core Area's natural features or ecological functions an EIS is required. The EIS inventories and describes the existing Core Areas and ecological functions of the site within the surrounding landscape; assesses the potential negative impacts and provides recommendations to accommodate or enhance existing natural features and functions. Where new development or site alteration is proposed within a Linkage, a Linkage Assessment is to be prepared. Where an EIS is being prepared, the Linkage Assessment can be included as part of the EIS.	NRSI	EIS, Linkage Assessment and Tree Inventory have been submitted.	EIS
	127	Natural Heritage - As part of the Urban Boundary Expansion (UBE) Formal Consultation materials, an EIS/LA has been prepared by Natural Resource Solutions Inc. (NRSI) (February 2020). Natural Heritage Planning staff has not completed a full review of this report. As a result, the EIS has not been approved.	NRSI	With the approved of the Terms of Reference for the EIS, Linkage Assessment and Tree Inventory. Review of the materials should be able to occur.	EIS

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
	128	Natural Heritage - EIS and Linkage assessments required as per Council-approved Terms of Reference. As outlined within the City's Council adopted EIS Guidelines (revised March 2015), a Terms of Reference (ToR) outlining the contents and scope of the EIS is to be prepared to the satisfaction of the City and the relevant Conservation Authority (in this case, NPCA). This was identified at the previous Formal Consultation (FC-19-126; Nov. 27, 2019). To date, a ToR has not been submitted or approved for this work. It is important to have an approved ToR prior to completing field work so that the right surveys are completed in the appropriate timeframes. A ToR should be submitted as soon as possible. (Concerns have been identified with field studies related to wetland boundaries, terrestrial crayfish, winter wildlife surveys, bat assessment and marsh inventories.)	NRSI	Terms of Reference has been approved, following the issuance of these comments.	EIS
	129	Natural Heritage - Linkages have been identified on the subject lands. There is concern that Linkages have not been identified within the NHS and that impacts to Linkages on the adjacent properties have not been considered.	NRSI	Linkages have been assessed as part of the EIS.	EIS
	130	Natural Heritage - Core areas are identified within the candidate expansion area and adjacent to the lands. These features must be characterized through completion of a Sub-watershed Study early in the process, including hydrology, hydrogeology, aquatic and terrestrial environments. This Study is one of the first steps in the process because it identifies areas of protection, land use impacts, mitigation measures and management strategies.	NRSI	Core areas have been assessed as part of the EIS.	EIS
	131	Natural Heritage - The NPCA will also require floodplain mapping on any watercourse with an upstream drainage area greater than 125ha.	NRSI	Noted	
	132	Cultural Heritage - The subject property meets five (5) of the ten criteria used by the City of Hamilton and Ministry of Tourism, Culture and Sport for determining archaeological potential. Staff require that an Archaeological Assessment be completed and submitted with any future application	Golder	A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment is currently being completed and will be submitted shortly.	
	133	Cultural Heritage - A variety of properties subject to this application are included in the City's Inventory of Buildings of Architectural and/or Historical Interest, as illustrated by the yellow high lighted areas below. As identified in the Cultural Heritage Screening Report, there are additional properties of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest. Staff have briefly reviewed the Cultural Heritage Screening Report and cannot fully comment on the content or recommendations of the report. Notwithstanding, Staff would require the applicant to submit a cultural heritage impact assessment for any future developments.	Golder	A Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment is currently being completed and will be submitted shortly.	
	134	Public Service Facilities - In conformity with the Growth Plan and Policies for Settlement Area Boundary Expansions, the proponents shall include as part of their analysis confirmation of sufficient capacity in existing and planned public service facilities and infrastructure, including the need and availability for lands to accommodate future school sites.	CLS	Noted. Please see enclosed Parks and Community Infrastructure Facilities.	Parks and Community Issues Assessment

Department/Agency	UWS Comment Number	Formal Consultation Comment	Consultant	Response	Responding Document
Building	135	1. The purpose of this Formal Consultation application is to request that the City consider the expansion of the urban boundary to incorporate the subject lands, generally located southeast of the Garth Street and Twenty Road West intersection. The lands have an approximate area of 27 ha. The proposed land use includes residential uses, natural heritage features, stormwater management, and a collector road network.	CLS	Noted	
	136	2. It is noted that an application for an Official Plan Amendment would be required to bring the lands into the urban boundary. At a later phase, Draft Plan of Subdivision and a Zoning By-law Amendment would be required to implement any proposed development. Therefore, the Building Division has no comment on the proposed expansion at this time.	CLS	Noted	
	137	3. All new signs proposed for this development must comply with the regulations contained within the Sign By-law.	CLS	Noted	
	138	4. The designer shall ensure that the fire access route conforms to the Ontario Building Code.	CLS	Noted	