



Hamilton

Planning and Economic Development Department
Development Planning, Heritage and Design
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor, Hamilton ON L8P 4Y5
Phone: 905.546.2424 - Fax: 905.546.4202

Formal Consultation Document

Meeting Date: April 15, 2020 File No: FC-20-028/029/034

Owner: Spallacci & Sons Limited, 2112443 Ontario Ltd, Twenty Road Developments Inc, Sullstar Twenty Limited, Lynmount Developments Inc, 909940 Ontario Ltd, Liv Developments Ltd

Applicant: Corbett Land Strategies Inc

PROPERTY INFORMATION

Address and/or Legal Description: portion of 555 Glancaster Rd, 9751 Twenty Rd W, 9625 Twenty Rd W, 9511 Twenty Rd W, 9445 Twenty Rd W, 9285 Twenty Rd W

Lot Frontage (metres):1696.4 m Lot depth (metres): 1331.5 m Lot Area(m²): 214 ha

Rural Hamilton Official Plan Designation: Rural and Open Space

Other Plan Designation: _____

Zoning: A2, P4 and P7

Description of current uses, buildings, structures and natural features on the subject lands: agricultural lands, single detached dwellings, former golf course

Brief description of proposal: Three formal consultation applications have been submitted to bring three blocks (east whitebelt, central whitebelt, and west whitebelt) into the urban boundary. Each area is less than 40 ha in size in accordance with the requirements of the Provincial Growth Plan. The applicant is proposing to expand the urban boundary to accommodate a residential development comprised of 2,450 units (196 singles / semis, 1,715 towns, and 539 apartments) across all three blocks. The planned density according to the calculations provided by the applicant is 71 persons

and jobs per hectare. Other uses on the subject lands include a natural heritage system, collector road network, and stormwater infrastructure.

APPLICATIONS REQUIRED

Rural Hamilton Official Plan Amendment	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment – Urban Boundary Expansion	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Local Official Plan Amendment	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Zoning By-law Amendment (Routine or Complex)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Subdivision	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Condominium (Type: _____)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Site Plan (Type: _____)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Consent	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Variance(s)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
Other	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

Note: The City of Hamilton is in the process of creating a new comprehensive Zoning By-law for the entire City. The new Zoning By-law is being prepared in phases by Land Use topic. New Rural, Commercial and Residential zoning may be implemented which could be different than the current zoning. Accordingly, additional applications may be required. If a Building Permit has not been issued by the City prior to the new zoning coming into effect, the approved site plan may be affected, related to zoning compliance, which may require further planning approvals (i.e. Minor Variance, Zoning Amendment, etc.).

FEEES REQUIRED

City of Hamilton:	OPA: \$67,875 x 3 = \$203,625 Less FC fee: \$1,200 x 3 = \$3,600 Subtotal: \$200,025
Conservation Authority Review Fees:	OPA review fee: \$2,770 Review of EIS/Watercourse assessment: \$2,205 Review of SWM Report or FSR: \$1,755 Subtotal: \$6,730 x 3 = \$20,190
Other:	
TOTAL:	\$220,215

Notes:

- *Formal Consultation fee may be credited towards a future application*
- *Notwithstanding the fees noted above, all fees are payable based on the rate in the fee schedule by-law in effect on the date the payment is made.*
- *Further fees may be required at a later date as per the fee schedule.*
- *Separate cheques are payable to the City of Hamilton and the applicable Conservation Authority.*
- *A Cost Acknowledgement Agreement for potential costs at the Ontario Municipal Board may also be required.*

DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

The Design Review Panel shall provide urban design advice to Planning Division staff on Planning applications with respect to complex Zoning and Site Plan applications in the following Design Priority Areas:

- (a) Downtown Hamilton Secondary Plan Area;
- (b) Areas of Major Change and Corridors of Gradual Change within the West Harbor Secondary Plan Area;
- (c) Primary Corridors as shown on Schedule E – “Urban Structure” of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan;
- (d) Any other large scale projects that may impact the physical environment functionally and/or aesthetically.

The Director of Planning or his or her designate may waive projects from the review of the Design Review Panel, if the project is not deemed to have the potential to significantly impact the physical environment functionally and/or aesthetically.

Design Review Panel review required? Yes No

REQUIRED INFORMATION AND MATERIALS

All identified reports, studies, and/or plans must be submitted before an application is deemed complete. Unless otherwise noted, 5 copies of each item and an electronic digital file in PDF locked file format must be submitted.

Reports, Studies, Plans	Required	Staff Responsible for providing guidelines or terms of reference
Background Information		
Survey Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning (H. Travis. ext. 4168)

Concept Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning (H. Travis. ext. 4168)
Planning		
Affordable Housing Report/Rental Conversion Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Draft OPA, and By-laws	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning (H. Travis. ext. 4168)
Land Use/Market Needs Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Planning Justification Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning (H. Travis. ext. 4168)
Site Plan and Building Elevations	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Urban Design Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning – Urban Design (A. Crueru, ext. 5707)
Cultural		
Archaeological Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning – Cultural Heritage (M. Brunton, ext. 1202)
Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning – Cultural Heritage (M. Brunton, ext. 1202)
Environmental		
Aggregate Resource Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Aggregate/Mineral Resource Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Air Quality Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Channel Design and Geofluvial Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Chloride Impact Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Cut and Fill Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Demarcation of top of bank, limit of wetland, limit of natural hazard, limit of Environmentally Significant Area (ESA), or limit of Conservation Authority regulated area	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning – Natural Heritage (M. Kiddie, ext. 1290); NPCA (S. Mastroianni)
Erosion Hazard Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Fish Habitat Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Floodline Delineation Study/Hydraulic Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NPCA (S. Mastroianni)
General Vegetation Inventory (GVI)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Impact Assessment for new Private Waste Disposal Sites	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Karst Assessment/Karst Contingency Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning – Natural Heritage (M. Kiddie, ext. 1290)
Landscape Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Linkage Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning – Natural Heritage (M. Kiddie, ext. 1290)
Meander Belt Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Nutrient Management Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Odour, Dust and Light Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Restoration Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Shoreline Assessment Study/Coastal Engineers Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Slope Stability Study and Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Species Habitat Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Tree Management Plan/Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Tree Protection Plan (TPP)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning – Natural Heritage (M. Kiddie, ext. 1290)
Environmental/Servicing and Infrastructure		
Contaminant Management Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Record of Site Condition (RSC)	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Erosion and Sediment Control Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Hydrogeological Study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hamilton Water (C. Vega, ext. 1301)
Grading Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Master Drainage Plan	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Stormwater Management Report / Update	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Development Engineering (Z. Panovski, ext. 2435); NPCA (S. Mastroianni)
Soils/Geotechnical Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sub-watershed Plan and/or update to an existing Sub-watershed Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning – Natural Heritage (M. Kiddie, ext. 1290)
Financial		
Financial Impact Analysis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning (H. Travis, ext. 4168)
Market Impact Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Servicing and Infrastructure		
Recreation Feasibility Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Recreation Needs Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
School Accommodation Issues Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	HWCDSD (J. Volek)
Parks Issues Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Recreation (S. Cellini, ext. 3859)
Functional Servicing Report with Preliminary Grading Plan	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Development Engineering (Z. Panovski, ext. 2435)
Servicing Options Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Comprehensive Water Servicing Study (see details in comments)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hamilton Water (D. Arsenault, ext. 6413) Development Engineering (Z. Panovski, ext. 2435)

Comprehensive Wastewater Servicing Study (see details in comments)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Hamilton Water (D. Arsenault, ext. 6413) Development Engineering (Z. Panovski, ext. 2435)
Land Use Compatibility		
Agricultural Impact Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning (H. Travis. ext. 4168)
Dust Impact Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Land Use Compatibility Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Landfill Impact Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Minimum Distance Separation Calculation	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Noise Impact Study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning (H. Travis. ext. 4168)
Odour Impact Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Sun/Shadow Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Vibration Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Wind Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Transportation		
Cycling Route Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Transportation Impact Study	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Transportation Planning (M. Radaelli, ext. 4801)
Parking Analysis/Study	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Pedestrian Route and Sidewalk Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Roadway/Development Safety Audit	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Modern Roundabout and Neighbourhood Roundabout Analysis	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Neighbourhood Traffic Calming Options Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Transit Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Transit (A. MacLaughlin, ext. 1809); Transportation Planning (M. Radaelli, ext. 4801)
Transportation Demand Management Options Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Transportation Planning (M. Radaelli, ext. 4801)
Cost Recoveries		
Cost Acknowledgement Agreement	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning (H. Travis. ext. 4168)
DRP Submission Requirements		
Public Consultation Strategy	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning (H. Travis. ext. 4168)
Other: Land Needs Assessment	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning (H. Travis. ext. 4168)
Energy and Environmental Assessment Report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Planning (H. Travis. ext. 4168)

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Additional Agencies to be contacted: Airport, Hydro One

Comments:

Planning

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. 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).
6. 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.
7. Application for conversion of a portion of the adjacent employment lands to a non-employment designation through the Municipal Comprehensive Review remains under review.

8. Peer reviews of submitted studies / reports may be required. All peer reviews shall be at the expense of the applicant.
9. Public consultation strategy should indicate how all landowners in the proposed 'candidate areas' have been contacted and if they consent to the application. The strategy should also outline the future plans for public consultation.

Servicing

1. Applicant shall refer to and be consistent with the following studies:
 - AEGD Phase 2 Water/Wastewater Servicing Master Plan Update – Dillon & AECOM
 - AEGD Subwatershed Study & SWM Plan Implementation – Aquafor Beech
2. It is the responsibility of the applicant to demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity in the City's infrastructure to accommodate the proposed land use and density of development. The estimated population density exceeds the original assumption taken into consideration under the Master Servicing strategy significantly. (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.) There is 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. 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
3. 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.

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

to development of the urban AEGD lands to the south, consistent with infrastructure master planning.

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.

4. A comprehensive wastewater servicing study is required for the entire gravity drainage catchment of the Twenty Road Pumping Station, as follows:

- 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;
- Characterization and hydraulic analysis of anticipated 2041 conditions, with the proposed Dickenson Road diversion trunk in service;
- 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.

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.

5. A comprehensive water servicing study is required, as follows:

- Watermain hydraulic analysis will be required for the whole of Pressure Zone #6, using anticipated 2041 development conditions;
- 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.

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.

6. The water, wastewater servicing and stormwater management strategies for these three areas have been included in the Upper West Side Master Drainage Plan & Servicing Study by the landowners' group. However, the Upper West Side Master Drainage Plan & 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.
7. The February 2020 Urbantech report did not demonstrate the following:
 - i) Concept plan including local road networks with land use
 - ii) Standalone SWM plans & 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.
 - iii) Phasing and implementation plans from available and future servicing perspective.
 - iv) The servicing capacities and allocation policies for projected growth in the existing urban boundary and urban boundary expansion.
 - v) Boundary Road (Twenty Rd, Glancaster Rd) improvement works.
 - vi) Front Ending Cost polices and agreement

These items need to be addressed in a future revised report.

8. 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.
9. 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.

Transportation

1. 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.

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.

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.

2. 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.
3. 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.
4. Hamilton Street Railway (HSR) does not currently operate along Glancaster 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.
5. 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.

6. Additional transportation-related studies may be requested in future once the proposed road network has been established to the City's satisfaction.
7. Right-of-way dedications and daylighting requirements shall be provided in accordance with detailed comments provided by Transportation Planning staff dated April 15, 2020.

Natural Heritage

1. 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.

2. 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.)
3. 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.
4. 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.

5. The NPCA will also require floodplain mapping on any watercourse with an upstream drainage area greater than 125ha.

Cultural Heritage

1. 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
2. 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.

Public Service Facilities

1. 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.

PLEASE BE ADVISED OF THE FOLLOWING:

1. *The purpose of this document is to identify the information required to commence processing a complete application as set out in the Planning Act. Formal Consultation does not imply or suggest any decision whatsoever on behalf of City staff or the City of Hamilton to either support or refuse the application.*
2. *This document expires 1 year from the date of signing or at the discretion of the Director of Planning.*
3. *In the event this Formal Consultation Document expires prior to the application being accepted by the City, another document may be required.*
4. *If an application is submitted without the information and materials identified in this Formal Consultation Document the City may deem such an application incomplete and refuse to accept the application.*
5. *In accordance with the Planning Act, it is the policy of the City of Hamilton to provide public access to all Planning Act applications and supporting documentation submitted to the City. Therefore, the information contained in an application and any*

documentation, including reports, studies and drawings, provided in support of an application, by the owner, or the owner's agents, consultants and solicitors, constitutes public information and will become part of the public record. With the filing of an application, the applicant consents to the City of Hamilton making the application and its supporting documentation available to the general public, including copying and disclosing the application and its supporting documentation to any third party upon their request.

6. It may be determined during the review of the application that additional studies or information will be required as a result of issues arising during the processing of the application.
7. The above requirements for deeming an application complete are separate and independent of any review under the Ontario Building Code (OBC) as part of the Building Permit review process. In the event that a building permit application does not comply with the OBC, a letter outlining the deficiencies or areas of non-compliance will be issued to the owner and/or agent. Formal consultation and building permit review are separate and independent processes.

SIGNATURES

Heather Travis	<i>Heather Travis</i>	May 5th, 2020
Planning Staff	Planning Staff Signature	Date

Yvette Rybensky	<i>Y. Rybensky</i>	May 4th, 2020
Planning Staff	Planning Staff Signature	Date

Engineering Staff	Engineering Staff Signature	Date

Owner	Owner Signature	Date
<i>Nick Wood</i>	<i>Nick Wood</i> <i>c/o Upper West Side Landowners Group Inc.</i>	<i>Aug 12, 2020</i>

Applicant (I have the authority to bind the Owner)	Applicant Signature	Date
--	---------------------	------

Agent (I have the authority to bind the Owner)	Agent Signature	Date
--	-----------------	------

Other Staff or Agency	Signature	Date
-----------------------	-----------	------

Other Staff or Agency	Signature	Date
-----------------------	-----------	------

Other Staff or Agency	Signature	Date
-----------------------	-----------	------