WELCOME TO THE GREENBELT BOUNDARY REVIEW OPEN HOUSE

**ORIENTATION SESSION**
**OPEN HOUSE**
6:00 PM
6:00 PM to 8:00 PM

**TODAY’S OBJECTIVES**

- Give you information on the Greenbelt and the City of Hamilton.
- Get your feedback on areas that could be considered for addition to the Greenbelt.
- Get your feedback on areas that could be considered for removal from the Greenbelt.

**IMPORTANT NOTES ABOUT TODAY’S OBJECTIVES**

The purpose of this open house is to get your input on what Greenbelt boundary changes the City should recommend to the Province. The final decision around any changes rests with the Province of Ontario.

The purpose of this review is to develop a high-level understanding of opportunities to refine the Greenbelt boundary. Areas discussed will not necessarily be added to or removed from the Greenbelt. Any changes made to the Greenbelt will be minor.

The final decision on changes to the boundary rests with the Province of Ontario.

This review is not about the policies in the Greenbelt Plan.
**OPEN HOUSE FORMAT**

**HOW CAN I PARTICIPATE?**

Take part in an orientation with staff or use the workbook to guide yourself.

Provide your feedback on the panels or workbook as requested.

As always, staff are here to answer any questions you may have.

**WHERE CAN I GET BACKGROUND INFORMATION?**

Visit the green-themed panels to get an overview of the Greenbelt and the City of Hamilton. Here you will learn why the City is doing this Greenbelt boundary review.

**HOW DO I GIVE MY FEEDBACK?**

Visit the blue-themed panels to give your feedback on areas considered for addition to the Greenbelt.

Visit the orange-themed panels to give your feedback on areas considered for removal from the Greenbelt.
2015 PROVINCIAL PLAN REVIEW: PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

**FEBRUARY 2015**
Province announces 2015 Coordinated Provincial Plan Review (plans in **bold** apply to the City of Hamilton)
- **Greenbelt Plan**
- **Growth Plan for the Greater Golden Horseshoe**
- **Niagara Escarpment Plan**
  - Oak Ridges Moraine Plan

**APRIL 16, 2015**
Province hosts Regional Town Hall Meeting to obtain input on the Plans

**APRIL 7, 8, 9, 2015**
City of Hamilton hosts three consultation sessions to obtain input on the Plans that impact Hamilton

**APRIL 16, 2015**
City of Hamilton hosts a Stakeholder Session regarding the Greenbelt Boundary Review draft criteria

**OCTOBER 2015**
Staff report to be presented to Planning Committee and Council. Staff report, including revisions from Committee/Council, to be forwarded to the Province for consideration in the 2015 Coordinated Provincial Plan Review

**JULY 28, 2015**
City of Hamilton provides preliminary (May) and Council endorsed comments to the Province (June)

**SEPTEMBER 10, 14, 17, 2015**
City of Hamilton hosts three open house sessions to obtain comment on potential revisions to the Greenbelt Plan boundary. Information gathered at the sessions will be analyzed to inform a staff report that will recommend locations for Greenbelt Boundary revisions.
GREENBELT PLAN VISION
The Greenbelt is an area of land in Ontario which:
• Protects the agricultural land base;
• Protects the natural heritage and water resource systems;
• Supports rural communities and agriculture, tourism, recreation, and resource uses.

GREENBELT FACTS
The Greenbelt protects 1.8 million acres of land across Ontario including:
• 535,000 acres of natural heritage system, and
• 100,000 acres of tender fruit and grape specialty crop areas.
The Greenbelt Plan includes the:
• Niagara Escarpment Plan;
• Oak Ridges Moraine Plan; and
• Parkway Belt West Plan.
**GREENBELT PLAN & GROWTH PLAN IN HAMILTON**

The Greenbelt Plan and Growth Plan are Provincial Plans. The Growth Plan tells municipalities how much residential and employment growth they should plan for.

The City of Hamilton must implement both the Greenbelt Plan and the Growth Plan. When thinking of the future, the City must consider what both of these plans mean for Hamilton.

**QUICK FACTS**

- 78% of the entire City is protected by the Greenbelt.
- The City has worked with the Greenbelt Plan for 10 years.
- The policies of Greenbelt Plan and Growth Plan are reflected in the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and the Rural Hamilton Official Plan.
- Both Official Plans direct the future of the City.

**LANDS IN THE CITY OF HAMILTON CAN BE DESCRIBED AS...**

- **GREENBELT NATURAL HERITAGE SYSTEM**
  - Key natural heritage and water resources identified by the Greenbelt Plan

- **URBAN AREA**
  - Approved urban uses

- **GREENBELT PROTECTED COUNTRYSIDE**
  - Agricultural and natural systems lands identified by the Greenbelt Plan

- **WHITEBELT**
  - Lands in neither the Greenbelt nor the Urban Area

- **SUBJECT TO GROWTH PLAN POLICIES**
  - Whitebelt and Urban Area
WHY ARE WE REVIEWING THE GREENBELT BOUNDARY?

WHY DO THIS REVIEW?

1. Provincial Plan Review
   The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing initiated a Provincial Plan review in February 2015. The province has asked all municipalities to provide their recommendations for Greenbelt boundary changes. This is the City’s opportunity to provide comment to the Province on how Hamilton can better meet the objectives of the Greenbelt Plan.

2. Refine the Greenbelt
   Over 30 years of working with the Greenbelt, the City has identified opportunities to refine it. There are areas that may be more appropriate to be included in the Greenbelt. Others areas may be more appropriate for removal from the Greenbelt.

3. Plan for Growth
   The City must think about where to direct future growth. A lot of growth will occur in the existing Urban Area, some as intensification. Some growth will take place in the Whitebelt. However, not all lands in the Whitebelt are suitable or available for growth.

4. Uphold the Greenbelt Vision and Function
   The Greenbelt is important to the City of Hamilton. If lands are removed from the Greenbelt, other lands of equal or greater area and value will be added to the Greenbelt.

WHO DECIDES?

Based on your feedback today, a report will be developed and provided to City Council and the Province. Ultimately, the decision to modify the Greenbelt boundary rests with the Province.

WHEN PLANNING FOR GROWTH IN THE WHITEBELT, WE NEED TO CONSIDER...

EXISTING MASTER PLANS
Lands are included in Airport Employment Growth District master planning

AIRPORT LANDS
JCM Hamilton International Airport and expansion area identified in the Urban Hamilton Official Plan

NOISE CONTOUR
Lands within this contour (NEF 28) are not suitable for sensitive land uses such as residential and institutional

ELFRIDA LANDS
Lands identified in Urban Hamilton Official Plan for future residential use (Elfrida Urban Boundary Expansion area is under appeal at the Ontario Municipal Board)
ISSUES TO CONSIDER

REMINDER
The purpose of this review is to develop a high-level understanding of opportunities to refine the Greenbelt boundary. Areas shown and discussed will not necessarily be added in whole or even in part. Any changes made will be minor.

SOME AREAS OF LAND ARE NOT CONSIDERED APPROPRIATE AS GREENBELT LANDS. TODAY WE ARE NOT PROPOSING TO ADD ANY LANDS TO THE GREENBELT THAT ARE...

ALREADY DESIGNATED BY THE CITY FOR DEVELOPMENT
Urban areas subject to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan

IDENTIFIED FOR FUTURE RESIDENTIAL USE
Elfrieda Urban Boundary Expansion area has been identified in the Urban Hamilton Official Plan for residential uses (under appeal at the Ontario Municipal Board)

AREAS WITH EXISTING MASTER PLANS
Airport Employment Growth District expansion lands with master plans

SURROUNDED BY EXISTING URBAN AREAS
Whitebelt areas surrounded by existing urban uses are not necessarily the best opportunities to uphold the vision and function of the Greenbelt

DESIGNATED AIRPORT LANDS
Airport lands that have been identified in the Urban Hamilton Official Plan

Large area adjacent to the urban area and to a major arterial road, contains no major natural heritage system and needs to be developed comprehensively

VISIT PANEL 8... to see areas that could be considered for addition to the Greenbelt.
What do you think about the areas that could be considered for addition to the Greenbelt?
Should other areas be considered for addition?
Your workbook includes a map of the areas that could be considered for addition. Mark up the map and provide comments in your workbook. Include reasons why an area should or should not be considered for addition to the Greenbelt.

REMINDER
The purpose of this review is to develop a high-level understanding of opportunities to refine the Greenbelt boundary. Areas shown and discussed will not necessarily be added in whole or even in part. Any changes made will be minor.

AFTER CONSIDERING THE ISSUES DESCRIBED ON PANEL 7, THERE ARE TWO REMAINING AREAS THAT COULD BE CONSIDERED FOR ADDITION TO THE GREENBELT....
## Proposed Criteria to Assess Areas That Could Be Considered for Addition to the Greenbelt

To help consider the areas for potential addition to the Greenbelt, criteria were developed. The criteria were developed using strategic Provincial and City planning documents as well as feedback from a stakeholder workshop. The table presents the proposed criteria to assess areas that could be considered for addition to the Greenbelt. The criteria are presented in no particular order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Group</th>
<th>To be a good addition to the Greenbelt, the area should...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Agriculture</td>
<td>Contain Agricultural lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contain Specialty Crop lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be adjacent to established farms to protect the land in the long-term for agricultural use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Character &amp; Economy</td>
<td>Contain agricultural-related uses (e.g. farm markets, farm implement dealers, etc.) or on-farm diversified uses (e.g. farmers markets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support rural character, and leverage rural amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Contain portions of the City’s Natural Heritage System, which could include portions of the existing ravine system and protect core features and functions by connecting linkages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be an extension of the Greenbelt Natural Heritage System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be an extension of the Greenbelt Protected Countryside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>Provide opportunity for protection to known municipally identified trails, parks, conservation areas, or other cultural heritage (landscapes or buildings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Area</td>
<td>Contain land that is constrained by the NEF 28 contour because it precludes residential and any other sensitive land use within the NEF contour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not contain land that is highly suitable for employment or residential uses (i.e., surrounded by existing or future employment / residential uses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contain lands that are suitable for a limited amount of land uses (e.g., only employment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and Natural Resources</td>
<td>Not contain existing or planned water/wastewater servicing and not provide opportunities for efficient servicing expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not contain existing or planned connections to higher-order road networks (e.g., arterial roads).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not be in proximity to identified inter-regional transit corridors, mobility hubs, or other sustainable transportation networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contain aggregate mineral aggregate resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do you think about the criteria presented? Is there anything else we should consider when we assess areas for addition to the Greenbelt? Add your comments to the table using the sticky notes.
### Applying Proposed Criteria to Area 1 – Book Road

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Group</th>
<th>Draft Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Protection of Agriculture**       | • Primary land use is Agriculture in and surrounding the area  
• Some areas of Open Space and Rural (north-east of area) land uses and Urban land uses to the north  
• No Specialty Crop lands            |
| **Rural Character & Economy**       | • Agriculture-related uses such as a farmer’s market on Fiddlers Green Road  
• Potential on-farm diversified uses (i.e. bed and breakfast) which may be defined as a rural amenity that maintains rural character |
| **Environmental Protection**        | • City Core Area and Existing Greenbelt Natural Heritage System features bisect the area  
• Opportunity to enhance protection of an existing east-west City Linkage  
• Opportunity to extend City Core Area south of Garner Road.  
• Greenbelt Protected Countryside borders the area to the west and the south. |
| **Cultural Heritage**               | • Existing bike route on Book Road and Fiddlers Green  
• No identified cultural heritage resources, conservation areas, or City classified parks. |
| **Settlement Area**                 | • Major NEF 28 noise contour constraint on the area meaning sensitive land uses (i.e., residential and institutional uses) are not suitable  
• Bounded by residential uses to the north  
• Bounded by future employment to the east and partially to the west. |
| **Infrastructure and Natural Resources** | • No existing watermain servicing within or near the area  
• Some wastewater infrastructure to the north of the area  
• Potential Rapid Transit Line to run along Garner Road East  
• Current transportation infrastructure is a rural network  
• Potential to connect to infrastructure serving existing residential development north of the area  
• Contains a small area of mineral aggregate resources |

What do you think about the Draft Results for Area 1? Have we missed anything? Do you have any changes?  
Add your comments to the table using the sticky notes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Group</th>
<th>Draft Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Agriculture</td>
<td>• Agriculture land use is only land use in and surrounding the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No Specialty crop lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Character &amp; Economy</td>
<td>• Potential on-farm diversified uses (i.e., scrap yard) which may be defined as a rural amenity that maintains rural character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>• Opportunity to connect City Core Areas within the area and to the north and south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extension of Greenbelt Natural Heritage System to the north</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunity to enhance protection of existing north-south City Linkages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extension of Greenbelt Protected Countryside found to the east and south</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>• Multi-use path (Trans-Canada Trail) goes through the north-west portion of the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No identified cultural heritage resources, conservation areas, or City classified parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement Area</td>
<td>• Major NEE 26 noise contour constraint on the area meaning sensitive land uses (i.e., residential and institutional uses) are not suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bounded by Agriculture uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and Natural Resources</td>
<td>• No existing watermain servicing within or near the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• No existing wastewater servicing within or near the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Current transportation infrastructure is a rural network including rural Arterial road (Nebo Rd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does not contain mineral aggregate resources</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
URBAN RIVER VALLEYS
OPTION FOR ADDING TO THE GREENBELT

URBAN RIVER VALLEYS ARE AN ADDITIONAL OPTION TO CONSIDER FOR POTENTIAL ADDITION TO THE GREENBELT

What are your thoughts on potentially adding the Red Hill urban river valley to the Greenbelt?
Provide your comments on the sticky notes and add them to the map.

Should other urban river valleys be considered for potential addition to the Greenbelt?
Provide your comments on the sticky notes and add them to the map.
SELECT WHICH AREA(S) (INCLUDING ANY YOU MARKED IN YOUR BOOK) THAT YOU THINK WOULD BEST HELP MEET THE VISION OF THE GREENBELT PLAN AND THE GROWTH PLAN IF THEY WERE TO BE ADDED TO THE GREENBELT

GREENBELT PLAN VISION
The Greenbelt is an area of land in Ontario which:
- Protects the agricultural land base;
- Protects the natural heritage and water resource systems;
- Supports rural communities and agriculture, tourism, recreation, and resource uses.

Place a green dot on the area you think would best help meet the vision of the Greenbelt Plan.

Place a yellow dot on the area you think would least help meet the vision of the Greenbelt Plan.

If you have additional comments on the best opportunity to add to the Greenbelt, write them on the sticky notes provided and place on the map.
ISSUES TO CONSIDER

ONLY APPROPRIATE LANDS WILL BE CONSIDERED FOR REMOVAL FROM THE GREENBELT. TODAY WE ARE NOT PROPOSING TO REMOVE ANY LANDS FROM THE GREENBELT THAT ARE...

- within the Niagara Escarpment area; have significant natural heritage system features; or have servicing constraints due to escarpment
- distant from existing Urban Area or the Whitebelt
- separated from existing Urban Areas by natural heritage system features
- Isolated Urban Areas surrounded by Greenbelt Protected Countryside

REMINDER
The purpose of this review is to develop a high-level understanding of opportunities to refine the Greenbelt boundary. Areas shown and discussed will not necessarily be removed in whole or even in part. Any changes made will be minor.

VISIT PANEL 15... to see areas that could be considered for removal from the Greenbelt.
AREAS THAT COULD BE CONSIDERED FOR REMOVAL FROM THE GREENBELT

AFTER CONSIDERING THE ISSUES DESCRIBED ON PANEL 14, THERE ARE FOUR REMAINING AREAS THAT COULD BE CONSIDERED FOR REMOVAL FROM THE GREENBELT.

What do you think about the areas that could be considered for removal from the Greenbelt?

Should other areas be considered for removal?

Your workbook includes a map of the areas that could be considered for removal. Mark up the map and provide comments in your workbook. Include reasons why an area should or should not be considered for removal from the Greenbelt.

REMINIDER

The purpose of this review is to develop a high-level understanding of opportunities to refine the Greenbelt boundary. Areas shown and discussed will not necessarily be removed in whole or even in part. Any changes made will be minor.
## Proposed Criteria to Assess areas that Could be Considered for Removal from the Greenbelt

To help consider the areas for potential removal from the Greenbelt, criteria were developed. The criteria were developed using strategic Provincial and City planning documents as well as feedback from a stakeholder workshop. The table presents the proposed criteria to assess areas that could be considered for removal from the Greenbelt. The criteria are presented in no particular order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Group</th>
<th>To be suitable for removal from the Greenbelt, the area should....</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Agriculture</td>
<td>Not contain Agricultural lands                                                                                      &lt;br&gt;Not contain Specialty Crop lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be surrounded by land uses that prohibit typical agricultural practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Character and Economy</td>
<td>Not be supportive of rural character nor allow for rural amenities and assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Not contain portions of the City's Natural Heritage System (local features)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not contain portions Greenbelt Plan's Natural Heritage System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage</td>
<td>Not undermine known, municipally identified trails, parks, conservation areas, or other cultural heritage (buildings and landscapes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Urban Area(s)</td>
<td>Contain land that is not constrained by the NEF-28 contour as those have greater flexibility for a range of land uses including residential and institutional uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contain land that is clearly highly suitable for employment uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be contiguous with existing urban land that would create a complete community or complete an existing community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Have a configuration suitable for urban uses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure and Natural Resources</td>
<td>Be serviced or in an area where water/ wastewater servicing is already planned or provide opportunities for efficient servicing expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contain existing or planned connections to higher-order transportation networks (e.g. arterial roads).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Be in proximity to identified inter-regional transit corridors, mobility hubs, or other sustainable transportation networks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What do you think about the criteria presented? Is there anything else we should consider when we assess areas for removal from the Greenbelt? **Add your comments to the table using the sticky notes**
### Criteria Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection of Agriculture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Specialty crop is the only land use in the area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Surrounded by residential and employment uses to the west, north, and east</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rural Character and Economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Allows for some rural amenities and assets (i.e., Winona Gardens and Imperial Precast Corp. by Fifty Road)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Most of the area does not contain City’s Natural Heritage System features (Core Area nor Linkage) or Greenbelt Natural Heritage System</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Eastern part of the area contains a small Community Park and a small individually designated cultural heritage property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No conservation areas or existing trails in the area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Urban Area(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Area is not constrained by NRE 28 noise contour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Opportunity to complete an existing community as area is virtually surrounded by employment or residential uses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure and Natural Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- In proximity to existing water and wastewater servicing (Barton Street, Fifty Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Potential Rapid Transit Route along Barton Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adjacent to Barton Street Pedestrian Promenade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Near potential multi-modal hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adjacent to Highway 8 potential transportation corridor expansion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Criteria Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Group</th>
<th>Draft Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Protection of Agriculture**      | • Specialty Crop is the only land use in the area  
• Urban Neighbourhood and Arterial Commercial uses to the west  
• Planned future residential uses to the south |
| **Rural Character and Economy**    | • Allows for some rural amenities and assets (i.e., Drive-in theatre, container/trailer services, golf centre, Dofasco Park, and Green Mountain Gardens) most found along Green Mountain Road |
| **Environmental Protection**       | • Contains some City Natural Heritage System features (Core Area and Linkage) in the north of the area and south of Green Mountain Road  
• Contains some Greenbelt Natural Heritage System in the north |
| **Cultural Heritage**              | • Individually designated cultural heritage property in northwest portion of the area  
• No conservation areas, existing trails, or City classified parks |
| **Existing Urban Area(s)**         | • Area is not constrained by NEP 28 noise contour  
• Suitable for employment uses  
• Opportunity complete an existing community as area is adjacent to existing urban boundary and planned future residential uses to the east and south |
| **Infrastructure and Natural Resources** | • No existing water or wastewater servicing in or near the area  
• Some opportunity for water and wastewater servicing expansion from the west  
• Potential Rapid Transit Line along Upper Centennial Parkway  
• Adjacent to identified transportation corridor (Upper Centennial Parkway) |

---

What do you think about the Draft Results for Area 2? Have we missed anything? Do you have any changes?

Add your comments to the table using the sticky notes.
### Criteria Group

#### Protection of Agriculture
- Agriculture is primary land use, with Rural land use north of Highland Road
- Planned future residential uses to the west

#### Rural Character and Economy
- Allows for some rural amenities and assets (i.e., B&G Multi Services on Highway 20)

#### Environmental Protection
- Contains some City Natural Heritage System features (Core Area and Linkage) north of Highway 20 and between Highway 20 and Golf Club Road
- Does not contain Greenbelt Natural Heritage System

#### Cultural Heritage
- No identified cultural heritage resources, existing trails, conservation areas, or City classified parks

#### Existing Urban Area(s)
- Area is not constrained by NEF 28 noise contour
- Suitable for employment uses
- Opportunity complete an existing community as area is adjacent to planned future residential uses to the west

#### Infrastructure and Natural Resources
- No existing water or wastewater servicing in or near the area
- No planned connections

---

What do you think about the Draft Results for Area 3? Have we missed anything? Do you have any changes?

Add your comments to the table using the sticky notes.
### APPLYING PROPOSED CRITERIA TO AREA 4 – NORTH TWENTY MILE CREEK

#### Criteria Group | Draft Results
--- | ---
**Protection of Agriculture** | • Agriculture is the only land use in the area  
• Planned future residential uses to the north

**Rural Character and Economy** | • Allows for some rural amenities and assets (i.e., Fletcher Fruit Farms, and Slack Lumber & Supplied Limited on Highway 56)

**Environmental Protection** | • Most of the area does not contain City Natural Heritage System features (Core Area nor Linkage)  
• Area does not contain Greenbelt Natural Heritage System

**Cultural Heritage** | • No identified cultural heritage resources, existing trails, conservation areas, or City classified parks

**Existing Urban Area(s)** | • Area is not constrained by NEF 28 noise contour  
• Suitable for employment uses  
• Opportunity complete an existing community as area is adjacent to planned future urban uses to the north

**Infrastructure and Natural Resources** | • Existing watermain along Highway 56 to Binbrook  
• Existing sewer on Golf Club Road and Highway 56 to Binbrook  
• Contains rural collector and arterial roads  
• No planned connections to higher order transit or other sustainable transportation networks

---

What do you think about the Draft Results for Area 4? Have we missed anything? Do you have any changes?  
Add your comments to the table using the sticky notes.
SELECT WHICH AREA(S) (INCLUDING ANY YOU MARKED IN YOUR BOOK) THAT YOU THINK WOULD BEST HELP MEET THE VISION OF THE GREENBELT PLAN AND THE GROWTH PLAN IF THEY WERE TO BE REMOVED FROM THE GREENBELT

GREENBELT PLAN VISION
The Greenbelt is an area of land in Ontario which:
- Protects the agricultural land base;
- Protects the natural heritage and water resource systems;
- Supports rural communities and agriculture, tourism, recreation, and resource uses.

Place a green dot on the area you think would best help meet the vision of the Greenbelt Plan.

Place a yellow dot on the area you think would least help meet the vision of the Greenbelt Plan.

If you have additional comments on the best opportunity to remove from the Greenbelt, write them on the sticky notes provided and place on the map.