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1. Frid Street
1. Frid Street

Concerns:
- Loss of high tech employment land and non-residential assessment
- Potential loss of land with proximity to McMaster Innovation Park, that can not be replicated anywhere in the City.
- The appropriate size of a Research and Development Park is 145 acres, however WHID is only 125 acres currently with this land.
- Bisected by Frid Street extension

• Screened out (Planning Policy Conflict – WHID)
2. Stuart St.
2. Stuart St.

Concerns:
- Does not meet the intent of the Secondary Plan
- The intent of Setting Sail is to promote remediation of lands and conversion from industrial to residential use
- City owned portion of site is too small and irregularly shaped
- Relocation of metal works would be required

• Screened out (Planning Policy Conflict – Setting Sail)
3. Burlington / Wellington
3. Burlington / Wellington

- Concerns:
  - Loss of employment lands
  - Multiple property owners
  - Active heavy rail spur lines bisecting the site
  - Spur Line distance 1.25 km (along Wellington)
  - Wellington is not grade separated at CN main line
  - Spur Line following Burlington and John Street would be 2.5 km
4. Victoria / Ferrie
4. Victoria / Ferrie

Concerns:
- Loss of employment lands
- Proposal to redevelop the site

- Screened out – Proposal to redevelop the site (Demolition permit approved at Planning Committee on August 14th, 2012)
5. Barton/ Gage West
5. Barton/ Gage West

Concerns:

- Area specific policy identifies that industrial should be compatible with adjacent non-employment land uses.
- Property is made up of 2 to 15 privately owned parcels, including 9 residential lots
- Spur line would run 900 meters along Gage Avenue North
6. Barton / Gage East
6. Barton / Gage East

• Concerns:
  – Area specific policy identifies that industrial should be compatible with adjacent non-employment land uses.
  – Lots are privately owned and used for metal recycling
  – Shape is irregular
  – Site is not easily accessible and additional properties may be required to facilitate spur line access
  – Spur Line would be 1.4 km following Barton/Ottawa and would require crossing of CP heavy rail spur
  – Spur Line would be 1.2 km following Barton/Gage
7. Barton / Parkdale West
7. Barton / Parkdale West

Concerns:

- Orlick Industries occupies most of the site
- Orlick property is triangular, which would not permit MSF layout.
- Additional Properties would be required to the east or west of the site.
- Spur Line would be 1.24 km long, following Parkdale Avenue North (if the properties on the east side of the site were acquired)

- Not recommended due to impact on employment and technical challenges with site.
8. Barton / Parkdale E.
8. Barton / Parkdale E.

Concerns:

- Previous attempt to purchase the property was unsuccessful (2009)
- Spur Line distance would be 1.5 km following Barton Parkdale alignment
- Site is privately owned
9. Barton / Lake
9. Barton / Lake

Concerns:
- Privately owned (three separate lots)
- Multiple businesses located on site
- Site is very far from the A-Line
- Spur line is 1.5 km following Barton and Centennial
10. Barton / Grays - A
10. Barton / Grays - A

Concerns:

- Site is irregularly shaped and slightly under the 5 hectare size
- Multiple businesses are located on site
- Site is privately owned
- Site is very far from the A-Line
- Spur line would be 2.5 km following Barton Centennial

- Not recommended since site is 2.5 km from the B-Line and over 10 km from the A-Line. The site is also irregularly shaped and too small for potential future system expansion.
Barton / Grays - B
Barton / Grays - B

Concerns:

- Site is privately owned
- Site is developed
- Site is very far from the A-Line
- Spur line would be 3.3 km following Arvin/Barton/Centennial

- Not recommended since site is 3.3 km from the B-Line and over 11 km from the A-Line.
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12. Aberdeen Yard
12. Aberdeen Yard

[Map showing Aberdeen Yard with marked areas]

Proposed PanAm games stadium
12. Aberdeen Yard

Concerns:

- Only considered as part of stadium redevelopment at this location
- CP rail yard relocation required
- Spur line would be 1.8 km following Aberdeen/heavy rail spur corridor
- Spur line would be 1 km following Aberdeen and Longwood.
13. Fortinos Plaza
13. Fortinos Plaza

Concerns:
- Site is too small for future expansion
- Site is a significant commercial area
- Site is privately owned
- Site is surrounded by residential properties

• Not recommended since site significant commercial area and too small for system expansion
14. Ivor Wynne
14. Ivor Wynne

- N/A Considered when Ivor Wynne was relocating
15. Frid St. North
15. Frid St. North

Concerns:

- Loss of high tech employment land and non-residential assessment
- Potential loss of land with proximity to McMaster Innovation Park, that can not be replicated anywhere in the City.
- The appropriate size of a Research and Development Park is 145 acres, however WHID is only 125 acres currently with this land.
- Multiple property owners
- Main Street rail underpass would require widening

• Not recommended since site is part of West Hamilton Innovation District
16. 330 Wentworth
16. 330 Wentworth

Concerns:
- May require relocation of some city programs
- Spur line is 1.2 to 1.8 km following range of routing options
17. Arrowsmith Rd.
17. Arrowsmith Rd.

Concerns:

- Property is planned for the Confederation GO station
- Site is too small for B-Line fleet
- Spur line is 1.3 km following Centennial Parkway

- Not recommended since site is planned Confederation GO station
18. Centennial Parkway
18. Centennial Parkway

Concerns:

- Property has been redeveloped as a Smart Centres
- Spur line is 1.5 km following Centennial Parkway

• Not recommended since site has been redeveloped as a Smart Centre (Walmart)
New Sites Considered in early 2012

• A - Montgomery Park
• B - Zellers Plaza – S/W corner of Nash@Queenston
• C - Eastgate Square
• D - Barton@Glendale (Mr. Used)
A - Montgomery Park
A - Montgomery Park

Concerns:

– MSF would not be permitted within the P1 Zone and therefore a Zoning By-Law amendment would be required
– Proximity to Adjacent Residential
– Potential Loss of Parkland
– Cost, if MSF is to be underground

• Not recommended since site is community park and underground MSF would be cost prohibitive
Eastgate Square

Concerns:

- Ability, cost and viability of Mixed Use
- Proximity to Adjacent Residential
- Loss of Commercial
- Cost of Land
- Prime redevelopment land

• Not recommended due to cost of land and impact to community node.
C - Zellers Plaza – Queenston @ Nash
Zellers Plaza – Queenston @ Nash

Concerns:

- Ability, cost and viability of Mixed Use
- Proximity to Adjacent Residential
- Loss of Commercial
- Cost of Land

- Not recommended since site is privately owned commercial adjacent to residential, too small for future expansion and is prime mixed-use redevelopment land.
D – Barton @ Glendale (Mr. Used?)
D – Barton @ Glendale (Mr. Used)

Concerns:

– Proximity to Adjacent Residential
– Cost of Land, 3 different owners (current Warehouse Space, Mr. Used, industrial)
– Size = +/- 2.7 ha irregular shape. (4.7ac; 1.4ac; 0.62ac)

• Not recommended since site is too small and irregularly shaped
## Top sites

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Burlington/Wellington</th>
<th>Barton/Gage West</th>
<th>Barton/Gage East</th>
<th>Barton/Parkdale East</th>
<th>Barton/Lake</th>
<th>Aberdeen Yard</th>
<th>330 Wentworth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publicly Owned Land</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of land</td>
<td>5.2m</td>
<td>5.3m</td>
<td>3.5m</td>
<td>4.5m (unable to acquire previously)</td>
<td>4.3m</td>
<td>Equal or greater than other privately owned sites</td>
<td>City Owned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Spur</td>
<td>63.7m</td>
<td>31.5m</td>
<td>45.5m</td>
<td>52.5m</td>
<td>52.5m</td>
<td>35m</td>
<td>62m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spur Routing</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>Res</td>
<td>Com</td>
<td>Com</td>
<td>Rail</td>
<td>Res</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spur costing inclusions</td>
<td>Grade separation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site surroundings</td>
<td>Res.</td>
<td>Res.</td>
<td>Res.</td>
<td>Com/Ind</td>
<td>Com/Ind</td>
<td>Res/Golf Course</td>
<td>Ind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact to private businesses</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to relocate business</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance from A-Line</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preferred Site

330 Wentworth Street North recommended as preferred site
Spur Line Options
Spur Line Screening

- Routes via Burlington to John/James screened out due to distance (2.3 km to James Street + 800 meters to King Street). A-Line Rapid Transit Technology not yet selected and insufficient capacity on James to provide dedicated outbound track.
- Wentworth screened out (option 1b) as it is not technically feasible (insufficient distance from property to clear CN main line)
- Sherman screened out (option 4b) due to grade separation requirements at CN main line
## Spur Line Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>1a – Birch/ Barton/ Wentworth</th>
<th>2a – Birch/ Barton/ Sanford</th>
<th>2b – Birch/ Barton/ Princess/ Myler</th>
<th>3a – Birch/ Cannon/ Sanford</th>
<th>3b – Birch/ Cannon/ Sanford, Sherman/ Cannon/ Birch</th>
<th>4a – Birch/ Wilson/ Sherman/ Cannon</th>
<th>5 – Birch/ Wilson/ Cannon/ Sanford</th>
<th>6- Birch/ Wilson/ Cannon/ Sanford</th>
<th>7 – Birch/ Wilson/ Sanford/ Barton</th>
<th>8 – Birch/ Cannon/ Sanford/ Barton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Impacts</td>
<td>High – Barton Street</td>
<td>High – Barton Street</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High – two lanes on Cannon</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck Routes</td>
<td>Full Time Truck Route</td>
<td>Full Time Truck Route</td>
<td>Myler and Princess are not Truck Routes</td>
<td>Full Time Truck Route</td>
<td>Full Time Truck Route</td>
<td>Princess is not a Truck Route</td>
<td>Wilson is not a truck route</td>
<td>Wilson is not a truck route</td>
<td>Wilson is not a truck route</td>
<td>All roads are full or part-time truck routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts to Community Features/ Facilities</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low to Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Low to Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning Radii</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buried Hydro Lines</td>
<td>CN to Barton</td>
<td>CN to Barton</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>CN to Cannon</td>
<td>CN to Cannon</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>CN to Cannon</td>
<td>CN to Cannon</td>
<td>CN to Cannon</td>
<td>CN to Cannon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Property/ Land Take</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Parkland impacts and Heritage Property</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Private Property Required</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spur Line Recommendation

- Option 8 recommended due to lowest overall impacts
- Option 5 is second best option
- Option 7 is third best option
Walking distance to B-Line Stops
www.hamiltonrapidtransit.ca