

## Public Comments (email) – Option 3

1.	<p>Allow for intensification in existing urban area. i.e. conversion of garage into living spaces on the Mountain. Some discussion of this is already ongoing in the lower city. There is no affordable housing anymore so we must be able to make more apartments and living spaces within the current footprint with no addition of high rises.</p> <p>We must preserve our land and our wildlife and prevent contamination of our waters.</p>
2.	<p>I suggest we determine who is paying for this campaign to promote high rise condo development, particularly in the lower city.</p>
3.	<p>In the survey we had 3 options to choose from, I decided on my option #3. My idea is similar to option #1 but with modifications. I suggest expanding into green space BUT with the idea of building smaller homes on larger lots. Keep some areas farming zones mixed with urban living. We are in an era where obesity, especially childhood obesity, is a major problem. More and more people will also continue to work from home. Backyards are essential to a happy and healthy family and as you are aware, newer home's backyards are non-existent.</p> <p>Also, all these new "McMansions" The City continues to approve of, are not affordable for many, not only the price of the house, but the property taxes are insanely expensive. If you drive through, Vaughn, Halton Hills, Milton, Brampton etc. all these municipalities ALL LOOK THE SAME. They are a sea of beige roof tops; no soul or character to be seen. Many of these homes have become multiple family dwellings because it is too expensive for one family to maintain. Don't you want Hamilton to maintain its unique character? I don't want Hamilton to blend in with the GTA, do you?</p> <p>Lastly, if you expand into green space with a "green attitude" you will please most, not all but you will never please all. By maintaining the feeling of a rural area by having smaller homes on larger lots, it will continue to have the appearance of "farmland". I know builders don't want to hear that, it's all about maximizing profits but we have to meet in the middle on some issues and the whole world needs to start doing this. It's called compromise.</p> <p>My idea will allow the City of Hamilton to expand to accommodate more residents while maintaining that precious green space with modifications. I personally don't like that you only gave two polar opposites options on the survey card, but thank you for at least allowing us to make an Option #3 and allowing me to share it with you.</p>
4.	<p>I think an option 3 needs to be considered where affordability for lower and middle class hamiltonians and ontarians is considered. Or that the impacts of density in our neighborhoods are for the benefit of lower and middle class ontarians.</p> <p>As a background, I have lived at my current address as a renter for two years. Due to the "hot" housing market in Hamilton, we have been told by our landlord that it's likely they will sell the property soon to cash in. If we wish to purchase a</p>

	<p>home it is likely we will have to move and leave the city where we have jobs and family.</p> <p>In addition, rent is rapidly increasing which has out paced our earnings in a dual income household. We would have to pay the same or more for a smaller sized apartment rental.</p> <p>If the city adds 81,520 or 110,180 new housing units - whether that's townhouses or low apartment buildings, who can afford to live there? Who can afford to rent or buy these places?</p> <p>I know supply and demand impacts prices but so does desirability. Hamilton being close to so many places - I do not predict that an influx of housing and development will inherently lower prices. In fact, it could cause more people to push up prices, push out renters and continue the churn of gentrification.</p> <p>I know the city is trying to accommodate provincial numbers and projections, but is that it? At what level does the city care about affordability? Can affordable rents and properties be mandated - so that at least some percentage of new builds has affordability in mind?</p>
5.	<p>Developing greenfield lands is not the answer to expansion, particularly farmland. We are already losing 175 acres a day in Ontario of farmland to development. If the new 400-series highway goes through, the project will also wipe out the equivalent of 13.6 functioning farms.</p> <p>Intensification of our urban area must be done carefully, as no sane person wants Hamilton to copy Toronto and become an unlivable city of towers, highway gridlock and mega malls.</p> <p>Rather than erecting countless towers or wiping out precious farmland, I suggest:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purchasing vacant homes and businesses. We have MANY in Hamilton. So, repair the vacant homes and build low-rise / mid-rise buildings on the land currently occupied by non-operating businesses. Nationwide, data shows that 8.7 per cent of all homes were vacant in 2016. That rate is five times higher than the U.S., where 1.7 per cent of homes are vacant.</li> <li>• Allow more laneway houses and stacked town houses to be built within the city.</li> <li>• Develop the acres of underused parking lots and land occupied by closed down factories.</li> <li>• Push the Provincial Government to change the law, which would then require newcomers to initially move to less populated cities and towns. There is no reason everyone this country accepts has to live in Hamilton, Toronto, Vancouver, etc. This would be for a period of say, two – three years and then the newcomer could relocate to another area if they so wished. This has been implemented in other countries and could work</li> </ul>

	<p>here also.</p> <p>Will we have the infrastructure to support 236,000 additional people by 2051? We need to address our current issues, including high numbers of disabled people, the aging, the homeless and the \$3.8 billion maintenance shortfall we currently have. With an increase in population, there is not only "growth," but a concurrent increase in resources needed to support that population.</p>
6.	<p>A significantly reduced expansion rate (~10-15%). Increase density and put money towards municipal infrastructure to maintain it. Use the income towards improving the green space in and around the City. Hamilton is where people came during the pandemic because we had to room for them to come. Increased sprawl means going further and further to get good recreation, which means jumping in your car rather than walking, which is greater need for roads and other associated infrastructure, more transit routes, more vehicular exhaust, etc. The new sprawl homes are high cost without much input into the general economy. Put money back where there is already lots of life.</p>
7.	<p>Hamilton has all kind of space to grow up and not out. East and west of downtown. On the mountain from the brow to 53 hwy. I would like to see these areas densify before stretching out to more rural areas. Hamilton should never have been expanded to include the large rural areas that surround it.</p> <p>Greater density will support better public transit. Take a look at NYC., Manhattan, very dense - great transit. My son lives there.....I have personal knowledge.</p> <p>Our immigrant population is growing and I believe they would accept higher density.</p> <p>Also, I think the LRT should be left until a later time when greater density would give Hamilton more taxes coming in. I think the projections for what the LRT would do for Hamilton are overstated. Just because there is LRT, ridership is not going to suddenly jump. People with cars will continue to drive. I do not think Hamilton's middle class will suddenly embrace public transit.</p> <p>I travel by bus and there is Much room for improvement.</p>
8.	<p>My suggestion is actually a modified Option 2 No Urban Boundary Expansion scenario however before expansion is done in established neighbourhoods, the following should be undertaken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*enable development of vacant brownfield throughout City first</li> <li>*enable the adaptive reuse of existing commercial buildings to allow for apartments,</li> <li>*in buildings such as the City Centre block, on vacant land such as the Tiffany Lands and empty downtown parking blocks</li> <li>*enable garage apartments, coach house and alley way apartments, other non conforming rentals with a permit process</li> <li>*encourage adaptive reuse of heritage buildings for apartments including vacant churches and schools</li> </ul> <p>Incentivize adaptive reuse first rather than demolition of heritage structures.</p>

	<p>Keep history and increase living spaces. Strengthen procedures to stop demolition of heritage buildings by developers. Steer development to vacant lots first. Stop issuing demolition permits on heritage buildings without a process of consultation with the community. It is important to us.</p> <p>I am proud of Hamilton's heritage and it saddens me to see developers tear down usable structures to put in condos.</p> <p>Limit tall stories in areas with individual houses. We are not Toronto yet. No one wants to live next door to a hi-rise. Concentrate height in commercial areas away from residential neighbourhoods. Keep to the city plan's height caps.</p> <p>* Enable small buildings in residential neighbourhoods, in keeping with the character of individual places. Smaller multiple unit buildings can fit easily without overwhelming services in smaller residential areas, limit the increased traffic problem and remove the shadow issue.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to voice my opinion.</p>
9.	<p>Your pamphlet uses the term "intensification rate" several times without making clear what this means. What would be 100%? What would be 0%?</p> <p>In regard to the options you ask about, I would favour forms of medium density. I think I understand what this means.</p> <p>As a resident of Dundas, I would like to see the existing height limits on new construction maintained, as this would keep the population density at a comfortable rate. I would expect that similar limits should work throughout the existing boundaries of Hamilton without gobbling up more rural space.</p>
10.	<p>First Choice - Option 3 Push back on any provincial mandated intensification. All population growth should be mandated away from the GTHA. Growth within GTHA should be natural and without mandates. Conversion from north end industrial lands to low to medium density residential housing would be my preference.</p> <p>Second Choice - Option 1 This will maintain our current already high density and maintain our green spaces.</p> <p>Last Choice - Option 2 We have enough density - no more intensification.</p>
11.	<p>Option 3</p> <p>Aim for 75% intensification and around 850 ha expansion.</p> <p>There are still a lot of empty or underused buildings in the city. Some can be turned into condos or torn down and build apartments. Also encourage developers to renew intensify some neighbourhoods. e.g. Buying 3 older homes and building 4-5 townhouse units. Also encourage/facilitate more home owners to convert basement or garage into an a rental unit.</p>

12.	<p>In lieu of completing the survey which has minimal space for detail, I've chosen to respond by email.</p> <p>I favour an intensification rate of between 60 and 70%. But to consider the climate change issues, this intensification should initially be concentrated in areas served by the LRT project and other areas with very good mass transit service. Use of existing structures such as the former Delta secondary school should also be a priority to provide condo type housing. Higher density developments should not be allowed to be scattered randomly so as to add more volume to already clogged roads such as the Redhill and Linc. Planning should ALWAYS be aligned with efficient mass transit systems. To allow young people to realize the dream of owning a home and raise a family, we must not allow the existing inventory of single homes to be converted e-mass into rental units as is happening in many parts of the city today. Development of new housing on green field sites should be done with the utmost care to preserve the most valuable farmland for food production. As such, priority for preservation should be given to fruit growing areas and other such zones of unique soil and climate conditions ( there's lots of places you can grow corn but very few where you can grow peaches and apples).</p> <p>We should also move very slowly on the entire project as we seem to be putting the cart before the horse. The growth forecast is predicated on new housing being available. If you build it they will come. Conversely, if you don't build it, many will not come.</p> <p>Also, we should not spend much time listening to the input of real estate developers on this issue. Their feedback is completely tainted by self interest as they will push and support whichever proposal will earn them the most money, with no consideration for environmental, transit or farm preservation considerations. Might as well ask the fox to design the chicken coop.</p>
13.	<p>Thank you for accepting opinion on this matter.</p> <p>At the core of the issue is the basic environmental concern about growth. It is a basic environmental position that world population growth is bad. As we have seen since antiquity, the development of urban life promotes close living, higher needs for production of animals, and with it the spread of disease to humans from animals.</p> <p>There is no environmentalist/scientist that believes growing world population is good. The world populations needs to shrink. So, the entire concept the city of Hamilton, Ontario, and Canada has, that growth is good, is wrong.</p> <p>So firstly, Hamilton must stand up and say we don't want Canada to have millions and millions of more people.</p> <p>We need to encourage zero growth of our population. That requires federal policy that possibly accepts fewer new Canadians and promotes modest sized families.</p> <p>Beyond Canada's borders, via the United Nations, we need to continue to promote healthy environmental living via population control. If the world population bomb is not diffused, then no matter what our country's policy is, the</p>

planet will suffer due to greater use of fossil fuels. More and more people require more and more resources and produce more and more pollution.

In Canada today, we cannot accommodate the needs of the people with adequate housing, police, hospitals etc., etc.

There is no logical reason to increase Canada's or Hamilton's population.

But if the insanity of encouraging growth continues, and Hamilton is a victim of it, then we must grow smartly.

That will include housing intensification, and if needed, possible expansion of the urban boundary for both housing and various forms of industry and business.

But that must occur smartly. There must be separate bicycle lanes, far from vehicle traffic. Every greenfield development must have a dedicated cycling lane, pedestrian lane, vehicle lane, and perhaps transit lane, as is often the case in The Netherlands. The best practices of the world need to be examined by our planners (I am certain many have done these studies) and adapt the best strategies for our needs.

There must also be very light taxation on farmers within Hamilton, so as to encourage their farming profession. There needs to be a "green belt" within the city that is sacred and cannot be built on. It will be for agriculture or recreation. It should wrap the city, as occurs in Ottawa.

We need apartments for the young, the single, the elderly. So, we need intensification and attractive development within our existing boundaries. We need retirement homes, nursing homes, some single homes and townhomes and condominium buildings. So, a good mix is welcome. But all efforts to contain growth within the city and infill first, is what I feel would work best but we must all be open to compromise. Perhaps it will be a mix of all the options.

Please recall that the very first decision, is to decide why you want to grow. Who says we have to grow?

And if we do, how much? Canada prides itself on welcoming new citizens and we should continue to do that, especially refugees. But how many? Do we want 100 million citizens, 200 million? We need some answers from our federal leaders.

The rest of the world is trying to shrink its population (China a key example) and here Canada is a complete outlier in wanting to grow. As I said, more people mean more cars, more pollution, greater demand for scarce resources such as water and arable land. It is insane for the world population to grow. We are already short water and food. The oceans are littered, the planet is burning. Climate change is brought on by our deforestation and pollution.

Please address the core issue first: Who says we want to grow? Do we have to grow?

	And if we do, let us do it slowly and smartly. I volunteer to serve on a panel that might reflect on all the needs and aspects of this important discussion.
14.	<p>Hello, I've done very little analysis on what land is required vs the forecasted demand in the coming years. Maybe this proposal addresses that (and I hope so) but I'd like to give my opinion on the situation right now</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The actual built housing has clearly not kept up with demand as evidenced by continuously rising real estate prices</li> <li>- As a result many individuals have been forced to live with their parents, rent tiny apartments and postpone building families due to financial constraints.</li> <li>- Hamilton is now one of the most expensive cities in the world against income, despite Canada having an abundance of land per person</li> <li>- Landlords, homeowners, real estate agents are becoming obscenely wealthy while young trades workers, nurses, firefighters, engineers are being taken advantage of. Why should any of them stay and contribute to this city, if they have to give all their hard earned dollars directly to their landlord just for the privilege of residing in a tiny concrete box?</li> </ul> <p>Keeping this in mind PLEASE consider adding a margin of safety in the proposed expansion land needed</p> <p>Shelter is a necessity, so why are the values of houses so detached from the cost it takes to build them? The stakes are extremely high. Please keep this in mind when moving forward with this.</p>
15.	<p>I have filled out the form recently sent to me in the mail and will return it this week, but I also wanted to add additional comments.</p> <p>The downtown area of Hamilton is currently a wasteland of parking lots and underutilized spaces, including many such areas along Main ST East, King St. East and Barton St. East among others, where the existing built fabric is often not being utilised to its potential and could be re developed for more effective use.</p> <p>In this day and age, we should be focusing on improving urban density where servicing already exists or is readily accessible, where transit and other public services and utilities are more practical, and where the addition of more housing and commercial options could help to recreate vibrant, sustainable, and serviceable communities.</p> <p>Why not promote the creation of new mixed-use developments on this underutilised land where such development would not reduce our existing limited supply of farmland. This does not need to be the often used pattern of very tall apartment style buildings with a lot of empty space in between but could include housing in many forms and with varied heights of up to 4 or 5 stories as well as varied setbacks with commercial and City Services on the lower floors and residential above and include diverse forms of outdoor spaces both public and private.</p> <p>Good planning and design would make such development both attractive and enjoyable for day-to-day life and would help to create a sustainable city for the future including easy access to transit and other services.</p> <p>It should also help to minimise or reduce the tax increases which would be required to subsidise the ongoing creep of municipal infrastructure into distant rural spaces.</p>

	<p>I realise that this might take money out of the pockets of the land speculators who likely already own most of the rural lands in question, but I believe it to be the most sensible and cost-effective option for the future.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these ideas and I wish you lots of luck in confronting the Provincial Government with any ideas that do not promote urban sprawl!</p>
16.	<p>My thoughts for what they're worth:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Start with brown lands first</li> <li>- increase density but - more low rise 6-8 storey apartments. A cluster of smaller apartments with green space in the middle. ( parking could be under there).</li> <li>- all new apartment builds must have parking for 1 1/2 cars per unit and sufficient visitor parking. Need to get cars off the street parking if we want to encourage bikes. (Build at James and stone church has no visitor parking planned? - great if you have no friends)</li> <li>- build more communities like Garth Trails for retirement. That would sell out instantly</li> <li>- builders need to get on board with smaller houses, eg East 38th. 2/3 bedroom bungalows without all the waste space for first time buyers, downsizers. Most of us grew up in these houses and survived.</li> <li>- free hold town homes</li> <li>- I think given the development at the airport that building toward that is a given. Need to save prime agricultural land toward Niagara.</li> <li>- perhaps builders could plan around trees instead of clearing the land totally. Builders need to take some responsibility in this.</li> </ul> <p>When I look at many of the high rises in Hamilton, they look like they are ready to fall down, which is discouraging. Who wants to live in a dump? Places like Costco, Walmart should be 2 levels to save space.</p> <p>It would be nice to know what 1340 ha looks like in terms of streets. Eg upper James to Wellington , fennel to Mohawk. 1340 means nothing out of context</p>
17.	<p>My Opinion:</p> <p>Near zero growth</p> <p>Please don't be startled. Population growth has already taken away all that most of us loved about Hamilton. Why make it worse? I am 62 years old. Why would we want more;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. traffic congestion, stop signs and traffic lights?</li> <li>2. reduction in speed limits?</li> <li>3. Traffic noise?</li> <li>4. Line ups at cash registers?</li> <li>5. Creeks turned into sewers?</li> <li>6. crowding during hiking?</li> <li>7. No parking spots left.</li> <li>8. crowding on beaches.</li> <li>9. Fences around water falls</li> <li>10. parking meters to park and go hiking.</li> <li>11. impossible opportunities to book a local campsite?</li> </ol>

	<p>12. more taxes?  13. less farms.  14. less green space.  ...must I go on?</p> <p>Bet you can't answer any of my questions.</p>
18.	<p>In reading through the options 1&amp;2, we suggest a blend of the two options would be preferable allowing for the protection of valuable farmland while containing the rate of intensification.</p>
19.	<p>I believe Option 2 is the best option; however, someplace between option 1 and 2 might be acceptable.</p> <p>We need to limit destruction of farmland and use what is available within our boundaries first. That is most cost effective for a city that has some of the highest realty taxes in Ontario.  <b>LOBBYISTS HAVE NO PLACE IN THE DECISION MAKING HERE.</b>  Developers will always push to open everything so they can increase their profits, meanwhile buying up every farm in sight. Wrong way to do things by letting them give the city an earful how all of their land must be developed. They have huge self interests. The city does not necessarily have the same self interests and needs to make its own decisions of what is financially viable and also keep the ability to farm.  I hope the right decision is made for the people of this city.  Thank you for sending a survey and hearing us out, but you truly need to listen.</p>
20.	<p>I chose option 3. We need to develop the urban area first. Then, reevaluate whether we need to expand the boundary. It is not an all or nothing approach. Perhaps we require only 25% additional land. I am hesitant to believe predictions that are so far away.</p> <p>I agree with responsible development, but not to the detriment of green space. We need to ensure that we are in line with combating climate change as well.</p> <p>Please listen to all citizens, not just developers.</p>
21.	<p>My suggestion is medium density housing ( Option 2 or 3) within the City of Hamilton without Option 1, not to frustrate those of us who want intensification within the City of Hamilton without taking away from the character of the areas we live in.</p> <p>Hamilton has so much to offer with vacant properties ( some for 20 odd years like in my neighbourhood which is really unacceptable), derelict properties, underdeveloped and quite esthetically unpleasant areas such as Kenilworth North, various pockets of Barton Street East, derelict areas on Main Street East and King Street East. I live around these areas and really do wish that the City would work with developers and charitable developers ( ie Indwell) to really build that walkable and livable city that we all dream of having now and in the future.</p> <p>Medium density to me would mean, townhouses, stacked townhouses and low rise apartments ( affordable and market rent) maximum height 7 storeys.</p>

22.	<p>I would like to provide an 'Other Suggestion' #3 which is to focus on both Urban Expansion following the screening criteria outlined AND expansion of existing urban areas through SDUs and other strategies. I feel both areas are beneficial for the City and would provide a variety of housing options.</p> <p>I also would like Council to consider bringing back the LRT plans as this would make a significant impact on our communities, businesses and benefit our future transportation needs with the projected population as was indicated.</p>
23.	<p>No to Option 1 - Absolutely not at the further elimination of agricultural land in Southern Ontario. Canada may be a huge landmass but apples will not grow in our sub Arctic!!! Apples grow in Ancaster and Carlisle and our Farmers feed us. I never want to rely on apples from China (easily found in Walmart) because our Ontario apple farms become concrete and asphalt treeless jungles of tightly packed mass housing (which seems to be the trend) or monster houses for the privileged few.</p> <p>As for Option 2 - If our ill advised Hamilton politicians insist on enabling an LRT that 90 % of Hamilton taxpayers will never use, why not build dozens and dozens of high rise towers (geared to income, luxury, student housing etc) all along the entire LRT route. Then with those tax \$\$\$\$ cover the cost of what is destined to be a white elephant and restore and maintain the crumbling lower city infrastructure. Maybe then the tax \$\$\$\$ collected from all the taxpayers of the Year 2000 amalgamated communities can be dedicated to ensuring Dundas, Ancaster, Rockton, Stoney Creek, Waterdown, Lyndon, Binbrook etc don't fall into the bankrupt mess that original core Hamilton continues to be despite sucking all tax \$\$\$\$ from amalgamated communities for 20 years.</p>
24.	<p>My preference would be a "balanced" third option that permits some increased density within the existing city boundaries but also extends the boundaries. Highrises provide a greater tax base and single family dwellings on country lots, less so.</p> <p>That said, there is a limit to how many people you can accommodate in already densely populated areas. It becomes a quality of life issue.</p> <p>Everyone needs some space to enjoy outdoors. There are increasingly fewer in the lower city.</p> <p>The issue of traffic congestion is already very real and will only grow worse even with the LRT.</p> <p>I'm sensitive to the infrastructure costs with suburban expansion yet this may be the price we pay as citizens.</p> <p>Burlington is currently dealing with this same issue and I applaud their commitment to a quality of life for ALL citizens with a clear focus on their highly developed core area.</p>
25.	<p>Residential Areas: 3 to 4 stories with retail/commercial at street level, for example Convenience and grocery stores, coffee shops where practical.</p> <p>Commercial Areas: 4 to 6 stories with commercial or retail on the ground floor.</p> <p>Downtown: Not over 30 stories with underground parking, and with tourism, retail, or commercial on the ground floor</p> <p>No more residential development outside the existing urban boundary. New</p>

	<p>development there should be for commercial or industrial use only ... something which generates income and wealth for the city. (We're definitely against building low density homes on prime agricultural land, and prefer to maximize brown space within the borders for industrial or commercial use! California and our food supply are under attack by climate change. It's a matter of survival. We MUST keep Greenfield land for food production for future generations! Think big ... not in terms of lining developers pockets, but of veering development away from our farmland. If I had my druthers, I'd want all those new monstrosities at City's edge torn down, and rebuilt as high density! This latter portion is from _____.</p> <p>Develop parking lots and brownfields for residential use, with parking below grade.</p> <p>Develop green space and parks in brownfields and parking where appropriate and needed.</p> <p>Transit plan should connect various neighbourhoods and venues.</p>
26.	<p>Hello Hamilton ,</p> <p>1) intensification units should be using areas downtown where old buildings are not being used to their potential and torn down...old vacant lots also decrepit " malls" etc.</p> <p>Use the space you already have downtown for high density high rises near the transportation routes...lots of that could be redeveloped for a more beautiful Hamilton.</p> <p>If you want to attract people to the down town ,below the mountain area then redevelop those areas...no one I know has gone downtown for anything ,in thirty or more years or more except for hospital care. The impression Hamilton gives of its downtown the very Face of the city of Hamilton below the mountain area is dirty, unsafe, unkempt, crime ridden etc, except for the redeveloped Bay Area. You are pouring billions of dollars into transportation routes downtown that basically service crime ridden neighbourhoods, and young buisnesses struggling to survive there. Who is attracted to go downtown to live or shop etc? No one I know....as it is now. Take an example from Toronto Harbourfront high density housing ,and make Hamilton beautiful...change its reputation of filthy steel town, with a beautiful face lift of redevelopment, like all the other beautiful towns and villages below our beautiful escarpment. Hamilton does not need to look poor, worn out and filthy and falling apart at the seams, unkept and uncared for...</p> <p>2) On the mountain, Do not disturb/ ruin pre existing single home neighbourhoods, with high density high rise housing crowding onto " vacant lots"...single family home neighbourhoods should remain single family home neighbourhoods without changing the zoning, to accommodate " apartment buildings or so called " condos"/ high rises...</p> <p>3) New neighbourhoods well planned for family living( like Losani,Robinson ) development in Binbrook, should be Hamilton's model...including park, and natural green space left undisturbed for wildlife, for each new survey/ neighbourhood.This attracts healthy families with healthy incomes into the city for your desired " tax dollars".</p> <p>Slum type high density townhouses, hidden in the centre of the Binbrook</p>

development should not be allowed. Junk housing creates junk neighbourhoods and increased crime, overcrowding etc. depleting your tax base, with increased need for social services...

4) Slum corridor housing like the Rymal road Garner road stretch, is a shame to our community .Expensive and overpriced, cheaply built, and not conducive to healthy family living...crowded, narrow, shoddy...eye sore to our community...WHAT DO YOU WANT THE FACE OF HAMILTON TO LOOK LIKE??? What message are you giving when you allow this type of development ??? New York Bronx maybe .A non planned chaotic community, not conducive to healthy living...soon to become a greater eye sore...and problem area...

5) If you want a healthy Hamilton community, build healthy neighbourhoods or you will be paying for it in the end, with increase crime, and more people on social services...

6)  Try building west on the Hamilton Highway #8 corridor towards Cambridge...Lots of that " farmland "dormant because of rock and shallow/poor soil conditions...miles and miles of it...ripe for development...access to Toronto and Guelph bound routes etc.

7) Hamilton should be developed as a family friendly place to live...well planned, parks and natural green space with each new neighbourhood development, attracting the income for tax base you are looking for. Suburban atmosphere. Advertising our beautiful waterfalls, and putting up high density housing where ever you can get away with it are incompatible and irresponsible. What kind of city do you want?. more of what we already have in many areas...high density overcrowded, slum living or a community of neighbourhoods people want to raise their families in?...a beautiful " suburb type community, people want to move into, and are attracted to from other areas...

8) keep high rises below the mountain...no one wants a repeat of the dark ugly, Mohawk high rise corridor, east of upper James...more slum housing ,not maintained by slum landlords.

9)productive occupied farmland, should remain undisturbed. Non productive dormant farmland could be challenged...either become productive, or prepare for zoning change...

10) lots of high density high rises in Hamilton downtown area not being used / vacant, completely empty, because of bug infestations, holes punched in walls, electrical ,plumbing issues, mould etc. Why would you build more of the same? Repair or tear down the decrepit high rises that already exist below the mountain and rebuild...with responsible building owners ,landlords that live HERE in our community and are held accountable to maintain their properties, or eliminate high rises altogether. People/ families that own their homes, tend to take pride in the m and maintain them...healthy families, healthy neighbourhoods, healthy communities make a much more healthy Hamilton. Neighbourhoods, do not need to be all monster sized homes...they can be neighbourhoods of smaller homes also. Look at the beautifully planned high density " Silverbirch" community off Twenty Road ,and the other bungalow condo neighbourhoods in that area...beautifully planned and beautifully kept neighbourhoods. Plouff Homes development in Hagersville is another example of smaller affordable housing in a well planned,beautiful neighbourhood. The choice is yours Hamilton to make...are you building for a healthy future

	<p>,healthy stable neighbourhoods and communities ,and a beautiful Hamilton or not? How much do you really care about our potentially beautiful city, on the Bay, on the Niagara escarpment, flowing with waterfalls, and trails. Are you going to invest in the most beautiful location that we have been given, or sell out for greed and short term monetary tax dollar gain. It is possible for Hamilton to be beautiful, and a desired place to raise a family.</p> <p>Think carefully. Think carefully about what kind of community you choose to build. Plan well, plan for a beautiful future of Hamilton.</p>
27.	<p>To counter the threat to the ecologically and economically important Ontario Greenbelt, the existing yet rapidly diminishing amount of high quality food land near urban centres, the remaining Carolinian Forest ecosystem and the vitally important Niagara tender fruit lands, I support the building of a new city in Eastern Ontario north of the 401 and east of Kingston on low grade farmland. This visionary new city will incorporate the best practices for sustainable urban planning and construction from around the world, showcase new technologies and provide the economies of scale necessary to build quickly, effectively and efficiently with local materials, manufactured goods and labour.</p>
28.	<p>land needs assessment survey:</p> <p>As a third generation Building Contractor here is my input:</p> <p>1-COMBINE as many different main and sub-buildings as possible into the same piece of land or and buildings.</p> <p>1.1-EXAMPLES=Libraries, Sub-Police Stations, Fire and EMT, sub Hospitals and Doctors offices and medical needs, Municipal and Federal main and sub stations/sub buildings, Schools for children, Schools for teenagers and Schools for adults, Schools for trade and scientific training regarding assistant status and up to College/University, Libraries, pre-school, as well as multi use commercial buildings, low rise and high rise, etc.</p> <p>2-NOTE-All land according to master plan should be designed and planned out at the point all is needed is FOR THE CITY TO SELL THE PARCELS AND TO LEASE THE PARCELS to developers, preferably smaller developers versus huge developers and here is the reason why:</p> <p>2A-the land should be a curvy long ribbon extending from one end of the new development Master Plan to the other end, keeping in Mind alloted land that has already been determined and future land that the Municipality as well as the Provincial as well as the Federal Plans have taken into consideration Master Plan wise=similar to the Perimeter road originally thought of in the 60's or 50's. The Municipality should buy an option to purchase at Market value as of a certain date and add inflation plus a small percent when the City is ready to buy and the City must include a first right of refusal to Purchase. The fact must be noted in the notice given to each landowner that the City and or Province and or Federal Government retain the right to EXPROPRIATE due to the Master Plan that has the official blessing from the current municipality, from the current Provincial leaders and from the current Federal Government and written in such a way as to not be withdrawn or altered regarding purchase/expropriation and that no private individual or corporation or group can profit.</p>

2B-The land should be a ribbon with widened spaces to accommodate the uses noted herein. The reason a never ending wavy ribbon is required is to take into account any and all mature forests and excellent locations for said uses, whereby the City can start to plant the correct foliage and trees and build or subcontract the nature trails now and anticipate good sewer line and substation planning as well as electrical and water reservoirs and traffic controls both slow speed and bypass and highway traffic lanes.

2C-Designing a major ribbon with interjoining smaller ribbons of greenspace will result in a design that works for everyone even though that never ending green space combined with all the uses and almost everyone will just about walk to their nearby available for use share of the green space ribbon.

2D-All housing to meet human needs not warehousing. Food, service, stores, etc can be in designated pockets that are at major roadway intersections which must have some sort of the green space ribbon nearby. Keep in mind environmental pollution KILLS many trees or stunts their growth so an arborist who only writes reports and perhaps works for the Government should be consulted. In fact as much free consultation as possible can be gotten through universities and colleges and schools as these things can be a part of the curriculum, since this is a movement that can expand to every single town and city in Canada.

2E-regarding use. Not only hi rises and low rises and multiple use must be included. Townhomes and cooperatives, low income and high income homes have to be included. six plexes and special designs need to be included. Old folk buildings and condominium parcels and tenants and so much more needs to be thought of. There is a huge savings when one building is used almost 24 hours a day to full or part full capacity. There was a concept where people leased the property and bought the home and if the City could "HOLD" the paper and finance a part of each piece of land this would help pay for the municipal bonds interest payout I speak of to get this system going.

2F-All commercial and very nice tenant buildings can be close to roads. Berms and trees and bushes and concrete can be acoustically designed to reflect sound away from living spaces.

3-Speak with \_\_\_\_\_ about ideal story height and layouts, speak with the boys at \_\_\_\_\_, speak with \_\_\_\_\_, speak with \_\_\_\_\_, speak with \_\_\_\_\_, and so on. Ask the \_\_\_\_\_ boys to step in and have a special night with food and a small jazz background group playing over a few nights to figure out the beginning steps to help create a long term plan that will work with the people identified herein as well as Government types and finance CEO's among a few others but keeping the meeting of a size that is handleable in the beginning. To sell it later on things can become a fundraiser and social for ideas presentation and public relations as well as media presentations

Once the ideal plan and people have been determined they just replicate. Similar to a sheet of paper and using an ink stamp just keep stamping out the

	<p>master plan to keep growing. Keep in mind it can be something the rest of the World will look back upon and admire in many years to come. I have absolutely no doubt this can happen and work because all the people named herein have multi-generational roots in the Hamilton area and ALL have a vested interest in helping Hamilton grow-not to just fill their pockets which everyone needs to do but to really make a statement and leave a lasting legacy on behalf of their fathers, grandfathers and great grandfathers WHO BUILT THIS CITY!</p> <p>4-Assemble money people to get the wheels turning. Municipal bonds need to be sold to individuals NOT by the millions to Corporations so a limit should be allowed, say maybe 100 shares per single purchase with no one purchaser able to purchase more within a 30 day time frame. The interest that will be paid back can be much higher than the so called going rate and will take the place of Canada savings bonds in people's minds regarding guaranteed insured certificates with terms that vary and with special goodies attached to those certificates that are not cashed in but reinvested but these special ones have to be of a longer term initially and then reinvested into a longer term to be predetermined as the money experts are consulted. CMHC should be included to help things happen. THIS IS CRITICAL to long term healthy design.</p> <p>5-The City should begin to hire special investigators/inspectors. This division has to correctly inspect all work done by contractors and tradespeople. For example no cheating on work agreed to according to detailed specific plans and contracts which will help guarantee a fantastic design helping to ensure the least problems with the least maintenance and upkeep resulting in a long trouble free life span timeframe. EXAMPLES-roads, highway grade asphalt compressed to what thickness of concrete according to what strength? Sidewalks that have been dug and backfilled correctly with multiple water soaking and rolling with perhaps the preparation work can be done by a special City owned and operated division.</p> <p>6-There must be an allowance made for future things such as helipads as well as cameras everywhere meaning at minimum conduit installed and cameras later so that facial recognition works as well as speeding fines and traffic fines due to computer controlled cameras and upcoming artificial intelligence sensors that will automatically adjust continuous green lights with 40 to 45 kilometer per hour speed which will keep road noise down.</p> <p>Of course there is lots more to add but this should be enough to start things. Just remember, the City should be seeking the best design. Then the best materials and the best installation methods, then some sort of guarantee of a long trouble free life. It won't be the cheapest nor does it have to be the most expensive but the design is the key. No one should place anything more than reasonable profit over excellent design and resulting extra long lifespan build.</p>
29.	<p>I think that option one or really leaning into option 3 ... urban expansion would be a must, at least initially.</p> <p>About the only way to safely or thoroughly achieve the density that you're after</p>

	<p>would pretty-much require going in and buying up entire blocks, establishing the infrastructure required and then building as you can't reasonably expect utilities that have been in place for near a century to support fifty people on a street to suddenly be able to support five-thousand ... nor can you expect an old firehouse with two trucks to be able to support a block of apartment buildings ... nearby emergency clinics, etc.</p> <p>Recent history also shows that you have to have something in place to provision for those displaced by crisis as well. Look at the recent apartment building fires experienced in the GTA where you suddenly had 1300 + people displaced, during the pandemic times. Or look at our own history where you had a couple of buildings downtown with 100+ people infected by the virus due to having to funnel into a single elevator or go through those single lobby doors. Now that we've actually experienced those things that were only thought remotely possible in the past, it would be truly irresponsible not to account for them going forward from this point.</p> <p>For what it's worth,</p>
30.	<p>While options 1 and 2 of the survey both have good points and bad points, my suggestion is to (similar to option 2) not expand boundaries and work within the city as it exists today.</p> <p>The infrastructure is already or should already be in place. Things like roads, sewers, water main, hydro are already there. there is no need to run these services further out of the city.</p> <p>There are too many large metropolitan areas. Large cities like Montreal, Toronto, New York, London, etc are all vey nice. Lots of people living and working in a large sprawling city. I would prefer to increase density and reduce sprawl.</p> <p>There are viable options that will reduce the need to expand the city and add to urban sprawl. Things like in-fill housing options on un-used or under used city land. Laneway and secondary units where space permits. Repurposing former industrial lands to housing (after any needed remediation paid for by land owner or former industrial occupants). Increase the height of new condo and apartment buildings. Convert un-used or underused retail spaces to housing.</p> <p>I do live in Stoney Creek. I have seen the changes that a sprawling city does to formerly rural and agriculture land. I don't wish that practice to continue.</p>
31.	<p>No new housing units through development of new greenfield lands beyond our current urban boundary.</p> <p>We need farmland, vinelands and green space to be intact.</p> <p>The livelihood of our farmers depends on this. We need to be self-sufficient to grow and market our own produce.</p> <p>Encroaching on this lands disrupts the delicate balance of nature.</p> <p>We need to develop existing lands within the city's area.</p> <p>We need low density 2b, single detached and semi-detached homes. Any new development should reflect the existing surrounding</p>

	<p>community's needs and wants.</p> <p>On small acreage., e.g. 1.17 hectares, we prefer the existing zone 2b not a zone 3 .</p> <p>There is an existing two lane road and no space for widening. A zone 3 would increase traffic flow. Disrupt our privacy, endanger our children (children are always playing in the streets). People are walking, jogging and riding their bikes. Fifty Point Conservation area is nearby with lots of birds and wildlife that call this area their home.</p> <p>MLS Residential Market Activity Feb. 2021 reported that sales were up 14.9 percent since Feb. 2020.</p> <table> <tr> <td>Hamilton : number of sales</td> <td>2020</td> <td>679</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>2021</td> <td>745</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Compared to Burlington</td> <td>2020</td> <td>241</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>2021</td> <td>309</td> </tr> </table> <p>In conclusion, people are moving here to Hamilton and demanding single family detached and attached housing.</p>	Hamilton : number of sales	2020	679		2021	745	Compared to Burlington	2020	241		2021	309
Hamilton : number of sales	2020	679											
	2021	745											
Compared to Burlington	2020	241											
	2021	309											
32.	<p>My husband &amp; I think a combination of hi-rise, low-rise buildings, townhouses, and semi-attached homes is the way to go.</p> <p>But let's get real. We don't need an LRT. It doesn't service the mountain, Ancaster, or Dundas, to say nothing of people living on the outskirts. Yes, you can charge higher taxes for homes in Stoney Creek, but they will park their cars at Eastgate Mall, taking up space you hope to fill with students. The B-line already works well.</p> <p>And if the government is serious about switching to electric cars, we need the infrastructure so people living in hi- and low-rise buildings have a place to charge their vehicles. Council is going round and round about LRT. You should focus on providing power for newer cars. We live in a hi-rise condo that is 45 years old and the units run on 60-watt energy. There is no way our condo corporation can provide electricity for us to charge our cars, so we are driving old ones.</p>												
33.	<p>I have only two comments regarding the intensification and density plans for Hamilton over the next 30 years:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Please plan for more and larger parks and leisure areas. If the population density of Hamilton is increasing during the next 30 years, it is essential that Hamilton have large park areas with grass and trees and shelter. This is essential from a recreational point of view as well as a carbon zero point of view.</li> <li>2. Please plan for more bike lanes on all new neighborhoods and rural and secondary roads. This would make cycling safer for everyone. It would also encourage more people to use bicycles as a means of transportation.</li> </ol>												
34.	<p>Option 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exploit every bit of "brown fields" for residential development;</li> <li>• Expropriate abandoned homes and industrial properties for residential development;</li> <li>• Limit high-density development to arterial roads and next to already existing</li> </ul>												

	<p>high density development;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Limit urban expansion into "greenfields" to a maximum of 200 ha;</li> <li>• Include low-rise co-op buildings in all developing neighbourhoods to ensure maintain an orderly nature;</li> </ul> <p>Comments:</p> <p>The increased density of Westdale and West Hamilton (Ainslie Wood) with their unkempt homes, strewn garbage, noise and absentee landlords is an example of everything that Hamilton does not want. I do not want to see other neighbourhoods ruined in this way through unfettered increased density.</p>
35.	<p>Has the City of Hamilton considered the needs of the largest demographic of population who are 60+ years of age, or those how are not able to navigate 3 levels of stairs on a daily basis? The monster houses, townhouses and housing that has been developed over the last 10 years are not meeting the needs of a large portion of Hamilton's population.</p> <p>Have you considered or researched how many people live in their own home in Hamilton that needs to find more appropriate housing? How many homes are owned by single (widowed, widower) or empty nesters, where younger families would benefit from the space? There are very little options for many of us to move within the City of Hamilton.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example: We live in a 4 bedroom house on a huge lot with only two adults. Both in our 60s, fairly good health, looking to the future for when our health may not be as good. Looking for a community similar to those in the west-end Hamilton Mountain with homes that are smaller, detached one floor plans with a small yard. Paying monthly fees for lawncare, shoveling in the winter, community activities and security are a bonus. Currently, as far as I am aware, there are no planned developments for this type of community in the east-end of Hamilton.</li> <li>• Due to the recent exodus of home buyers coming from the GTA, Builders are creating "intensification" for a greater profit, more than communities with options for all age groups and abilities. How many of these new homeowners work in the Hamilton area? This encourages more congestion on our highways, and will not help with climate change.</li> <li>• There are limited options for one floor plans (bungalows); instead Builders are investing in 3-4 level townhouses, condominiums and high rise apartments. These might make sense for your tax base and land use, but does not support what most homeowners want.</li> <li>• Recently seen the HSR route map in the Hamilton Spectator which I found very interesting. The intensification plan should also consider those main routes and LRT for growth expansion. The LRT route alone should count for at least 5,000-10,000 new housing units to be developed for intensification. If so, when planning a community, there needs to be jobs for people to go to within that route. Lets not become a bedroom community with jobs elsewhere!</li> </ul> <p>So, to be honest, I do not support Option 1 or 2 as it stands. I am not opposed</p>

	<p>to using the expansion lands per se, only that the Builders are eliminating a large part of the population in their designs and the City of Hamilton is letting it happen! When speaking about Density, you need to consider all residents of Hamilton and their needs as opposed to focusing on the tax base and growth identified by the Province of Ontario. Build healthy communities for a stronger Hamilton.</p> <p>I am also a big believer of work where you live. Let's work on getting more jobs in this community as part of the COVID recovery.</p>
36.	<p>Plan for 99,520 new housing units through development in the existing urban area, for an average Intensification rate of 79% between 2021 and 2051.</p> <p>Plan for 10,660 new housing units through development of new greenfield lands beyond our current urban boundary.</p>
37.	<p>I watched the Grids2 presentation and have been considering the choices and challenges outlined for the planning department and the city of Hamilton. I received the comments card in the mail, but the area for comments is a bit short for sharing my thoughts.</p> <p>Expanding the urban boundary lands without a correlated, comprehensive 'big picture' planning strategy is unwise &amp; an abdication of municipal planning authority. A growth plan must incentivize existing land mid-size densification and discourage (taxes/fees/levies/DC) sprawl, before additional lands are opened. Regardless of what growth densities the provincial government of the day dictates a municipality must meet, municipalities must plan for their responsible future growth. The long-term cost of sprawl to a city (roads, water, sewers, treatment) is never recaptured through tax revenues, requires infinite growth to be successful, and drives a community towards insurmountable life-cycle debt.</p> <p>A robust, committed, long-term vision, founded on a comprehensive city-wide land use register, identifying/supporting disenfranchised community nodes &amp; with incremental strategies that encourage existing land densification, taxing under-utilized brown-field lands &amp; low-density developments, providing simplified planning approvals in existing neighbourhoods for mid-sized developments, incorporating mandatory community services (schools, libraries, parks, walkable commercial streets) and discourages car-dependant, green-field developments, is the only means by which a city can safe-guard their growth patterns for future generations.</p> <p>Hamilton has a strong, unique and resourceful history. The growth plan for Hamilton's future deserves nuanced, proactive planning, insulated from the influence of developers and provincial government.</p>
38.	<p>I would choose Option 3 which would be a combination of mainly "no urban boundary expansion" and minimal "ambitious density" of new greenfield lands beyond our current urban boundary.</p> <p>I think the city should be focusing on creating more affordable housing units within its current boundaries. This could be done (partially) by re-purposing existing structures (e.g. the building that houses the art gallery at the southwest corner of Bay Street North and Barton Street West).</p> <p>Hamilton has a lot of aging infrastructure that needs to be maintained and/or replaced. The cost of this needs to be balanced with the cost of</p>

	<p>building/providing new infrastructure in development of any new greenfield lands. Protection of farmland and green space is important for local farmers and the environment in general. Buying produce grown close to home decreases the amount of truck traffic on the highway which thereby decreases air pollution.</p> <p>Some development of new greenfield lands is inevitable. It needs to be carefully monitored every 5 years re: impact it has both financially and economically on the area as a whole. Creating new housing units is not a static process. It requires ongoing consultation with community stakeholders.</p>
39.	<p>Thank you for reaching out to citizens regarding this issue - I greatly appreciate the actions the city takes to enhance participatory democracy.</p> <p>I received the survey and I chose 'option 3: other suggestions'; the survey indicated I could email you ideas.</p> <p>I do not have expertise in urban planning, but I do not think an 'either / or' approach is feasible to intensification vs. expansion. Population growth and NIMBYism are contradictory challenges. Some who choose option 2 in the survey may not be open to intensification in their communities... Realistically, expansion is inevitable, so what can be done to minimize the negative impacts of that? I read a bit of the report available on the website, and I think city staff have developed a great framework for assessing the impact of expansion in different areas.</p> <p>I see various empty lots and fields in Hamilton, and quite a few in Ancaster. Are there policy/zoning limitations preventing them from being developed?</p> <p>Do municipalities coordinate urban planning? I imagine some greenfield lands are more critical for agriculture and/or habitat preservation than others. If so, some municipalities might be more limited in their ability to expand than others which are nearby (e.g. Hamilton and Grimsby). Could municipalities coordinate to address this?</p> <p>Could greenfield areas further away from a city be cultivated to replicate the function of greenfield areas close to a city (opening those which are closer to expansion)?</p> <p>What role does/could the province play in the above?</p> <p>How can municipalities, the province, and maybe the federal government work together to address policy/zoning challenges to urban development?</p> <p>I don't know if the above is at all helpful, but I appreciate the opportunity to provide input! No need to reply to any of the above.</p>
40.	<p>I appreciate the opportunity to have a say on how I think Hamilton needs to grow. I think the main goal is to provide affordable housing for all residents. This does not mean putting up another highrise, or building a condo that rents out half the units. Hamilton needs to support public housing through community based projects. Think co-ops and rent-geared-to-income.</p>

	<p>New development should focus on townhomes, three-storey structures with room for 2 separate living spaces. The bottom level could contain a unit for a senior, a couple or a single person while the top two floors could be for a growing family. Townhome projects can fit into a variety of spaces, from underutilized parking lots to empty lots. Townhomes could also be built on commercial lands - all those ugly plazas that are half empty of tenants. I think both the inner city and the suburban neighbourhoods would support a growth in attractive, low density housing.</p> <p>Greenspace should never be developed. If the Covid lockdowns taught us anything, it is the importance of greenspace and the preservation of food-producing land. Hamilton must also do a better job of preserving the city's history. No developer should be able to tear down an historic structure - just look at the church disaster on James Street North.</p> <p>We need to think outside the box built by single family homes or intrusive highrises. Let's re-think how we use space and look to fresh ways to transform it.</p>
41.	<p>Our household strongly encourages a modified density scenario with urban expansion and intensification of 40% - 50%.</p> <p>The current push to expand development to the southeast of Hamilton is extremely confusing as there are many farms and sensitive waterways in that direction, which are among the same reasons the city has used to not expand south.</p> <p>In the area south of Rymal between James and Dartnal, there has been piecemeal development and now the land that remains is a mix of subdivision, rural residential, public (schools, churches, recreational, and a number of Whitefield plots that are almost useless as agricultural lands.</p> <p>We would strongly support filling in the whitefield lands as there is already substantially more existing infrastructure butting up against these areas, there appears to be a desire on the part of the city to draw people out this way (again, the construction of schools, churches, plazas, etc.), numerous residential areas already built in the area, and land deemed agricultural that is not producing very well.</p> <p>Intensification is critical, especially to support infrastructure such as transit, policing, services, etc., and the infill in areas such as Pier 4 is fantastic, however, with many new residents moving into the city, intense residential is not a reasonable option given family size, residence type preferences, and in some cases, capacity and land ownership (railways, etc.).</p> <p>It is truly unimaginable that there are plots of land in areas that are partially developed already (Upper James, Upper Sherman, Nebo, Dartnal) and the city is resisting additional residential in these areas, instead forcing the people who would work here and utilize the city approved services such as education, to have to drive to these areas from downtown as there is little to no access and a contradictory approach to the development in the area</p>

42.

The basic concept of growing Hamilton to the numbers proposed goes against Doug Ford's pre-election promise. When he was caught out saying he was going to develop greenbelt areas around the Golden Horse Shoe, he quickly rescinded this statement, but now it seems he is going to impose this anyway. A person who might only be in office for one more year, yet this is a 30 year plan. The Ontario government have brought about Ministerial Zoning Orders (MZOs) giving ministers individual and singlehanded power to change zoning and develop land, without public consultation or appeal. This is disgraceful. Equally this has occurred with extensive planning permission approvals being made during the pandemic with no public consultation.

Now the public are being told that this is going to proceed and we have two options. Option 1 to develop Hamilton beyond its existing boundary's, swallowing up greenbelt lands and increase Hamilton's population by nearly 50%. Or option 2 the same population increase, to increase population density within its existing urban area, but leaving surrounding greenbelt land untouched.

Neither option 1 nor option 2 is desirable because:

The City of Hamilton cannot cope with its existing population and is failing regularly with its demands on the existing infrastructure exceeding the capacity of these resources with the current population. In the last decade Hamilton has experienced a building frenzy that has spread well beyond its existing urban area, until the City as it once was is no longer recognizable. Do we want Hamilton to turn into another Toronto?

In considering the potential effects of increased population in Hamilton it is important to consider the fact that Hamilton is a city which has the highest hate crime rate in Canada. Yet also, Hamilton has received the most immigrants of any city in Canada (last year I believe). It appears that while we are increasing our racial and ethnic diversity we have few resources to invest in practices of diversity and inclusion that would likely reduce incidents of hate and crime.

Another example of our failure to deal with our current population increases, it is clear that Hamilton cannot currently manage appropriately the sewage created by this city. As a result of our incapacity residents have to pay 200 million dollars for works that include clean up of Chedoke Creek, and for new monitoring staff to ensure that work, which should have already been in place, paid for by city taxes. Also residents will have to pay the Federal Government a fine attached to the Chedoke Creek contamination incident. Furthermore, Cootes Paradise has been destroyed by the feeding waterways, which is an environmental disaster. Note that no one was held accountable and 'no heads rolled' for this incident among City Staff.

Our drinking water is suspect (due to the presence of ecoli etc.) resulting from the Chedoke Creek incident mentioned above and other environment issues outlined in reports like "Code Red". I personally know/knew three people within 10 houses of my home who have/had 4th stage renal cancer. There are sewer pipes and storm water cross over issues within the city. Burst water mains are a

reality everywhere in the city and occur on a regular basis. Are lead pipes still in existence in the City.

The increased contracting out of services like the collection of Garbage, with food waste stinking out the city and recycling (constant changes in guidance) are issues and these are all contracted out services, that experiences poor management, with ever increasing costs. Where does our recycling go? I, for one, do not stand on Lake Ontario throwing it into the water. Who is our recycling sold to? Is it dumped into the ocean?

Hamilton Police, embrace the motto 'Protect and Serve', but they are now pretty much ineffective. They refuse to protect the Hamilton residents property. I have seen this first hand, a neighbours hedge being destroyed by a person (not from this neighbourhood) with a chainsaw, the police refused to attend, twice. Also there was an AirBNB issue, where occupants refused to leave, shown on CHCH, with Police forcing these issues to civil courts. Yet, they will protect business property it seems, ie LCBO. When it comes to more serious crimes they are always appealing for public help. This makes our Police Force just administrators, only. Crime is increasing, homicides increasing, road accidents increasing and physical attacks increasing. Speeding and aggressive driving are everywhere in Hamilton; it is now the norm. There is no enforcement; therefore there will be no compliance. Hamilton is a lawless city.

Roads infrastructure

It was published from an Audit on 8th July 2021 that Hamilton City (on CHCH) on its current rate of maintenance, it would take another 240 years before it can get our roads in order.

Schools are dysfunctional mainly because of constant fighting with provincial government and strikes.

The return of the Rapid Transit LRT to Hamilton, being pressed by Federal Government is something that no one from Hamilton Mountain will use. Yet, we will have to pay for it in our City Taxes.

So Option 3 (my choice) is to stop developing Hamilton completely, a moratorium, or at least slow down significantly; to get our city in order and well managed. Stop building on every available patch of grass. Why would Hamilton city allow a 'luxury complex' of apartments within feet of the Lincoln Alexander Parkway (west 5th) to be built, for the new residences to breathe in exhaust fumes all day long.

As it stands Hamilton is not a place anyone would or should want to live. Hamilton used to have a big heart, now its being torn out...

Sometimes, it's better to create new towns and new cities rather than the endless expansion of the existing ones; which our municipal or provincial governments can maintain.

Fix what we have, instead of creating more problems.

43. Option 1 – "Ambitious Density" Scenario:  
One only has to look at the impact of a global pandemic on areas of high density, ie Toronto where there is no room to grow other than up. The end result is and has been a generation of "condo kids" that rarely see green space, have never enjoyed the smell of freshly cut grass, allergies notwithstanding, that have never seen a real live farm animal, where health and safety are minimal at best. If they had an option would any concerned parent allow their children to ride an elevator up and down to visit, play or interact with friends, without constant supervision, I certainly would not. Again using Toronto as a reference point, high density may fuel the City's tax coffers, but it is blatantly obvious that high density significantly increases crime, be it shootings, stabbings, rival gangs, the list goes on and has become a "normal daily occurrence," thereby fuelling the need for more police, more firefighters etc.
- While Hamilton certainly has its share of crime, one of its major attractions has always been the amount of green space, a City of residential family homes where adults and children actually know their neighbours, can depend on neighbours to keep a watchful eye on kids playing outside, keep an eye on each other's property, lend and borrow tools and gadgets that every homeowner needs at some point in time. A place where families remain and children develop lifelong friendships.
- As a homeowner, I am appalled at the massive, pervading underground economy that has been slowly and insidiously buying up properties in residential neighbourhoods, mangling them into multi use units, charging outrageous rents, with a total disregard for building codes and/or permits. Case in point a residential property on Rymal Road East that has been converted into 3 units, unbeknownst to the City, which means no adherence to building codes. The home sits back from the road obscuring the address so a sign post was made with the address and units 1,2,& 3, to also ensure each tenant gets their own mail. The owner requested that the #3 be removed, why, because it has been illegally converted and according to city records it is still a single family residential home. NOT!! With the limits on how many garbage bags can be put out, there is now an ongoing issue with garbage pick-up. The basement tenant complains that it is too cold, the other tenant complains it is too warm, the middle tenant is just that, caught in the middle.
- The homeowner has repeatedly offered and asked to purchase my home. THAT'S NOT GOING TO HAPPEN! If and when I sell my home, it will be with a legal caveat that it remain a single family home, that it not be converted to multi-purpose units, legally or otherwise, and that it not if fact be turned into a rental at all. It was interesting that the recent visit by the Green Party individual enthusiastically endorsed the conversion of single family homes into multiple rental units. I seriously doubt he would actually reside in one, so nope, no brownie points from this homeowner.
- This same individual has recently purchased 3 more units to be renovated into multiple units, again without any knowledge, approval and/or building permits. I greatly suspect that if the City actually took the time to investigate, to get these underground contractors to pay their fair share of property taxes, to actually pay

for building permits, my property taxes wouldn't have to be raised every year.

So, Density has been quietly happening under the City's nose with absolutely no consequences. Add to that my quiet residential street has a home that was renovated, and is now listed as an airb&b. Having total strangers come and go with a growing number of small children on the street is certainly not conducive to a family oriented neighbourhood. I suspect the City is unaware of that conversion either.

Option 2 –“ No Urban Boundary Expansion” Scenario: “development of new greenfield lands beyond our existing boundary.”

With the growing concerns and scientific data over climate change, we need to maintain all the greenfield lands we can. Hamilton certainly has enough space to accommodate more housing units without impinging on what existing albeit diminishing greenlands we have. Case in point Hamilton Centre where it seems the only thing the powers that be think that we need a convenience store on every corner from Wentworth to Gage St. without one accessible grocery store other than the Centre on Barton St. there is only ONE family style restaurant in the area, which closes by 2:30 p.m. Yet we now have more pot stores and potheads than we need, who are too stoned to realize that legalization was nothing more than a revenue tax grab, taxes which certainly didn't get fuelled into mental health services for addictions. Add to that we have government officials that purport to address climate change, set goals to reduce emissions, and conversely allow big corporations to build big box stores where, yup you need a car to get from one to another. Let's go back to the Centre mall, where there is a Metro grocery store at one end, Canadian Tire at the other, so take your pick, get groceries drag them home on the bus, then go back for a return trip if you need anything from Canadian Tire, unless you can drive from one store to another. Oh and if you want to grab a decent bite to eat, good luck, you can walk or drive from one end to Tim Horton's or the other end to Boston Pizza. And this is supposed to be family friendly, accessible to all, and conducive to cutting car emissions. Really?? Oh and if you have children, AND are dependent on public transportation, try dragging tired irritable kids from one store to another, then get them and everything else home in one piece.

It seems to me it's time city officials started to think outside the proverbial box and come up with some alternative options other than destroying more green space. Do I think they will, absolutely not. Having expressed concerns over previous issues that were ignored, I hazard a guess any surveys are nothing more than another attempt to convince people into believing they actually have input, when in fact our voices are simply not heard.

There has to be a third option, wherein existing space is legally used to create more family friendly neighbourhoods, where people of all ages have equal access to the resources they need, because at this juncture neither option 1 or 2 are conducive to the latter.

At the end of the day, as a senior citizen, my only solace is that I won't likely be around to see the mess that is eventually created, irrespective of what people

	<p>actually want and/or need.</p> <p>And that is my perspective, time will tell.....</p>
44.	<p>I pick the third option for the Urban Growth Survey, which is neither option 1 or 2, but to have the population remain stable, so no influx of residents. No need to expand the borders of the city, or to increase the density of population within its current boundaries</p>
45.	<p>As a resident of rural Binbrook for almost 40 years, I have already been dealing with the influx of thousands of new homes and people. The main problem is that our current road systems and services are extremely ill-equipped to handle the throngs of traffic. Some rural roads have become almost impossible to cross in a vehicle, for example Fletcher Road and Binbrook Road.</p> <p>Urban sprawl is NOT the answer. We need our farmland, otherwise we will need to import all of our food at a premium cost, and I for one do not welcome that inflation.</p> <p>Hamilton wants to build an LRT downtown. Why not make full use of it and rebuild the city? If you want new residents, make better living spaces downtown and in the lower city. Developers are just looking to get rich quickly by purchasing land from farmers at a cheap prices and selling overpriced houses to Toronto escapees. Make it easier to allow developers to renovate or rebuild in the lower city.</p> <p>So my preference is really somewhere between Options 2 and 3 - I prefer ZERO growth of Hamilton (I think a half million people is enough), but if you must, don't expand into our farmland and rural residences.</p>
46.	<p>I am opposed to Option 1 and 2.</p> <p>I feel that development should take place downtown on empty lots and vacant buildings, and near mass transit.</p> <p>There should not be any more development on greenfield land (farmland or fields). We need these properties for local grown fruit and produce.</p>
47.	<p>One of my problems with city growth, particularly a city like Hamilton, is the loss of the prime farmland -- the area below the escarpment is a unique place in a way -- lots of things grow well, and there is a large water source nearby in case of need for irrigation -- I think this will become even more critical with water shortages in places like western USA. For instance, I was told that my home at _____ was once probably part of an apple orchard. I do know that cherries, peaches etc grow well -- I have both in my backyard.</p> <p>So when the city talks about density etc -- I wonder. I see a lot of areas like lower Centennial or Upper James -- really busy in the day -- because there are lots of business along the street -- but quiet at night because the people don't live there. Most of the business don't require huge high ceilings -- and most aren't really noisy -- so why is there no layer of people over them.</p> <p>Buildings from the "old days" had businesses on the lower floors and residential on the upper floors -- and I think the city should be seriously looking at going that way again.</p>

	<p>The other thing I would really like to see is larger wider apartment buildings -- maybe 200 ish feet wide by whatever long -- maybe 4 or 5 stories tall with intensive agriculture on top -- greenhouse (included a pic below), orchard, vineyard. That way we don't keep replacing farmland with asphalt and concrete, and we can grow food locally rather than continuously importing it.</p>
48.	<p>I have a few comments on the growth options which cannot be accommodated in the mail in questionnaire.</p> <p>The Growth Plan projections have a reputation for being very optimistic as demonstrated in previous versions of the Growth Plan.</p> <p>The latest Growth Plan population projections and allocations per municipality where completed prior to the Covid 19 pandemic and the latest housing boom in Hamilton, making it one of the least affordable cities to live in. Has the changing settlement patterns, e.g. moving to smaller municipalities for more affordable housing coupled with the increased ability to work from home been taken into account?</p> <p>The pandemic showed the higher density housing, especially high-rise developments, which rely on restricted access like elevators, seem to have a higher rate of cases and outbreaks. It would seem that lower rise intensification (gentle intensification) would be more appropriate and reduce the health risks associated with very high buildings. (Unfortunately, I expect there is less financial benefits for lower rise buildings.) The lower rise intensification also would be more compatible with existing lands uses, yet still achieve intensification targets. The lower rise intensification could also provide more affordable housing.</p> <p>Given the above I believe some modest increase in the urban area will be needed in order to provide a range of housing types and avoid an over abundance of incompatible very high rise buildings, e.g. over 8-12 storeys.</p>
49.	<p>To me the high density should be located to the old city below the mountain . Urban growth should then be allowed with urban expansion on lands less likely to be high farm producing ie rockton and areas fully developed in the trinity church area What I would love to see is redevelopment of the older streets smith ,oak etc , old homes to be replaced with new homes , adjustments needed to bring modern homes which may have to replace two lots as garages would be needed.</p>
50.	<p>I own 10 acres in Ancaster. Couldn't each land owner/farmer decide to sell their land to help facilitate growth instead of others deciding for them?</p>
51.	<p>OPTION 2. "NO URBAN BOUNDARY EXPANSION" SCENARIO Urban Expansion Land Need 0 ha OPTION 3. OTHER SUGGESTIONS? Growth up not out!!</p>
52.	<p>80% intensification and 20% expansion on greenfields.</p>

53.	100,000 new units 1280 acres greenfield Intensification with 72,000 units
54.	Balanced growth leaning towards option 2. Don't make a Toronto out of us. Our downtown is still a big sky downtown. Don't ruin it with too many highrises.
55.	<p>Option 1 needs 3,300 acres of arable land, means less farmland growth in urban areas means upward growth with tall towering buildings where will this growth take place? Along our waterfront? Will we be looking like Toronto where only a few will be able to see the waterfront?</p> <p>Option 2 leaves us with greenland but with a city so dense that it might be difficult to get around. Too much traffic concentrated in existing space.</p> <p>Option 3 Because I am not a developer, farmer, investment firm, etc. who is bound to make money, I am at a loss as to what direction the city of Hamilton should go. I like Hamilton as it is now. It takes me 20 minutes to go downtown from Mount Hope (I go at off hours). This plan is for the future and younger people who like big buildings, have grown accustomed to traffic snarls, and like the glamour of a large city and what it has to offer.</p> <p>From what I have read in the Spec recently, urban development has already started with each developer outdistancing each other with the height of their buildings, Couldn't they have built the tallest ones at the base of the escarpment and gradually shortened the next ones as they build closer to the lake? That way everyone has a lake view.</p>
56.	A friend of mine who does not have online access asked me to share her opinion (below) Option 3...Agri Urban. People need their feet on the ground. Especially children. Build agri towers..solar powered..fish pond basements. Rural development with small houses and joined garden yards. Encourage private ownership of homes and agriculture versus corporate owned.
57.	<p>Circled: Option 3: Other suggestion: "expropriate" municipal golf course, mismanaged industrial sprawl, enact policy to prevent suburban big box outlet strip malls. Stop killing urban centres! Create conservation areas, and keep building up.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. You have undervalued the land. Why pave over prime agricultural land?</li> <li>2. Hamilton exists within a broader region, so you must think beyond Hamilton: Greenbelt; 7 Generations; have you consulted with Mississauga and Haudenosaunee Nations? you must uphold the Dish with One Spoon Treaty; UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration- All levels of government are urged to act to curb the loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services.</li> </ol>

	<p>5. What happens when there is downstream flooding because forests and wetlands upstream are now brand new houses? You can't keep shunting water off the land. By making development opportunities, you are also creating infrastructure problems downstream. Have you considered those costs?</p> <p>4. Please accept this image from Agriculture Canada to highlight the urgency by which we must prevent further sprawl in southern Ontario. "Greenfield" are the shards of the landscape. You're taking away scraps from people who can't find trails to hike on that aren't overwhelmed. (Photo attached in email)</p>
58.	<p>We support a blend of both Options #1 and #2...therefore Option #3. We realize that Hamilton's urban area has to grow but when we look at housing spreading into the rural areas and gobbling up farms, we think that intensification of homes/apartments/condos within the current urban boundaries needs to be a priority.</p> <p>The building of more high rises has already started in the much of the downtown area but there are other areas within the city that can sustain this type of housing...along the proposed LRT route, near shopping malls (Eastgate, Limeridge, The Centre on Barton, etc.) along Mohawk and Fennel and other arterial roads.</p> <p>We value and appreciate the rural farms and their contribution of fruits, vegetables, wine, grain, animal products and the recreational benefits that they provide...waterfalls, riding stables, hiking trails, U-Pick farms, etc. We have often commented that in Hamilton, the countrysides and farms are just a few minutes by car from the rural areas. Look to Toronto to see how long it takes to drive to escape the urban sprawl.</p> <p>The Niagara Escarpment has been beneficial in halting urban growth in areas above Stoney Creek, in areas of Ancaster, Dundas and Flamborough. We do not want to see homes and malls spreading through many of these. He hope that many of the small towns with the Hamilton urban boundary can maintain their rural flavour but recognize that perhaps height restrictions for small apartments/condos/townhouses might allow for them to built in these outlying areas.</p> <p>During this pandemic, we recognize the significant role that the farms in the rural areas play in providing produce for urban dwellers. If we can grow it locally, then we do not have to rely as heavily on imported foreign produce whose supplies lines can be affected by negative environmental conditions that seem to happen more often.</p> <p>We are unique in this urban area of having tender-fruit production so close. The soils and weather are perfect for growing peaches, berries, grapes for wine, etc., and when this land is covered over by homes, malls, concrete parking and roads, we lose those important products and land forever. It is very rare indeed that significant areas of urban land have been turned back into lush fields and farms. *** Kudos to those in the planning department who value City planned urban gardens, large parks, green areas within mall parking lots and small green areas incorporated into the many high rises going up.</p>

	<p>To come back to the original Options, we favour #3...a Hamilton urban area that has increased density with very limited expansion into the current rural areas. Summit Park on the East Mountain is scary. Very nice homes but the sprawl appears to be unlimited....</p> <p>south, east from Rymal Rd. and Centennial Parkway.</p>
59.	<p>I am in favour of increasing intensification within the existing urban area to accomodate growth. This will put investment into the city and support the new LRT., utilize existing services and provide a better chance at affordability.</p>
60.	<p>I am responding to your questionnaire about how the city should accommodate growth.</p> <p>Like many others to whom I have spoken, I do take umbrage at being offered a choice of two options, when there are obviously more, and of course you provide no justification for the two options. It really is a bit offensive.</p> <p>You seem to be dedicated to a concept of "sustainable sprawl" though you do not call it that, and it would appear in reality not to be sustainable. Since I have witnessed for a long time the farms of my youth being eaten up by piecemeal development, without any overall plan; and with ever declining infrastructure, which you are unwilling and unable to maintain, I query your competence to tackle the problems facing this generation. . You say that you need to accommodate immigration, but do not explain why should we have such massive immigration. You can hardly expect intelligent citizens to answer such a questionnaire.</p> <p>The ineptitude of the Hamilton planning department is on public view, and we can soon expect gridlock at Toronto levels. For example, busses have no dedicated set-offs or lanes. Schools are created without turnoffs for their traffic and so forth. This is entry level stuff, which Hamilton cannot handle. WE would need fresh brains in the planning department, when we cannot even handle the sewage from Chedoke, and have to be disciplined by the province.</p> <p>I feel sorry for those that have to live in this place in the future.</p>
61.	<p>I would like to support a version of option 1 where new greenfield lands are developed beyond the current urban boundary.</p> <p>Plots should be developed in 2-5 acre parcels. This coupled with encouragement through tax breaks for families that plant gardens and greenhouses with hydro generation is the most sustainable and green use of the space. This would mitigate some of the most damaging aspects of urban sprawl (removal of green areas, water shed issues, deforestation, loss of habitat) as only 1 house could be built per parcel.</p> <p>If you were to survey individual families aged 20-40 you would find that this is their dream housing scenario, a parcel of land 2-5 acres with room to grow and build what they want.</p>
62.	<p>My main concern is development of Housing without hampering green land by the following measures.</p>

	<p>1) Survey should be carried out properly to find out small units of land spread out all over Hamilton region where it is possible to construct housing projects without cutting trees or bushes or there is no possible of grow greens. Small size builders may involved and huge employment generation possible.</p> <p>2) Modify and reconstruct the existing unplanned housing so that unused land can be use for high rise building</p> <p>3) Try to construct 4 story double side town house So that minimum land can be use for maximum number of house.</p>
63.	<p>My comments would be - Lets try as much as possible not to use farmland - so i would circle Option 2 /Option 3. There will always be a need for brand new homes but option 1 can be a small portion of the future, not all of it.</p> <p>If we are going to build more apartment buildings (Condominiums) the units to be purchased should be of various sizes... one or two bedrooms yes, but also 3 and 4 bedroom with 2 baths, etc... those are the people who are looking for the houses so if the apartment had enough space for a family, including grandparents, etc then new houses may not be as required is such big numbers. These would also have to have built in laundry.</p> <p>I also think that adding the first 3 floors of condos should be for senior apartments - we are getting to the point where many seniors will be looking to downsize to something affordable - and it would be good (3 bottom floors) since they will not be able to climb so many stairs with walkers even when the elevators eventually break down, temporarily I hope! so 3 floors for seniors or special needs such as wheelchairs would be good. I am really thinking about my parents here!</p> <p>Another thing that we could explore is allowing people to build smaller buildings on their properties/backyards... "tiny homes". the size of these could be proportional to the home already there so no monster houses would be built in backyards... unless possibly they are on a laneway where there would be a separate entrance/no impacts to the neighbours, etc.</p>
64.	<p>I choose survey option 3 - other suggestions. I think the City of Hamilton should expand its urban boundary to plan for new housing and job growth by following the growth plan minimum intensification rate of 50%.</p>
65.	<p>I select Option 3 - I think the split should be 50/50 for intensification/use of new land.</p> <p>I understand that using additional lands can greatly influences infrastructure costs and know that green space is valuable - but the cost of intensification on the urban population can be high for emotional well being.</p>
66.	<p>In reading your proposed options I believe that this survey and the SDU proposals should go hand in hand.</p> <p>You have proposed "new housing units" in both scenarios. Urban growth will continue to happen and SDU's in the urban areas will increase your density</p>

	<p>along with building new housing units.</p> <p>If you allow rural properties to also have the same 3 options as the urban area regarding SDU'S this will allow for ambitious growth without overwhelming the urban area. This would maximize existing rural properties without completely capturing new greenfield lands.</p> <p>The city once again has created an exclusive scenario where SDU'S are concerned. With the future affordable housing crisis in this highly expensive area you are limiting only urban dwellers to benefit by 3 different living options.</p> <p>The city should allow those in the rural area to have the same 3 (inclusive) options for secondary dwelling units. Those who choose to live in the rural area accept the lack of infrastructure for a reason.</p> <p>To deny tax payers the same options is very short sighted and EXCLUSIVE.</p>
67.	<p>As I understand it, your future expansion of the city is being dictated by the provincial government.</p> <p>I don't believe we should rush to satisfy their needs. We as a city will live with the consequences of these decisions long after changes in government. Those of us that chose to live outside of the big urban centres to the east of us would be forced to move again to get away from your option 1 of "ambitious density" and in the current real estate market wouldn't be an easy task. As you drive away from these big urban centres that neighbour our city and encounter the abundant greenfield lands I'm sure most would feel as I do..... more relaxed and calm. If urban expansion is a necessary evil chalked up to progress then we should at the very least take a long term view as to how we get there. It seems to me that "option 1" or "option 2" as presented are all or none extremes. Since the city is already looking at more affordable housing options currently with their "SDU" proposal, an "option 3" where you would allow for urban and rural intensification without drastically changing neighbourhood streetscapes through the "SDU" proposal could achieve both objectives of increased density and more affordable housing through SDU's however, the same 3 options must be offered to those that have elected to live outside of the city centre. If the same 3 options for creating an SDU are available spread equally across the city without either the urban or rural residents solely bearing the brunt of future intensification.</p> <p>If this city truly wants to achieve some kind of cohesiveness between the 2 residential factions (urban &amp; rural) then the municipal government has to start treating us as equal stakeholders. It is still proving difficult to pull neighbouring communities together, to think and act as one city when their amalgamation was forced in the first place. People who decide to live in a rural setting do so as a choice and are aware that they are foregoing all of the services and infrastructure that come with urban dwelling but they should not be excluded from having the same rights and options with respect to their properties and what can be done on them. Neighbourhoods change over time organically, the municipal government should be observant of why and how this is happening and then help foster those changes instead of dictating change that a select few at city hall have deemed necessary.</p>

68.	<p>I think that there should be No Urban Boundary Expansion as detailed in Option 2 but Hamilton should plan for LRT expansion over the next 24 years to maximize growth within the existing boundaries that would include ALL areas of the city (Downtown and Mountain). Areas of the city serviced by an expanded LRT would be enjoyed by ALL citizens of the city.</p> <p>LRT Expansion should be staged in the following phases over 25 years:</p> <p>Stage 1: Complete Eastgate Square to McMaster University line.  Stage 2: Build McMaster to Ancaster Meadowlands line via Main Street W/Wilson Street W.  Stage 3: Build Eastgate Square to Elfrida Meadowlands East line Centennial Parkway/Upper Centennial  Stage 4: Build Ancaster Meadowlands to Elfrida Meadowlands East line via Garner Road W/Rymal Road.  Stage 5: Build John C. Munro Airport to Hamilton General Hospital line via Upper James Street/Claremount Access/Victoria Ave N terminating at General Hospital or Burlington Street.</p> <p>Ultimately this would provide access to LRT to the entire city and to most citizens. It would intensify the city around the LRT and allow access to shopping in the downtown and the East and West in both the downtown and the Mountain. Cars would be reduced in these busy corridors, those without cars could travel to Doctor Appointments easier. The distance between grocery stores (which is growing) would not burden be such a burden to citizens. Bus service could easily fill in the gaps until the system is built. You could literally travel the entire city in one train.</p> <p>This would achieve: Intensification within the city limits. Reduce car traffic. Facilitate access to grocery/shopping services by those without cars and get people to use transit. (Younger population will likely drive less than current generation). Facilitate visits to hospitals/doctors because of easy access and direct connections. Provide access from downtown to the Airport and distribution centres for passengers and employees. Make getting to airport more attractive for Airport passengers thereby more attractive to potential airlines.</p>
69.	<p>First I'd say there is no answer that will please everyone.</p> <p>In my opinion expansion should occur in all of the above. I said years ago already that the city should be buying up huge blocks of the Lower city. Many of the homes at that time (20 yrs ago) were in disrepair and houses were cheap. Today that wouldn't even be a financially viable option. However large downtown properties should be converted to inner city intensified condo style housing. If done properly (not as Toronto has done...over intensified) living downtown Hamilton could be a serene place to live. Proper spacing of highrise structures with lower floor retail and generous greenspace (..as in Mississauga) strikes a balance between intensified population/ places to shop / places to work and places to relax. Live, work and play within a city block. The outcome is less expensive housing / lower unemployment / higher property tax revenue / a happier population and thus a lower crime rate.</p> <p>Farmland within the city of Hamilton boundaries vary from heavy clay (glanbrook/binbrook/mount hope) to sandy loam (Waterdown/millgrove) to</p>

	<p>mineral rich loam (west flamborough/West Ancaster/Lynden)</p> <p>The obvious answer would be to convert clay soil lands to residential since those are the poorest and least desirable lands for agricultural use.</p> <p>Protect existing green land and forested areas but convert the open land to residential.</p> <p>Huge tracts of housing outside of the city proper is not the way to go. It should be pockets of housing between greenspace, not pockets of greenspace between housing.</p> <p>Wider roads and minimum 1/4 acre properties for the most part.</p>
70.	<p>My opinion is, why everyone needs a freestanding house. We have only so much we can build on. With that said we should look in more highrise building or smaller combined houses like we see a lot in Europe. Maybe we have to change our view of ownership of a house. Maybe we should focus on owning a Apartment. We can only expand so much as city. We also have to watch that we still have enough green fields, CO2 household, and also accra fields. We really need to rethink our kind of living in the future. Do we need all huge big houses and land? No we don't. We have to keep the Greenbelt as a Greenbelt and stop building just single family homes</p>
71.	<p>I believe we need to close the gap between outer Urban areas like Binbrook and Hamilton. Closing the gap makes the most sense as there is infrastructure investment already happening there such as the sewer on Hwy 56 and the sewer on Dickenson Road. I believe this configuration makes the most sense.</p>
72.	<p>It means aggressive push in building huge amount of various types of units in both existing urban area and development of new greenfield lands.</p> <p>We are in extremely difficult situation were people will soon have to choose between putting a food on the table and paying their rent. I am not even gonna talk about buying a real estate.</p> <p>Most comprehensive analysis of where we are when it comes to affordable housing was done by Scotiabank analysts:</p> <p><a href="https://www.scotiabank.com/ca/en/about/economics/economics-publications/post.other-publications.housing.housing-note.housing-note--may-12-2021-.html">https://www.scotiabank.com/ca/en/about/economics/economics-publications/post.other-publications.housing.housing-note.housing-note--may-12-2021-.html</a></p> <p>We are well beyond nice timely planning for future.</p>
73.	<p>I don't agree with either option 1 or 2. The urban boundary should be expanded as much as needed to increase the availability of single family housing, which is the preferred option for many buyers. A larger supply is needed to help contain the ever increasing prices for this type of housing. Otherwise, house prices will continue to rise, putting a single family house beyond the reach of many more potential buyers.</p> <p>The City also needs to look into reducing the "red tape" associated with land development, to help speed up the supply of building lots and keep up with demand.</p>
74.	<p>Use existing space! No more green space expansion!</p>

75.	we did not receive this survey to these household to contribute to the urban growth survey and this is something that should be mandatory and mandated like the Canadian census, that of which does not collect important information such as urban development. We vote for option 3 because we need to focus on affordable housing and jobs as these are two major things this city is majorly lacking.
76.	<p>My response to the survey is a combination of #2 and #3 - stop the sprawl. Other cities have taken this approach with developers to prevent house price inflation and land being held for speculation.</p> <p>Allow people who own land of a certain size (e.g. 5 acres) to be able to build another dwelling on their own land. We have owned this land for over 120 years and are not able to sever 2 lots for our kids. We owned the land before amalgamation of Hamilton, before there was such a thing as the "green belt" and before there was even a township of Glanbrook.</p> <p>If we are unable to sever our land, our kids who have grown up in Hamilton and have just begun their careers in Hamilton will, like most of their friends, have to move out of the City of Hamilton due to the house prices. By allowing individuals with land to sever for another dwelling, long time residents will be able to stay in the area.</p> <p>I look forward to hearing about why we did not receive this survey.</p>
77.	No new development of farm land or green space. No high rise apartments or condos. No LRT.
78.	<p>My response is that option 2 (no expansion) is the ideal choice, but probably unrealistic. Option 1 "Ambitious Density Scenario" may be worthy, but I suspect that choosing that will mean the named acreage will be chosen, no matter the good intentions of the council. I would like to see Council consider a third option: Option 2 with measured, well thought out flexibility to expand - but only if issues around "No Expansion" have been fully explored.</p> <p>I am not fully versed in the plans, but assume that there is some flexibility in decision making timelines as the process proceeds. Council needs to decide those timelines and monitor issues along the way, albeit with a clear plan in mind.</p> <p>Again, I am not fully informed but, if I were on Council I would wish to proceed guardedly, with full information at every step</p>
79.	<p>I choose option 1 over option 2; but with only the density concept in mind, my choice is option 3. Why option 3? Experience has shown that the denser the population the more unhealthy the population. Infectious disease travels quicker, delivery of emergency services (fire, ambulance, etc.) is negatively impacted, and slums and crime levels increase. Studies have shown that the higher you are living in tall buildings, the lower the life expectancy.</p> <p>These and other related factors would return Hamilton to the reputation it had in the years of heavy industry (not a place to live); this city has been in the process of becoming desirable. Why regress?</p> <p>( I remember when Hamiltonians were so happy to see the old "LRT" gone, but that is another story. Sorry. )</p>

80.	<p>An intensification rate of 50% with urban expansion to 2,200 ha is most reasonable.</p> <p>Greater than 50% Intensification is not recommended by the consultants. Greater intensification will over intensify many municipal services with risk of costly ramifications on city infrastructure.</p> <p>My wife and I have observed the effects of Covid seen in crowds of people (intensification) on walking trails in Dundas Valley, Bayfront and other areas. Waterfalls are already becoming inaccessible due to lacking infrastructure for the crowds.</p> <p>Future generations will thank us for protecting greenfields. I suggest that prime agricultural lands should remain greenfields. Urban expansion should be in areas that are least productive.</p> <p>Follow the science, not the woke crowd.</p>
81.	<p>My choice would be option 3. Option 1 is not ambitious enough. All of this needs to have more than just how many homes. The planning department needs to do a lot of work first. As the urban boundary expansion does effect a lot of other areas as well. Smart huge growth is the key, infrastructure such as roads, sewer, and other utilities need to planned out. So there is not huge costs to the city.</p> <p>I think the city needs to plan a hi-way that goes from the red hill into the hi-way 6 bypass as well as a hi-way in the stoneycreek area that runs the same way as the red hill that would join up with the Redhill to hi-way 6 bypass. But also that section would bypass Lynbrook to take traffic from there. This way it can protect the grape area from development. Prices from homes are going up in part because of the lack of cheap land that can be developed.</p> <p>I support an urban boundary that takes in all of the municipality to it's borders. Land needs to have mixed use, there needs to be homes with land attached to it. Every home seems to be on top of each other and the green areas the size of a car. There was a study that stated that this kind of development is becoming part of the climate change issue as green areas around home cushion pollution, allows more tress to be planted as well as the side effect of having failed more active outside.</p> <p>I put in the part about the hi-way as people need access to get to work quickly, plus sitting in traffic just causes more green house gasses.</p> <p>I think that there could be some hi rises or higher density areas done, maybe as little villages like Binbrook that people can walk to stores, for groceries or other.</p> <p>I also think that all new lighting for streets should have a solar panel to help the grid during the day, or a small wind turbines. Even if each one only generates 10 watts when you do the math time 1000 lights put in it starts to add up. Plus any new homes should include green solutions like solar, wind, having dry wells for laundry or any other acceptable waste water so it does not go into the sewer system.</p> <p>So I think the city should plan for minimum of 500,000 homes. At least half of the that are semi or detached homes with a backyard that is at least 3 times as big as the house to promoter green areas around the homes. The rest townhouse and apartment buildings. I think what could be included as well it</p>

	some small homes, or prebuilt homes, some lower cost options with different sizes to help first time home buyers.
82.	<p>I am extremely disappointed that I did not receive the survey that was mentioned in the news this morning on CH Television regarding urban development. I understand that the deadline is today.</p> <p>I am writing to inform you that I am strongly against developing green space. However, I recognize that Hamilton is in the middle of a housing crisis. I would like to opt for Option 3 - alternative solution. Hamilton has so many abandoned/unused buildings/lots that should be utilized for housing. It does not make sense why we would take away green/rural areas when we have so much urban decay.</p>
83.	<p>Options 1 and 2 are NOT desirable for the following reasons but not all reasons stated here.</p> <p><b>Option 1</b> It is foolish to expand on more green space and farmland especially now with climate change hitting everywhere. Hamilton is lucky right now as the climate here is turning very favourable for farming which is a lot more important than concrete expansion on these precious lands. As more land west and south of us experiences disasters from draught, flooding. Fires, etc., food costs will go up. Having local grown good makes a huge amount of sense right now as without food who cares about more people living here that are starving. There is a lot more I can say here, but let's start with that</p> <p><b>Option 2</b> Also NOT desirable. Ward 7 is getting congested now and green space has been sold to developers that was either parkland or previous farmland and is not set for multiple condo developments in small spaces in low density neighbourhoods already crowded by school and other activities not to mention a favourite sport of racing down streets regardless of low speed signs or speed bumps. Expansion in low density areas using valuable green space once owned by the city is as bad as expanding on additional farmland in option 1. Both options 1 and 2 are not desirable as they will create damage to the environment at a minimum and will create a larger than desirable carbon footprint while destroying green space and remaining flammable land which aids in cleaning out air. Concrete does not clean our air nor does it support growing crops locally which can also help the food banks and people that are poor.</p> <p><b>Option 3</b> The LRT is scheduled to run mostly down King St. It makes sense to redevelop decapitated homes on streets like Barton and King which have been used as businesses for decades. These buildings are falling apart and still have dirt floor basements. Queenston too can be redeveloped in line to this as well. It makes more sense to follow the LRT route or closeness as opposed to destroying low density neighbourhoods on the mountain or using up any or all the green spaces and potential farmland there. Remember that Upper Sherman is minor</p>

	<p>artery too yet it is important for ambulances, fire trucks and police as well as fighting to stay uncrowded during school activity and rush hours that use Upper Sherman to go to Elgrida or Ancaster. Rebuilding old buildings is the most logical to me. It builds a future while improving the beauty of our city.</p>
84.	<p>Hamilton is unique. We're lucky to have farms and we definitely need to keep them! Provincial governments can never ever ever have the right to force an urban sprawl ! ??!</p> <p>20% intensification difference between the two options given are not worth losing green fields, increase contribution to climate change, put greater load on existing infrastructure.</p> <p>It is also immoral to force out multi generation farmers from their lands. Is that how the city (or the province) wants to be thought of? What were people thinking here?!</p> <p>Option 3 There are areas in the existing urban boundary that could be revitalized. Why not use those? Renewed development should include some incentives, community gardens, parks, creative, resourceful, energy efficient, sustainable designs. Please use the talented architectural, GIS and engineering teams to develop housing throughout the city that will work in the residents favour and not give in to some number that someone somewhere higher up came up with one day after a 20 minute thought. Based on the information given, this sounds like it wasn't properly worked out at the decision makers level, wherever that was. I'd like to believe that my city can protect itself from pressures, give this much more thought and work this out positively without creating unnecessary frustration among residents and not destroy precious resources. We all have to live with the decisions you come up with!</p>
85.	<p>I currently live in ancaster in a townhouse. Young people do not want to be confined to a condo for their adult lives. Most people opposed to green space expansion already owned homes and basically want the best of both worlds (large detached house with option of green space day trips)</p> <p>I vote for a option 3- large rural expansion with minimal urban development. Downtown core will soon become too much like Toronto and recent changes have already removed available parking (ie- wooden patios on the road and removal of city parking lot on John st between Rebecca and king william to make room for a poorly designed park).</p>
86.	<p>Two adults and one 17 year old, we believe that there should be "Option 2 No Urban Boundary Expansion" PLUS an Option 3 with limited to no expansion of Urban housing unit development density (not only on Farmlands, and into Greenspace) but not to continually overdevelop village areas such as Waterdown and Flamborough. Condensed housing only serves to be detrimental to peoples health.</p> <p>The existing glut of expansion and development is so poorly organized and mangled that the infrastructure (including schools, roads, sewer system, electricity grid which is continually blacking out) cannot handle it, there isn't enough child care, AND the pressure on existing residents to adapt is an unneeded stressor. Hamilton planners and building developers are doing this</p>

	<p>solely for economic growth reasons and not to sustain and serve the needs of its existing residents (who foot the bill and pay the price in discomfort for all of this).</p> <p>Also, eliminating farmland and green space to increase housing takes away from the environmental health and richness of the area, puts our local food and water sources at risk and is simply irresponsible. Commit to a ZERO growth plan and improve the existing infrastructure. And MAKE housing developers pay ALL of the contingent expenses for such development (including full school builds, facilities expansions, etc) in FULL before allowing development in order to take the burden off existing and new residents.</p>
87.	<p>City growth and expansion is not just about building more. It is about building in a thoughtful, smart and responsible way when planning new developments being aware of the environmental impacts.</p> <p>Is there infrastructure to support it? Does the scale fit in with the existing housing? e.g. A 51 story building in downtown Hamilton makes more sense whereas in the outskirts of Hamilton it does not; 51 stories is too high and does not fit in with existing housing. (i.e. It has to be considered that for each new dwelling there could be at least one car; traffic will be increased. Are there roads to support the increase in traffic? Is there efficient public transport to support the new dwellings so people will consider not using their cars?)</p> <p>Build green – use renewable new technologies (e.g. bricks made from plastic waste, solar panels on roofs). Whenever possible use products produced in Ontario and Canada.</p> <p>Build affordable housing – find ways to help the homeless. Think how you would feel if you had no home and how you would want the city to help you. The recent federal government monies will help with this.</p> <p>Promote support for local farming - No urban expansion – we need what farmland there is to grow food.</p> <p>Protect existing wetlands.</p> <p>Think about climate change. We need Green Space – Consider green spaces on roof tops.</p> <p>According to the World Health Organisation (WHO), every city is recommended to provide a minimum of 9 square metres of urban green space for each person, provided that it should be accessible, safe and functional. Green spaces can reduce the ambient temperature of cities by 1°C, thus reducing the urban heat island and harmful city smog. In this sense, 1°C cooler urban environments prevent the harmful ozone layer that is triggered during intense heat episodes from forming.</p>
88.	<p>Having discussed with many of my neighbors, the City of Hamilton’s “survey” to the Public concerning the “Land Needs Assessment” (2021-2051), I feel compelled to point out and voice, what the “public” is thinking, and feeling about the “matter of Hamilton”. Evidently, it is now well documented (reported in the Hamilton Spectator, ie. “Is Hamilton Planning the Problem”, April 12, 2021, and</p>

"Grassroots campaign to stop sprawl in Hamilton gets city counselor's attention", July 20, 2021), that there is a great deal of criticism concerning the "advertised" rollout of the questions posed to the public, about the urban Land Needs Assessment. If the "lawn signs" are any indication of the public's response, then there is a "ground swell" of support, to keep Hamilton "green".

Having reviewed the "analysis, and assessment" completed by Lorius and Associates, in association with Hemson Consulting Ltd, I find it seriously lacking, in the sense of the want of "applied" terms, of the modern computer based "topological data analysis" available. Their (Lorius) mission, as I have read it was to provide; "A forecast of population, housing and employment by type to 2051; Housing market and trends analysis; Residential intensification market demand analysis; Employment and economic analysis; and Designated Greenfield Area (DGA) analysis." The "boundary map" that Lorius provides, is an aerial 2-D "static topological map" of "Hamilton". As I understand it, we no longer live in the early to mid 20th century, computer based "dynamic mapping tools", have been in use for city planning since the 1970's, perhaps earlier.

Pointing to one such study, the Swiss-American geographer Waldo Tobler "A Computer Movie Simulating Urban Growth in the Detroit Region", was published in 1970. Computer mapping tools have dramatically improved in the last 50 years, to the point that it is now possible to map, and create a computer "simulation" of the three dimensions of "urban spaces", streets, buildings, business work places, institutional infrastructures, traffic patterns, etc. A visual four dimensional, urban space-time model, can simulate existing, as well as future urban area growth of Hamilton from 2021 to 2051.

Do "Hamiltonians" not have the right to see such a computer simulation before they make a decision, and choose the urban topological model that is best suited to the needs of Hamilton? Some may make the argument, that such a "mosaic cartographic" simulation, would be too costly. While I do not have the exact numbers that such a simulation/model would cost, I can "see" the benefits of such a computer generated "geo-visualization" model, and public "cognitive map" of Hamilton can provide, in the long term. The question that I am interested in, is how much did the Lorius assessment cost the tax-payer? A computer driven simulation can most likely be conducted by McMaster University. Why was the Hamilton Land needs assessment not carried out by McMaster, in the first place...?

Evidently, there will be a "peer review" of the Lorius assessment. Reading a "Global News" article "Hamilton to get peer review for consultants report on expanding urban boundary", was reported by Don Mitchell, June 24, 2021. On the cost of a peer review of the Lorius plan, Mitchell quotes the general manager of planning and economic development for the city of Hamilton, Jason Thorne who said; 'he couldn't confirm the final cost of the review since no one has been approached to do the study.' Thorne reportedly stated; "I can give you my best ballpark, and say we're probably in the neighborhood of about \$25,000."

What I do know, is that according to "Statistics Canada" the daily GDP statistics of Hamilton is circa \$100 million/per day, and increasing. Does the Federal,

	<p>Provincial, and Municipal government not have an obligation to the Canadian "tax-payer" to provide an accurate computer based simulation model, and plan for future urban growth? Given, that this computer model is based on "public information", and can be updated for policy planning purposes (ie. issuance of building permits), on a daily basis, until 2051, it seems a small price to pay. Invest in the present, to create and build an "information science" based "road map" into a better future.</p> <p>As I read them, the numbers (based on Statistics Canada census data) that Lorius provides, concerning the population growth of Hamilton, increasing by 236 thousand people in the next 30 years, seems reasonable. As I understand it, the projected number of 122 thousand jobs, and roughly 110 thousand new housing units needed in Hamilton, over the next 30 years, also seems reasonable, and plausible. As for the over 30 "tables" Lorius provides the reader, they are at best 2-D projections, lacking depth, and real time dynamic "everyday changes", that "in fact" is going on in Hamilton, as we speak.</p> <p>What is needed, is a computer model of Hamilton, that provides a dynamic "multivariate" map of Hamilton, that includes the land base use, people, work place structures, infrastructures, and institutional superstructural needs. The dynamic urban planning basis for such "metacartographic" ideas, was already presented by such people as the American urban planner Kevin Lynch "Image of the City" (1960), the American geographer William Bunge's "Atlas of Love and Hate" (1969), and the American-Canadian journalist Jane Jacobs "Death and Life of Great American Cities" (1961).</p> <p>In closing, my "option 3", is asking, and calling on the City of Hamilton, the Province of Ontario, and the Federal Government of Canada to invest in a computer driven information science model of Hamilton (let's call it "Project Hamilton: 2021-2051"), so that a dynamic real time "multivariate" road map of Hamilton can assess the needs of Hamiltonians, "On the ground". I believe that all three levels of government need to rationally invest in the present "public policy", to build a better future, for all Hamiltonians, and Canadians....</p> <p>Note: Please make me aware of any "factual" errors the this open letter has, so that I can make the necessary corrections....</p>
89.	<p>No urban boundary expansion until unused space within the city is developed. We understand that urban boundary expansion may be necessary to support a growing population, but there are so many unused and vacant spaces, particularly in the lower city (vacant schools, industrial sites and tons of derelict commercial spaces particularly along Kenilworth, Barton and King St E). Development of these spaces should keep within the community's character i.e no highrises in predominantly residential areas with single-detached homes, but medium and low-rise buildings would be ok.</p> <p>Finally, the city needs to cut the ridiculous amount of red tape and financial cost to develop and redevelop housing, and perhaps more property owners would consider creating rental units within their existing properties as a viable option. Right now the level of bureaucracy and the astronomical costs of permits to even build a deck--let alone add a second story, addition or basement suite--are</p>

	<p>completely prohibitive to homeowners. We love our small home and neighborhood in Crown Point, but if we ever decided to expand our family it would be much more difficult and expensive to modify our existing home than to buy a new build in an outlying area where there is no character or sense of community. It's a shame.</p>
<p>90.</p>	<p>I am strongly opposed to OPTION 1 - maximum expansion.</p> <p>This is a more important issue than just people's opinions!!</p> <p>Why?</p> <p>Remember the recent vaccine shortages? Countries saved it for themselves (their own people).</p> <p>With Climate Change, there are likely to be global food shortages, and countries that normally export food to Canada may be unable to continue to do that.</p> <p>For example, California, a major agricultural food producer, already has horrible drought and fire conditions.</p> <p>These conditions are likely to get worse.</p> <p>We NEED TO PROTECT all of the farmland that we have left. This area has some of the best growing conditions IN THE WHOLE WORLD. In the area around Hamilton, we can grow a vast array of fruit and vegetables, due not only to good climate conditions, but also very fertile soil</p> <p>If we put buildings or roads on it, it can't be turned back into farmland because the topsoil has been lost!</p> <p>There is land in Northern Ontario, but the soil is mostly very poor (with a few exceptions), and would be difficult or impossible to turn into good farms, even if the climate there became warmer.</p> <p>.....</p> <p>Other Options:</p> <p>As some people have already pointed out, there is land within the city that could be re-developed, such as older industrial areas in the north end, and around the railyards and Barton St., for example.</p> <p>Developers like new "fresh" land that's easy (and cheap) to develop, but we can no longer afford to just keep expanding into new areas like that.</p> <p>Their profits may be greater for developing new land, but the rest of us pay a price for that, and with Climate Change, the price is getting unaffordable.</p> <p>I would favour more medium density developments, like some of the older buildings already seen along Main St. E. and King St. E. (For example, 3 to 7</p>

	<p>stories). Also, townhouses.</p> <p>They are also nicer to live in than super high rise buildings.</p> <p>This is another thing shown by the Covid virus - crowded elevators became super-spreaders.</p> <p>We don't "owe" the developers the huge profits that they are accustomed to!</p> <p>We also could re-consider ideas of community building.</p> <p>We can also re-purpose older, well-built buildings no longer needed for their original purpose, such as churches, etc.</p> <p>These options can use further consideration.</p>
91.	<p>I'm just hoping to add my opinion to the options being presented for future growth in Hamilton.</p> <p>Current urban intensification is a must with the goal of avoiding as much rural take over as possible. It becomes evident that when urban expansion happens in formerly rural areas the economic status of those residents is often lacking diversity. This moves further to create ghettoized core areas and further limits access for economically marginalized people.</p> <p>Affordability of housing must be the number 1 priority in any plan.</p>
92.	<p>I select option 3. I recommend an intensification rate of about 75%, allowing a small amount of urban expansion with the emphasis on increased density.</p>
93.	<p>#2 No urban Boundary Expansion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- stop the sprawl!!!!</li> <li>- find a way to convert areas that are desolate within the city eg. shops &amp; buildings in the older part of the city....Barton Street, King &amp; Main Streets, North end, etc and rejuvenate them into low income housing projects, upgraded neighbourhoods that would attract population, new families and new businesses</li> </ul> <p>#3 Start Addressing Provincial Government Plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Gov't is planning mandates until 2051 and trying to steam roll their agendas .....who is stopping them?</li> <li>- we know the Premier is with industry, commerce, retail and developers</li> <li>- they are already targeting farm land and conservation areas for transportation, building expansion, industry and commercial expansion</li> <li>- WHERE DO YOU THINK OUR GRANDCHILDREN WILL GET THEIR FOOD? WE ARE GOING TO BE "BEHOLDING" TO OTHER NATIONS??? ....WE HAVE TO KEEP GOOD FARM LAND AND MAKE AGRICULTURE ATTRACTIVE TO OUR YOUTH!!!!!! ....any plans or incentives for that????</li> </ul>
94.	<p>I believe the ambitious density scenario (or lower) is important to ensure availability of ground oriented homes for current and future generations as our city grows. However I would support a lower density rate (50%) in line with the land needs assessment-as I'm a firm believer that market forces should not be</p>

	<p>ignored in planning decisions because people vote with their feet if they can't meet their housing needs in our City. I've already lost two of my siblings to other municipalities with more affordable and available housing that meets their needs, and my other sibling is planning to buy in North Bay within the year. Ideally I would like to remain in Hamilton when I can afford to purchase a townhouse/home, but it doesn't make sense to buy a condo in Hamilton smaller than my current rental.</p>
95.	<p>My main suggestion is Option 2. No urban boundary expansion but with some modification. Some unsuitable farm land could be used, especially around the airport where people could live close to where they work in airport or industrial related activities.</p> <p>The main increase in housing should be in the city but not in super high rise apartments that block the sun and the view and create wind tunnels.</p> <p>I think that small apartment buildings, 3 or 4 stories, placed near schools would help create sustainable education buildings and be a better environment for families. Some of the mountain residential areas, Rosedale and Birch areas, and even Westdale would be prime for this type of living. You could replace 4 or 5 houses with a small building. One thing that apartment buildings need is balcony space, no one should live in a box. This should be a regulated requirement. Buildings should also have 25 percent geared to income and more family units. They would need green space like a park, a community garden and a rec centre or swimming pool close by so people can be active and healthy.</p> <p>Thank you for asking for our input.</p>
96.	<p>For what it's worth,</p> <p>I understand growth and the question you are asking is difficult to answer.</p> <p>However, what comes to mind is the number of cars I see at the end of the day on residential streets. I feel that by increasing the density this problem will get worse.</p> <p>I am sure that most household have at least two cars and in some cases 4 or 5. I see driveways full, streets full, and unfortunately garages used very little. It seems that the parking strategy is to not be blocked in. So wider driveways may be more functional than long narrow ones and should be a factor when increasing density.</p> <p>I like the idea of allowing homeowners to be able to create an apartment in their home provided the home owners live in the home, I think allowing this to become an investment vehicle should be discouraged. However, I think the residence having enough parking spaces on the property that allow for easy movement of any vehicle should be a factor when considering where to allow this.</p> <p>I don't think public transit will solve this problem, people still seem to have to get the station and will still own cars.</p>

97.	<p>I would prefer a happy medium in between 1 &amp; 2. I am sending this link in the hopes that this may be achieved. There are some interesting articles on how urban sprawl contributes to our environmental impact on the planet and the shrinkage of greenspace is detrimental to our planet. Loss of farmland reduces the availability of local goods and increases importation of goods which drives prices up. It also increases local job loss. Destruction of ecosystems and the effects on wildlife are impacted as well. We have a lot of abandoned properties in Hamilton. Why not convert them rather than leaving them empty to rot or having them be a victim of demolition by neglect. I'd rather see what is existing re-purposed than having to use farmland to build 3000 ft houses that 2 people live in. I understand that not all of the existing properties can be used or re-purposed but I'm sure a vast majority can. Please take a look at these articles and the impact on the environment and solutions other countries have undertaken to fix this issue.</p> <p><a href="https://environmentaldefence.ca/campaign/protecting-ontarios-environment/">https://environmentaldefence.ca/campaign/protecting-ontarios-environment/</a></p>
98.	<p>Lower density in all areas, no apartments or condos higher than 5 stories. More green space and natural areas in all parts of our city. We are concreting everything over and building ever upwards and outwards and it is to our peril both as humans and to our environment. Restrictions should be placed on amounts of concrete that can be used and where, more natural products and environmentally efficient building practices should be in place. Question the need for basements in every single home. More community involvement should be considered when building houses.</p> <p>We are already seeing the impact our current practices are having in our extreme weather patterns and I feel if we continue at same pace &amp; type &amp; style of intensification, weather patterns and impacts of such will be even more detrimental then currently being experienced.</p>
99.	<p>I applaud the city fathers for being proactive by looking ahead to the future. But what will the world be like in 30 years? What will be the age distribution? How will societal ways of being shape our community ? Economically, Education and culturally ? I believe these need to be factored in to any long range planning . It is not just numbers to consider. Quality of life and enjoyment of the community weigh in too. One just has to look at all the burgeoning high-rises that are beginning to block the view of lake Ontario . We are beginning to copy Toronto's error did by making the lake view waterfront enjoyable to only a select few condo owners. We should be cautious so as not to replicate these same errors.</p> <p>With the galloping climate crisis I think we need to be evermore diligent about safeguarding green spaces , tress and much loved out -door space . this pandemic taught us about the perils of living in confined indoor space without adequate out door access for prolonged periods.</p> <p>Therefore I am advocating for a compromise: I think we should amortize the evolution gradually over the 30 years aiming for 96, 00- mixed housing units including single dwelling , multi-unit accommodation and small multiunit apts / condo and housing that is rent geared to income across the entire city. I believe we need to continue to support our local farmers as food and shipping cost will continue to climb. There is some "rural" land that be expanded upon but encourage properties of 1-2 acres</p>

to continue to provide small farm plots or green spaces rather than carving off tracts of land into match box size lots and selling them as single family homes which simply creates dense living .81% intensification rate is just too steep for the amount of topography that we have access to. We will be eroding too much of our geography. The drive along Rymal Rd W/ Garner used to be a lovely refreshing, relaxing drive now it is congested , densely packed with multiple housing units including teaming with Town home properties. This will be a travesty if we continue at this pace. There is barely any land or green space visible . This community has exploded in size in the past 30 years since I moved here . It has almost doubled. This is partly due to amalgamation of the surrounding towns but also to the influx of people discovering Hamilton. We need to ensure we have adequate infrastructure , transport, schools, healthcare and social service resources to match the needs of this growing community. We will also need to advocate for a review of our electoral mapping as our existing provincial and federal ridings are already too big and too spread out across the city boundaries.