Due to the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, all consultations within the city are being held virtually to protect the health and safety of Hamilton residents and staff.
ABOUT THIS REPORT
The purpose of the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan Study is to develop a long-term land use plan for the central area of Waterdown. In Phase 3 of this study, staff discussed the preferred land use directions based on analysis and previous public input, and the public reviewed the draft Secondary Plan, the Urban Design Guidelines, and the recommendations of the Cultural Heritage Review.

Virtual consultations for the Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan Phase 3 were held in June 2021 and included the opportunity to review online materials and provide input to an online survey from June 1 to June 30 and to participate in a live information meeting held on June 17th, from 7:00 pm to 8:30 pm.

This report, prepared by the Community Engagement Facilitator Sue Cumming, MCIP RPP, Cumming+Company, provides a summary of the verbatim public input from the virtual consultation. All feedback is being considered by City Staff in the finalization of the Secondary Plan, the Urban Design Guidelines and Cultural Heritage Review. The final documents are anticipated to be submitted to City Council in the fall 2021 for approval.
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1. VIRTUAL CONSULTATION DETAILS

The Phase Three consultation was held virtually, and individuals were able to participate:

- By reviewing the Phase 3 information online on the project website from June 1 to June 30, 2021. Materials were available at engage.hamilton.ca/waterdownnode 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Participants were asked to submit their written comments on the Phase 3 materials online at engage.hamilton.ca/waterdownnode or via email.
- By joining and participating in a live Information meeting which was held on Thursday, June 17, 2021, from 7:00 pm to 8:30 pm. The project team provided an overview presentation of Phase 3 and answered questions from the public.

From June 1 to June 30, the website was visited 200 times and 13 individuals responded by providing their views on the Phase 3 Materials through the Engage Hamilton survey. Thirty-five individuals participated in the meeting.

The Phase 3 consultation materials included information about the draft Secondary Plan as well as information about the supporting Urban Design Guidelines and Cultural Heritage Review. The online information was organized by key topics as shown in Figure 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure 1: Online Consultation Materials Topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waterdown Community Draft Secondary Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants could read the highlight summary of the draft Secondary Plan, review the Secondary Plan text and Secondary Plan maps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waterdown Community Node Urban Design Guidelines</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants could read the highlight summary of the Urban Design Guidelines and review the detailed guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waterdown Cultural Heritage Review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants could read the highlight summary of the Waterdown Cultural Heritage Review and read the draft Cultural Heritage Review Report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Presentations at the live Information Meeting were provided by City Staff, Brook McIlroy Urban Design Consultants (BMI) and Archeological Services Inc (ASI). The meeting was facilitated by Sue Cumming, Cumming+Company. City Staff from Transportation and Heritage also participated. The presentations were followed by a live discussion period where individuals were able to ask questions orally or by typing using the meeting question function. The presentation portion was recorded and posted on the project website for viewing a few days after the meeting.
Questions posed to attendees were:

- We would like to hear especially what you like, if you think something is quite useful about the secondary plan, or if there's anything you think should be changed or added?
- On the Urban Design guidelines do you think they give suitable guidance for new development proposals to ensure that they are compatible and of a high-quality design, and should anything be changed or added?
- For the cultural heritage review, do you think the recommendations appropriately recognize and protect heritage resources and do you have any comments on the proposed study area for a heritage conservation district study?

2. GENERAL THEMES AND KEY MESSAGES HEARD

There continues to be significant community interest in the central Waterdown community. Residents are engaged about the future of their community and there has been a high degree of public engagement through previous consultations held during the project.

The City is committed to ensuring that there is full transparency in reporting on what was heard to ensure that the public feedback received is widely known and considered in the development of the preferred land use plan, Secondary Plan policies, Urban Design Guidelines, and Cultural Heritage Review for the Waterdown Community Node. All feedback is being considered by City Staff. Feedback reports and meeting notes from all consultations are made available on the project website.

Figure 2 is a high-level synthesis prepared by the Community Engagement Facilitator on the key messages heard through the Phase 3 virtual consultations. The verbatim input from the virtual consultations is included in the report appendices as follows:

- Appendix 1: Comments and questions together with responses given at the live Information Meeting on June 17, 2021. These were posted on Engage Hamilton in June.
- Appendix 2: Comments received on the Phase 3 materials through Engage Hamilton. Thirteen submissions were received responding to the question – What are your views on the Phase 3 materials?
- Appendix 3: Comments received by email relating to the Phase 3 materials.

It is important that this synthesis of key messages heard be read in conjunction with the verbatim detailed comments found in Appendices 1, 2 and 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Key Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Secondary Plan is seen to be important for managing growth and</td>
<td>Generally, there seems to be agreement that the community vision is well reflected through the directions and policy framework contained in the draft secondary plan and urban design guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development and residents would like to see it implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The draft text of the Plan together with the maps and detailed Urban</td>
<td>There is acknowledgement that the public input provided throughout the consultation has been well considered and that the draft Secondary Plan provides appropriate land use and policy direction for transitioning the community node to a more pedestrian friendly, walkable area while maintaining and enhancing the vibrancy of the commercial uses and maintaining a heritage focus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Guidelines reflect the community’s long-term vision and focus</td>
<td>The Urban Design Guidelines are seen as important for creating the appropriate scale, massing, height, materials, and design that will support the long-term vision of the community and retain the important heritage and livable character of the Waterdown Community Node.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on heritage and liveability.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, there is support for the Plan as written with particular</td>
<td>There are those in the community who remain concerned about the impact of development on the village and on the Waterdown community and would like to see the City put in place better controls to minimize impacts from new development. The Secondary Plan and Urban Design Guidelines are seen as important for managing growth and development. There are concerns about the potential for what is seen as overdevelopment on institutionally designated sites with a desire for policies that would prohibit incompatible development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support for preservation of the heritage character, for the policies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for lower heights of new buildings and pedestrian focus along Dundas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Hamilton Streets.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions and comments were noted on how and when the Secondary</td>
<td>There was a suggestion to see what policies would be included to ensure that redevelopment of commercial lands along Hamilton Street maintains the same amount of retail space as there is today, to support the commercial function of the core.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan would be implemented.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few areas were noted where further clarification would be helpful</td>
<td>It was further suggested that new language be considered for Principle 6 – to indicate support for infrastructure improvements to provide for safe cycling and other modes of active transport which contribute resiliency to climate change through reduction of carbon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>including support for commercial uses, for institutional designated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>properties and for further highlighting the importance of cycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infrastructure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Key Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents had questions about how existing zoning and other City planning studies would be addressed to ensure that the Secondary Plan intent and policy framework is implemented.</td>
<td>With respect to the timeline for the secondary plan going forward to approval, City Staff advised that they are planning to get a final report and a final plan to the City’s Planning Committee and Council sometime in the fall before the end of the year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarification was also sought on the timeline for the Secondary Plan in the context of the coordination, and alignment with City-wide zoning and planning studies.</td>
<td>During the live Information Meeting, questions and comments were noted which sought to clarify how the process and timeline for the finalization and approval of the Secondary Plan would be coordinated with the GRIDS MCR Process, the City’s residential zoning review, and a commercial zoning review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant support for the Urban Design Guidelines which are seen as important for creating the appropriate scale, massing, height, materials, and design that will support the long-term vision of the community and retain the important heritage.</td>
<td>City Staff conveyed the importance of ensuring that zoning be adjusted to align with the new Secondary Plan and directions set out in the Urban Design Guidelines. City Staff confirmed that the zoning for commercial areas and low density residential neighbourhoods would be dealt with when the Secondary Plan comes forward for approval. Other provisions would be addressed through the City-wide zoning review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant support for the Urban Design Guidelines which are seen as important for creating the appropriate scale, massing, height, materials, and design that will support the long-term vision of the community and retain the important heritage.</td>
<td>Clarification was sought about the C5 Zoning in the old core of Waterdown. City Staff advised that they would be looking at amending the C5 or the C5a zoning (depending on what portion of the Community Node), to be consistent with the Secondary Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant support for the Urban Design Guidelines which are seen as important for creating the appropriate scale, massing, height, materials, and design that will support the long-term vision of the community and retain the important heritage.</td>
<td>Questions arose about whether the Interim Control By-Law would be extended and whether there is still a moratorium on development in the heritage area. City Staff advised that the Interim Control By-Law was not extended by City Council. It was further noted that while there is no hold on any development at this time, any properties within the existing Heritage District would be subject to Heritage Permit requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant support for the Urban Design Guidelines which are seen as important for creating the appropriate scale, massing, height, materials, and design that will support the long-term vision of the community and retain the important heritage.</td>
<td>Overall, there appears to be support for the Urban Design Guidelines as written. Some specific comments were noted as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant support for the Urban Design Guidelines which are seen as important for creating the appropriate scale, massing, height, materials, and design that will support the long-term vision of the community and retain the important heritage.</td>
<td>• Clarification of section 5.1.1 which addresses clear glazing at street level. It was noted that this would apply to new development and not to existing buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is significant support for the Urban Design Guidelines which are seen as important for creating the appropriate scale, massing, height, materials, and design that will support the long-term vision of the community and retain the important heritage.</td>
<td>• Concern that the rear yard setback for Institutional Uses needs to be increased beyond 7.5 metres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Key Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| and livable character of the Waterdown Community Node. | • Clarification of how larger land parcels would redevelop. Questions arose about the long-term redevelopment of larger land parcels where commercial uses currently exist – i.e., various plaza sites. BMI clarified that over the longer term these sites would likely be redeveloped and that the Urban Design Guidelines are important for providing direction when that occurs. It was further noted that change may occur in phases over time as private landowners consider future opportunities.  
• There was also some discussion about how applications for exception to go to 8 storeys might be considered. BMI indicated that the intent of the Urban Design Guidelines is to ensure high quality future development respecting appropriate building heights, stepbacks and design. Heights of 6 to 8 storeys were noted to be possible for the largest and deepest lots on the west side of Hamilton Street provided that the massing, placement, transition, and placement of other buildings ensures a good fit. This is something that would require careful review to address the principles and specific direction in the Urban Design Guidelines.  
• It was confirmed that bird friendly guidelines are included in the Urban Design Guidelines. |
<p>| There is support for the recommendations outlined for the Cultural Heritage Landscapes and for recommending the creation of a new Heritage Conservation District adjacent to the Mill Street HCD. There was discussion about the benefits of creating a new district instead of expanding the existing one. | Questions were asked which sought to clarify how the heritage recommendations would be achieved through the Secondary Plan and Urban Design Guidelines. City Staff confirmed the work and recommendations from the Cultural Heritage Review are incorporated into the Secondary Plan. Additional detailed questions were asked about the heritage status of Mary Hopkins school, whether a Heritage Conservation District would apply to private property or the public realm, and whether additions to single family homes would require a heritage permit. A question was also posed about whether a tree by-law could be used to deter the destruction of older healthy trees on private properties. |
| There continue to be concerns were noted about existing traffic flow and safety along Dundas Street including truck traffic and | Staff from the City’s Transportation Division were able to provide an update on the completion of the Waterdown Community Transportation Management Study and the recommendation for not widening Dundas Street which is seen as important for maintaining the vision for the for the village core. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Key Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pedestrian safety, and traffic along Hamilton Street.</td>
<td>Questions were raised about the City’s broader consideration of truck traffic and truck routes. City Transportation Staff provided information the public meeting being held in June for the City-wide Truck Route Master Plan study and provided information for how residents could learn more and join the virtual open house. There are concerns about how Dundas Street in particular will be used in the future for trucks and the ability to protect the village and be able to implement the Secondary Plan policies and Urban Design Guidelines. Questions were addressed about the potential for new active transportation facilities, particularly new cycling infrastructure to connect to the north of Waterdown. Generally, there is agreement that the proposed secondary plan policies and urban design guidelines would improve pedestrian safety and traffic along Hamilton Street making it more walkable and safer. Other comments were noted about traffic light synchronization during peak travel times.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerns were noted about the potential redevelopment of 306 Parkside Drive – St. James Church</td>
<td>Residents inquired as to the status of applications for the redevelopment of 306 Parkside for townhouses and whether the Secondary Plan would prevent or limit large scale development which is being considered for the sites. Concern was expressed about the number of units, density, traffic access and built form considerations. City Staff advised that no applications have been submitted to the City and that applications will require future public consultation. City Staff advised that the site is currently an institutional designation in the draft Secondary Plan. The townhouse form of development would be permitted by the Secondary Plan. Any proposal would have to comply with all of the policies of both the Secondary Plan and the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. A heritage impact assessment report would also be a requirement if the City did get an application. There would be some limitations on what can be done. The townhouse type of development would not be prohibited but there would be some parameters set around that use. It was further noted that in terms of contextual fit, the Urban Design Guidelines would be important to address scale, height, massing and other design factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Key Themes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>It was suggested that the 7.5 metre setback for institutional uses be increased in the Guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Further concerns were noted by residents about access via Kelly Street and traffic congestion at the intersections of Kelly Street and Main Street and Mill Street and Parkside.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. NEXT STEPS

Following the virtual consultation, City Staff are moving into the final and last phase of the study which includes:

- Reviewing Phase 3 public feedback and feedback from staff, agencies, and other stakeholders.
- Finalizing the preferred Land Use Plan and Secondary Plan.
- Finalizing the Urban Design Guidelines.
- Finalizing the Cultural Heritage Review and recommendations.
- Preparing the Staff report and recommendations for presentation to Planning Committee and Council for approval in the late fall 2021.
Appendix 1
Questions/Comments Noted at the June 17 live Information Meeting

Following the presentations, individuals could ask questions by typing into the question-and-answer box or by raising their hand to speak. The facilitator read aloud the questions and comments noted in the meeting’s question box. Figure 3 includes the verbatim input received and responses provided at the meeting by City Staff and Consultants. These are numbered for reference purpose only and each number represents a different individuals’ comments.

Figure 3 – Live Information Meeting Questions/ Comments and Responses Noted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Live Information Meeting Questions/Comments and Responses Noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. When would the Zoning By-law be amended to implement the Secondary Plan, for both commercial and residential? Would the regulations to implement the plan be incorporated in the commercial and residential portions of the new Hamilton By-law or into the Flamborough Zoning By-law?  
Response from City Staff: We are looking at making the changes at the same time that the Secondary Plan comes forward. We are currently looking at making both commercial and residential changes, but we do know that the residential zoning project City-wide is being initiated. That may take some time for new residential zoning to come forward. In the meantime, as a means of addressing some of the things we’ve heard and some of the heritage conservation goals we’re looking to make some zoning adjustments to both commercial and residential right away when the secondary plan comes forward. Then for some of those things we would be looking to have them carried forward when the new residential zoning comes in as well. |
| 2. Would the zoning be as part of the new Hamilton by-law, or would it be part of a Flamborough specific by-law?  
Response from City Staff: The commercial zoning is part of a new City-wide zoning so the amendments would be made to that zoning for commercial. The residential areas are currently under the Flamborough Zoning By-law, so we’d be looking at making changes to the Flamborough Zoning By-law. The zoning team working on the City-wide zoning would be looking at carrying forward those things to the new zoning by law as well in the future. |
| 3. What policies would be included to ensure that redevelopment of commercial lands along Hamilton Street maintain the same amount of retail space as there is today? Additionally, what opportunities would be available to ensure that grocery stores are maintained through redevelopment, which typically require a greater retail gross floor area (GFA)?  
Response from City Staff: We have done an assessment of the amount of commercial gross floor area that is in the area now and we’ve put some policy language in the draft secondary plan that talks about how we want to maintain a certain level of commercial in the area. Any significant reductions to the amount of commercial would require a commercial impact assessment. We’ve included that language in the secondary plan. It’s very difficult to require specific uses like a grocery store but we are anticipating that those types of uses would still remain in the node because they are a significant service within the node. |
4. Will this presentation be made available to the public?  
Response from Facilitator: Yes, the verbal presentation will be posted on the website and the slide decks will also be available for people to see. That would be a number of days from now, but they will be available for everyone to see.

5. Are residential single-family dwellings exempt from Heritage Conservation District Plan submissions if you're considering an addition?  
Response from Archaeological Services Inc.: The way that a Heritage Conservation District Plan process works is that first a Heritage Conservation District Study is done, similar to the work that we've done for the Cultural Heritage Review in which the area is researched and understood and there's community engagement done as part of that process. Then if Council approves the study and the recommendations of the study state to move forward to a plan then the Heritage Conservation District Plan would review what kinds of policies and guidelines would be put in place that would apply to the properties within the boundary for the Heritage Conservation District. It certainly could apply to residential properties. It could also apply to commercial properties within the area, so any type of property. There would be some level of distinction generally made between which properties are seen as contributing properties. They would have a certain set of guidelines towards conservation different from those that are non-contributing. Those differ from the properties that exhibit the values of the area, and they would have a different set of guidelines.

If this goes forward, there would be consultation establishing that so there will be opportunities to have further discussions.

6. Will the cultural heritage landscapes apply only to the public realm (i.e., the municipal right-of-way) or will they apply to private property? If so, how?
Response from Archaeological Services Inc.: The cultural heritage landscapes apply to public lands as well as private property so it's all of the land that's included within the boundaries for the cultural heritage landscape. The guidance is provided through the policies in the Secondary Plan as well as the Urban Design Guidelines, so that's how it would apply. That's where we've come up with recommendations related to heights or setbacks or those Zoning By-law recommendations.

7. There are challenges to increasing access from narrow secondary streets. Proposals for new developments along John Street and White Oak have had suggestions to ensure access to Hamilton rather than off of the secondary streets.  
Response from Brook McIlroy Urban Design Consultants: This is certainly something that will have to be considered on a site-by-site basis as some secondary streets lend themselves as vehicle access routes, and some do not. Where possible, we would look to ensure that new secondary streets provide adequate widths and traffic movements to enable them to function as good vehicle access routes.

In our plan, we look at if new secondary streets become part of that street network, we want to ensure that they are designed in such a way that we can use them as those access routes to try to remove a lot of the traffic turning on and off of Hamilton and Dundas. That isn't to say that every curb cut can be eliminated from those streets because there certainly are existing streets that don't lend themselves as those
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Live Information Meeting Questions/Comments and Responses Noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vehicle access roads and that might be because of what’s adjacent to them or simply the widths of them that they won’t support being a main access road. It is really a site-by-site basis and I think in these guidelines we’re really hoping to achieve those new streets so that they can start alleviating some of that traffic pressure on the main roads and eliminate a lot of those turning movements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. **Is this plan suggesting that the Sobeys property will be redeveloped?**  
   *Response from Brook McIlroy Urban Design Consultants:* We are not making any suggestion that this property will be redeveloped. Our team simply selected it as a good example of a large lot where we could illustrate how the principles of the guidelines could be applied. The same principles could apply to any of the large lots along Hamilton Street were they to be redeveloped.  
What we find in drafting urban design guidelines is that a picture is worth 1000 and more words because we can have all this policy language written but until you really see how it hits the ground on the real example it’s hard to really understand what those relationships are. We often find that these demonstration plans which are our hypothetical examples are a really good way to show how the guidelines can be applied. In no way do they indicate any future development or the potential for development. That was a selected site that we thought was of a nice size and it had the frontages and a lot of conditions we wanted to speak to in terms of how the guidelines will work but there’s no indication that anything will be happening soon on that lot.

9. **We have recently learned about the Truck Route Master Plan which is underway. Why is the Waterdown bypass not shown or discussed in it? You can never achieve the pedestrian, historical and retail goals for the Waterdown town centre if the large trucks continue to speed through the town causing noise, dirt, and distraction. Dundas Street through the historic core town centre must have “Trucks Prohibited” regulations to have successful village character.**  
   *Response from City Transportation Staff:* We have a Truck Route Master Plan Public Information Centre next Thursday from 6 to 8 through our Engage Hamilton portal (see link below). The reason why it’s not on the maps currently is because the road doesn’t exist so we think we have to really think about how fluid that plan will be. In the future once that road is extended to Hwy 6 there will certainly be an opportunity to guide any truck traffic heading to and from Hwy 401 area or other areas in north Flamborough to take that route. We will certainly encourage them to do so. In the interim there are things in our Transportation Management Plan that we could do to reduce and mitigate those negative effects of trucks; reducing speeds to manage the noise and vibration issues that affect the heritage core. We have that challenge in the lower city as well. Any time you have truck traffic going through a pedestrian-focused area there’s a negative effect and we want to mitigate that as best as possible. We appreciate the comment, and we encourage you to participate in that Public Information Centre and provide us all your comments through that avenue. That is next Thursday a week from today. If you were to go back onto the Engage Hamilton site, you can find that under Truck Route Master Plan “TRMP”. Email Link provided: [https://engage.hamilton.ca/trmp](https://engage.hamilton.ca/trmp)
**Live Information Meeting Questions/Comments and Responses Noted**

10. Are traffic lights to be synchronized during peak travel times 6:00 to 8:30 AM easterly and 4:00 to 6:30 PM westerly? Presently commute times of the last seven years have increased two to three minutes per year.

*Response from City Transportation Staff:* Through our Transportation Operations and Maintenance Division in the City we do network reviews of the traffic signal synchronization periodically so that’s something that we would always manage and monitor to see what we could do. That's good for vehicular traffic however sometimes from a pedestrian perspective that creates an issue as well, having too much synchronization. There’s that balance between the desire for the vehicular traffic while trying to balance that pedestrian focused urban community core. These are things that we will always continue to work on and manage and adapt now and in the future.

11. St. James church at 306 Parkside Drive is located within the boundaries of the Waterdown Node Secondary Plan study area and currently has a proposal to build 40 townhomes on the property with the church to remain. Does the Secondary Plan limit the size of the development within the Waterdown Node study area?

*See response to Question 12*

12. When approved would the Secondary Plan prevent or limit a large-scale development (40 townhomes) which is proposed for the site?

*Response from City Staff:* (Response to questions 11 and 12) The secondary plan specifies through the land use designations that we’re applying the types of uses that are permitted. It also talks about building heights and in some situations provides directions for densities as well. That property is currently an institutional designation. We are proposing to maintain that. The standards of the institutional designation are implemented through zoning. The townhouse form of development, the secondary plan would not prohibit that. That type of adaptive reuse is permitted on institutional lands when they are no longer being used for institutional purposes. Any proposal that comes in for a site like that would have to comply with all of the policies of both the Secondary Plan and the Urban Hamilton Official Plan. Those are things regarding appropriate design, compatibility, and heritage conservation. It could be looking at the design of the buildings, the orientation, the layout, access, landscaping, all those types of matters. A heritage impact assessment report would also be a requirement if we did get an application for that site. So, there would be some limitations on what can be done. The townhouse type of development would not be prohibited but there would be some parameters set around how you could do that.

13. I have concerns about the proposed development at St. James Church on Parkside. It is population dense and will impact the core in a very negative way. Traffic is already in nightmare on Parkside, and this will only make it worse. It’s too many units for the size of land. How does adding the proposed housing units onto the St. James United Church property maintain the visual aspects of the Waterdown old core?

*Response from Brook McIlroy Urban Design Consultants:* In terms in terms of the contextual fit, this is why the guidelines become very important. It’s because the guidelines have the ability to get into a certain level of detail and granularity when looking at proposed developments to ensure that very specific things help those...
developments to fit into the context. So, we're talking about everything from scale and height and massing but also really looking at materials and composition and what this building appears like from the public realm, from the street, from adjacent properties. Within the guidelines we're really looking at ensuring that cladding materials, lot layouts and setbacks are appropriate. When you see a development and say that is too dense or it's bad there are a lot of nuanced details about it that you can start to look at and analyze and figure out why it seems so dense and bad. This is why it's really important that as part of the approvals process these guidelines are going to be embedded as part of that Secondary Plan and spoken directly to in the Secondary Plan. As developments come in and the site plan control approvals process moves its way through the system it's the staff at the City that are able to take all of those specifics within the guidelines and evaluate and work with the developer to provide comment on how that can be achieved within that development site. It's a critical component and I think it'll help with those types of developments that that some might see and be shocked at either the size or the density of them. I think that that's why this is such a critical piece right now.

14. Will there be access to the proposed housing units via Kelly Street? Specifically, there is the very narrow piece of land between two of the Kelly Street homes that connects Kelly Street to the church parking lot. What is to become of that narrow piece of land?

See response to Question 15

15. Traffic congestion at the intersection of Kelly/Main, Mill/Parkside and Main/Parkside already exists. How will these congestion issues be addressed through this proposed plan and development?

Response from City Staff: (Response to questions 14 and 15) There have been no applications submitted on that site but typically if there were a type of infill development like townhouses, we'd be looking to put the access off of a collector or arterial road, not off of Kelly Street. That's usually the requirement for traffic and transportation staff. In terms of the traffic review of a proposal our transportation planning staff review every proposal that comes in so they would be responsible for looking at impacts of the proposal, whether it can meet current requirements and what type of impact it will have on traffic. That would be something that they would have to do a review of in detail when we get an application.

16. What is the timeline for the secondary plan going forward to approval?

Response from City Staff: The timeline that we're hoping for is to get a final report and a final plan to the City's Planning Committee and Council sometime in the fall before the end of the year.

17. Why was Mary Hopkins School not included in the Cultural Heritage Protection area? If this school is closed the property could be developed and that would be a disaster for the heritage area of Waterdown. The school itself should be preserved for its heritage features.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Live Information Meeting Questions/Comments and Responses Noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response from Archaeological Services Inc.:</strong> Mary Hopkins School is within the Mill Street Heritage Conservation District, so it is designated under part five of the Ontario Heritage Act. It is already protected.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. **Regarding the Sobeys example (albeit a new compelling vision) it seems like a major reduction of car parking. Do you feel that that can be a reality?**  
   **Response from Brook McIlroy Urban Design Consultants:** In terms of the example lot plan, we're looking at typical mixed-use development and considering that there will be different parking rates for different types of buildings and some larger buildings. If they end up being partially office or commercial, they may have some underground parking with a lot of surface parking for things like retail. So, what we've done is a combined example of some of those uses. You would see an overall reduction but don't forget that when you introduce a new street network and show street parking on all the secondary side streets you actually introduce a remarkable number of easy to find new spots. So, it's not all located in lots, but it's bridged between those interior surface lots, some underground, some under buildings and then also on street edges. A lot of times with the mid-rise development form a lot of the parking can be underground in those developments. That's why you might not see quite the same amount on the surface.

19. **Can you provide clarity on where applications for exception to go to 8 storeys might be considered?**  
   **Response from Brook McIlroy Urban Design Consultants:** What we were looking at is that the largest and deepest lots just on the west side of Hamilton Street might be considered for buildings above 6 stories up to the 8 story range. That really relates back to some of the guidelines in the draft urban design guidelines document. We'd be looking at how the massing would work in order to reduce the perception of that height and looking at where the placement of those buildings might be and how the transition works, having some sort of intervening lower-rise land use in between that and any other existing neighborhood areas on the other side of those Hamilton Street properties.

20. **Will all C5 zoning (6 to 8 storey limit) be removed in the old core of Waterdown (Dundas Street, Mill Street and Main Street) and replaced with the BD zoning (2 to 3 storey limit) as per the Secondary Plan recommendations?**  
   **Response from City Staff:** The zoning in the area used to be a Business District zoning under the Flamborough Zoning By-law. Now all the commercial zoning in the amalgamated City has been consolidated into one zoning by-law which is the C5 zoning that's being referenced. We wouldn't be reverting back to the original zoning when we're making zoning changes, we would be amending the current zoning that's there. So, we'd be looking at amending the C5 or the C5A zoning depending on what portion of the node, in order to be consistent with the Secondary Plan and things like the height recommendations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Live Information Meeting Questions/Comments and Responses Noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 21. **By-law number 20-101 was in effect for one year from the date of passing (May 20, 2020). Now that the year has passed, does the city plan to seek another similar by-law?**  
*Response from City Staff:* Another interim control by-law is not anticipated. There is a three-year moratorium on passing another interim control by law in an area after the interim control by-law tool has been used once, since that by-law was in place for a full year and has now expired, we cannot pass another interim control by-law in that area for the time being. |
| 22. **On one of the maps in this study a potential corridor between Sealey Park and the waterfall is shown. I think the idea is great, but wonder what is being considered as this connection would need to cross the rail line?**  
*Response from City Transportation Staff:* Identification of that link is important and will be carried forward to the Recreational Trails Master Plan. That Plan will look at a little bit more at feasibility but absolutely we would want to ensure safe crossing of any rail line. It would probably be a structure which would come over top of that (railroad) to make sure that there would be a safe crossing. We wouldn't want to have anybody cross at grade if at all avoidable so that would be something that would be looked at in more detail, but we just want to identify the linkage as part of this process. |
| 23. **Is there still a moratorium in the heritage area?**  
*Response from City Staff:* There is no hold on any development in the heritage area at this time. Any properties that are in the existing heritage district would still be subject to the heritage permit process for any changes within that area. |
| 24. **Can you describe the goal or outcome of implementing a heritage tree by-law? Will this deter the destruction of old (healthy) trees on private properties?**  
*Response from City Staff:* The idea behind a tree by-law is that it would protect, maintain, and enhance the long-term health of trees that were subject to that by-law. Usually there would be some indication of the size of tree within the by-law. The diameter of the tree trunk would define which trees it would apply to. |
| 25. **What planning tool will be used to implement urban design policies for residential areas? Would site plan control be what’s used to implement the urban design policies?**  
*Response from City Staff:* Within the residential areas the primary tools we’re looking at in order to address some of the heritage things, it would not be through site plan control. Typically, that process is for larger developments and not for single detached housing. What we’re looking at doing primarily is the zoning adjustments to try and see if there are adjustments, we can make that would reflect some of the things that we’re trying to maintain in the area. Also, the Heritage Conservation District Study would be a follow-up measure that we’re looking at that might introduce a district in the area where a heritage permit would be a way to look at proposed changes in the area before something is built. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Live Information Meeting Questions/Comments and Responses Noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.</strong> Could affordable housing be considered an approved use for institutional zoning so as to provide perhaps a more shortened way to have affordable housing built, giving recognition to the zoning challenges that can be onerous? Given as an example, could intensification of the Mary Hopkins School grounds include affordable housing if it was considered that you would allow it as part of institutional zoning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Response from City Staff:</em> When we’re looking at secondary plan policies and zoning requirements it doesn’t set out specific levels of affordability. That’s not something we can regulate through those tools. We can only regulate types of land uses and things like the heights and densities. As with the other site at the St. James church property, the institutional zoning does allow for reuse for low density residential uses if an institutional use ceases or if there is something like excess surplus lands. Those types of things like single detached and street townhouses are something that could be permitted within the institutional zone, but the affordable housing component is more of the ownership type of aspect which is something that we don’t regulate through the Secondary Plan or zoning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.</strong> What is planned to increase safety of pedestrians along Mill Street south of Dundas? They are now crossing under the rail line on a very narrow path.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Response from City Staff:</em> That is addressed by the proposed Sealey Park crossing to the waterfall. That was the intent of that rail overpass structure. That would resolve that issue of the tight right-of-way with the rail bridge there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28.</strong> Section 5.1.1 of the design guidelines speaks to clear glazing at street level. This may compromise some heritage features of buildings in the core. Would there be consideration to amending that narrative?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Response from Brook McIlroy Urban Design Consultants:</em> The first thing to mention is that in terms of the requirements for facades like glazing it applies to new development so not existing buildings. If we have heritage buildings that exist in the area, we’re not saying that they need to suddenly comply with minimum glazing requirements. The second piece would be that in terms of building within the heritage area and finding a fit I think that a larger glazing actually fits very well with a lot of the traditional heritage buildings. You’ll see a large range depending on original uses of these buildings, but there are great examples of buildings from the 1840s and 1850s where designs were opening up the lower commercial facades with cast iron beams that are even more glazed than a lot of buildings we see today. I think there are ways to incorporate that and still fit into the heritage context. I don’t think they are necessarily competing interests, but they are certainly going to be important considerations for what is adjacent to that site. When you are building directly adjacent or within a heritage area you have to consider what the surrounding context is and what’s appropriate there. Trying to hit those thresholds within the guidelines is as important as ensuring the contextual fit of the surrounding buildings as well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live Information Meeting Questions/Comments and Responses Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 29. The core (Main/John/Mill) currently has a zoning by-law that permits urban farming and some commercial activity. Is the proposal by going to Residential 2 density removing that alternative expanded use and what implications does this have on current site use?  
*Response from City Staff:* The area that I think is being talked about is the historic core area and some of the permissions in that area within the zoning. What we're looking at with the land use designations is essentially following the current zoning that's there. Any lands that have a commercial mixed-use zoning are still designated for commercial mixed use and lands outside of that which were zoned for residential are still designated for residential. We are not making any real changes to the boundaries there, we're just mostly looking at tweaking the existing zoning for those height permissions and ensuring that the pedestrian-focused requirements that are in the historic core are being carried over to some portions of Hamilton Street.  

*Additional comment from City staff after the meeting:* Some residential areas closest to the historic commercial core have zoning which permits an urban farm, a community garden, and an office of one Physical or Mental Health Practitioner, Physician or Dentist located within a Single Detached Dwelling (Flamborough Zoning By-law Core Area Residential (R5) Zone). The proposed Secondary Plan would remove the permission for a Health Practitioner, Physician or Dentist within single detached dwellings. These would only be permitted within the Mixed-Use commercial area. |

| 30. After the Waterdown Node Secondary Plan is complete will the study continue on the possibility of an additional heritage district along Dundas and Main streets in Waterdown? If so, what is the timeline to complete that study?  
*Response from City Staff:* There is a Heritage Conservation District Study being recommended for the area and as the question implied it would be a follow-up step to address heritage conservation. It would not be part of the Secondary Plan, but it is a measure that may help to implement some of those objectives for heritage conservation in the secondary plan. We are gathering any feedback that the community has about what areas they may like to see protected through a Heritage Conservation District study. We'll be proposing a study area boundary as part of our recommendations. A study can take roughly 18 to 24 months from the initiation of the study through to completion of the final passing of the by-law and implementation of the Heritage Conservation District Plan. |

| 31. Will there be guidelines to prevent bird strike on new building windows? I am thinking of feather friendly technologies.  
*Response from Brook McIlroy Urban Design Consultants:* The guidelines do contain guidance currently about deploying bird friendly design especially through facade designs. Things like building materials and visual markers are referenced in the document currently. It's becoming so important. Toronto was one of the first cities to really have a robust bird friendly guidelines document so we've really looked to that, and we hope that can happen everywhere in Hamilton. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Live Information Meeting Questions/Comments and Responses Noted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **32.** Bedrock exists at the northwest corner of Hwy 5 and Hamilton Street two meters below grade. How feasible would underground parking be achieved or proposed?  
*Response from Brook McIlroy Urban Design Consultants:* Site by site it may be feasible. It’s certainly possible to build underground but as soon as you have a lot of bedrock the cost goes up very quickly, so it’s a site-by-site question for sure. |
| **33.** The Memorial skate park will be undersized for youth growth. Is there expansion or alternate site proposals?  
*Response from City Staff:* The project team will follow up with Recreation staff to confirm if there are any future changes proposed for the skate park. The project team is not aware of any expansions proposed to the skate park at this time. Park amenities in the various parks are assessed regularly by our recreation staff to determine what kinds of facilities might be needed and if there are changes needed within the parks over time. |
| **34.** Can you please clarify what a designation under the Ontario Heritage Act means as a landowner? What approvals would we need if we were to modify our home?  
*Response from City Staff:* Municipalities are able to manage and guide change to properties that have been designated under the Ontario Heritage Act through the Heritage Permit Process. For information on this process please visit: [https://www.hamilton.ca/city-planning/heritage-properties/heritage-permits](https://www.hamilton.ca/city-planning/heritage-properties/heritage-permits) |

**General Comments noted at the meeting:**

- I trust I will get support that going up to 8 storeys in the secondary plan is too high. Please consider going to 6 storey maximum and step backs/setbacks should be considered to minimize perceived massing.
- Perhaps density (# units per hectare) could be a consideration/limitation in the Secondary Plan
- I appreciate all the work of this committee. Great to hear the emphasis on green space, mixed use areas, and pedestrian access. Question of whether there is discussion on increasing/improving access to Smokey Hollow. This is a great feature of the city but very hard to access.
- I think the concern around the interim control bylaw is around development on Main St. North, which is not in the Heritage Conservation District.
- Thank you for the thoughtful approach to these recommendations. There might be a few tweaks, but we are definitely on the right path for our Secondary Plan!
- Thank you for the presentation!
Appendix 2
Comments received on the Phase 3 Materials through Engage Hamilton

Through Engage Hamilton, the City’s online public engagement platform, the public was able to submit general written comments on the Phase 3 Materials. The following are the comments received. For the following, specific names and addresses provided have been omitted from this report. Each represents an individual’s comments. The following comments are verbatim.

Provide your comments on the Phase 3 materials

1. I have lived in Waterdown for 22 Years in the older section of town and have been a contributor to local media and area neighbourhood projects. Amalgamation with Hamilton was a huge mistake. Waterdown has gone from being a local village to a suburban glut, there has been too much growth allowed, and too fast growth. Developers are given a carte blanche and the developments are out of character with the old Flamborough and far too dense. Your study said "Overall, the vision and principles are supported." This is FAR from the truth. "One comment suggested that the vision be amended to focus more on strengthening the village character." This is laughable given that the City of Hamilton Council, planners, and developers have gone out of their way to bulldoze Waterdown and its original village character. To be honest we've never felt more like leaving Waterdown since its out-of-control growth in the past 5 years. It's a sad shame that improving the tax base (that ends up really only benefiting downtown Hamilton) overrides all decent provisions for the existing older properties and residents of Waterdown.

2. I believe an addition to Principle 6- Improve Sustainability & Resilience to climate Change on page 4 page 5 of 35 is required.

3. To Principle 6 add v) Support infrastructure improvements in order to provide for safe cycling and other modes of active transport which contribute resiliency to climate change through reduction of carbon.

4. I like the idea of limiting building height in the historical areas, downtown core.

5. These are comments that relate to and go beyond the phase 3 materials.

- Intersection of Hwy 5 and Hamilton Street - consider ways to improve the appearance of this main intersection - it's an eyesore -facilitate more safe ways to cross Hwy 5 which cuts through the town, especially the stretch between Riley Street and Dairy Queen

- Reflect on the impression as you enter the town down Hwy 5 from both directions - not welcoming, not attractive entry -accommodating needs of senior citizens should always be a priority in planning.

- What considerations have been given to this population? -how many more live/work buildings do we need? Do these represent the character of the town? -how many more condos do we need?
• Consider quality of life - e.g., Should we be approving townhouses so close to Hwy 5? How will the density of the town and the resulting transportation issues affect the quality of life for the people in the community?

• Build a community centre in Waterdown - pool, gym, courts, library etc. - see Burlington's Tansley Woods as an example - we've all given the YMCA here a try and it's a disappointment - not working to bring community together and quality of services is low.

• Looking around other areas in Hamilton and over to Burlington there are much better outdoor recreation areas such as more multi-use courts for both tennis and pickle ball - it's great to have parks for the children, what about places for adults to exercise? At least consider adding pickle ball nets to Sealey Park tennis courts.

• Do something about the business of the waterfall area on Waterdown Road - someone is going to get hurt - this doesn't necessarily mean shutting it down and making it challenging to access (i.e., Websters Falls) - how about considering creating a larger parking lot, communicating about alternative entry points. Also, signage needs to be added and speed levels dropped through that area before someone gets hurt.

6. Commercial uses not mandatory...doesn't make sense. If you're going to require commercial on ground floor, make it mandatory. Buildings in the downtown area should be able to be increased to the next level of development. For the downtown core, this would mean potentially allowing up to 5-6 stories instead of 2-3. Upper floors should be required to be set back to maintain consistent street wall but should be allowed. Focus on the intersection of Hamilton and Main St. as a mixed use, destination area... replace gas stations and strip plazas with mixed use with retail oriented to the street. Widen sidewalks and add cycling facilities. Waterdown is a prime destination for cycle tourism despite being designed as a car first town. A large number of Hamilton, Burlington, Oakville, and Mississauga residents visit Waterdown on their bikes every weekend. Embrace this and make the roads in and around Waterdown safer to cycle on, which will support area businesses in catering to this massive market opportunity. It will take a long time and a lot of investment to deliver on the desire to make Hamilton St. pedestrian oriented. Right now, this area is a car sewer, an urban heat island and an example of suburban blight. Continue to invest in prioritizing non-car modes of transportation in this area and do not give in to developers who want to compromise this vision in order to turn a profit.

7. I would like to know if the Secondary Plan, when approved, would prevent, or limit a large-scale development (40 townhomes) which is being proposed for 306 Parkside Drive, property of the St. James Church which is within the Waterdown Node Secondary Plan study area?

8. How does adding the proposed housing units onto the St James United church property maintain the visual aspects of the Waterdown old core? - will there be access to the proposed housing units via Kelly Street? Specifically, there is the very narrow piece of land between two of the Kelly Street homes that connects Kelly Street to the church parking lot. What is to become of that narrow piece of land? - traffic congestion at the
intersection of Kelly/Main, Mill/Parkside, and Main/Parkside already exists. How will these congestion issues be resolved through this proposed plan and development?

9. Thanks for providing this information. It doesn’t appear like enough clarity is around density of development in institutional sites (St. James United Church, Mary Hopkins school). The biggest risk to the Waterdown community node is what happens on these sites and the focus should be on those sites. The Waterdown community node and the core streets of Mill, Main, and Victoria will not be able to support the added traffic of highly dense development of townhomes. Careful consideration needs to be made for these sites. Otherwise, there is significant risk that these sites will be like the rest of the intense development in the west and east Waterdown, and the historical character of these sites will be lost.

10. The city must allow institutional sites with the ability to sever lands to neighbouring residential lots. For example, St. James Church is only considering severing the unused land due for financial reasons. Allowing neighbouring residential lots to purchase some of this excess land as opposed to intensifying the core with townhomes (for which townhomes do not fit within the historical nature of the core) would fit within the nodes mandate. Careful consideration should be made with regards to these sites as the attraction to the core will be entirely lost and the core will become like the rest of Waterdown which I don’t believe is the intention.

11. Under section 8.1.2 of the guidelines for large site intensification, it mentions a setback of 7.5 metres. This is not a standard within the neighbourhood as backyard is back-to-back. The potential for a multi unit building to only be 7.5 metres from the back property line is very different than the norm. Therefore, I highly suggest this setback be increased to be aligned with the average setbacks within the neighbourhood.

12. As stated in the documents, the Waterdown core is low rise residential homes with an average of 2.5 stories. However, the institutional intensification describes that up to 3 stories can be allowed. This is contradictory to the vision of maintaining the neighbourhood characteristics. Therefore, institutional sites should not be able to build 3 stories in the core.

13. The recommendations for what residential homeowners can do in terms of renovations/additions are very specific. However, when it comes to institutional sites the recommendations are entirely vague. There needs to be much more specificity with regards to building on institutional sites. This is also where there is significant risk to the historic nature of the area. Please provide more guidance in this area to ensure institutional sites are not overwhelmed with development. This is the risk; not what homeowners do.
Appendix 3
Comments received by email on the Phase 3 Materials

1. The current Review (nearly 300 pages) completely disregards your entire Community Node Planning process and your Secondary Plan Development. It barely mentions the Bypass which has been underway for 20 years. Dundas Street through the central village of Waterdown should NOT be designated as a Truck Route! Surely the Bypass Route was intended to take all large truck traffic away from this local historic area, which you rightly plan for pedestrian, family safety and local business scale.

Your publicly presented visions will be impossible to achieve if the Truck Route continues on Dundas Street. Your excellent plans are doomed to failure.

The QEW, Highway 403, Highway 6 and the Bypass are scaled and sufficient for all through traffic.

A Truck Master Plan should lay the foundations for the future as does a Community Secondary Plan.

To quote Donna Skelly MPP “it is absolutely imperative that the Bypass be built . . . traffic nightmare in Waterdown is unacceptable”

Omar Shams himself said “Does that truck NEED to be THERE?”

Our public representatives for Waterdown and Hamilton must be responsible to thoroughly evaluate all studies together for compatibility and cohesiveness. The public process of consultation and planning is wasted if it can not be implemented.

We thank you for your consideration and hope for your successful correction of these issues.

2. Letter from Urban Solutions (see next page)
June 7, 2021

VIA EMAIL

Melanie Pham, MCIP, RPP
Senior Planner, Community Planning & GIS
City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5
melanie.pham@hamilton.ca

Dear Ms. Pham,

RE: Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan

UrbanSolutions Planning & Land Development Consultants Inc. (UrbanSolutions) is the authorized planning consultant acting on behalf of Parkside Hills Inc., (the Owner) of the property located on the lands municipally known as 609 & 615 Hamilton Street North, 3 Nisbet Boulevard, and 129-137 Trudell Circle in the City of Hamilton. UrbanSolutions submitted applications for an Official Plan Amendment (UHOPA-17-03), Zoning By-law Amendment (ZAC-17-013) and Draft Plan of Subdivision (25T-201702) for the subject lands on December 23, 2016, which were subsequently appealed to the Ontario Municipal Board on February 3, 2017 on the basis of a non-decision (PL171131). At this stage, the proponent and the City of Hamilton have been engaging in productive settlement discussions.

The purpose of this letter is to acknowledge and monitor the City of Hamilton’s evolving Waterdown Community Node Secondary Plan. We recognize that the subject lands were initially part of the Study Area for the proposed Secondary Plan but have since been excluded from the proposed boundaries of the Waterdown Secondary Plan. We are in support of this decision and the ongoing Secondary Plan development process, provided the current land use designation attributed to the subject lands remains unchanged.

We ask that our office is notified of any updates on the development of the Secondary Plan, as well as any decisions that are made on this matter.

On behalf of the Owner, we appreciate the City’s efforts in this regard and for the opportunity to participate in this important process.
Please feel free to contact the undersigned with any questions or comments.

Regards,

UrbanSolutions

Matt Johnston, MCIP, RPP
Principal

Scott Beedie, BURPI
Planner

cc: Parkside Hills Inc. (via email)
Mr. Scott Snider, Turkstra Mazza Associates (via email)
Ms. Anna Toumanians, Turkstra Mazza Associates (via email)