



City of Hamilton PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM

Meeting #: 20-012
Date: October 20, 2020
Time: 9:30 a.m.
Location: Council Chambers, Hamilton City Hall
71 Main Street West

Lisa Kelsey, Legislative Coordinator (905) 546-2424 ext. 4605

	Pages
7. PUBLIC HEARINGS / DELEGATIONS	
7.2. Applications to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Glanbrook Zoning By-law No. 464 for Lands Located at 1912 Rymal Road East, Glanbrook (PED20164) (Ward 9)	
*7.2.a. Written Submissions:	3
(i) Tony and Shannon Porcaro	
7.3. Applications for a Rural Hamilton Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law Amendment for Lands Located at 8475 English Church Road East, Glanbrook (PED18077) (Ward 11)	
*7.3.b. Added Written Submissions:	4
(ii) Kunal Kanani	
(iii) Sonia Pronek	
*7.3.c. Ed Fothergill, Agent	6
Video Link: http://hwy6-lot-relocation.com/	
7.4. Urban Hens Backyard Pilot Program	
*7.4.a. Added Written Delegations:	8
(ix) Maria Mule	

11. NOTICES OF MOTION

- *11.1. Demolition Permit for 1355, 1359, 1375 Upper James St. and 16, 24, 34, 40, 48 Stone Church Rd. East

Attention: Legislative Coordinator, Planning Committee, City of Hamilton, Ontario

October 19, 2020

Re: File ZAC-18-029; UHOPA-18-11

Subject Property 1912 Rymal Road East, Glanbrook

My husband and I would like to again formally object to the second notice we received for the Zoning By-law Amendments (ZAC) and the Urban Hamilton Official Plan Amendment (UHOPA), allowing for the construction of a five-storey building for the following reasons:

1. Our backyard backs on to the pond at Rymal and Fletcher's Road and we feel that this is an invasion of our privacy to have a five-storey building with 92 units that will have a clear line of vision into our yard. We pay a lot of property taxes to have full enjoyment and privacy of our yard. It will create additional noise and litter from the occupants, visitors and contractors that service the building.
2. The increase of traffic (115 parking spaces) will dangerously strain an already overcrowded Rymal Road. With several schools and business's located nearby, which alone create heavy traffic, approval of this project means even more traffic from the persons that reside in the building, visitors to the building and contractors that service the building. This creates unsafe hazards for everyone but particularly for the children that live and go to school in the area. Traffic will also bottleneck at the nearby intersection creating additional hazards as people enter and leave the subject property.
3. There is a large daycare next door and it always concerns us when a large amount of people will be living next to an area where there are children. We worry about an increased chance of unsavoury occupants, visitors or contractors doing harm or taking pictures of vulnerable children as they play.
4. There is also wildlife that live in the stormwater pond at Rymal and Fletcher Road. They will have their surroundings upheaved and altered from the additional noise and litter the occupants, visitors and contractors that service the building will create.
5. Additionally, we cannot understand why the Planning Committee would take the time to make an Official Plan if all someone has to do is apply to amend it when the plan doesn't suit them. The Official Plan was made for a reason, stick to it please.
6. It also creates a blight on the sightline as there are no other buildings in the area that are of that height. The Eramosa Karst sits across from the proposed development, this will create a harmful impact on the Karst ecosystem.
7. There has been a steady increase of criminal activities in the Summit Park area without an increase of police presence. Having 92 units occupied, visitors that will visit these occupants and contractors that will service this property will only increase the need for more policing as potential for more crime will also increase.

We ask that the planning committee give serious consideration to these issues going forward as they will set a precedent for any future development.

Sincerely,

Tony and Shannon Porcaro
Hannon, ON

From: KUNAL KANANI
Sent: October 14, 2020 9:17 AM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: Files RHOPA-17-039 and ZAC-17-082

To whom it may concern:

This comment is in response to the Notice of Public Meeting of the Planning Committee regarding the plan amendment and zoning by-law amendment of the subject property 8475 English Church Road East, Glanbrook.

As a resident of English Church Road, I am opposed to such a plan to create 2 new residential lots. I value the quiet open space and country living on English Church Road, and don't want to have that ruined by further development. I have spoken to the owner of the land across the street from the proposed lots (currently farmland), and they have expressed that if these amendments are passed, they will also try to sever much of their land for residential development. I don't want to see a residential subdivision across the street! To me, further development will only degrade the quality of life on this beautiful quiet road, so I am strongly opposed to these changes.

Thank You.

From: Sonia Pronek
Sent: October 19, 2020 6:06 AM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: Notice of public meeting 8475 English church rd mt hope

Legislative coordinator
Planning Committee
71 Main Street west 1sr fl
Hamilton, Ont L8P4Y5
Clerk@hamilton.ca

I have just received this notice in my P.O. Box over the weekend. I do not believe I can be a part of this on Oct 20 2020 due to my line of work and schedule.

I do not agree with this amendment. I am not in any agreement to build more houses and change the zoning on land in this neighborhood and out in the country.

This neighbourhood is becoming congested and the volume of traffic has increased due to the business smacked out in the country and the amount of change that is happening on the street and especially the nearby roads and residential has taken away from the country.

If these amendments don't stop this will continue to set presidency for other people and builders. I am afraid that the golf course who has other vacant land will keep building more properties.

In front of 8422 English church there is vacant land this has now caused fear for me as this is in front of my property.

We Do not need more development in the country we need green space, forest and need to keep the land in the country safe for wildlife.

I am not agreeing anymore changes on English Church regarding building on vacant land. The country must be and look like the country not a residential neighborhood in the city.

I would like to be included and notified when a decision is made on this meeting, please send email correspondence.

Sincerely,
Sonia Pronek

FPD**FOTHERGILL PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT INC.**

62 DAFFODIL CRES. • HAMILTON, ON L9K 1E1 • PHONE: (905) 577-1077 • FAX: (905) 546-0545 • E-MAIL: edf@nas.net

October 16, 2020

Lisa Kelsey
Legislative Coordinator
Planning Committee
City of Hamilton
71 Main St. W.
Hamilton, ON

Dear Lisa:

**Re: Application for Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-law
8475 English Church Road
Willow Valley Holdings Inc.**

Please accept this letter as notice that we will be asking the Planning Committee to defer consideration of this matter at the upcoming Public Meeting on Tuesday October 20. The staff report notes that we have been endeavouring to meet with the local councillor to review this matter. That has most recently been delayed by the complications arising out of the Covid situation. We have finally been able to establish a meeting time with the Councillor. However, the first available date for that meeting is Friday October 30. The date has not yet been confirmed, but hopefully if not confirmed for that date, can be held in the next week or so following the 30th.

The second reason for the deferral will be to ask for further input from the Planning Department. Reviewing the recommendation report, it is clear that staff have not fully assessed the full implications of what is being proposed. Recommendation (a) and (b) for denial are based solely upon the consideration of the severance application on English Church Road. If that were the only matter in front of the Committee, we would agree with staff that the application should be denied and would not be pursuing this with the Committee.

What is missing from the staff report is consideration of transfer of development rights for two residential lots which front onto Upper James Street, and relocating them to a location adjacent to the golf course. The proposal also calls for the consolidation of three small parcels into one large agricultural parcel, which is a highly desirable objective of the Regional Official Plan and the Provincial Policy Statement. Given that the proposal generates no net new development, many of the development related policies of the Provincial Policy Statement are not applicable and should not be considered in the assessment of this application.

It is noted that the focus of the denial is based on the consideration of noise impacts. The Report at the bottom of page 172 and 173 notes that the proponent submitted a Noise Study. However, the Planning Report did not identify the conclusions of that report which stated that the cumulative noise impacts for the proposed lots on English Church Road are acoustically comparable to the noise impacts of the existing residential lots on Upper James Street. Therefore, there is no difference from a noise perspective whether there are two new houses are built on Upper James Street or on English Church Road.

There are other omissions in the staff report, including the absence of comments from Traffic on the comparative benefits of driveways on Upper James Street as opposed to English Church Road, and the results of technical studies which were peer reviewed and confirm the servicing feasibility of each lot.

The staff report also erroneously states that agricultural lands will be lost through this application. That is not true. The lands to be considered for new homes on English Church Road are part of the golf course and are not being farmed. Further, the benefits of farm consolidation resulting from this proposal have not been identified in the report.

We believe it is important for the Committee to fully assess all of the implications of the application which essentially improve the future quality of life for two residential dwellings that are proposed to back onto the golf course as opposed to fronting on Upper James Street, both within close proximity to the Airport. The fundamental question for the Committee is whether it is preferable to have two new dwellings constructed on Upper James Street where future residents will not only be faced with safety concerns, but also noise from both the Airport and the roadway, or to have two new homes built on the quieter side street, backing onto the golf course.

To have a better understanding of the site context, can you please forward the video attached to my transmittal email, prepared by Mr. Schiedel, to all of the Committee members in advance of the meeting.

Mr. Schiedel and I will be in attendance at Planning Committee and will be speaking further to this matter at the Committee.

We are hoping that with the site visit with the Councillor and the consideration by the Committee of the full range of implications of this application, that the application could be supported.

Sincerely,

FOTHERGILL PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT INC.


E.J. Fothergill, MCIP/RPP
President

cc. Steve Schiedel
June Christy
Elyse Meneray

From: Maria
Sent: October 13, 2020 8:45 PM
To: Danko, John-Paul <John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca>
Cc: clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: Backyard chickens

Hello Councillor Danko,

I am a resident of Ward 8 who really would love to have my children experience raising chickens. It would give them responsibility, assist with their mental health, as COVID has thrown us many curveballs in the health and wellbeing of our family members and they need something positive to help them cope, and we have ample space. It would also help my husband and I as well. I know that there are breeds that are silent which would be great, even though I think dogs make more noise and they are rampant in the city. Also, if we had chickens I would ensure that they stay in my backyard and not walk them around the neighbourhood and let them leave their droppings on every lawn they see as many of my neighbourhood dog owners like to do, which makes mowing the lawn fun. We would build the appropriate dwelling for them and enjoy fresh eggs daily. I truly hope that you consider backing this project not only as a representative of our ward but as a parent and family man as well.

Sincerely,
Maria Mulè and family

CITY OF HAMILTON

NOTICE OF MOTION

Planning Committee

Date: October 20, 2020

MOVED BY COUNCILLOR J.P. DANKO.....

SECONDED BY.....

DEMOLITION PERMIT FOR 1355, 1359, 1375 UPPER JAMES STREET AND 16, 24, 34, 40, 48 STONE CHURCH ROAD EAST

WHEREAS, the owner has received zoning approval and is currently working through site plan approvals.

WHEREAS, the owner has boarded up the vacant properties but continues to have untoward activity at the properties that are uninhabitable; and,

WHEREAS, it is not appropriate to pursue repair or restoration of these building as prescribed by the Property Standards By-law or maintain the properties on the Vacant Building Registry and demolition is appropriate; and,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Chief Building Official be authorized to issue a demolition permit for 1355, 1359, 1375 Upper James Street and 16, 24, 34, 40, 48 Stone Church Road East, Hamilton, Ontario, in accordance with By-law 09-208, as amended by By-law 13-185, pursuant to Section 33 of the Planning Act as amended, without having to comply with conditions 6(a), (b), and (c) of the Demolition Control By-law 09-208.