



City of Hamilton PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM

Meeting #: 21-001
Date: January 12, 2021
Time: 9:30 a.m.
Location: Due to the COVID-19 and the Closure of City Hall

All electronic meetings can be viewed at:

City's Website:
<https://www.hamilton.ca/council-committee/council-committee-meetings/meetings-and-agendas>

City's YouTube Channel:
<https://www.youtube.com/user/InsideCityofHamilton> or Cable 14

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

6. DELEGATION REQUESTS

6.2. Delegations respecting Application for Amendments to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for Lands Located at 15 Church Street (Ancaster) (PED20205) (Ward 12) (Item 10.1)

*6.2.b. Added Written Delegations:

4

- (v) Ted Robinson
- (vi) Darren Earl
- (vii) Jerry Cole
- (viii) Jim MacLeod
- (ix) Chris Cunningham
- (x) Sarah Wellman
- (xi) Nancy Hurst
- (xii) Rowen and Mavis Baker
- (xiii) Brad Davis
- (xiv) Bob Maton
- (xv) Sandy Price
- (xvi) Debra Mills
- (xvii) Marian Ewen
- (xviii) Ancaster Village Heritage Community
- (xix) James Webb, WEBB Consulting

*6.2.c. Virtual Delegations:

- (i) Jim MacLeod, Ancaster Village Heritage Community

8. PUBLIC HEARINGS / DELEGATIONS

- 8.2. City Initiative CI-20-A to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Zoning By-law for lands located at 1400 Baseline Road, Stoney Creek (PED20002) (Ward 10)

*8.2.b. Added Written Submissions:

34

- (iii) Stan and Renee Kurak
- (iv) Sherry Hayes
- (v) Bill Milar
- (vi) Sharon Williams
- (vii) Valerie Gardner
- (viii) Donna Head
- (ix) S. Dale
- (x) Georgina Beattie
- (xi) Trena Ennis
- (xii) Deborah Martin
- (xiii) Thomas Bibby
- (xiv) Dawn Simpson

14. PRIVATE AND CONFIDENTIAL

- *14.2. Update and Instructions regarding Local Planning Appeal Tribunal Appeals of 600 James St. N. (LS21003) (Ward 2)
Pursuant to Section 8.1, Sub-sections (e) and (f) of the City's Procedural By-law 18-270, as amended, and Section 239(2), Sub-sections (e) and (f) of the *Ontario Municipal Act, 2001*, as amended, as the subject matter pertains to litigation or potential litigation, including matters before administrative tribunals, affecting the City; and, the receiving of advice that is subject to solicitor-client privilege, including communications necessary for that purpose.

From: Ted Robinson
Sent: January 6, 2021 7:04 PM
To: Van Rooi, James <James.VanRooi@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Re: 15 Church Street, Planning Committee Meeting

Do you have my response recorded as officially supporting the development?
If not how do I get counted in?
Best regards
Ted

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 24, 2020, at 9:08 PM, Ted Robinson wrote:

Thanks again James.
After reviewing all the material sent, I fully support this proposal
All the best for Xmas and the new year.
Regards,
Ted

Sent from my iPhone

On Dec 23, 2020, at 4:38 PM, Ted Robinson wrote:

Thank you James.
I was also pleased to read in today's Ancaster News that the proposed height has been reduced.
Regards
Ted

Darren Earl
Ancaster

In reference rezoning of 15 Church Street Ancaster (UHOPA-20-006 and ZAC-20-011)

I am writing today to follow up on a previous letter I submitted and after having attended the live committee meeting on Dec 8th 2020 and the follow on community consultation on Dec 17th 2020. Based in these meeting I have several concerns with the reasoning for the planning departments whole heated endorsement of this development.

Point 1:

During the Dec 8th committee meeting there was a concern that if the developer's plans were rejected, the developer would appeal to LPAT. I wanted to point out that if the developer is rejected and appeals to LPAT it would have to be against the ER zoning rules. Furthermore, the ER zoning rules have already been appealed to the LPAT on July 11 2019 (OMB Case No.: PL180522) and the rules were upheld. I encourage the committee members to review the LPAT ruling. But they essentially say that the ER zoning rules comply with both the cities official Plan and UHOP policy.

I will quote an excerpt from the ruling regarding maximum height provisions:

“The Tribunal finds that with respect to issues regarding maximum height provisions, the Zoning By-law Amendments comply with UHOP policy 2.6 in that they address lot fabric, streetscape, built form and character issues. Based on Ms. Fulford's uncontradicted opinion evidence, the Tribunal finds that the Zoning By-law Amendments' height provisions are appropriate to implement flexible policies and that they will assist in maintaining the existing character of neighbourhoods.”

<https://www.canlii.org/en/on/onlpat/doc/2019/2019canlii64650/2019canlii64650.html>

The ER zoning laws were brought in to specially address protections for Ancasters mature neighborhoods.

<https://www.hamilton.ca/city-planning/official-plan-zoning-by-law/ancaster-existing-residential-er-zone>

It is very worrying to me that public official would approve something on the sole basis that they fear their decision would be appealed. Just imagine if a superior court judge took a similar approach with a criminal case.

Point 2:

Why is the maximum lot coverage provision so easily being brushed aside?

Per the zoning bylaw for ER and R1 ([ancaster-zoning-by-law-87-57-oct2020.pdf](#))

“Table 10.3.3 – Maximum Lot Coverage

Lots with an area less than or equal to 1,650 square metres = Maximum 35 percent”

Based on the slides presented at the committee meeting on Dec 8th the interior units will have 49% lot coverage and the exterior units 32% coverage and the site averages to 37% (37.66%).

As presented, this means we will either be creating 1 property that violates the so called “monster home” provision or 2 homes that grossly violate the monster home provision.

So how dose the planning department justify breaking the so-called ER monster home by-law for a non-mandatory intensification project. A by-law that has already stood up to an appeal to the LPA tribunal.

Point 3:

The 15 Church street property is zoned ER

Per the zoning bylaw for ER ([ancaster-zoning-by-law-87-57-oct2020.pdf](#)) the maximum height of a building is 9.5 meters and there is no provisions for a 2.5 story building in the ER bylaw.

Table 10.3.7 – Maximum Height

Two-storeys Maximum 9.5 metres (1)

Based on the presentation of the proposed homes “Appendix “F” of Report PED20205 Page 1 of 2” . The drawings are indicating the homes will be 2.5 stories tall with an official height of 10.5m.

The planning department has attempted to justify the additional 1-meter height based on the “Urban Hamilton Official Plan - Ancaster Secondary Plans” page 43 which states:

“Notwithstanding Policy E.3.4.5 of Volume 1, the maximum building height shall be 2.5 storeys.”

I would like to point out that “**2.5 storyes**” is not an official recognized measurement standard as the actual height of a storye can be affected by many factors. If the authors of the official plan had wanted to define a specific numerical maximum, they would have.

The developer should be held to the 9.5 meter maximum. There is no reason that a 2.5 storye building could not be 9.5meters tall.

Point 4:

I am very concerned with the intensification of the Village Core that this development represents. 15 church street is located within this historic “Village Core” and as confirmed by city staff on page 344 of “PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA Meeting #: 20-015” this area of Ancaster already meets

the Intensification targets set by the OMB.

Furthermore, per the “Urban Hamilton Official Plan - Ancaster Secondary Plans” page 41 this type of intensification in Ancaster should be directed to the “Uptown Core”

Within the Ancaster Community Node, larger scale development and redevelopment are encouraged to be directed towards the Uptown Core and western portion of the Gateway Residential area, as shown on Appendix A - Character Areas and Heritage Features.

In conclusion:

The ER zoning laws were brought in to specially address protections for Ancasters mature neighborhoods.

<https://www.hamilton.ca/city-planning/official-plan-zoning-by-law/ancaster-existing-residential-er-zone>

In consultation with the Ancaster community, a pilot project for the “ER” Zone has been developed, consisting of a series of changes to the regulations of the “ER” Zone. Zoning By-law regulations establish an as-of-right building envelope that guides development or redevelopment on individual properties.

The “Urban Hamilton Official Plan - Ancaster Secondary Plans” page 43 indicates that lots designated as “Low Density Residential 1” are permitted to be single detached dwellings and semi-detached dwellings

“Notwithstanding Policy E.3.4.3 of Volume 1, the permitted uses shall be limited to single detached dwellings and semi-detached dwellings.”

With a lot as large as 15 Church street a proposal consisting of Semi-detached dwellings would allow for intensification within the bounds of the Ancaster Secondary Plan and respecting the ER zoning bylaw. I implore the committee not to approve the first mega project that happens to come along.

The Ancaster Secondary Plan and the ER zoning bylaws were passed by City Counsel for a reason they should not so easily be brushed aside.

Regards
Darren Earl

From: Darren Earl
Sent: December 6, 2020 10:20 PM
To: james.vanrooi@hamilton.ca <james.vanrooi@hamilton.ca>
Cc: lloyd.ferguson@hamilton.ca <lloyd.ferguson@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Reference UHOPA-20-006 and ZAC-20-011

in reference rezoning of 15 Church Street Ancaster (UHOPA-20-006 and ZAC-20-011)

Darren Earl
 Ancaster ON

I am writing to express my concern over the planned townhouse development at 15 Church street in Ancaster Ontario. I am an Ancaster resident and frequently walk by this property along Church street as I bring my children to the local daycare center.

I have issues with many of the conclusion drawn by staff as to why this application should be approved.

- 1) I have issue with the "ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION" point 1 sub point 4

"The proposed development represents good planning by, among other things, providing a compact and efficient urban form that is compatible with the area, enhances and continues the streetscape of the neighbourhood and provides additional housing opportunities in the community.

The proposal of 6 townhouses would in no way continue the streetscape of the local buildings. Directly across from this building is one of the oldest town halls in all of Canada. Comparing modern 2.5 store "urban efficient" town houses to heritage buildings is simple not rational. Not to mention the countless other heritage homes and buildings on neighboring properties.

- 2) I have issue with the "ANALYSIS AND RATIONALE FOR RECOMMENDATION" point 2

"The Official Plan Amendment is for an amendment to the Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan to change the designation from "Low Density Residential 1" to "Low Density Residential 3" to permit six, two and a half storey street townhouses"

By Referencing the zoning map in [Appendix "B" to Report PED20205 Page 5 of 5] one can see that there are currently no "Low density Residential 3" lots on the East side of Wilson street in the core of Ancaster Village. By changing this solitary plot you would be creating an out liner that does not conform to commune uses of the "Low density Residential 3" zoning. Once again referring to the zoning map one can see that all other uses of the "Low density Residential 3" zoning are on much wider and more substantial streets. Such as directly on Wilson, Halson or Fiddlers Green. This section of Church street is very narrow and in no way compares to streets like Wilson and Fiddlers green.

- 3) I have issues with city staff's justification for increasing zoning targets.

As confirmed by city staff on page 344 of "PLANNING COMMITTEE AGENDA Meeting #: 20-015" this area of Ancaster already meetings the Intensification targets set by the OMB. Therefore, there is no mandate for the city and community to increase densification through any and all possible means. By design once targets are meet city staff then have more discretion to approve developments that meet and enhance the local area rather then deform it.

To conclude, I believe that city staff should use the flexibility given to them by the fact that area does not require densification to reject the proposals:

1. Reject the proposal to change the zoning of 15 Church Street (Ancaster). From designation from “Low Density Residential 1” to “Low Density Residential 3”
2. Reject the change in zoning from the Existing Residential “ER” Zone, to Holding Residential Multiple “H-RM2-712”

Ancaster Village is a community older than Canada itself. People from all over Hamilton and the GTHA come to experience and enjoy that heritage. Our community's greatest asset is our physical heritage, it is what draws people in. If we let it slip away, we will not get it back.

Regards

Darren Earl

January 3, 2021

Planning Board and Planning Committee

Re: 15 Church Street Application
Ancaster Zoning By-Law 87-57.

Zoning By-Laws are specific with minimum and maximum set-backs, coverages, heights and more.

Let's call these measurements standards.

The application for town-houses at 15 Church Street specifies the following:

1. Area for six units 32.22% sub-standard
2. Lot coverage 5.71% in excess of standard (35%) if 37% quoted is fact.
3. Front set-back to garage door 20% sub-standard
4. Front set-back to front door 26.66% sub-standard
5. Frontage 27.1% sub-standard.
6. Lot depth 16.18% sub-standard
7. Rear set-back to deck 30.9% sub-standard

How is it remotely conceivable that the planning department could countenance such an obvious flouting of the standards? Now the planning committee has been called upon to bail out the department by approving a plan that should never have been considered, to keep it from going to LPAT.

With the current provincial government's governing by fiat, and no-appeal provisions, who knows what might be permitted.

The City of Hamilton in recent years has had too much bad press due to scandals such as with waste pick-up, building construction with no plans or permits in place, asphalt not being properly used, sewerage, and Red Hill Expressway. There seems to be a serious lack of leadership almost everywhere. Do we have to allow this to continue?

The approval for this project should be rescinded and the applicant charged with providing a new plan to construct "luxury" town-homes instead of "luxury sub-standard" town-homes, if in fact town-homes should even be considered.

Jerry Cole

From: Jim MacLeod
Sent: January 2, 2021 2:19 PM
To: Van Rooi, James <James.VanRooi@hamilton.ca>
Cc: Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Commercial Use--15 Church

I am following up on my question about the relationship between Ancaster Bylaw 87-57 and the Wilson Street Secondary Plan. I did some reading over the holidays and think I have it worked through in my mind.

Thank you for the link to the maps. I note that 15 Church (and all of Maywood) is specifically excluded from the Community Node and the Village Core—I had a different impression from the Staff Report.

However, my point today is one I hope you can point out where I have erred in my logic.

I note in the Wilson Street Secondary Plan Low Density Residential 1 is limited to single family and demi detached. Low Density Residential 3 permits all forms of town homes, but I also note the following (Vol 2, Chapter B, subsection b):

iii) In addition to Policy E.3.4.3 of Volume 1, small scale commercial uses shall be permitted, including business and professional offices, medical office uses or clinics, day nursery, artist studios, funeral homes, and personal services.

There are restrictions to the main floor in mixed use buildings. Parking is pretty much brushed off as being “if feasible”. This use is only permitted in stand alone commercial or mixed-use buildings, and my logic is each unit at 15 Church could be a mixed use building.

Given that these are freehold townhomes, each will have individual title and it appears to me that once these units are built and occupied any one of them would be permitted to have a commercial use in their unit—main floor commercial use, upper floor residential. The fact they are attached by one or two walls would be immaterial—they have separate title. As they are designated Low Density Residential 3 and this is a permitted use it appears they could do this without any further approvals.

I note on the map that virtually all of the Low Density Residential 3 is on Wilson Street, Fiddlers Green and other larger roads so this limited commercial use makes sense. Bringing this into a heritage neighbourhood with a 12 meter road seems problematic.

I truly hope you can tell me that no commercial use could ever happen at 15 Church as a result of the move to Residential 3, and explain why.

Thank you

Jim MacLeod

Ancaster Ward 12 Councillor Lloyd Ferguson,
lloydferguson@hamilton.ca

December 29, 2020

Dear Councillor Ferguson,

I am writing in response to Application UHOPA-20-006 more commonly referred to as No. 15 Church Street. In reviewing report PED2025 planning staff is supporting a “site specific policy to recognize the existing road right-of-way width for the lands located at 15 Church Street”. This is a substantial deviation from the requirements of the City of Hamilton Urban Official Plan and presents serious future implications for the City if adopted. The staff report fails to present any pro's or cons of approving this “new policy” and therefore ignoring the guidelines of the Official Plan altogether.

No width of Church Street is shown on the site plan, but someone is certainly aware that it is undersized in order to insert this seemingly innocuous statement to “recognize the street width” while ignoring the results of implementing it. The result of my inquiry to a local surveyor was that Church Street was shown as 60 1/2 links (or about 40 feet) on an old plan, but could not confirm what it was today. In the normal course of events NO development would be allowed on a street of only 12.19 metres in width, but the City in their wisdom recognized that some streets, in the very, very old parts of the city, could be considered for development, but only if they could be widened to a minimum of 15.24 metres, and further, that it still had to be proven by the proponent that this reduced minimum could support all future servicing requirements.

OFFICIAL PLAN URBAN AREA SECTION C-4.5-2f

“f) Local roads, subject to the following policies: i) The primary function of a local road shall be to provide direct land accesses. The secondary function shall be to enable the movement of low volumes of traffic to collector roads. ii) **The basic maximum right-of-way widths for local roads shall be 26.213 metres in designated Employment Areas and 20.117 metres in all other areas,** unless specifically described otherwise in Schedule C-2 – Future Right-of-Way Dedications; (OPA 109) iii) The City recognizes that in older urban built up areas there are existing road right-of-way widths significantly less than 20.117 metres. **Notwithstanding the other road right-of-way widening policies of this Plan, it is the intent of the City to increase these existing road rights-of-ways to a minimum of 15.24 metres with daylight triangles at intersections instead of the minimum required 20.117 metre road right-of-way width, provided all the required road facilities, municipal sidewalks and utilities can be accommodated in this reduced road right-of-way width.** iv) Trucks shall be restricted from local roads, except for local deliveries and in Employment Areas. v) Sidewalks should be provided on both sides of the street. (OPA 109) vi) Horizontal and vertical traffic calming measures, including speed humps, may be implemented where appropriate subject to meeting City Traffic Calming etc etc”

So in normal circumstances the City would require a road widening dedication of 1.525 metres in the development process along Church Street, but in this case it is being waved by the City without any explanation.

With complete lack of foresight, the planning report then goes on to support a reduction in the front yard set-back from 7.5 metres to 5.5 metres. The applicant intends to supply one of the two parking spaces required in the front driveway. The City by-laws require a minimum depth of 5.5 metres for a parking space. If this application goes forward there will be no possibility of ever widening Church Street to the absolute minimum required by the Official Plan without making front yard parking impossible. There is absolutely no reason whatsoever for the City to not take a

road dedication now, in a process that is creating a 6 lot subdivision on an existing single lot. Even with the road dedication and the proposed relief of front yard set-back to 5.5 metres, the building will still be closer to the road than the required minimum of 7.5 metres.

Your observations on why this seems to have been overlooked would be greatly appreciated.

Regards,
Chris Cunningham
Ancaster, On

cc: James Van Rooi, Planner

December 31, 2020

Subject: Applications for Amendments to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Ancaster Zoning By-law No. 87-57 for lands located at 15 Church Street (Ancaster) (PED20205) (Ward 12)

Dear Councillor Ferguson,

I would like to bring your attention to to the following statement on Page 12 of this report.

Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP)

The subject property is identified as “Community Node” on Schedule “E” – Urban Structure and designated as “Mixed Use – Medium Density” on Schedule “E-1” – Urban Land Use Designations. The lands are also designated “Low Density Residential 1” on Map B.2.8.1 – Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan.

This statement is **not** correct. The subject lands are **not part of a “Community Node”** and are therefore **not** subject to **“Mixed Use – Medium Density”**.

Detail from Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan - Maps B.2.8-1

Community Node Area- Outlined in Blue



Subject Lands-Low Density Residential 1

The Planning Report for this application then goes on to incorrectly identify the subject lands as 'Community Node', and 'Community Nodes' sixteen (16) times, and each time extracts a use under the 'Community Node' designation to try to justify this planning reports support for the Official Plan Amendment. The 'Community Node' uses, in the Secondary Plan, refer to *Areas of commercial, multi-residential, mixed uses and employment development, redevelopment, infilling and intensification along the Wilson Street Village Corridor*”, and do not apply to this property whatsoever. The Ancaster Wilson Street Secondary Plan was prepared in accordance with Section 'E' of the UHOP, which set-out

guidelines for designating and establishing uses in and along interconnecting urban transportation corridors, village commercial centres, community nodes, rural and urban residential, heritage lands, natural resources etc etc. and it is the primary planning document for the Village of Ancaster. As a secondary plan, it is the application and fine-tuning of the broad outlines of principals and guidelines set out in Section E of the UHOP and has been approved by council and inserted into the UHOP after several years of reports, studies, public meetings, input from stakeholders, and input from multiple departments at local, municipal and provincial levels.

The planning report is free to quote from the wisdom of Section 'E' of the UHOP, but it has to get the designation of the property right, or else its comments make no sense whatsoever. As the UHOP sets out Urban Systems and Designations, it is quite clear that detailed Secondary Plans will be required.

Chapter E – Urban Systems and Designations

2.3.3.11 Detailed secondary plans shall be undertaken for Community Nodes to establish boundaries and provide greater direction on mix of uses, heights, densities, built form, and design. Pending the completion of secondary plans for Community Nodes, the land use designations and policies set out in this Chapter shall provide direction for development proposals. (OPA 64)

The resulting secondary plan did not include the subject lands in a 'Community Node'. Comments in this application, using this erroneous assumption, completely invalidate all its recommendations of support and must be corrected, or withdrawn altogether.

Your attention to this matter is greatly appreciated,

Regards,

Chris Cunningham,

Ancaster, ON.

From: Sarah
Sent: December 22, 2020 10:48 PM
To: Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>
Cc: Van Rooi, James <James.VanRooi@hamilton.ca>
Subject: 15 Church street

Hello Councillor Ferguson,

I am writing to object to the development planned at 15 Church Street in Ancaster. It's coincidental actually - I had contacted you back in 2019 expressing the challenges that I was having, as a pedestrian, crossing in front of this property with two young children in tow in a stroller. I would love to hear the suggestions for how a family such as mine is meant to navigate around the cars parked at this proposed development as they overhang onto the sidewalk. Does the City plan to impose limits on the types of cars these (future) residents can own (so that they can actually fit into their driveway)? Likely not.

After viewing the most recent Planning Committee's meeting from December 8th, I am even more appalled. The proposed project will ultimately sacrifice the already limited walkability of this area that I utilize **everyday** - picking up my young son (2 years old) at Little Gems in town, with my 4 year old Kindergartener in tow. I would implore you to imagine the safety concerns I already have when I enter this stretch of road, leading up to the Wilson & Church St. intersection.

On more than one occasion I have expressed to my husband that I should be wearing a body cam so that I can record the near-misses I have experienced in almost being hit by a car (with a double stroller in hand). It's great that Mr. Van Rooi came out on a Sunday morning to snap some photographs of the seemingly quiet streets, however isn't a more reliable source of information the people who walk (and drive) these streets every day?

It is evident that the City *already* has not prioritized pedestrian safety in this area (as a mother, how can I now not think of the Strickland family when considering pedestrian safety?) so is it safe to actually trust their approval of this? What is unfortunate however, is moving forward on a proposal such as this will only worsen the situation - in no way can an argument be made that it will improve it, which is actually where everyone's time and effort should be directed.

The fact that the proposed development appears to require 12 variances from zoning and bylaws should be a red flag in and of itself - what is the point of having such standards if they are simply going to be amended rather than upheld? You can appreciate how community members find it completely absurd that such bylaws can just be changed to meet the needs of someone with deep pockets (and the City clearly wanting to profit off of it!)

I have to admit, watching this process unfold has led to my complete loss of faith in municipal affairs, and City staff - of course the developer is going to look out for his best interests, however my understanding is that our local councillor is supposed to be the representative to look out for our community's best interests and our voice. The only

beneficiary of this proposal appears to be the developer - what other justification is there for cramming in 6 units? Obviously to make the most money.

I was encouraged that you at least took the opportunity to defer the council vote to think on this some more. However it would be very refreshing if this additional time wasn't all for none, and for community members' concerns to not just be brushed off simply because City staff have already indicated their approval of this proposal (oh, and because of your fear that the developer will appeal if the proposal is not approved).

Thank you in advance for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Sarah Wellman

Hello to you all,

I am writing out of concern that the presentation given on Dec 8, 2020 to the planning committee by Mr. James Webb of Webb planning and developer Mr. Joseph Veloce contained some inconsistencies which I wish to address.

1) This home suffered a fire in the attic only in Feb 2018. Mr. Veloce incorrectly stated at the planning meeting that the home "has been vacant for sure since the fire four or five years ago, I believe" In fact the fire was minor and occurred 2 years ago.

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/hamilton/monday-ancaster-house-fire-1.4542302>

He also stated that he acquired the property "substantially after the fire" which he said occurred "4 or 5 years ago" Records show that numbered company 2692544 purchased the property in April 2019 which was one year after the fire. Mr. Veloce led the committee to believe the home has been vacant and rotting for well over five years but in fact this home had been vacant for one year when he bought it and after the fire, this rare Arts and Crafts style home got a new roof and so has been protected from the elements. He bought it last year, one year after the fire. It is stripped to the studs but according to the heritage consultant, is salvageable and given that it could take years to be designated as a heritage building (the backlog is up to 2040 according to Yvette Rybenay from the Heritage department) we obviously don't have that long.

*As set out in section **B.3.4.2.6** of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP), Volume 1, the City recognizes that there may be cultural heritage properties worthy of conservation that are not yet included in the Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, nor designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. **This may include properties that have yet to be surveyed or otherwise identified, or where a property's significance and cultural heritage value has not been comprehensively evaluated.***

I believe 15 Church st could be one that has not yet been recognized.

2) At 2:07:30 into the meeting, Mr Webb stated misleadingly that this project: "Is very much in keeping with a lot of the recent approvals for townhouse developments throughout Ancaster".

However his own slide to support this disagrees and shows this:

APPROVED 125 Wilson st E 49.2% coverage - **Condo**

APPROVED 393 Wilson st E 62 %coverage - **Condo**

APPROVED 515 Garner 55 % coverage - Townhomes

PROPOSED 154 Wilson st 40% coverage - Single Family

His slide included one example that was only a proposal and three other examples that weren't even townhouses. If you didn't look carefully you would have heard him say all these townhomes were approved but you may not have noticed that his own slide contradicts that. Furthermore, I believe at least some of these that exceed coverage were granted before the Monster home bylaw came into effect. This is to be confirmed when Permits returns my call.

3) At 2:07:46 in the video Mr Webb states "**The coverage in its entirety if you were to treat it as a condominium or rental project, is 70%**" yet his slide says 37%. He also states there is a minimum 30% available for landscaping which supports the 70%. I have reached out to Mr. Webb to clarify what he meant by 70% coverage.

4) This proposal requires 12 variances - even from the zoning and bylaws that the developer is asking for. This is outrageous. The lot is far too small for this monster home development on this narrow street.

5) Each of these units will be sold individually as freehold units on their own parcel of land. **Once severed, the two interior units of the freehold properties will be 49% lot coverage. Therefore, each of these two freehold properties, when severed, will violate the Monster home bylaw considerably.**

6) Church Street, which has a sidewalk only on one side, is far too narrow to accommodate even its current traffic, without the addition of 12 additional vehicles. Since the two parking spaces are single car garage and driveway, this will result in the "car shuffle" every morning as one person leaves earlier than the other and needs to park one vehicle illegally on Church Street in order to move the other vehicle back onto the drive.

7) Many vehicles will be too long to park on the short driveways. **The most popular truck in Ontario, the Ford F-150 is up to 6.3 meters in length not including a trailer hitch which is an additional one foot at least.** Larger vehicles or those with hitches will overhang the sidewalk by a considerable amount and force pedestrians into the road, where traffic is dangerous.

8) The modern design of this development is not consistent with the neighbourhood by any means and it does not reflect genuine heritage design. It will be white siding with black trim and roof and massive picture windows overlooking the street. Adding red bricks salvaged from the demolished century home as chimneys to these townhouses is a lame and colour-clashing attempt to incorporate "heritage features"

9) This development is similar to the Losani townhomes at John Fredrick and Garner. It has single garages and single driveways and to avoid the car-shuffle problem that comes with two vehicles being forced to park on behind the other in the garage and the drive, people have resorted to simply parking the second vehicle in the visitor parking spaces. With this proposed development, **visitors and services will either park illegally on Church st, or move over to Lodor, Academy, the Medical building or the Fire hall.** I doubt very much that any of these would appreciate extra cars and service vehicles in their spaces and streets.

10) **Net zero ready??** Pwaa. It has a roof that will accomodate a solar panel 'somewhere down the line'. Just like my 1950s house does. Thank you for asking the question **Councillor Wilson.** His answer was not satisfactory and further, he claims he has several locals who wish to move into these townhomes, especially given each unit will have its own elevator. I'm guessing he means millionaires from Toronto when he says 'locals'.

If any of you want to take a little drive to Ancaster village, I would encourage you to swing by the house and envision the monster townhouses that would dominate that small spot. Pictures in the planning application don't tell the full story.

I am honestly not sure who will be involved in this decision so I am initially sending this to the councillors I saw in the meeting as well as Mr. Van Rooi.

Thank you for your time and attention to this pressing matter. With Christmas coming we are racing against the clock to be heard and understood by Jan 12, 2021.

Thank you for your time and concern and thank you for the work you do under these strange Covid circumstances.

Nancy Hurst
Ancaster

From: Rowen Baker
Sent: December 22, 2020 11:24 AM
To: Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>
Cc: Bob Maton; Van Rooi, James <James.VanRooi@hamilton.ca>
Subject: 15 Church Street

Lloyd,

Although we have already written to the planning department, we want to make doubly sure our concerns about this development are lodged.

Although relative newcomers to the Village we are appalled at the rampant destruction within Ancaster which has occurred recently. Whilst development must be expected, it needs at least to conform to the heritage, planning and zoning requirements of the area.

We wish to register the following objections to this development:

- 1) It requires demolition of an attractive heritage home.
- 2) It requires 12 variances from the zoning and bylaws. The lot is far too small for the monster home development envisaged.
- 3) It violates the monster home bylaw you successfully introduced a couple of years ago and which is widely supported within the community.
- 4) Church Street has a sidewalk only on one side. It is far too narrow to accommodate even the current traffic flow, without considering the addition of potentially 12 more vehicles.
- 5) Many vehicles are too long to park on the proposed short driveways. They will overhang the sidewalk forcing pedestrians into the road, where traffic flow is already dangerous.
- 6) There is absolutely no provision for guest parking. Parking is already at a premium in the village, it will only be exacerbated when the new Arts Centre opens.
- 7) The design of this development is not consistent with the neighbourhood, it does not reflect genuine heritage character.

We hope our objections are considered and that this development application is rejected.

Rowen and Mavis Baker

Ancaster

From: Brad Davis
Sent: December 22, 2020 10:44 AM
To: Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>
Cc: Bob Maton; Van Rooi, James <James.VanRooi@hamilton.ca>
Subject: 15 Church Street Objection

Good morning Councillor Ferguson and Mr. Veloce,

I live in the Maywood neighbourhood and have participated in the past two Zoom meetings regarding 15 Church.

Last week I questioned Mr. Veloce on what, if any, due diligence was done on the home when you purchased it in April 2019. Mr. Veloce mentioned that a structural engineer was not consulted on the integrity of the home. Therefore, it became clear to me that there was never any intention to try and salvage this home and the sole purpose was to tear it down.

Had any reports been presented from a qualified third party stating that this home is no longer salvageable I would be far more sympathetic to your efforts.

I had also mentioned that I spoke to the previous owners of the home who owned it when the fire occurred. She mentioned that after the fire, the whole house was water-logged and all walls, flooring etc needed to be torn out. Their insurance company compensated them for the cost to renovate the home. They felt they weren't up to the task of a full renovation and sold it to Mr. Veloce. I am not an insurance adjuster but if common sense prevails I would assume that if the home was not salvageable, the insurance company would have torn it down because it is a major liability at that point.

None of this passes the smell test.

Mr. Veloce, you have built some truly remarkable homes in Ancaster. I have read about you and there is every indication that you are the type of person that residents of Ancaster can point to and say that man is a leader: Husband, father, businessman, Olympian and community builder. You have an extraordinary opportunity here to demonstrate your leadership and recognize the community does not want this project and you can restore 15 Church Street to a beacon of the Village again. Money only lasts so long, but goodwill can last forever.

Councillor Ferguson, I have always been an ardent supporter of you and voted for you every single municipal election that I have participated in. Your leadership in the community on projects like the Memorial Arts Center is inspiring. I understand your position that you must pick your battles, but this is certainly one that you should be fighting for. I implore you and your Council colleagues to critically evaluate what message is being sent by allowing this project to move forward.

Best regards,

Brad Davis

From: Bob Maton
Sent: December 19, 2020 9:31 AM
To: Van Rooi, James <James.VanRooi@hamilton.ca>
Subject: 15 Church Street

Good morning James,

FYI - below see the awful traffic yesterday on Church Street viewed from a neighbour's kitchen window. As you know, Church Street is a cut-through between Rousseaux and Wilson Streets. The 6- townhouse development proposal for 15 Church Street is 2/3rds of the way along on the right, close to Wilson which is at the far end. We have been told by Councillor Ferguson and the developer that the townhouse development is aimed at a senior population with limited mobility (there will be elevators installed in the units). Imagine a physically challenged elderly person trying to get their car in or out of a driveway along that street, or if an ambulance, service vehicle or delivery van were parked there. Yesterday's traffic may have been unusual during the pandemic, but it is a fairly typical situation at rush hours in normal times.

Best wishes, Bob Maton, President, Ancaster Village Heritage Community



From: Sandy Price
Sent: December 16, 2020 3:05 PM
To: Van Rooi, James <James.VanRooi@hamilton.ca>; Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>
Cc: Bob Maton
Subject: 15 Church Street

To Councillor Ferguson and James Vanrooi I have been thinking about the recent Planning Committee meeting of Tuesday December 8 and as I do this, I become increasingly disappointed and more angry at the council members who are supposedly looking out for their constituents.

I attended what I thought was going to be a council meeting to discuss the PLANS for the development of 15 Church Street. I was unaware that you had already decided to support and approve the plans of the developer before you even heard the arguments put forward by various members of the Ancaster Village Heritage Community.

This is an organization which consists of people who live in this area and will therefore be directly impacted by the ultimate decision. Other members of this organization either live in other parts of Ancaster or are former Ancaster residents.

Many of those who live in other parts of Ancaster have already been adversely affected by developers who are only looking to make money. Former Ancaster residents have many happy memories of this area because of the tennis courts, former soccer field, play equipment and the library. The addition of the splash pad increased the attraction of this area to young families.

This is the area where the Ancaster Heritage Day Parade starts and there are many activities in this area that residents are able to walk to and enjoy.

The developers don't live in the immediate area of Church Street so they will not be directly affected by any change. They are not a part of the friendly, peaceful neighbourhood that makes this area conducive to raising a young family or enjoying their retirement years.

This is an area that offers many amenities which makes it a popular destination in the good weather. As you are no doubt well aware Councillor Ferguson this often makes parking spaces disappear quickly.

This neighbourhood is made for walking, not commuters. We have a very high walk ability designation.. You, of all the people at that meeting Councillor Ferguson, have a first hand knowledge of this area. You are an Ancaster resident and your family has a long history of working to improve the lives of those of us who have chosen to live here.

Therefore I find it very puzzling as to why you would support the idea of cramming six dwellings in an area where there are currently only single homes. Why do you feel it is a good idea to tempt fate by increasing the traffic on a street where many families take advantage of the amenities that are within walking distance.

This area leads to green space and many dog walkers take advantage of this feature. It is also an area where families like to ride their bicycles, some of them with little ones either in a bike trailer or on the back of an adult bike. The addition of 6 townhouses crammed into a lot that was once home to a single dwelling will make these activities dangerous. Will it take serious injury or a death for the planning committee to realize that the current plan of 6 townhouses is not only totally inappropriate but also filled with potential danger?

As someone who has lived in this area for over 40 years I have enjoyed seeing the resurgence of families enjoying time together. You do not see this same kind of activity in areas where there is a lot of vehicular activity.

Six houses do not necessarily add up to only 12 vehicles. I am also puzzled to find out that the person who spearheaded the movement to prevent "McMansions" is now the person who is supporting the building of townhouses in a totally inappropriate location. In addition these are townhouses which will

require many zoning and bylaw amendments. I thought these laws were put in place to prevent the very action you appear to be encouraging.

Were all the variances listed and or discussed at the December 8 meeting or will we just learn of them if the current plan gets approved? If we learn of them after is this fair to your constituents. If the current plan is accepted does that mean that any and all variances will then also have to be accepted?

This will definitely set a precedence for other builders.

If this is democracy in action then I need to learn the new meaning of that word.

In closing I would like to say how extremely disappointed I was in your behaviour at this meeting Councillor Ferguson. I can't help but feel that you have sullied the Ferguson name. Even if you do not run in the next election is this really how you want to be remembered?

Sandy Price

Ancaster

From: Debra Mills

Sent: December 22, 2020 9:37 AM

To: Ferguson, Lloyd <Lloyd.Ferguson@hamilton.ca>; Addington, David <David.Addington@hamilton.ca>;

Cc: 'Bob Maton'

Subject: Proposed Development at 15 Church Street Ancaster

Dear Councilor Ferguson,

I am writing regarding my objections to the development planned at 15 Church Street. There are several reasons this development should not go ahead.

- It requires demolition of a heritage century home
- The lot is far too small for this monster home development
- It violates the monster home bylaw you, Lloyd Ferguson, brought in 2 years ago
- Church Street, which has a sidewalk only on one side, is far too narrow to accommodate even its current traffic, without the addition of possibly 12 more vehicles
- Many vehicles are too long to park on the short driveways; they will overhang the sidewalk and force pedestrians into the road, where traffic is dangerous
- The design of this development is not consistent with the neighbourhood by any means, it does not reflect genuine heritage design

Please consider these concerns and advise the developer that there are many people opposed to this development.

Thank you

Debra Mills

Hamilton, ON

From: Marian <
Sent: December 22, 2020 7:07 AM
To: Addington, David <David.Addington@hamilton.ca>
Subject: 15 Church St ,Ancaster

Please recognize the importance of the preservation of the historical properties in the Village of Ancaster and reject the proposed demolition of 15 Church St . It is wrong on every level ,from history to safety of the existing neighbourhood . The wound from the loss of Brandon House will never heal., please don't continue to scar our village. Thank for your time.

Sincerely
Marian Ewen
Ancaster resident for 60 years



330 Lodor St, Ancaster L9G 2Z2

Submission to Chair and Members of the Planning Committee 12 January 2021

Ancaster Village Heritage Community Inc is a vibrant community organization working to preserve the heritage of one of Canada's oldest communities. We wish to improve quality of life and encourage the positive development of this community to ensure its rich legacy is maintained.

Since the December 8 meeting that considered applications for amendments to the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Bylaw 87-57, regarding 15 Church Street, we have become aware of some further matters on which we would like to comment.

We respectfully request the Planning Committee to consider these comments in their deliberations.

AVHC hosted a live online community meeting on January 6 to discuss matters relating to 15 Church Street. The 33 participants from Maywood specifically requested that AVHC should speak on their behalf.

Matters for your consideration:

1. **Variations:** There have been various numbers discussed about how many variations from Bylaw 87-57 and the Wilson Street Secondary Plan would be required to let this project proceed. It seemed to be 12 on December 8.

A careful count shows there are 21. We suggest that any project that requires 21 variations is probably not suited for the intended property.

2. **Changes?:** Since December 8 Councillor Ferguson indicated the applicant agreed to confine the height to two and a half storeys, and he will request basements. The applicable bylaw permits 10.5 meters and we understand the applicant intends to utilize the full height. We also note that 15 Church is on a rise in the land 1.5 meters high. That means an apparent 12 meter height viewed from Wilson St. We are also aware of a proposal for basements. AVHC does not see basements as a solution for the parking issues we raised. Many homes with basements still have full garages.

3. **Consider the Possibilities, NOT the Renderings:** In order to build street townhomes a rezoning to RM2, Bylaw 87-57 is applied for. That is the appropriate required zoning. This also necessitates that the property be designated Low Density Residential 3 as the current designation of Low Density Residential 1 only permits single and semi-detached homes.

AVHC has become aware that Low Density Residential 3 permits light commercial use on the main floor of all forms of townhouses and low-rise multiple dwellings.

While commercial use may be limited in the townhomes, as shown in renderings, once this property has been designated Residential 3, this designation remains for a future owner to take advantage of.

Fewer townhomes with wider form factor could facilitate light commercial uses as it is just steps away from Wilson Street.

We have no reason to doubt the intentions of Mr. Veloce, but we ask the Committee to focus on the uses that Low Density Residential 3 could bring to the established ER neighbourhood, rather than on the specific proposal advanced. Residential 3 is permanent regardless of ownership.

We should never underestimate the creativity of a developer. Once a Residential 3 status has been approved, adjacent to Wilson Street, it can bring unexpected plans. Once approval is given, the re-designated land then meets the Official Plan requirements and the City has very limited power to control it.

4. **Neighbour Oversight:** We have since seen renderings for the rear of the property and note there are balconies proposed on the second floor that overlook adjacent properties. Trees are being removed and oversight of adjacent residential properties (to the east and Lodor) may result. These balconies are not permitted in ER zoning. We request that the Committee require their removal should this application be approved.
5. **Construction Issues** are a significant concern. With the limited front setback, it is hard to see how construction can take place without blocking the Church St sidewalk and indeed Church Street itself. Church Street has active pedestrian traffic. It is narrow, so stepping onto the street is not a solution.

If there is any thought of using the City parking lot to the rear that would be another major issue. This is actively used in the daytime and by the new Arts centre. The congestion will be exacerbated as Covid recedes and life and traffic return to normal.

AVHC asks the Committee to require the developer to submit a plan at Site Planning that will ensure that the sidewalk always remains accessible, other than for the installation of services.

6. **Traffic:** The concerns about traffic seem to be overlooked despite the fact it has been a long-standing issue for 20 years or more.

The current pavement is 6 metres wide, just under 20 feet.

Believing a picture is worth a thousand words:



On the left you will note the vehicle is tight against the single sidewalk. **On the right** the view from the driver's seat as traffic approaches.

A courier van, garbage truck, school bus etc. effectively block the road. 6 additional homes in a neighbourhood of 8 will bring significant increases in service traffic.

AVHC rejects the position that traffic is not an issue.

7. **Notwithstanding traffic issues** and that Church St is one of the narrowest roads in Ancaster, this application to amend Section B.2.8 of the Wilson Street Secondary Plan to correct "local roads" under the Plan to 12.19 meters is unacceptable. This would be unnecessary if the lot at 15 Church was the 30 meters deep required by Bylaw 87-57.

Remember that a 12.19 meter right of way yields about a 6-meter road.

There is no pressure from residents to widen this street, although this development might cause that.

The applicant should provide the standard road widening allowance

AVHC asks the Committee to require the normal road widening allowance from this applicant and deny the Official Plan amendment that could negatively affect the literally thousands of residents who use this road. Granting a single developer this amendment at the expense of the community due solely to lot size being too small is unacceptable.

8. **A formal traffic study** for the neighbourhood is requested by AVHC. Church Street is a gateway to the neighbourhood. In more normal times, and they will return, cut through traffic is a major issue.

Before road widening or other future adjustments are curtailed by this development, a formal traffic study could alleviate our concerns, or confirm this development is inappropriate.

9. **Site Planning:** AVHC notes the offer by Councillor Ferguson to supervise the site planning process. With all due respect, AVHC believes this development is unique enough that some formal public oversight should be instituted.

10. **Dawson Avenue:** On December 8 this Committee denied an application on Dawson Avenue that has many similarities to this application. We understand that each proposal stands on its own merits. There was significant public input for Dawson Avenue, much as there is for 15 Church.

In that presentation a view was expressed that Council “**Should listen to its citizens.**”

On behalf of the 56 individuals who have participated in this important process we ask the same for 15 Church.

AVHC thanks you for consideration of our comments. They represent the views of a wide cross section of our community.

Respectfully Submitted

Rowen Baker—Director, on behalf of

Bob Maton—President

Jennifer Davis—Director

David Watkins—Director

Donna Stechey—Director

Andrea Connor—Director

Chris Kruter—Director

Jim MacLeod—Treasurer

33 Neighbourhood Participants at
January 6 Consultation Meeting
(names not disclosed for privacy)



January 10, 2021

City of Hamilton
Planning Committee
71 Main Street West
Hamilton ON L8P 4Y5

Attention: Councillor John-Paul Danko, Chair
Committee Members

Re: Application for Official Plan and Zoning By-law Amendment
15 Church Street, Ancaster, City of Hamilton

WEBB Planning Consultants are retained by Veloce Luxury Homes as their Professional Land Use Planner to process planning applications for the above noted property.

A Public Meeting was held of December 8th, 2020, to consider Staff Report PED20205 respecting applications to amend the Official Plan and Zoning By-law. At the request of the Ward Councillor, the matter was deferred and rescheduled to be considered as Agenda Item 10.1 of the January 12th, 2021, Planning Committee Meeting.

We are writing to confirm our continued support of the Staff Recommendation to approve the planning applications. Further, we are endorsing the proposal to modify the draft Zoning By-law amendment to include a Regulation to cap the overall lot coverage. In response to further consultation, we can also confirm the owners agreement to incorporate basements into the design of the proposed dwelling units and our support for the Ward Councillor to monitor to Site Plan Approval process.

We do not intend to seek permission to provide an oral submission at the January 12th Meeting but can be available to participate should Committee raise any matters that may benefit from our input. Thank you for the opportunity to present this submission, please feel free to contact our office should you have any questions or require additional information.

Yours truly,

WEBB Planning Consultants Inc.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James Webb", is written over a light blue horizontal line.

James Webb, MCIP, RPP

cc: Veloce Luxury Homes

From: Stan Kurak

Sent: January 7, 2021 2:52 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: Notice of Zoning By-Law Amendment to Stoney Creek By-Law No. 3692-92 - 1400 Baseline Road, Stoney Creek (Ward 10)

Regarding: Changing low density residential to medium density residential for multiple storey high-rise dwellings

We strongly object to the proposed amendment. There should be a HEIGHT restriction imposed.

Also we object to any zoning changes to this area. Keeping in mind that there is no sufficient infrastructure in place or any room adequate to improve such.

AND I WOULD ALSO ASK TO HAVE OUR LETTER INCLUDED IN THE AGENDA OF THE JANUARY 12TH, 2021 PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING.

THANK YOU,

Stan & Renee Kurak

From: Sherry Hayes

Sent: January 7, 2021 3:15 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: Notice of Zoning By-Law Amendment to Stoney Creek By-Law No. 3692-92 - 1400 Baseline Road, Stoney Creek (Ward10)City Initiated Application CI-20-A

clerk@hamilton.ca

Notice of Zoning By-Law Amendment to Stoney Creek By-Law No. 3692-92 - 1400 Baseline Road, Stoney Creek (Ward 10)
City Initiated Application CI-20-A

**PLEASE INCLUDE OUR LETTER IN THE AGENDA OF THE JANUARY 12TH, 2021
PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING**

Regarding: Changing low density residential to medium density residential for multiple storey high-rise dwellings

To the Mayor, City Planners, City Council, Planning Committee,

Regarding the proposed zoning amendment for 1400 Baseline Road, Stoney Creek, as residents of the lakeside community in Stoney Creek, we are vehemently opposing these proposed changes for our many concerns that follow within this letter.

Including our noted objections - With regard to the proposed zoning changes, the following questionable information has been noted and taken from within this zoning amendment proposal. In particular:

Excerpt...

BY-LAW NO. 21-_____ To Amend Zoning By-law No. 3692-92 (Stoney Creek) Respecting Lands Located at 1400 Baseline Road (Stoney Creek) Page 149 of 275 Appendix "C" to Report PED20002 Page 2 of 7 NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows

NOW THEREFORE the Council of the City of Hamilton enacts as follows:

1. That Map No. 4 of Schedule "A", appended to and forming part of By-law No. 3692-92 (Stoney Creek), is amended by changing the zoning from Neighbourhood Development "ND" Zone to the Multiple Residential "RM3-69(H)" Zone, Modified, Holding on the lands, the extent and boundaries of which are shown on a plan hereto annexed as Schedule "A".

1. That Subsection 6.10.7 "Special Exemptions", of Section 6.10 Multiple Residential "RM3" Zone, of Zoning By-law 3692-92, be amended by adding a new Special

Exemption, “RM3-69(H)” Zone, Modified, Holding, as follows:

“RM3-69(H)” Zone, Modified, Holding, 1400 Baseline Road, Schedule “A”, Map No. 4
For the purposes of this By-law,...

Notwithstanding the provisions of Paragraphs (d), (e), (g), (i) and (j) of Section 6.10.3 of the Multiple Residential “RM3” Zone, on those lands zoned “RM3- 69(H)” Zone, Modified, Holding by this By-law, the following shall apply:

(c) Maximum Residential Density - 99 dwelling units per hectare

(d) Maximum Building Height –
For Townhouses – 11 metres
For Apartment Dwellings –

End of excerpt.

Referring to the line noted above in **bold** print:

We ask at this time - Why is there NO MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT noted for the Apartment Dwellings in this Zoning By-Law Amendment under (d) Maximum Building Height of Subsection 6.10.7 “Special Exemption”? It was clearly stated in the public notices that were cited in the newspaper that - The proposed amendment will permit multiple dwellings up to a MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF NINE STOREYS.

We find this lack of information very concerning and in direct opposition with the public notice. Will this lack of maximum building metre height that is missing from this document proposal be yet another opportunity to use the ‘no height restrictions’ zoning on another specific parcel of land such as we are now experiencing and opposing on Frances Avenue? Will this now allow the city and developers the opportunity to capitalize on this ‘missing’ maximum building metre height restriction within this proposed zoning change?

Sadly, it appears that single family homes are no longer being encouraged in this area. Rather crowded townhouses and apartment style buildings, each with small square footage per unit, are being encouraged and approved as this city continues to re-zone to suit this over-intensification explosion in Stoney Creek’s lakeside community.

Residents of this area community have sited on countless occasions that the serious and negative ramifications are currently and will continue to be extreme regarding severe traffic issues, safety, infrastructure concerns and environmental impacts. The minimal or lack of green space and trees that come with this style of development is destructive in nature for several of the reasons noted within. We reiterate those same

concerns for the 1400 Baseline Road site.

This entire area of land from Grays Road and easterly bound -including 1400 Baseline Road - that sits north of the QEW and the North Service Road has taken and continues to take the brunt of over-intensification just within the past few years, with continued applications for extreme levels of high-density residential buildings.

To continue to take one site at a time and deem it 'Site Specific' for 'Special Exemptions' and rezoning is interpreted here as taking every site, one by one, and changing it to suit the city's mandate of population expansion, while using the lakeside area as the perfect spot to create desirable and quick property/residential sales that no longer represent 'family living' due to the minimal square footage of the units. Therefore, these property/unit purchases appear to be driven by speculators rather than purchasers planning to live on-site in a community.

We ask that you reconsider and not move forward with this zoning change for this site and maintain the current Neighbourhood Development "ND" Zone.

Sherry Hayes & Dennis Facia
Stoney Creek, ON

From: Bill Millar

Sent: January 7, 2021 4:05 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: Notice of Zoning By-Law No. 3692-92-1400 Baseline Road, Stoney Creek, Ward 10, City Initiated Application CI-20-A

City Initiated Application CI-20-A.

As a resident of the Stoney Creek Lakeshore area, I am concerned that, while provisions for density are worthy of consideration to reduce urban sprawl, the access roads in our area are in danger of being overwhelmed with significant increases in population density. There appear to be few solutions to this situation with expansion of the road network limited by the QEW and the lake. I am also concerned about the difficulty of the needed expansion of other services such as sewer and water for the same reasons.

I note as well, that section (d) of the proposed amendment also numbered 1 states no restrictions to building heights for apartments, either by number of storeys or height in metres, even though the published public notice for the by-law change indicated a proposed maximum height of nine storeys. Given proposals for extremely tall buildings at the corner of Green Road and the North Service Road, which are strongly objected to by local residents, this omission is a serious concern.

Staff reports on the density issue make reference to the need to pay attention to the nature and realities of the existing affected neighbourhoods. I am concerned that this may be ignored in the development rush.

W. T. Millar,
Stoney Creek, ON

From: Sharon Williams <

Sent: January 7, 2021 6:53 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: Notice of Zoning By-Law Amendment to Stoney Creek By-Law

**Notice of Zoning By-Law Amendment to Stoney Creek By-Law No. 3692-92 - 1400
Baseline Road, Stoney Creek (Ward 10)
City Initiated Application CI-20-A**

Regarding: Changing low density residential to medium density residential for multiple storey high-rise dwelling

I most strongly reject change in Zoning in order to amend the stories heights to be increased in our Community Beach from the existing Max heights.

Please count me as rejecting this proposal to our Zoning in this area.

Sharon Williams

Resident on Green Road Stoney Creek.

Please stop the over population this very small community.

From: Valerie Gardner

Sent: January 8, 2021 11:49 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: Notice of Zoning By-Law Amendment to Stoney Creek By-Law No. 3692-92 – 1400 Baseline Road, Stoney Creek, (Ward 10) City Initiated Application CI-20-A

To: The Office of the City Clerk, City of Hamilton

Regarding: Changing low density residential to medium density residential for multiple storey high-rise dwellings

In reference to the Subject of this e-mail, we are writing to voice our concern over a potentially serious omission in Subsection 6.10.7 pertaining to Paragraph (d) in Subsection 6.10.3 of the Multiple Residential "RM3" Zone of Zoning By-law 3692-92.

While there is an 11 metre Maximum Building Height noted in section (d) for Townhouses, the By-Law amendment fails to denote the Maximum Building Height in metres for Apartment Dwellings. We are assuming that Apartment could also imply Condo Dwellings.

We are very concerned that without a specific building height being written into this By-Law, it might erroneously imply that there is NO MAXIMUM HEIGHT. This oversight cannot be allowed to go uncorrected. An unfortunate precedent has already been set just down the North Service Road from this proposed site.

We are speaking of the proposed three tower high-density, high-rise development at 310 Frances Avenue. Because of a past By Law "slip up", two towers reaching in the 50 storey range, and a third in the 40 storey range, are to be built on one site over the vociferous objections of the surrounding community.

It would be a travesty to see this current By-Law oversight go uncorrected and result in another such high density, high rise development along this already busy and well populated corridor.

In conclusion, and in light of the concerns raised here, we would like to bring your attention, and that of the City Council, to something that left us both dazed and baffled. It concerns something attributed to Jason Thorn, GM, Planning & Economic Development for the City of Hamilton. In the October TVO episode of "**The-Life Sized City**", which featured Hamilton, the host, Mikael Colville-Andersen, interviewed Mr. Thorn on camera at some length. Following the interview, Mr. Colville-Andersen, the host, said, and I quote, "**Jason and his team are working closely with developers, pushing them to integrate Hamilton's legacy into future construction and limiting the height of condo towers.**" The positive impression one gets from this message is that efforts will be made by the city to restrict building height. If this By-Law Amendment goes without designating the height of Apartment dwellings, we will be left with the reality that indeed it is the developers who have the upper hand.

Sincerely,

Valerie Gardner and Peter Miller
Stoney Creek, ON

From: Donna Head
Sent: January 11, 2021 8:48 AM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: City Initiative CI-20-A 1400 Baseline Rd., Stoney Creek

Good morning,

I understand that the Hamilton Planning Committee is proposing the building of maisonette apartments, townhouses, etc at 1400 Baseline Rd., Stoney Creek. Our family is objecting to this plan.

Baseline Rd that flows into Winston Rd, Grimsby has become a busy traffic and pedestrian thoroughfare over the past several years due to the high density development both at Fifty Rd, Casablanca Blvd and in between. Baseline Rd does not accommodate vehicle and pedestrian traffic at all well.

To add more high density development, more vehicles, more foot traffic to an area that is already burdened is not safe for all the families that have now moved into this corridor.

How will all this extra traffic be managed to ensure safe passage for all the walkers, bikers and especially children who all currently live and play in this area?

Families have moved out to this area, away from high density development so their children have a safe environment to live in. This plan does not fit in our area.

Sincerely.

From: S Dale
Sent: January 11, 2021 8:58 AM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: 1400 baseline road development

Good day

Please no more development! Why can't we have some green space. Hamilton is so filled with litter and garbage lining every road you pass so why bring more people in to add to it. Seriously! Drive down any side road and service road. Not every space should be built on.

Dale

From: thebeatties thebeatties
Sent: January 10, 2021 11:30 PM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: 1400 Baseline Road, Winona, Ontario (Ward 10) Jan. 10, 2021

To members of the Planning Committee, City of Hamilton

January 10, 2021 11:30 p.m.

Re: 1400 Baseline Road, Winona (Ward 10)

City Initiative CI-20-A to Amend the Urban Hamilton Official Plan and Zoning By-law for lands located at 1400 Baseline Road, Stoney Creek (PED20002) (Ward 10) -

*1400 Baseline Road, in order to **permit** Maisonettes, Townhouses, **Apartment Dwellings**, Dwelling Groups, a Home Occupation and Uses, buildings or structures accessory to a permitted use, for lands located at 1400 Baseline Road, Stoney Creek, as shown on Appendix "A" to **Report PED20002**, be APPROVED*

The possibility of a NINE storey Apartment Building at this site is not in keeping with the homes surrounding this site. Also the Fifty Point Conservation Area, only a few steps from this site, should not be overshadowed by such a proposal. **Please do not vote to approve this amendment.** Maintain the current Low Density Residential Designation!

Please also make a site visit to see the neighbourhood!

Is there a way to watch this public meeting without participation?

As per the public notice of Dec. 24, 2020 in the Stoney Creek News, stated under 'Collection of Information', I request that you please remove my personal information before publishing my comments.

Thanking you in advance,

Georgina Beattie

From: Trena
Sent: January 10, 2021 10:52 PM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: Winona & Baseline Rd

Hello,

I was made aware this evening that the development at this location may be expanded to 9 stories and would like more information please.

This community is not the right place for this density. I live at Benziger and Winona and there is enough unchecked traffic in the area as it is.

Trena Ennis

From: Deborah Martin

Sent: January 10, 2021 5:33 PM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: Notice of zoning by-law amendment to Stoney Creek by-law No. 3692-92 --- 1400 Baseline Road, Stoney Creek (Ward 10)

To members of the Planning Committee

I am writing in regards to the Planning Committee to be held Tuesday, January 12, 2021 at 9:30am. This meeting is being called to discuss changing low-density residential to medium density residential for multiple storey high-rise dwellings.

In my residential area this zoning change proposed has become another attack on the Lakeside properties. If current zoning of low density is changed to areas of high-rise density it will only add to the ongoing crisis of traffic congestion in our community and overwhelmingly on the North Service Road. Other neighbourhood issues have previously been mentioned regarding the overdevelopment of certain areas with the concomitant challenges of parking, safety for residents and the protections for the environment. We are strongly opposed to this over intensification in development.

In the amendment, Part D, there is no height stated. In the Spectator article the maximum height of multiple dwellings was stated to be 9 storeys. No height was stated in the zoning by-law report on the city of Hamilton's website available on January 7, 2021 under (d.) Maximum building height of subsection 6.10.7. We understand development is important and needs to occur. Our residents have put forth what some planners have called the middle ground structures. This category includes three and four storey buildings, duplexes, semi-detached homes and low to mid-rise apartments.

The people living in this neighbourhood would like to have input with our councillor regarding the size and nature of the areas in future development. We are the people who've lived here and continue to because we appreciate the delicate balance of what our neighbourhood contains.

There is no need for more multiple storey, high-rise dwellings as our neighbourhood has already accepted 2 new developments of multiple storeys within a 4 block distance. Since Hamilton is expected to grow within the coming years, surely space remains between the downtown core and our outlying area. One area, like ours, does not have to be inundated with development when so many parts of Hamilton are empty.

Therefore, I am opposed to an amendment to the present zoning by-law in Stoney Creek By-law No. 3692-92. I do not endorse changing low-density residential to medium density residential for multiple storey high-rise dwellings.

Thank you,
Debbie Martin

From: Tom Bibby
Sent: January 10, 2021 5:03 PM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: Notice of Zoning By-Law Amendment #3692-92

To Whom it may concern:

My name is Tom Bibby and I am sending this email on behalf of my wife, Catharine and myself. We reside at Green Rd, Stoney Creek, ON .

With regard to the above mentioned amendment, there is no maximum height noted in the zoning by-law for the apartment dwelling (d) Maximum Building Height of Subsection 6.10.7. It was clearly stated in the public notice sited in the newspaper that-the proposed amendment will permit multiple dwellings up to a MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF NINE STOREYS.

WITH THIS METRE/BUILDING HEIGHT NOT BEING INDICATED/INCLUDED IN THE ACTUAL AMENDMENT, IS THIS ANOTHER OPPORTUNITY FOR THE CITY AND LOCAL COUNCIL TO USE THE "NO HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS" ON A SPECIFIC PARCEL OF LAND SUCH AS WE ARE NOW EXPERIENCING AND OPPOSING AT 310 FRANCIS AVENUE?

THIS IS A SERIOUS OMISSION. PLEASE SEE THAT THERE IS A MAXIMUM HEIGHT STATED AND IT IS MADE PUBLIC.

Please confirm to us that this email message was received before the meeting.

Yours truly,
Thomas Bibby

From: Dawn Simpson
Sent: January 11, 2021 11:46 AM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: 1400 Baseline - proposed development concerns

Hi there! My name is Dawn Simpson and I am a resident of Winona and a real estate agent in touch with the needs of my community. I grew up here and I now live at ## Winona Road, close to the proposed development at 1400 Baseline Road. I understand there is a public meeting being held this week with regards to the future of this development.

I have heard that a 9-storey development with up to 99 units may be on the table. If this is true, then I do have some concerns, firstly with the potential for increased crime in the area. Condo units are more affordable than housing units, so it's a given that this kind of development would attract lower incomes. Let me make it clear that I have no problem with affordable housing, however, when low-income housing is highly concentrated, it creates problems with crime and a declining quality of the neighbourhood. Low-income units should be dispersed here and there instead, not concentrated in large developments where problems with crime can develop. Following several community pages, I see reports of residents upset with the frequency of neighbourhood crime quite frequently already, especially in the Lake Pointe and Fifty Point West areas. A large development here attracting lower-income residents would only further degrade the quality of the community

A low-income, concentrated development can also serve to devalue the properties in the immediate area, driving local residents away, changing the community demographics. This is not the vision that I think most Winona residents have of their lives as they have flocked here from other areas, settling in to raise their families in a safe and beautiful community.

Additionally, a large building with up to 9 storeys would be out of keeping with the rest of the area. It wouldn't fit in visually, and the increase in traffic would create additional complications with safety, noise, and congestion. While more concentrated developments have sprung up at the end of Casablanca, that doesn't mean that residents here would welcome the change in community direction with open arms. These are major concerns, as this type of development is not what attracted most of Winona's residents to this area initially. It would change the feel of community, and not for the better.

What this area lacks is housing for seniors. There is very little available in units that are one-floor, or accessible, for seniors to live independently. If there was an exclusive place for some of our seniors to live so they could remain in their community, i.e. accessible condos or bungalow townhomes, that might be one way to increase density somewhat, without bringing concerns of increased crime in the area. But 9 storeys, that would be out of keeping with the rest of the community, and I don't believe it would be welcomed by most residents, who moved here for the quiet, the quaintness, and of course, the safety.

Please consider the impact on the community before being wooed by the prospect of the city making a lot of money on a huge development that I know this community would not want.

Regards,
Dawn Simpson