



City of Hamilton PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM

Meeting #: 22-016
Date: November 29, 2022
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
5. COMMUNICATIONS	
*5.1 Taxicab Licensing (i) Ijaz Ahmad (ii) Iftikhar Ahmed	3
6. DELEGATION REQUESTS	
*6.2 Sarah MacLellan respecting a Permit for a new Deck and Gazebo (For the January 17, 2023 meeting)	
*6.3 Various Delegations respecting Bill 23 (Item 11.3) (For today's agenda) (i) Kojo Dampthey, Hamilton Centre for Civic Inclusion (in person) (ii) Karl Andrus, HCBN (in person) (iii) Anica Rak, ACORN (pre-recorded) (iv) Gord Smyth, ACORN (pre-recorded) (v) Marnie Schurter, ACORN (pre-recorded)	7
*6.4 Alex Shepherd respecting 168 Jackson St W (Item 9.6) (virtual) (For today's meeting)	
*6.5 Matt Johnston, Urban Solutions, respecting 66-68 Charlton Ave W (Item 9.6) (in person) (For today's meeting)	
9. CONSENT ITEMS	

9.6 Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee Report 22-010

a. Written Submissions:

*a. Added Written Submissions:

10

(iii) Idan Erez (Item #1)

(iv) Geoff Roche, Durand Neighbourhood Association (Item #1)

10. PUBLIC HEARINGS

10.2 Application for a Zoning By-law Amendment for Lands Located at 11 Springside Drive, Hamilton (PED22198) (Ward 8)

a. Written Submissions:

*a. Added Written Submissions:

12

(iv) Karen Gowan

(v) Cathy Blancher

(vi) Cecil Cooke

(vii) Rick and Susan Biggley

From: ijaz ahmad
 Sent: November 23, 2022 8:38 PM
 To: clerk@hamilton.ca
 Subject: Written submission to the Planning Committee, Hamilton City Hall.

Subject: Increase in Taxi Tariff/Fare according to existing prices of Taxi Cost.

There are some constant components and others are based on fluctuating prices. These all components are mentioned in the Taxi Tariff/Fare and Taxi Cost Index (appendix # 1 & # 5) on pages # 300 & # 306 of the Bylaws 07-170, schedule 25, as below.

<https://staging.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/media/browser/2017-07-06/07-170-consolidated-oct11-22.pdf>

I want to highlight the increased prices in constant components. The rates and functions of these constant components are recognized by our Ontario Government (as Harmonized Sales Tax and Earnings-all drivers), on the above pages of by-laws.

A.

Harmonized Sales Tax.

In the Taxi Tariff of 2008, it is mentioned that the Federal Goods and Services Tax (which is 5% on sales) is "INCLUDED" in the taxi Tariff by-laws 07-170 Schedule 25, on page # 2 (as below).

<https://www.hamilton.ca/sites/default/files/2022-02/08-175.pdf>

After two years, Harmonized Sales Tax was started with an addition of 8% (including the previous) Federal Goods and Services Tax.

But, the Taxi Tariff/ Fare, remained the SAME since 2008 till now (\$1.80 per KM). It means that a taxi driver (merchant) is paying 13% Harmonized Sales Tax from his pocket/earning money. But, the above Harmonized Sales tax may be based on the sale price as it is a Universal Truth that "Customers pay the Harmonized Sales tax and every merchant deposits to our Government". This Harmonized Sales Tax may not be "included" in the expenses and earnings of a taxi driver. It may be added after the base fare/ tariff (base sales price) of a taxi driver. So, It is requested that 13% of the taxi base fare may be increased in the taxi tariff/fare.

B.

Earnings -All Drivers.

In the Taxi Cost Index (Component # 6 of appendix # 5 of the by-laws) as above, the Taxi Tariff/Fare should be at least to the minimum wage per hour in Ontario. Ten years ago the minimum wage was \$10/ per hour but now in 2022, this wage is \$15/ per hour.

The minimum wage is increased by 50% but the Taxi Fare/Tariff is the same from 2008 till now (14 years), which is still \$1.80 per KM.

It is again requested that please increase the Taxi Fare/Tariff to the same ratio of increased minimum wage per hour in Ontario.

Thank you for your sympathetic consideration.

Ijaz Ahmad

Note: I have not considered other increased prices (from 2008 to 2022) of the following factors of components of the taxi cost index.

(a) Taxi Auto Insurance.

(b) Taxi brokerage/despatch fee which was ten years before \$474 per month and Now in 2022 \$674/ per month.

(c) Repair and maintenance costs have doubled since the last Taxi Tarif/Fare raised.

(d). Renting prices of the taxi/cab from brokers also increased from \$325/ per week (in 2008) to \$425/ per week in 2022.

From: Iftikhar Ahmed
Sent: November 23, 2022 10:59 PM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: Comments for committee meeting

Find attached comments for the upcoming committee meeting by the city of Hamilton licence cab drivers on the above mentioned subject.

Subject: REQUEST FOR ONE TIME EXTENTION OF 2 YEARS TAXICAB AGE RESTRICTION FOR THE 2012 MODEL YEAR VEHICLES ALREADY BEING USED AS TAXICAB SINCE THE START OF COVID-19

1. The City of Hamilton through By-law 18-252 based upon the recommendations given in Report 08-012 (PED16099(c)) submitted before the Planning Committee on August 14, 2018, by Mr. Ken Leendertse Director, Licensing and By-law Services, Planning and Economic Development Department amended the section 42. (1) of the City of Hamilton By-law No. 07-170 regarding TAXICAB AGE

RESTRICTION as under:

A taxicab shall be no more than ten years old, calculated from the model year.

2. The first COVID-19 case in Canada was reported on January 25, 2020, and since then the operational costs are soaring higher than reach of an ordinary resident of the city ibid and on the other hand the revenues are falling considerably.
3. In these Covid-19 years the following issues have badly impacted the taxicab industry in specific:
 - a. Inflation of 1.95% in 2019 has gone up to 6.40% in Oct 2022.
 - b. Taxicab Insurance increased to 275%.
 - c. Gas prices crossed the record high of above 2\$.
 - d. Inventory of used cars decreased to an alarming level.
 - e. Prices of used cars have gone up to 175%.
4. In view of the above it is requested that motor vehicles already in use as taxicabs since 2020 of model year 2012 may please be granted one time age restriction extension of two years to save the owner operators from the exuberant prices of the used vehicles as a result of lower inventory.
5. Currently at least 40 car is of 2012 years model in both the cab companies. Once these 40 plates are no longer on the streets it will financially effect drivers and their families as well as cab brokers.
6. On the other hand children's using cabs to commute to and fro from school may suffer from on time pick and drop.

All the Senior citizen who needs cab for their Hospital/ doctors visits may be disturb due to the shortage of these 40 Cabs.

Thanks for considering our humble request; a hard copy with signatures of cab drivers will be provided.

Sincerely

Iftikhar Ahmed

On behalf of cab drivers in the City of Hamilton, Ontario



November 29th 2022

ACORN Written Submission regarding Bill 23: Build More Homes Faster Act

ACORN members would like to share our submission to the Provincial government regarding recently proposed More Homes Built Faster Act 2022 (Bill 23).

ACORN (Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now, Canada) or ACORN Canada is a national, independent, membership-based community union of low- and moderate-income people with more than 160,000 members in 24+ neighbourhood chapters spread across 9 cities. For more information, please visit www.acorncanada.org.

ACORN members who are low-and-moderate income tenants, women, fixed-income seniors, people with disabilities, racialized people and newcomers, among others – have serious concerns with regard to Bill 23.

As a result of persistent efforts over more than 17 years, ACORN has been able to secure stronger tenant protections in case of renovations/demolitions and policies across different cities in Ontario to build real affordable housing. However, if this Bill is passed in its current form, it will have devastating impacts on low- and moderate-income tenants as not only will it create more unaffordable housing but it will also take away the powers cities have in building and protecting affordable housing.

These issues are detailed below:

1. Building more unaffordable housing.

The Act aims to build 1.5 million homes in the next 10 years. However, building more unaffordable housing is not the solution to the housing crisis. Ontario needs affordable housing and not more luxury condos.

2. Cities will have no power to build real affordable housing.

Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) allows cities to mandate a certain percentage of new developments to be set aside as affordable. Currently, cities have some powers to legislate their own IZ bylaws and build some real affordable housing. While the IZ policy was limited to major transit areas only, this Bill goes a step further limiting the potential of IZ in creating real affordable housing.

- 5% set aside rate for affordable housing units. Only 5% of the IZ units of a new development will be set aside as affordable. This is extremely low given the extent of the housing crisis. Data shows that each year in Canada, 64,000 existing affordable housing units are lost — 20,000 in Ontario alone. IZ has been implemented in several cities in Canada and the US, and studies show the best set-aside rates are 20-30%. ACORN members and allies won IZ bylaws in Toronto and Mississauga with set aside rates of up to 16% for affordable rental units and up to 22% for affordable ownership phased over years.
- The units will be kept affordable for a maximum of 25 years. Ontario is in a chronic housing crisis. There are massive incentives for landlords to up the rent once a tenant vacates the unit. After 25 years, the affordable housing unit will return to the market and the tenants will lose their affordable housing and communities. For IZ policies to be effective, the IZ units need to be kept affordable forever!
- The definition of affordable housing will be changed. There will be a standardized approach to determine the rent of an IZ unit. CMHC defines housing as affordable only if the rent is no more than 30% of the household income. The standardized approach will build unaffordable housing if it doesn't meet this definition.

3. It will make tenants more vulnerable to demovictions, increase homelessness crisis and destroy existing affordable housing.

In Ontario, landlords are increasingly using renovation/demolition as a tactic to evict tenants so that once the tenant moves out, they are able to substantially jack up the rent.

- One, the Bill strips the tenants' right to return in case of demolition. This is extremely disturbing since it will destroy existing affordable housing and accelerate evictions and homelessness crisis since the new units will be out of rent control.
- And second, the Bill proposes launching consultations to standardize municipal by-laws in cases of renovations and demolitions. Standardizing could also lead to diluting some of the strong tenant protections that ACORN and several other organizations have won across cities that have prevented evictions and homelessness.

ACORN members want energy efficient homes but meeting carbon emission targets at the expense of low-income affordability is not the solution! ACORN strongly believes in giving cities the tools and powers they need to protect tenants' rights. More, not less tenant protections in case of renovations/demolitions is the answer!

4. Other issues

Further, other aspects of the Bill that are concerning are the following:

- It proposes to exempt new developments, including affordable housing, from development charges. ACORN members are wary of this because in the absence of these charges, costs for important services such as transit and other city services will not be met.

- It also reduces the capacity of conservation authorities in the process of building more housing.

In short, the new legislation works to the detriment of low- and moderate-income tenants. ACORN strongly urges the Government of Ontario to scrap these aspects of the Bill as it will worsen the housing crisis, especially for low- and moderate-income tenants who are in desperate need of support.

ACORN members look forward to hearing how the City of Hamilton will share their opposition to Bill 23 with Premier Doug Ford and Minister Steve Clark. ACORN urges the city to explore all options to oppose the legislation and move forward with local policy to protect tenants from demoviction.

November 28, 2022

Hamilton Planning and Economic Development Department

c/o City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

To the Chair and Committee Members:

Re: Recommendation to Designate 66-68 Charlton Avenue West under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

I am the owner and occupant of [REDACTED] Charlton Ave. West in Hamilton, Ontario. I have owned and lived in the home on [REDACTED] Charlton since 2017. 64 Charlton Ave. West is the property located immediately to the east of 66-68 Charlton Ave. West (“66/68”).


I write in general support of the recommendation to designate 66/68 as a property of cultural heritage value pursuant to the provisions of Part IV, Section 29 of the *Ontario Heritage Act*. I have read the report of Lisa Christie and Steve Robichaud recommending the designation of 66/68 and, for what it’s worth as the immediate neighbour of 66/68, agree with the conclusions set out in that report by the author(s).

Apart from my support of the designation for purposes of recognizing 66/68’s cultural heritage, I am also concerned about the environmental impact of a demolition of 66/68. While I am admittedly no expert, I have seen reports that demolition results in 20-30% of municipal landfills; I have also read that, when century homes like 66/68 are demolished, there is a concern for the release into the environment of toxic contaminants.

While I am generally supportive of the designation of 66/68, I do ask that, in considering the question, the Chair and Committee Members balance the threat to heritage and the environmental impact of a demolition of 66/68, on the one hand, against the likelihood that that property will continue to deteriorate through its owner’s apparent neglect, on the other. 66/68 has been vacant since at least January 2022 and is now boarded up to prevent the unauthorized entry that was repeatedly reported to the owner and authorities (including by me) since its abandonment. A designation stands to be counterproductive to both any heritage and environmental objectives if it will only result in the owner’s further neglect of the buildings and their deterioration over time.

If designation can be accompanied by financial incentives to the owner of 66/68 aimed at facilitating preservation, or financial disincentives aimed at preventing further degradation, then my support of designation would be whole-hearted.

Yours very truly,



Idan Erez

November 17, 2022

Hamilton Municipal Heritage Committee
c/o City of Hamilton
71 Main Street West
Hamilton, Ontario L8P 4Y5

Attention: Alissa Denham Robinson, HMHC Chair
Heritage Committee Members



RE: Recommendation to Designate 66-68 Charlton Avenue West
under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act. (PED22208) (Ward2)

The Durand Neighbourhood Association (DNA) would like to support Hamilton Heritage staff's recommendation to 'Designate' 66-68 Charlton Avenue West under Part IV of the Ontario Heritage Act.

The DNA was founded in 1972 out of concern expressed by our citizens about the rampant demolition and destruction of exquisite homes within the community that were being bulldozed under the auspices for a new urban density by the City. We are now 50 years on and history is repeating itself. As a neighbourhood, we are crushed at the prospect of losing more of our contextual heritage fabric of turn of the century fine brick dwellings. These buildings were built with superior craftsmanship and style. Although 66-68 Charlton is in effect one building proposed for demolition, the loss would really amount to two original Queen Anne Revival dwellings and the sympathetic centre addition that joined them. The loss is therefore significant.

We have yet to hear from the land owner as to why the demolition is being proposed and for what reasons. We assume it is simply speculation. This is so unfortunate. There are so many great heritage attributes with this building that afford protection. It is also a crucial part of a community of similarly brick built buildings that form a critical mass that remain in the Durand and are quintessential to the contextual fabric of the neighbourhood. The moulded bricks and cut stone masonry on this building were crafted and shaped with intricate design, skill, texture, and refinement. It is a well-built building by the affluent land owners of the period. The decoration and proportions were well thought out. The dentil encrusted cornices, and large wood brackets supporting cantilevered gable pediments over three sided bays, are to be treasured. The building still retains so much of its original trim details, including the wood trimmed tripartite windows and original gable frieze detail. There are the scalloped clay tile wall shingles and delicate half-moon transom over the front doors, and the original dormers are intact and beautiful.

There were some later additions at the rear that the DNA would support removal of, but we certainly believe the original Queen Anne Revival structure(s) is worthy of designation. The DNA asks that Council recognize the inherent beauty of the building, and its contextual heritage importance to the Durand community, and protect it accordingly.

Respectfully yours,

Chris Redmond, President, Durand Neighbourhood Association
Geoffrey Roche, Chair DNA Heritage Subcommittee

From: Karen Gowan
Sent: November 27, 2022 12:00 PM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Cc: Van Rooi, James <James.VanRooi@hamilton.ca>
Subject: ZAC-19-056. 11 Springside Drive

I am opposed to this drastic zone change for this unique neighbourhood.

I am writing with my concerns for the proposed 7 dwelling complex at 11 Springside Drive.

Road safety is a major concern. Seven driveways coming onto the road in less than 60 meters of space. By a controlled intersection, with no sidewalks, just ditches and a lot of pedestrian traffic.

Storm water run off. Will swells & ditches be enforced between properties, even though the building is all attached?

Will the frontage of the complex be set back from the street like the rest of the neighbourhood?

There is a major water catchment at the corner of this property. How is this being addressed with the changes to the land & trees involved?

Going from a zone B to RT-30-H zone is a very drastic change for this neighbourhood. Please come up with an alternative plan.

Karen Gowan

From: Cathy Blancher
Sent: November 22, 2022 4:54 PM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca
Subject: 11 Springside Drive Hamilton

I would like to submit my comments for the above to be read at the next meeting.

I find this proposal the best offer so far. I am still very concerned about traffic at the corner of Springside and Rymal with 7 units right at the corner with 7 driveways on Springside. Is there any way a private laneway with access to Rymal be created for these units? I see a number of townhouse complexes with this idea (Raymond and Rymal area comes to mind). I would not like to see a laneway with access to Springside and Rymal because neighbourhood residents would cut through to avoid the light and it would be dangerous for the townhouse people. The corner is very narrow with deep ditches on both sides and no sidewalks for pedestrian access. There will be absolutely no visitor parking access near these units until you pass Lister Ave. These are my concerns and I hope they will be addressed by the city or the developer.

Sincerely,
Cathy Blancher

From: Cecil Cooke

Sent: November 25, 2022 10:57 AM

To: clerk@hamilton.ca

Subject: Cecil Cooke shared "Document 11 Springside Dr., Nov. 2022 1 1" with you.

File : ZAC-19-056

Re: 11 Springside Drive, Hamilton, Ontario

11 Springside Dr. is located in the Allison Neighbourhood which has 'B' zoning. This neighbourhood has two main roads as boundaries - on the north, Rymal Rd. East (formerly Hwy. 53) and on the west Upper James St. (formerly Hwy. 6 south).

A little history will explain the 'B' zoning.

The Allison Neighbourhood, when begun in the 1950's was located in Glandford Township. Because each lot had its own water and septic system, the lot area required was approximately 1/4 acre. The survey was named the Allison neighbourhood because it was the Allison family farm. This neighbourhood was annexed by the City of Hamilton in the early 1960's. City water came in the late 1960's, sewers not until the late 1990's. Several homes still use the septic systems.

Until now there have been no severances, no minor variances pertaining to lot sizes with the exception of the former Ryckman's Corners School property.

There have been four attempts by home owners to have lots severed. In three of the cases, the Ontario Municipal Board denied the applications.

-80 Lister Ave. in 2008

-49 Springside Dr. In 2010

- 11 Springside Dr. In 2013

The fourth application, by owner of 14 Lister Ave. and vacant lot beside, was denied by the City of Hamilton Planning Department in 2005.

In each case the comments from the OMB have been consistent. " This enclave of very large single-family lots is a somewhat unique feature in the City of Hamilton. The application before the Board does not maintain and enhance the character of

the existing neighbourhood. Allowing severances would have a destabilizing effect on the area which would result in piecemeal planning.”

The Allison Neighbourhood is noted for its unique characteristics of large open lots, green spaces and single family dwellings.

But, the rezoning and construction of seven townhouses on the property at 11 Springside Dr. raises several serious concerns:

1. This property is the lowest property in the Allison Neighbourhood. There are deep ditches on both sides of Springside Dr. as well as along Rymal Rd. E. This property is much lower than Rymal Rd. on its north side.

Therefore heavy rain runoff converges down Springside Dr. If seven driveways are built closely over this ditch where is the water to go? There is little green space to absorb water.

2. Springside Dr. in this area is narrow leaving no street space for parking extra vehicles. Also, it is directly at the intersection of Rymal Rd. E. and Springside where the traffic signal is located.

3. For several years the present owner has allowed this property to deteriorate doing little to maintain neighbourhood standards. It is apparent that the property owner has no interest in this neighbourhood other than development.

Regarding the proposed rezoning and severance at 11 Springside Dr., the average lot size in the Allison Neighbourhood is approx. 1455 sq. metres, the smallest being 1197 sq. metres. This is vastly different to the proposed lots and is not compatible with the neighbourhood .

The change of zoning from ‘B’ to ‘C’ in order to sever lots sets a precedent for future changes which would not enhance the neighbourhood.

According to the ‘Mountain News’, Thursday, April 21, 2022, Hamilton has over 35,000 residential units already approved, so severing a lot to construct seven additional townhouses does not seem to be necessary.

The Hamilton Spectator, Fri., July 8, 2022 tells of the 'low numbers of people who have migrated to the Hamilton Mountain in recent years.' Hamilton has seen a net loss in population to nearby communities.

This change of zoning from 'B' to "RT-30/H" to accommodate the severance of a lot at 11 Springside Dr.. is not compatible with the Neighbourhood Plan and therefore should be denied.

We believe that rezoning and severing the lot at 11 Springside Dr. in order to build seven townhouses does not benefit the neighbourhood in any way. It only sets a precedent for future severances with piecemeal planning , resulting in loss of the unique features which the residents of this area value and enjoy.

Marjorie Cooke

Cecil Cooke

Residents at ***. For 56 years

From: Rick Biggley <
Sent: November 28, 2022 11:40 AM
To: clerk@hamilton.ca; Van Rooi, James <James.VanRooi@hamilton.ca>
Subject: FW: Regarding 11 Springside drive zoning change request ZAC-19-056 Update

From: Rick Biggley
Sent: November 28, 2022 11:33 AM
To: 'clerk@hamilton.ca' <clerk@hamilton.ca>; 'James.vanrooi@hamilton.ca' <James.vanrooi@hamilton.ca>
Subject: Regarding 11 Springside drive zoning change request ZAC-19-056 Update

Good morning

Please find attached a copy of last years letter of opposition in regards to the request for a zoning change from "B zoning" to RT-30 (street townhouses), all of the information in the letter dated October 3rd 2021 is relevant in this latest change by the builder from 8 (eight) townhomes to 7 (seven) townhomes on number 11 Springside drive Hamilton.

We stand in opposition once again to this request for a zoning change from the current "B zoning" to RT-30 (street townhouses) in the Allison neighborhood @ 11 Springside drive Hamilton.

When my wife and I purchased our home in the Allison neighborhood 14 years ago, one of the reasons for our decision was the "B zoning", knowing that only large lots with single detached homes being part of the B zoning requirements.

Prior we lived off of Stone church road and the Upper James (Ward 8) for 13 years in a street townhome complex where there were sidewalks, which gave us a little safety buffer from the bumper to bumper parked cars, and crowded street on Dicenzo Drive.

Intensification brings with it, more traffic, more accidents, less areas for our children to enjoy the outdoors, more crime, more noise, more pollution and injuries to the residents involved.

The Allison community has no sidewalks for pedestrian safety as is, and no storm drains to support any attempt for intensification and should be considered as a risk while receiving requests for zoning changes. The builder requesting the zoning change at 11 Springside drive has been silent on the subject public safety and sidewalks. This is a big concern to the people who live in the area at this time.

Over the last 5 to 10 years there have been many zoning change requests which were denied, please find attached a few pictures of the single detached homes built within this B zoning neighbourhood. I include these homes as many of these owners requested zoning changes and were denied as they did not conform to the B zoning guidelines. There have been approximately 25 new single detached built and approved by the Hamilton city.

Thank you for your attention

Rick and Susan Biggley

From: Rick Biggley <

Sent: October 3, 2021 11:28 AM

To: Mark.Andrews@Hamilton.ca; John-Paul.Danko@hamilton.ca; Nikola.Wojewoda@hamilton.ca

Subject: Regarding 11 Springside drive zoning change request

Good morning;

In regards to the request for a zoning change at 11 Springside drive from a B zone to Townhouse "RT-30" District, Modified, we stand opposed to this request.

"The purpose of the application is for a change in zoning from the Suburban Agriculture and Residential, Etc. "B" District to the Street – Townhouse "RT-30" District, Modified.

The effect of the proposal would permit the demolition of the existing dwelling at 11 Springside Drive and the construction of eight (8), two-storey street townhouse dwelling units, arranged into a single block."

This proposed zoning change by the vendor (Townhouse "RT-30" District, Modified) does not fit into the existing B zoning guidelines and style of the residential lots and homes in the Allison community.

Over the last few years number 11 Springside drive has come to the city requesting zoning changes and or requests to sever the lot into smaller pieces. Approximately three years ago the owner at that time petitioned to sever 11 Springside drive into two separate lots. Their application was denied and the owner sold the existing home and lot as is.

Last year the new owner of the property applied to build a two-storey, mixed-use building with 535 m2 of commercial space on the ground floor, and seven (7) dwelling units on the second floor, including 19 parking spaces. This request again did not fit into the existing style of the Allison neighborhood and as of late has been Modified to the current request to build 8 Town homes on this single home residential lot.

Once again this style of housing does not fit into the existing B zoning of the Allison Community "where every lot or tract of land in a "B" District shall have a width of at least 20.0 metres (65.62 feet) and an area of at least 1,100.0 square metres (11,840.69 square feet) within the district. (8927/60) (71-327) (79-288) (80-049)"

Allison as a community does not have an under ground storm water system and relies on above ground water management for storms based on large lots being able to absorb storm water or channel it through the use of swales. The request to build multiple townhomes at 11 Springside does not take into consideration the effect of not having proper storm water management or green space to absorb storm water, this would and could cause flooding at adjacent lots.

Springside drive is a narrow street and does not support street side parking, which I'm sure you are aware that ALL town home surveys have multiple vehicles parked on the streets as the use of single car driveways and garage don't support growing families with multiple vehicles. This and the fact that 11 Springside drive is at the corner of Rymal Rd and Springside drive could cause safety issues to the public as Allison district does not have pedestrian sidewalks.

There will be issues with snow removal at this intersection, with 8 driveways and no where to put the snow. Where will it go?

The vendor who owns 11 Springside will not be living in the dwellings proposed and are only before your committee for sheer profit and not in support of the Allison district neighborhood. The vendors have now submitted 3 different requests to change the zoning of this lot, the last two were denied and we appreciate the planners office keeping with the existing zoning laws in the area and in keeping with the existing vision of the Allison district.

As this 60 year old neighborhood renews itself, older homes are sold and purchased, where they are being renovated or new single family homes are being built, supporting the Allison community and living up to B zoning. For example numbers, 65 Springside drive, 35 Springside drive, 95 Springside drive, 110 Springside drive, 106 Springside drive have all renovated or built new homes for their families to live in. These are just a few on Springside supporting the community of Allison districts existing zoning laws.

Once again we stand in opposition to the proposed zoning change at 11 Springside drive as it does not support the existing B zoning and is not a favorable addition to the Allison neighborhood.

Thank you

Rick & Susan Biggley



