



## City of Hamilton

### PLANNING COMMITTEE ADDENDUM

**Meeting #:** 25-004  
**Date:** March 18, 2025  
**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

#### 6. DELEGATIONS

- \*6.1 Phil Pothen, Environmental Defence, respecting Permit Reform Process (Item 10.1)

#### 8. PUBLIC HEARINGS

##### 8.2 PED25067

- \*a. Written Submissions:
  - (i) Rolf Nanninga and Yuru Irene
  - (ii) Robert Sturge
  - (iii) Marleen Van den Broek
  - (iv) Blake Thompson
  - (v) Michelle Kriedemann

3

#### 10. MOTIONS

##### 10.1 Permit Reform Process

- \*a. Written Submissions:
  - (i) Anthony Salemi, West End Home Builders' Association

10

#### 11. NOTICES OF MOTION

\*11.2 Hamilton Heritage Property Grant Program Application Criteria  
Exception for the Property Municipally Addressed as 2295 Troy Road,  
Flamborough (Former Troy School)

11

**From:** Rolf Nanninga  
**Sent:** March 12, 2025 10:48 PM  
**To:** [clerk@hamilton.ca](mailto:clerk@hamilton.ca)  
**Subject:** Re: File UHOPA-24-012 804 to 816 King St. West.

Dear City Clerk,

Thank you for taking the time to hear my concerns regarding **File UHOPA-24-012 (804–816 King St. West)**. I appreciate the city's efforts to increase housing density, as I recognize the need for responsible growth. However, I believe it is essential to approach this development with wisdom and prudence. As a homeowner living just two doors down from the proposed building, I kindly request that the following considerations be taken into account:

1. **Building Height & Privacy:**

The proposed building height raises serious concerns about privacy and sunlight in my backyard, where my children regularly play. A significantly taller structure so close to the property line creates an environment where they may feel unsafe using our playset. Additionally, the reduced sunlight due to the building's height will impact our outdoor space. I respectfully request that the building height be limited to a more reasonable level, such as four storeys, to help maintain privacy and adequate light for surrounding residents.

2. **Parking Availability:**

Parking in our neighbourhood is already at capacity, and the proposed plans do not appear to provide enough spaces for new residents. Without an increase in on-site parking, local community members and patrons of nearby businesses will face even greater difficulty finding available parking. I urge the city to ensure that the development includes sufficient parking to accommodate both new tenants and the existing community.

3. **Waste Management & Accessibility:**

The previous plans did not seem to allocate adequate space for garbage and recycling bins, which raises concerns about where they will be stored and how collection will be managed. It is important that these facilities are both out of the way of neighbouring residents and accessible for waste collection trucks. I ask that careful consideration be given to ensuring there is sufficient space to manage waste effectively.

I appreciate your time and consideration of these concerns. I trust that the city will balance the need for increased housing with the well-being of the existing community. Please let me know if there is an opportunity to discuss these concerns further.

Sincerely,

Rolf Nanninga and Yuru Irene

**From:** Rob Sturge  
**Sent:** March 13, 2025 1:07 PM  
**To:** [clerk@hamilton.ca](mailto:clerk@hamilton.ca)  
**Subject:** 804-816 King Street West Hamilton

Good morning,

Unfortunately, I will not be available to attend the public Planning Committee hearing the proposed By-law amendment slated for March 18th.

As a new home owner and resident of the Westdale North community, I do feel it necessary to add to and for the record that the proposal as presented in correspondence (March 7, 2025) is entirely contradictory to the proposal approved by the city on March 23, 2021.

First and foremost, the community was asked to consider a development containing 30 units, the new "amendment" increases that number by 129% above the approved density.

I would also highlight the justifications provided to approve the project proposal (original and revised) as stated by Ward 1 representative Ms. Wilson states the following;

"The development provides setbacks at the fifth and sixth floors. A building setback is an architectural design feature usually applied to the upper storey of a development. Just as the name suggests, a setback sees the building further pulled in toward the centre of the property. Setbacks help reduce the scale of a building while emphasizing the lower elements of a structure. Setbacks create a more human scale streetwall and reduce overlook and shadow impacts on adjacent properties".

The new proposal provides no such provision for a "set back" design to protect the "human scale" and privacy of those living in close proximity to the development.

Additionally, while notably downplayed as a "minor reduction" in available parking from 20 to 19 spaces, again the proposal as presented and approved was to accommodate students, whereas now the project purpose is to build apartments. It wouldn't take a scientific study to prove the ratio of student resident parking compared to "full time" residents surely cannot be considered the same?

I cannot for the life of me understand how these changes are being presented to the community as an amendment?

While I appreciate the need for housing, this was approved as living space for STUDENTS. The scope, size and physical appearance no longer resemble that which was approved. The way this is being presented feels quite manipulative and honestly risks harming those who already live, work, pay taxes and make this unique part of the city their home.

Robert Sturge

**From:** Marleen Van den Broek  
**Sent:** March 16, 2025 6:03 PM  
**To:** [clerk@hamilton.ca](mailto:clerk@hamilton.ca)  
**Cc:** Catarino, Jennifer <[Jennifer.Catarino@hamilton.ca](mailto:Jennifer.Catarino@hamilton.ca)>  
**Subject:** UHOPA-24-012

To whom it may concern,

My name is Marleen Van den Broek. I live on Glen Road, within 120 meters of the '804-816 King West' site. At this site, the owner, Gateway Development Group Inc. is proposing to decrease the retail space from 403 square meters to 330 square meters (ground floor) and to increase the amount of residential units from 30 student residential suites to 68 residential units. All these changes will be made within the original building envelope. The original 30 units were, according to the explanation in the original public meetings geared towards Phd and graduate students with young families, which would explain the high amount of bedrooms per unit.

In the new proposal, the units only contain 1 bedroom units with few 2 bedroom units and are thus more geared towards singles.

The change in internal layout of the building makes it clear to me that the developer has a different type of renter in mind. The new renter is not a young family, but singles. In se is that not a problem, though it is important to understand what happened to the original neighbors in the close vicinity after the approval for a 6 storey unit.

While the developer got the approval, the neighbors living in the close vicinity were left in the cold. Most of the neighbors (families) have moved away. I am thinking of the families that lived at 15, 16 Paradise Road, 139, 135, 163, 159 and 154 (and neighbor to the east) Glen Road. These families have left the area. At least, according to the plans, the inflow of potential new students with families to the area was definitely an option. In the new plan, this is very unlikely.

For the neighbors that live a bit further from the development site, such as me and my family, the impact of the increased traffic and parking in the area is also of importance.

In the new proposal, this will become a problem for us.

Please let me explain:

1) After an original transportation study impact executed by paradigm transportation solutions ltd, Mr. Wah (then owner of the building site) and Gateway Development Group Inc. received a letter that the city staff did not approve of the proposed 13 parking spots and demanded they follow the outlines as per By-law 05-200 approved by Council through By-law 17-240.

Specifically:

A total of 21 parking spaces (increase of eight spaces):  
 11 surface parking spaces; and 10 underground parking spaces (including two small car spaces).  
 Vehicle access is still proposed via one all-turns driveway connection to Paradise Road North.

On April 14, 2021 a zoning amendment 21-048 was approved to By-law 05-200), which stipulates the following rules concerning parking:

- 1) A minimum 0.6 parking spaces per dwelling unit shall be required.
- 2) A total of 2 parking spaces shall be provided for any permitted commercial use with a gross floor area less than 450 square metres.

This brings the total amount of parking spaces needed at 20 parking spots. providing for 30 units and commercial space.

In the new proposal, the amount of residential units has increased from 30 units to 68 units.

According to the stipulations in By-law 24-052, the new amount of parking spots would be 40.8 parking spots ( $68 \times 0.6$ ) for the residential units and 2 spots for the commercial units.

This totals 43 parking spots needed for the new proposal.

In the recent communication of the developer to the neighborhood (letter of March 7 2025) the amount of parking spots for residential units would be 2 parking spots + 0.05 spots per residential unit. No parking spots would be needed for the commercial units. This totals the units at  $2 + 3.4$  units or 5 units for all 68 units. The By-law 24-052 of April 10, 2024 is used as a reference document for their calculations.

The developing group is now using the By-law 24-052 of April 10, 2024 to increase the units while decreasing the amount of parking spots. Keeping in mind that most new renters will be singles, potentially each owning a car to go to work or activities, the amount of parking spots provided should be more than the original 20 spots, not less. The proposed amount of 18 spots is more than sufficient, according to the new by-law 24-052, but practically it is not enough for a total of 68 units. It would therefore be advised to judge based on the amendment 21-048. It was also the developer that requested the amendment in 2021 and, against all public input from the neighborhood, got it approved.

I ask you now, to please listen to one of the neighbors (me) that decided to stay and not to leave, and keep to the amendment 21-048 of April 14, 2021 in which the developer should provide 43 parking spots for the development, not 5. The developer was the one asking for the amendment in the first place. Why not hold them accountable to this now?

Thank you for reading and considering my letter. I hope that this time the neighbors will be heard.

Sincerely Yours,

Marleen Van den Broek

From: Blake Thompson  
Sent: March 17, 2025 9:39 AM  
To: [clerk@hamilton.ca](mailto:clerk@hamilton.ca)  
Subject: Written Comment for meeting March 18, 2025 File #UHOPA-24-012

Hello,

Please confirm receipt of this email.

I have numerous questions regarding the development of 804-816 King St W. Below are some of these questions:

1. What has delayed construction on this site from 2020 to present.
2. Why has there been no consideration to the lack of parking for this proposed project? Yes there is transit stops in the area however there will still be numerous tenants requiring parking for a vehicle. The surrounding streets are already completely full on a daily basis.
3. Are local residents going to have dedicated contacts with the city for issues that arise during construction. For instance water contamination, noise and other issues.
4. Will local residents be notified on FINAL plans and before construction starts?
5. Why has this development changed so many times and keeps getting larger and larger and parking reduced?
6. What portion of the units are going to be affordable units and not market rent?

Blake Thompson

**From:** Michelle Kriedemann

**Sent:** March 17, 2025 12:02 PM

**To:** [clerk@hamilton.ca](mailto:clerk@hamilton.ca)

**Subject:** Request for Consideration of Community and Environmental Impact for Proposed Development at 804 to 816 King Street West

Dear Members of the Planning Committee,

I am writing to express my concerns and request a thoughtful examination of the proposed development at 804 to 816 King Street West, as outlined in the notice for the upcoming public meeting on March 18, 2025. As both a resident and a business owner in the area, I am deeply concerned about the potential impacts of increasing the density to 380 residential units per gross hectare at this location. Had I had the opportunity to weigh in on this when the original proposal was made, I would have certainly added some of these thoughts then.

**Personal and Community Impact:**

My residence, located just a few doors down from another recent development directly across the street, has already suffered from the reduced sunlight due to new construction. The proposed building, being directly across the street, raises concerns about further loss of sunlight and increased noise, potentially degrading the quality of life for myself and my neighbors. In addition to this, there is the debris and garbage concern, all of which has already affected my quality of life, along with that of my neighbours.

**Business Impact and Economic Contribution:**

As the owner of a local business, Allure Fitness Inc., that contributes to the vibrancy and economic health of Westdale Village, I am particularly worried about the accessibility during the construction phase. The only lane of traffic in front of the proposed site on King Street West will likely require rerouting, significantly impacting customer access to our area. Such disruptions not only deter customers but affect the livelihood of all local entrepreneurs. The impending LRT construction and the closure of the Main and Longwood intersection will exacerbate these challenges, potentially isolating our commercial area during critical business hours.

**Environmental Concerns:**

Additionally, I am compelled to raise serious environmental concerns stemming from previous construction activities in our vicinity. The last large-scale building project resulted in considerable amounts of debris, including styrofoam and other materials, littering the area for months. Despite cleanup efforts, some of this debris has proven impossible to completely remove, with a significant portion entering Cootes Paradise. This is particularly distressing given the ecological importance of Cootes Paradise as a biodiversity hotspot and a vital component of our local environment.

**Request for Mitigation Strategies:**

I urge the committee to require the developers to present a comprehensive traffic management plan that includes alternative routes and clear signage to minimize disruption. It is also crucial that the developers are held to rigorous standards regarding noise and dust control, considering the prolonged impact the previous nearby construction had on the community. Moreover, I request that stringent environmental protections are implemented, including comprehensive environmental management plans that prevent contamination and debris dispersal.

**Engagement and Collaboration:**

I am fully committed to engaging in a constructive dialogue to find solutions that balance development



needs with community interests. I would welcome the opportunity to participate in any working groups or consultations related to this development.

**Legal and Regulatory Considerations:**

I request that the committee ensures that all legal and regulatory frameworks, particularly those related to zoning and environmental impact, are rigorously adhered to in the planning and execution of this project.

Given the tight timeline and the significant impact of this proposal, I sincerely hope that the committee will take these points into account and seek to mitigate the adverse effects on the community. I am keen on participating in discussions that aim for a balanced approach to development, which respects the needs of current residents and businesses while accommodating growth.

Thank you for considering my perspective. Although I am unable to attend tomorrow's meeting, I look forward to the opportunity to discuss this matter further.

Sincerely,  
Michelle Kriedemann



March 17, 2025

From:  
**West End Home Builders' Association**  
1112 Rymal Road East  
Hamilton, Ontario L8W 3N7

To:  
**Members of Planning Committee**  
City of Hamilton  
71 Main St W, Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

**WE HBA Letter: Hamilton Permit Reform Process Motion**

---

The West End Home Builders' Association ("WE HBA") is the voice of the land development, new housing and professional renovation industries in Hamilton, Burlington, and Grimsby. WE HBA represents 320 member companies made up of all disciplines involved in land development and residential construction.

WE HBA appreciates the motion brought forward today by Councillor Maureen Wilson requesting Planning and Economic Development and Public Works staff "develop an action plan to improve the timeliness, efficiency, customer service and accessible navigation of the development approvals and building permit processes to facilitate the construction of new housing supply". Our members have increasingly faced process challenges in Hamilton, and this is a positive opportunity to address these issues and find efficiencies. WE HBA appreciates leadership from the Councillor in putting forward this motion, and the industry looks forward to assisting in informing the scope of the review and action plan. We are eager to work collaboratively with Council to ensure Hamilton is an attractive place for investment in housing supply and for jobs in construction as we work together to achieve Hamilton's housing target of 47,000 new homes by 2031.

Sincerely,

**Anthony Salemi, BURPI**  
Planner, Policy and Government Relations  
West End Home Builders' Association

# CITY OF HAMILTON

## NOTICE OF MOTION

Planning Committee Date: March 18, 2025

**MOVED BY COUNCILLOR C. CASSAR.....**

**Hamilton Heritage Property Grant Program Application Criteria Exception for the Property Municipally Addressed as 2295 Troy Road, Flamborough (Former Troy School)**

WHEREAS, the Hamilton Heritage Property Grant Program (the Program) is intended to provide financial assistance to commercial, institutional, industrial or multi-residential properties that are designated under the *Ontario Heritage Act*, in the form of a grant for the conservation and restoration of heritage features, including the structural and stability work, up to a maximum of \$150,000, and for an additional \$20,000 for any studies, reports or assessments related to said work;

WHEREAS, applicants must meet the Council approved Program eligibility and grant criteria, including being located within defined geographic areas across the city, including Community Improvement Project Areas, the Mount Hope/Airport Gateway or the lower city between Highway 403 and the Red Hill Valley Parkway;

WHEREAS, program applications are subject to a comprehensive review by the City of Hamilton's Economic Development Division and approval of all Program applications are at the absolute discretion of the General Manager, Planning and Economic Development, and subject to the availability of funds;

WHEREAS, the property located at 2295 Troy Road, Flamborough, known as the former Troy School, (the Property) is designated under Part IV of the *Ontario Heritage Act* by Former Town of Flamborough By-law No. 95-67;

WHEREAS, the Property's existing historic wood siding is in a state of disrepair, and the estimated cost to restore and/or replace the wood siding with appropriate wood or wood-composite materials is approximately \$80,000 to \$120,000, and the Property owner has requested that the designation by-law be repealed because they do not have the funds required to appropriately conserve and repair the siding;

WHEREAS, the Property is not located within the geographic eligibility area of the existing Hamilton Heritage Property Grant Program, and would currently only be eligible for a maximum matching grant of \$5,000 per year under the Hamilton Heritage Conservation Grant Program; and,

WHEREAS, the Property is one of several designated heritage properties that are not currently eligible for the Hamilton Heritage Property Grant Program due to their geographic location, but its owners wish to undertake conservation and restoration work that warrants substantially more funding than is currently available under the Hamilton Heritage Conservation Grant Program;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

- (a) That, on a one-time basis, staff be directed to accept a Hamilton Heritage Property Grant Program application for 2295 Troy Road, Flamborough (Former Troy School) (the Property), for Program eligible heritage conservation and restoration work;
- (b) That staff be directed to review, process and approve any such application, provided the application, applicant and Property meet all other applicable Council-approved Program terms; and
- (c) That staff be directed to investigate opportunities to improve the Hamilton Heritage Property Grant Program and Hamilton Heritage Conservation Grant Program, including the potential to expand the geographic eligibility and funding amounts of the programs and any related impacts on funding, staffing and resources, and bring forward a report to the Planning Committee with recommendations, including any potential 2026 budget requests which may be required to support any recommended changes, by the end of Q3 2025.