

From: Morrison, Alison  
Sent: September-02-16 1:28 PM  
To: Bedioui, Ida  
Subject: FW: Zoning by-law amendment application ZAC-15-055 Cannon Nurseries  
Dundas/First St property

8.1 (iii)

Dear Councillor Partridge.

We are unable to attend the Planning Committee meeting scheduled for Tuesday September 6th.

So could you please include our comments in the minutes of the meeting?

We feel that IBI Group has no intention of addressing any of our concerns that were raised at the public meeting back in March 2nd 2016. Even though they told us there would be another meeting, where they would supply an updated traffic survey and how they would address our other concerns about the size of the development.

The points we raised were:

1. The Builder at the very least meet the Hamilton Building Standards. Their proposed sizes are smaller than the minimum, and larger than the maximum.
2. No walkway be allowed between the development and Boulding Avenue
3. Put in some Green Space (swing set, slide, teeter totter play equipment). The families living in the Back to Back condo's will need to spend time outside with their children. I/we can not see anyone wanting to walk 20-30 minutes just to "get some fresh air" with their children. Especially if their ages range from 2- 6 yrs olds.
4. No 2nd floor Balconies allowed on the North Side Townhomes.
5. If the Townhomes can not be reduced in Height along both Edges (Boulding Ave) then there needs to be some Buffering put in.
6. If the Townhomes can not be Pushed Back along both Edges (Boulding Ave) then there needs to be some financial Compensation for present home owners. Why? Because now they have between 8 and 14 families looking into their yards.
7. There should be a minimum of .3 visitor/unit and at least 2 Handicap parking spaces.

Funny thing, Thursday pm March 3rd. coming from the Dentist office at 1720hrs westbound traffic along Dundas was stopped on both sides of the light at Burke. Completely contrary to IBI Group's "normal traffic count"

Thank You

Bonnie Robb  
Gordon Robb  
19 Boulding Avenue  
Waterdown Ontario

Stewart White  
2 Boulding Avenue, Waterdown, On

August 30, 2016

Judi Partridge  
Ward 15 East Flamborough  
Waterdown, On

Dear Judi,

Thank-you for reaching out to residents regarding the Cannon Development Proposal. I would like to take this opportunity to express my concerns with the city's plan to rezone.

Despite the findings from the traffic study that was performed, all residents in Waterdown struggle daily with traffic congestion as lanes are reduced right at the very spot where the new Medium Density development is proposed. New housing which is underway east of the town will add undoubtedly additional traffic lights on Hwy 5 and only exacerbate the problem. Long lines of stop and go traffic during rush hour times will create a very dangerous situation for owners within the new Cannon location, as they struggle to get in and out, while looking east and west, directly into the setting and rising sun. We have already had serious accidents, some causing death, along that stretch of highway. I recall one morning driving to work past a vehicle lying on its roof after being t-boned by a gravel truck (which often race through town early in the morning). This was just at Pamela St. and Hwy 5. I worry that with 80 new resident's right at First Street (as proposed) it would not take long before one of them loses patience with the traffic and pulls out at the wrong time.

I understand the need for higher density housing in Waterdown and welcome it, but feel that the city planners should consider its whereabouts more carefully. I would prefer to have townhomes directly north of me, rather than 200m south of me along Hwy 5. Mixing fully detached houses with semi's and townhomes makes sense as it creates a more diverse mix of people within one neighborhood. However if higher density living is restricted to Hwy 5 than the children will grow up with a subtle yet obvious understanding on one's social 'economic' class, based on address. Those with a "Hwy 5" address may suffer isolation since they are seen as living on the "wrong side of the tracks". I am speaking here from experience as I remember at the age of ten the understanding implied when telling others that I lived in the "four-plexes" across the way. Additionally, parents might not allow their children to visit friends along Hwy 5 because of the traffic hazards.

A great example of a well-planned neighborhood is the Millcroft community in Burlington. The townhomes within this community are blended very well, alongside of large detached homes. Children living in the townhomes share the "Country Club Blvd" address and are not relinquished to exit and enter their cordoned off area via a main highway with their backs to the rest of the community. I would love to see this same development (proposed for Connons) broken up and added in smaller denominations (same numbers or even more) within the neighborhoods north and south of Hwy 5 which are being developed - and mixed right in amongst the fully detached homes. Entry and exit into these neighborhoods are each receiving or have already received a traffic light for safety.

The land where Connon's sits could remain as zoned and be used to expand the downtown look and feel of Waterdown. It is only a short walk away and would be ideal for a building similar to the one that was built in the core for Brown Dogs and Yogurty's. Personally I'd love to see a butcher, baker or coffee shop move in or a small independent grocer which I can walk to and get to know the owners personally. With so many new homes being added to the east side of Waterdown; expanding the shops along Hwy 5 and growing the downtown makes far more sense to me. I would go one step further and continue the downtown street lighting right up the hill along Hwy 5 to First Street or perhaps Burke St. People in my community could walk to the shops and not add to the traffic in and out of the core. With all the homes being built we certainly could support a few small businesses and as I've tried to communicate, I would much rather see the medium density complexes being designed right amongst the new homes, sharing the same quaint street names.

City planning does not simply mean building more houses. As the population grows, so too should the downtown core and amenities which attracted us all here in the first place. So let's lengthen the core, create beautiful lit sidewalks and add small shops. Keep our children and medium density housing off the main road (Hwy 5).

Let's blend townhomes, semi's and fully detached homes together so as to mix families and children of various backgrounds and incomes together. This has been done with success in neighborhoods in both Burlington and Oakville. Unfortunately, I cannot think of any examples in Hamilton as most townhouse complexes are satellite entities unto themselves which are almost always accessed along main roads. This Connon's location not only places the townhome owners on the outskirts of a new neighborhood, it exposes them to a traffic risk. Meanwhile the current zoning is ideal for growing our beautiful core with additional, successful small businesses.

Warm regards,

Stewart White

To Whom it may concern: August 30th, 2016

I am a resident of Mattawan for 54 years and having raised five children here, I am writing with regards to the proposed development of the former Cannon property at the corner of First Street and #5 highway.

We understand the need and the right to redevelop and while we realize that in accordance with new regulations there is increased density and intensification called for, we do have concerns about the excesses being proposed for the property in question.

After studying the proposed plans, it is disturbing to note how many of the proposals require a variance from the present rules... were they not meant to be followed?

It is also a concern that the buildings as proposed do not blend in with the long established single family homes in the neigbourhood and would have a serious impact on the integrity and privacy of the bordering homes.

As well as the planning issues such as drainage, noise, traffic, building height, architecture compatibility, parking, intensification & services, we would also appreciate thoughtful planning of:

lifestyle

environmental protection

recreation



Open space

compatibility of architecture

noise and air pollution

... all important factors in growing and sustaining a great community where people want to come and stay and raise a family... where the individual citizen has a sense of contributing and belonging!

This plan, as proposed does not leave any green space... there is no place to play outside, welcome friends or pets... concrete is not a substitute for green!

The number of new residents proposed does not match the number of employment opportunities in the area.

Therefore local transport services cannot possibly match the individual destination needs of this influx of new residents.

All recreation areas are distant--only reached by car... walkability is impossible to most amenities (e.g. Sans Park, library, arena, YCCA) and not many would appreciate hauling a bus loaded with big box store purchases or a week's groceries needing refrigeration.

The necessity for increased cars also increases air pollution.

Emergency vehicles, service trucks, delivery vans and visitor cars will be difficult to function properly in such a confined space.

There will be extra overflow parking on adjoining side streets. Already traffic on #5 ~~is~~ is using feeder roads to avoid delays and the new

proposed by-pass will not serve those  
travelling to the Watrous town.

It is our expectation and hope that  
by working together, our elected representatives  
and staff will give thoughtful consideration  
to making sure the present rules are upheld,  
the well-being of their communities is a  
priority and their constituents are heard.

Yours very truly,

Marlene J. Hankins

#10 First St.,  
Watrous, Wn

## 8.1(vi)

Re: 383 Dundas

Hi Judy,

I am sending this on behalf of my husband and I. If numbers are important for petition reasons please let me know and I will have him send you a separate email.

We are concerned with this project for several reasons.

Having 81 units on such a small piece of property raises concerns for several reasons. Parking is going to be an issue for one. Not to mention traffic in Waterdown is awful already. It's literally gridlock, there has been talk about building a bypass for some time now but we haven't seen any progress in this. Building this development will literally stop traffic. Waterdown was originally a small town. We are not built to house this many people and new developments.

As a resident on Boulding Ave we are not ok with having more vehicles parked on our street. We have children and families and living on a quiet street is what we paid for when we purchased our homes. Having more traffic and overnight parking is not ok.

Danielle Garrett  
26 Boulding, Waterdown

## 8.1(xvii)

**From:** Merrithew, Jason  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 1, 2016 12:19 PM  
**To:** Partridge, Judi  
**Subject:** September 6th Planning Committee Meeting

Hello Councillor Partridge,

I hope this email finds you well.

My fiancée Maegan and I live at 43 Milverton Close in Waterdown and I'm writing to you today about the proposed development at 383 Dundas Street. I know there is a Planning Committee meeting on September 6<sup>th</sup> which I will not be able to attend and I wanted to ensure that you got feedback in any event. I'd love for this email and our issues were entered into the minutes of the meeting.

The city is growing and that is, overall, a good thing for our community. What I wanted to discuss today was the specific issues that we had with the plan that was shown to us by the developers. The density of the proposed units is of major concern. While it is important to use available land to its fullest, the density (81 units on what is a small piece of land) is one of our major concerns. Such high density housing is so out of character with the rest of the neighbourhood that we are worried it would simply look like over development for the sake of maximizing profits as opposed to responsible development that respects the surroundings. The density leads to issues like lack of green space, no room for services and increase noise and light pollution.

The second and more serious issue that we have is that the development has a pedestrian walkway connecting Boulding Avenue (and by extension Milverton Close just around the corner) with the development. While not a huge concern at first, the density of the housing being proposed has virtually eliminated guest parking. We feel that guests of residents at the development will have no choice but to park on Boulding and Milverton and walk to their host's homes. This will majorly disrupt the neighbourhood; increased car traffic will be more dangerous to the children in the area, a greater number of unknown vehicles will be parked for indeterminate amounts of time and foot traffic of guests will pass extremely close to, thus invade the privacy of, residents on Boulding. Further, what would stop a resident with more cars than parking space in their purchased unit from simply parking full time in front of a house on Boulding or Milverton? The answer is that nothing would. The walkway serves no other purpose other than to encourage this behaviour. Waterdown is, based purely on its location, a commuter town. It is realistic to expect that all residents will have two cars to get to their jobs and take care of their families. It is therefore reasonable to expect that any guests would also drive, the proposal has not acknowledged this simple fact and has not provided for the needs of their residents by not allowing adequate space to allow their guests to visit.

Just to recap the major issues;



- The density of the housing proposed is not in keeping with the neighbourhood and is disrespectful to the character of the community that so many residents have already purchased homes in. The density also leads to other issues such as lack of guest parking, lack of green space etc.
- The walkway between the development and Boulding Avenue will serve no other purpose other than to increase car traffic and non-resident foot traffic on Boulding and Milverton, this is less safe for our community and will invade the privacy of residents.

As before, growth in Waterdown is inevitable and we welcome it. We feel however, as though this proposed development is “overdeveloped” and not in keeping with the characteristics of the established neighbourhood. If we could see this proposal amended in only two ways, we would believe all residents (current and future) would benefit:

- Lower the density of the housing
- Eliminate the walkway between the development and Boulding Avenue

By lowering the density of the housing more space could be dedicated to guest parking, green space, community services etc. By eliminating the walkway the developer is kept from exploiting the existing neighbourhood for basic services like parking. It is this exploitation that allows for the increased housing density in the developers out-of-character housing proposal.

By taking these two actions, you would turn what we believe to be an overdeveloped attempt to bring high density housing into the suburbs into a plan that is respectful of the neighbourhood and bring responsible growth to our community, growth that we would welcome with open arms.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Regards,

Jason

**Jason Merrithew**

City of Hamilton

Attn: Councillor **Judi Partridge**

Dear Judi,

My name is Frank Snyder. My wife, Carol, and I live at 6 Boulding Avenue in Waterdown.

I am writing to you today so that I may voice my opinion on the proposed development at 383 Dundas Street in Waterdown. Before I get right to the point, I wanted to give you a little background on our family which may provide a little more context regarding our concerns.

Since 1989 our family have been residents of Waterdown. During these 27 years we've experienced a huge range of economic, environmental and social changes created as a result of residential & commercial developments.

The "small town" environment, and the privileges it offers when it comes to raising a family, is what attracted us to Waterdown. The expansion and growth of the community is what has kept us here.

We've lived in 3 homes in Waterdown since 1989, all 3 located within a couple of blocks of each other, and 383 Dundas Street. Each one of these areas had something different to offer us. As our wants and needs grew, we chose the area we wanted to live in based on our changing social and economic needs.

From 1992 to 2000 we lived in a neighbourhood on Thornlodge Drive. This development was comprised of semi's, quads and single family detached homes. Although a great neighbourhood in which we made many friends, it came with its challenges. The congestion, the lack of green space for the kids and on-going parking nightmares became unacceptable...so we moved.

In 2000 we purchased the house at 6 Boulding Avenue. We purchased this house because of the neighbourhood (location, location, location)... all single detached homes, with large lot sizes, in an area designed for generally more mature (older) families. With the open fields facing our back yard to the west, and the garden nursery at our south side yard, we found the ideal location that provided us with the privacy and accommodations we were looking for. It was the ideal property that we could invest in to make it our long-term home. For the past 17 years we have done just that. The neighbourhood and our privacy are the keys to our long-term happiness in this home.

Not to speak for others, but I'm confident that my neighbours have the same or similar perspectives on the proposed development.

**Concerns regarding the proposed townhouse development at 383 Dundas Street, Waterdown.**

From: Frank Snyder, 6 Boulding Avenue, Waterdown Ontario

**GENERAL CONCERNS:**

- 1.) The proposal for 81 units on that size lot creates a density concern. There have been similar developments on larger lots with far less units and somehow the developer made it work.
- 2.) The traffic congestion along Dundas is already crippling the neighbourhood. The location of this proposed development will only compound this problem.
- 3.) The lack of "green space", in combination with the high density development, **will** create problems for the surrounding neighbours. I have been through this before.
- 4.) The idea of putting a walkway from this proposed development out to Boulding on that tight corner, directly impacting a residence, will, without a doubt, create an unreasonable hardship for those of us situated in that corner area.
- 5.) The visitors to this development will use this walkway as an access point. They will begin parking their vehicles directly in front of my house, as it is the closest legal location to park, with access to the walkway. The front of my house **WILL** become a parking lot. This will create an unsafe environment for everyone in the area, and an absolute nightmare for me personally. Again, I have been through this before.
- 6.) Our immediate neighbourhood is comprised 100% of single family residences, no high density housing. This type of development does not conform with the neighbourhood. Non-conformity has consequences.
- 7.) The fact that someone thinks it's acceptable to put a row of 3-story townhouses, within metres of my property line, who's balconies will look directly into my back yard, is infuriating. We will lose all our privacy which is the primary reason we've invested in this property for the past 17 years. There are other options!
- 8.) Last but not least, I have already been advised that if this development goes through as currently proposed, it will have an immediate, substantial, negative impact to the value of my home and property. This should not be allowed to happen when there are modifications that can be made to the plan that will limit this impact. (Eg.: More green space, Modified layout, Less Units... to name a few).

If you have any questions or would like further clarification on any of these concerns please feel free to contact me at your convenience. I can be reached at xxxxxxxx.

Respectfully,

Frank Snyder – 6 Boulding Avenue, Waterdown.

To Councillor Judi Partridge, I am writing in ref. to the Common Dev. to express our concerns. We have lived on HILVERTON CLOSE for over 40 yrs. and have watched as the many housing projects have developed around us. The amount of dwellings proposed for this site is alarming comparing it with the Bohemian development. 1 car units built on a larger property. Also the amount of traffic coming into Waterdown itself along HWY 5, as at First St. it goes into a two lane only road. Our survey is like a FREEWAY now with so many cars taking what they believe to be a short cut to avoid the excess traffic hold ups.

With so few parking spaces available to the residents of this future development I envision our streets being used as a municipal parking lot.

We sincerely hope that all of the concerns will be taken into account and common sense will prevail.

Yours sincerely

Brenda & Denis Holmes

August 31, 2016

Re: Connon Nursery Proposed Development

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing in regards to the above captioned which is located at the corner of Dundas and First Street in Waterdown.

While we are not opposed to residential development taking place at this location, we are opposed to what is being proposed at present. There has been extensive development in the Waterdown area, however, the predominance has appeared to have taken place in Greenfield space where it was known that high intensification would be taking place. Other than the nursery, this area is made up of predominantly single family homes and the addition of 81 townhouses clearly does not conform. When approving new development, I believe that consideration and strong regard should be given to the nature and make up of the immediately surrounding area and the impact it will have on those who currently live there.

In those areas where single residential homes were already in existence, precedent has been set in two areas that we know of.

The Bohemian townhouse development is on a larger piece of land than the Connon property and has 58 units. The perimeter townhouses are all two storeys in height with the intent I believe of trying not to overwhelm the surrounding homes. Unfortunately, the backyards of the northern side of this development are still overwhelmed by the townhouses and as a result all privacy not to mention portions of daily sunlight appears to have been lost. As a side note, this development is located in the west end of town, on Dundas street where the road is 5 lanes wide (2 lanes each direction and a turning lane) and has high visibility.

The second area of precedence is the Waterdown South Secondary Plan, and I refer specifically to Appendix "A" to Report PED10171 page 12 of 62, A.9.3.1.2 Low Density Residential 1 b. where it states:

*The new lots along the western limit of the Secondary Plan Area shall serve as a transition area between the established homes and new residential development internal to the Waterdown South community. The implementing zoning by-law shall ensure that all new lots immediately opposite those on Flanders Drive and Rosecliffe Place have a similar lot width at the point where the new lots are opposite to the existing lots.*

Based upon the various designations, a Low Density Residential 1 or Low Density Residential 2 would fit in much better and more effectively with not only the neighborhood, but also the location of this site in regards to traffic.

The Connon Property is located at the corner of Dundas Street and First Street, a unique location when it comes to traffic. It is located at a pinch point on Dundas Street, on the top of a hill that has a blind spot. Short of expropriating all the homes down the hill and the businesses through the village, this will always be the way. Add to this the approximately 8 to 10, 000 new cars that will be added when the Waterdown South Secondary Plan and the Mattamy development on the north side of Dundas is completed, this problem will not only intensify the traffic armageddon that already exists here, but the neighborhood roads will become even more congested with parking and overflow traffic as already evidenced by the increase in fast moving cars and the recently installed 40 km speed limit signs. Although the scale of this development pales in comparison to the size of the above -mentioned ones, we don't believe having high density at this specific site helps to remediate or minimize the traffic problem, nor conforms with the existing neighborhood. While we understand there are new provincial guidelines with respect to intensification, a one -size fits all approach is not what is needed here. Unique situations require unique solutions and we trust this is the route you will travel when determining what is best for this location.

The greenhouses and metal barn that currently sit on this site are approximately 6.5 meters in height. As we understand it, the developer is requesting a modification to 13.5 metres. At this height, not only would the townhouses tower over the surrounding properties, but all privacy would be lost and daylight would be greatly affected. There are multiple modifications being requested to the current plan and one would have to believe that the only person benefiting is the developer. When the minimums are further minimized and the maximums further maximized, one begins to wonder why we should have any standards at all and just let developers do what they want to do, particularly those who do not appear to be interested in communicating and working with the neighbourhood.

When making development decisions today, hopefully we are considering its affects on tomorrow, especially as it pertains to building harmony and cooperation amongst the neighbours in these new developments. When there is no place for children to play, when there are too few guest parking spaces for family and friends who want to come and visit, when there is no green space, adverse situations are created and tension and disagreement comes into play, and any sense of community becomes difficult to establish. It says Hamilton is a community of communities... I guess we shall see.

There is currently a walkway proposed on the north east side of the property. As presented, it would come out in the middle of a bordering residents driveway and would provide access to Boulding Avenue. Not only would this create a tremendous liability situation for the homeowner with respect to possible pedestrian collisions, and winter time slip and fall claims, it also an infringement on their property. The fact that this is even in the plans highlights the lack of regard on the part of the developer. In addition, this would also provide a convenient means for offsite overflow parking that will no doubt happen because there are too few on site guest parking spots.

There are multiple other issues such as drainage, property elevations, access roads, adequate services, etc that are too few to mention, but I would ask that for those of you not familiar with the property or location to take the time to come out and see just exactly the impact your decision will have on not just the immediate neighbourhood, but the community as a whole.

Remember, what is being proposed is a very major intensification over what is currently there. While I have been advised that compatibility/compatible as it pertains to the development means land uses and building forms that are mutually tolerant and capable of existing together in harmony within an area and that it should not be narrowly interpreted to mean "the same as " or even as being similar to," we believe the proposed development in its current form is not compatible by either definition.

Regards,

Michael and Rosemary Hawkrigg  
4 Balgownie Court  
Waterdown, Ontario

## 8.1(xi)

-----Original Message-----

From: Morrison, Alison

Sent: September-01-16 9:46 AM

To: Bedioui, Ida

Cc: Partridge, Judi; Mihalik-Liew, Julia; Judi Partridge; Morrison, Alison; Giroux, Madeleine; Christy, June; Fabac, Anita

Subject: FW: Town hall meeting

Hello Mr. Ariens and Councillor Partridge

Thank you both for taking the time to attend the town hall meeting last night at Knox Church regarding the development on the current Connon's property.

Both my husband and I attend and were very disappointed to hear that the proposed development has increased in numbers versus decreased. We have lived on Dundas St East, three homes down the hill from Connon's for approximately 6 years ( over 20 years in Waterdown). We are very, very familiar with the flow of traffic and if it were not for the fact that we have a long driveway and a turn around spot getting in and out of our driveway during peak times would be a complete nightmare. We can't imagine how much more difficult this will be with the increase in housing developments such as the one you propose.

We are also familiar with the flow of traffic on both Margaret and First St during peak hours. Last nights presentation in regards to traffic flow was not representative of what we and our neighbours face on a daily basis. Typically peak hours during the week in the evening is 4-7 pm.

You do have much to consider with this new build and it is our hope that you respectfully consider the many voices and input of the current and long standing residents of Waterdown.

We would like to invite you to park in our driveway during a week night from 4-7 pm so you can see the true picture of traffic.

Respectfully,

Gayle and Jim Reece

363 Dundas Street, Waterdown



**From:** Marilyn W  
**Sent:** September-02-16 12:17 PM  
**To:** Partridge, Judi  
**Subject:** Connon Development Meeting scheduled Sept 6/16

Due to work restrictions I will not be able to attend the meeting. I do have some very important concerns regarding this matter.

1) The number of units in this development is in my opinion excessive for several reasons. First it is going to create more of a bottleneck of traffic during the rush hour traffic times. At present #5 highway is basically blocked from before Burke Street all across Waterdown to Hamilton Street from approximately 4:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M. During the meeting we had with the representative from the developer, a survey was presented that there was not any issue at First St at approximately 5:30 P.M. This is deceptive because if you live in the area almost no one would go to the corner of First St at this time because they know it is a disaster to try to get out there. They would choose an alternative route. Secondly with the number of units planned there would not be enough visitor parking spots available for special occasion e.g. Mother's Day, etc. If there were too many visitors then the overflow of visitors would spill over to First Street and Boulding Ave. This would create a problem for all the people on First St and Boulding Ave. Next with this many units there is no room for children to play in the complex at all. There is no place for the children to play safely outside. There are two parks but they are not close enough to allow little children to go there without supervision from an adult. This means little children can not play outside in the fresh air unless there is an adult to accompany them. I have raised three children and have 4 grandchildren visit with me and I would not allow them to go to the parks that far away. I am glad that I have a yard that they can play in so that they can be supervised from my home.

Another thing I object to is the proposed walkway from the complex to Boulding Avenue. This would give visitors to the complex easy access to complex from Boulding Avenue. Therefore, this would create the parking problem for neighbours on Boulding Avenue.

The fact that all the residents of this complex will be exiting out onto Dundas Street is disastrous because #5 Highway (Dundas) goes from 5 lanes down to 2 lanes where this complex is located.

Lastly this complex is completely different from the surrounding neighbours as these are all single dwelling and three stories in height.

Please take the point into consideration at the time of the meeting.

Sorry I can't attend due to the time of day.

## 8.1(xiii)

**From:** Morrison, Alison

**Sent:** September-02-16 1:21 PM

**To:** Bedioui, Ida

**Subject:** FW: File # ZAC-15-055 - Open House / Connon re-development

Judi & Madeleine

I live on First Street and I would like to know the new sub-division (Connon Footprint) now is requiring a walkway from Boulding Avenue to the town homes and that the entrance on First street is now going to be a "temporary" entrance to First street. Nothing is ever temporary, so I suggest it to be totally removed as there are 2 entrances off of Dundas that are in correct spots for this new footprint.

Until the COH and Judi can explain to the folks living in this area why these two things are mandatory required I think the local residence will start listening and not firing email's and phones calls regarding it. Question: when a recent new subdivision on Dundas near DQ was created and designed and then released it only has one entrance in it and we all know that the DQ square footage is bigger than the new one going into the Connor footprint and it is supposedly holding a lot more homes???

Come on let's stop drinking the kool-aid and start taking the concerns from the families living directly in this area seriously. The frustration to all of this; is that people just checking boxes and checklist to see if it has what we need are the one's not living in the area. I missed the last meeting and wish I was available and from what I have heard, it did not go so well. I would like to know what were the outcome to what was learned that evening and enhancement and changes that are taking place to help the residence understand what is happening here.

I will try and be clear on the major four issues I see here:

- Entrance to First Street
- Walkway to Boulding Avenue
- # of homes within the footprint
- # of visitor parking spots

If you add an entrance to First Street you are causing more traffic and please if you want to witness the traffic versus what was presented at the meeting by the builder 3<sup>rd</sup> party hire, I would be happy to open my house up for anyone to enjoy the day and see what we are living with. I actually welcome you this Saturday to come on over (my house address is 8 First Street) and witness the mess that the street is in. It is a joke! Go on GOOGLE EARTH and look at the picture on FIRST STREET, it clearly shows the street is lined with cars (I have attached a picture)..... so can you image when you add X number of town homes in this area???? I have lost count as the number of homes as it continues to increase.....It is absolutely disgusting to continue to hear that this footprint of town homes is requiring more entrances and walkways.... we all know with extra access to other streets bring more parking and traffic nightmares.

I suggest that the COH and builder starts thinking in terms of reduces the # of homes versus increasing it and start thinking on where they will park all of the visitors; most homes now have 2+ cars and this footprint from what I can see will have a single garage and small driveway to do that. So tell me where the visitors are parking... right in the 15-20 visitor spots.... Ahhhhh... do not think that will cut it for 70+ town homes that we continue to hear and read about.

Sincerely,

David M. Coleman

## 8.1(xiv)

**From:** Morrison, Alison

**Sent:** September-02-16 1:19 PM

**To:** Bedioui, Ida; Giroux, Madeleine; Fabac, Anita; Christy, June

**Subject:** FW: Connon Development Dundas Street

Judi, As a resident of Pamela St. in Waterdown, I am increasingly frustrated with the traffic buildup on Dundas. It was totally congested today at noon, while trying to go to Fortinos. I don't even try anymore after 4pm. as I'm sure most of the residents east of town have. Even going the back way via Parkside is just as bad. I'm sure this is going to negatively impact our local businesses, if it hasn't already, since it is easier and quicker to do our shopping in Burlington instead. We can't stop progress , but a well planned community would have had the proper infrastructure in place to withstand the growth, rather than build first and worrying about it later. When we first moved here 23 years ago, they were planning the bypass around town, and we're still waiting for it. Since amalgamation, we've seen uncontrollable building taking place, primarily to feed the downtown Hamilton tax base, while our taxes keep increasing with little to show for it, except the dust and noise from the construction. I've attached 2 pictures taken at 6pm. tonight showing the traffic stopped at least past Evans road. This is the worst that I've ever seen it, but I'm sure that it will get much worse by the time the bypass is finally built. In the meantime, they're spending funds needed in the suburbs to build the LRT and the pet projects of the more influential councillors in the core.

It wouldn't surprise me to see community planners in the future using Waterdown as a prime example of how not to expand a community.

Andy Crawford

Waterdown

August 4, 2016

8.1(xv)

City of Hamilton  
71 Main Street West, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

ATTENTION: Madeleine Giroux, Planner II, Development Planning (Rural Team)

Dear Ms. Giroux:

**RE: RESIDENT CONCERNS  
CONNOR NURSERIES REDEVELOPMENT  
4 FIRST STREET AND 383 DUNDAS STREET EAST (ZAC-15-055)**

---

T. Johns Consulting Group has been retained by the owners at 10 First Street, Waterdown to formally communicate their concerns in response application ZAC-15-055, and the potential implications this development could have on the future development of their lands.

When the application was submitted initial concerns included: traffic, the driveway access off of First Street, the density, the lack of green space, setbacks, sidewalks, the compatibility with the neighbourhood, grading and drainage, bank stability, increase in traffic, and traffic safety. An application status update was requested on April 14, 2016 from the assigned planner to this file.

In response to the concerns raised at the Open House held March 6, 2016, a revised concept plan dated March 24, 2016 was provided. While the revised plan has addressed our client's concerns to some degree regarding onsite amenity space, continuous sidewalks, and revisions to the street pattern, it increased the number of units from 79 to 81 without addressing concerns regarding:

- overall compatibility;
- adequate transition to adjacent residential form;
- lack of landscaping, fencing and visual barriers;
- the emergency access design; and
- stormwater management.

### **1. Overall Compatibility to Community Character and Built-Form**

The goal of the Official Plan and Zoning By-law is to ensure that proposed developments respect and are compatible with the existing character of the neighbourhood without hindering the potential development of abutting lands. The applicant is proposing an increase in height of 2.5 metres over what is currently permitted in the zoning. The choice

of a 3-storey townhouse product abutting an established subdivision of 2 storey and bungalow dwellings is not the optimal transition. Best practices for compatibility would suggest that the height should be similar where it abuts a low density neighbourhood or a setback increase to mitigate the height transition. Proposing a development that meets the height requirement of the zoning by-law along the bordering properties would create greater compatibility between the proposed development and the abutting low density neighbours. No renderings have been shared to ensure that there is an appropriate transition from the proposed townhouses to the low density dwellings abutting the site, and regard has not been given to the development patterns and built form of the Waterdown neighbourhoods.

An additional mitigative option for increasing the compatibility with the adjacent residential would be to treat the side yard of the townhouse on the southwest property line as a rear yard by increasing the setback to the depth of a typical rear yard. This would allow for a 3 metre buffer strip in addition to the required side yard. **Our client requests that cross-sections be provided that demonstrate the compatibility of the proposed height in relation of surrounding properties, including their lands, and consideration be given to increasing the setbacks of yards abutting adjacent residential lands if there is going to be an increase in permitted height. Alternatively, the applicant could propose a built form that meets maximum height requirements of the zoning by-law.**

## 2. Landscaped Open Space

The submitted site plan does not include information on the overall built coverage, landscape coverage and density. Although each of the requested revisions to the zoning provisions, except for the increase in height, are individually minor, the cumulative impact of reducing the required lot width; the minimum lot area; the minimum front yard; the minimum interior side yard; and increasing the maximum lot coverage results in a tight development with an abundance of hardscaping and minimal landscaped open space. The rear yards of the stacked townhouses will consist entirely of driveways and the driveways for the street townhouses will dominate the front yards. When every minimum standard is reduced and every maximum standard is increased the net result is a property that is overdeveloped.

Overall the site design lacks landscaped open space and adequate amenity area for the residents. Section 5.12 of the Town of Flamborough Zoning By-law 90-145-Z requires that a minimum of 50% of the front yard shall be landscaped open space for street townhouse units. The provided information does not indicate whether or not the proposed development adheres to this standard. Section 5.12 also requires a planting strip to be maintained where a Medium Density Residential R-6 Zone is adjacent to any other Residential Zone. The submission does not speak to this requirement or provide a rationale for eliminating the required planting strip. A minimum 20% landscape coverage across the entire site is appropriate for ensuring sufficient open space, amenity space and

planting strips in areas adjacent to dissimilar uses. Further, a decrease in the number of units would allow for wider units with increased front yard space, and reducing height from 2-storeys instead of 3-storeys for the street townhouse units might address some of the compatibility concerns. **Our client requests that a 3 metre planting strip be maintained in addition to the rear and side yard setbacks where the development abuts the lower density residential and that this be included in the site specific zoning by-law.**

### 3. Fencing and Visual Barriers

No fencing or visual barriers have been provided between the internal road and abutting residential, or the proposed units and the abutting residential lands. Given the difference in unit types and heights it would be appropriate to ensure adequate buffering is provided to avoid any visual sightlines into adjacent properties that would impede the privacy of those landowners. The plan shows a stand of trees on the property line that are illustrated to be maintained however, if there is any retaining wall work and grading work at the rear of the property the existing trees cannot be maintained and will not be there to provide visual buffering. The existing trees provide a significant buffer as they are roughly 5 metres high and are located at the top of the bank. **The general provisions set out in section 5.6 and 5.12.2 would be appropriate for this development. It is understood that these details are addressed during site plan approval however, at a minimum, our client respectfully requests that the zoning by-law stipulate where fencing will be located.**

### 4. Emergency Access Point from First Street

The revised concept plan does not clearly communicate that the “Emergency/Pedestrian Access Only” will not become a future secondary access point as it has been designed in the same manner as the access point off Dundas Street West, with the exception of providing “Knock Down Bollards” that could be removed at any time. **We would suggest that the secondary access point be removed all together, as it does not seem necessary. Alternatively, a zoning provision similar to one imposed in R-6\_26 site specific zoning indicating that no vehicular access to First Street shall be permitted would address concerns about an access from the development onto First Street.**

### 5. Stormwater

Detailed grading and drainage is of concern given the existing terrain on the site. No preliminary grading or drainage drawings have been provided, and will likely not be completed until the Site Plan stage. Rezoning the lands will establish the amount of permitted coverage, density, type and number of units, heights and so on; therefore, preliminary plans should become available prior to the applicant receiving approvals. **It is requested that preliminary grading plans be provided for community review and knowledge.** The proposed concept plan does indicate that a retaining wall is to be provided on the northern edge of the property. Is this the existing retaining wall or will the existing retaining wall be removed and a new one installed? Our client has concerns with

the long-term bank stability. The site was lowered resulting in water runoff from our client's property due to actions taken by Connon Nurseries, our client would like to know that there will not be negative impacts or repercussions for them and their property as a result of any proposed retaining wall, fence, and grading changes.

## 6. Traffic

The applicant submitted a traffic impact study indicating that the proposed development will not adversely impact the functioning of the transportation network. Although this particular development may not result in unacceptable traffic movement and functioning there is an overall concern with traffic volumes in the community as the density of Waterdown continues to increase. In addition, the location of the proposed development is at a point where there is a hill and the road narrows, which has the potential to create a traffic pinch point. It is kindly requested that the City of Hamilton consider a comprehensive review of traffic and transportation in the community of Waterdown.

In conclusion, our client requests that the applicant:

- demonstrate that the proposed development is compatible with the existing built form;
- provide preliminary grading plan to clarify on the requirements of retaining walls and long-term bank stability;
- provide landscaping buffering at property lines abutting adjacent residential;
- increase setbacks or decrease height for units abutting adjacent residential lands to ensure a transition between forms; and
- eliminate the emergency access onto First Street.

Further, our client would like to request that the City of Hamilton consider a comprehensive review of traffic and transportation in the community of Waterdown.

Our client would appreciate a copy of all items submitted by the applicant. Any question can be directed to myself via email at [cselig@tjohnsconsulting.com](mailto:cselig@tjohnsconsulting.com) or via telephone at (905) 574-1993 ext. 202.

Respectfully Submitted,  
T. JOHNS CONSULTING GROUP LTD.



Cheryl Selig, MCIP, RPP  
Senior Planner



**From:** Garry Coles  
**Sent:** September-02-16 1:52 PM  
**To:** Partridge, Judi  
**Subject:** Concerns with 383 Dundas Street, currently known as Cannon Nurseries

Hi Judi:

My name is Garry Coles. I live at 18 Milverton close in the town of Waterdown. I live in close proximity to the proposed Town House Development at the above stated address. I am not sure if my wife and I can attend the meeting on Sept 6th at 9:30 am but just incase we wanted to let our voices be heard.

Concerns:

Traffic and Access on to Dundas Street:

As a former Police Officer I am very concerned about access at the top of a hill (First Street) coming out onto Dundas St. or coming onto First Street from part of this development. Anyone in their right mind would consider either a bad choice especially in the winter. One could say that Cannon traffic has used the entrance onto Dundas for years without issue, I would agree, but not the volume this development will have. There easily could be injury or loss of life. I would further guess that the city could be held responsible or partly responsible in a civil case for failing to provide safe access. Even though I am not right next to the development I want to make sure my family is not put in harms way with the undeniable traffic issues we will have.

Lack of Green Space

This is always a consideration in that 81 plus units certainly changes the picture of where we live. Such a confined space for so many units. It become an unpleasant view for us all.

Congestion of First Street.

This is already a bad intersection with Dundas Street. Now add the volume of vehicles and it become more of a safety issue

Proposed Height of Units-- 3 Storeys

This would be overpowering to the people that live close to these units and it shows a disregard for people who have paid taxes for all these years. Waterdown is beautiful and we really want to keep it that way. They bought their homes with an expectation of a view and now it will be in some cases obstructed.

In Summary Waterdown is for all the people that live here. Their voices need to be heard and should care great weight. I truly worry about public safety in this matter and hope I have made my points clear to you.

Thank you in advance for reading this email. I hope to shake your hand on the the 6th.

Garry Coles

# 8.1(xvii)

August 31, 2016

Judi Partridge, City Councillor - Ward 15

Subject: Development Proposal at 393 Dundas Street, Waterdown (Connon Nurseries Property)

Dear Councillor Partridge

I am writing in regard to the proposed development at 383 Dundas Street currently known as Connon Nurseries. I reside at 8 Balgownie Court and feel that this development would negatively impact our surrounding neighbourhood and broader Waterdown community. I understand that the City's Planning Committee will be receiving public comment on the development application at its meeting on Tuesday September 6, 2016 and that the application is proceeding to an OMB hearing. I am unable to attend the Committee meeting but would appreciate if you could arrange to include this letter for consideration at the meeting.

Having viewed the developer's proposal at a public meeting earlier this year, I am completely opposed to this project and I would urge City Council to do everything in its power to find a better solution for developing the subject property. Here are the concerns that I have:

1. Density: The densities proposed are out of character with the surrounding neighbourhood which is predominantly single family homes on large lots. The surrounding area does not have the infrastructure (roads, parks, recreation) to support another 81 homes. A recent townhouse development just west of Dairy Queen on Dundas Street was built with 58 units on a larger property than the Connon Property which proposes 81 units.
2. Traffic: This is a major concern. Dundas Street is already congested at peak times and its going to get worse with all of the new development coming on-stream. Westbound traffic on Dundas Street is backed up as far as Spring Creek Drive. The new development will intensify traffic congestion. I have a difficult time getting into my subdivision at rush hour. Residents of the proposed development will find diversions through local streets to get home faster and impact traffic and safety of local roads. Also residents of the proposed development will have a difficult time getting out of their survey during rush hour. Traffic congestion may also impede emergency vehicle response.
3. Design: The proposed design of the site has a number of issues. The site appears to have very limited visitor parking. Visitors will start lining their cars on local streets. The walkway to Boulding Avenue will encourage residents to park on easterly local streets. The 3 storey design of the proposed townhomes is invasive and imposing to the surrounding homes and will devalue our properties and impact the enjoyment of our properties. The height of the proposed buildings exceeds the current zoning regulations. The proposed subdivision lacks green space and play areas for children and will no doubt feel overcrowded with tall buildings and tight

roads, driveways and lots. Also, at a time where there is such heightened awareness about creating inclusive and age friendly cities, I am surprised that the developer has chosen to build 3 storey homes which are not really accessible or convenient for our growing seniors population. I hope that the City's Accessibility, Inclusivity and Age-Friendly Advisory Committees will have an opportunity to comment on these aspects.

Thank you for considering these comments. I sincerely hope that the planning approval process will result in a more compatible development plan for the subject property.

Jim Seferiades  
8 Balgownie Court  
Waterdown, ON