Appendix "G" to Report PED18085 Page 1 of 27

march 17, 2017. Dear Valeria maurizio, MAR 2 1 2017 "City of Hamilton" Planning + Economic Development Department Development Planning, Heritage + Design-Suburban Team 71 main Street West, 5th Floor, Hamilton, Ont., 18P-445 <u>Re-</u> UHOPA-17-009 + ZAC-17-020. 1st Complaint - Even now between the hours 7 to 8 a.m. and 5 to 6 p.m. the traffic is bumper to bumper in front of our house. If there's an arcident on the Q.E.W. Toronto bound or hisgars bound, our north Service Road problem has now doubled. Snow + bad weather also puts cars off the Q.E.W. + again onto our horth Service Road. [Refer to my mas #1.]. "2" Complaint" - There is a large apartment building being built on the north side of the north Service Road. There's now over a hundred town houses being built in this area now. This will extremely add to our now problem. I'm referring to

millen Road between the north Service Road & the Lake Ontario. [Refer to my map *1.].

"<u>3 " Complaint</u>" - In the area just East off Green Road, there's a massive new apartment building now being built. >

(Page 2.) There's also over another hundred or so tounhouses now being built in this area. I'm referring to the area between the north Service Road + Lake Ontario east of Green Road. Our traffic problem has now just amplified itself again. [Refer to my map "1.]. 4th Complaint - how I'll add again on our already overtaxed traffic problem. This refers to the access to the Red Hill Parkway. Firstly, you can't get onto the Red Hill Pkuy. by going West down the north Service Rd. to Centennial Pkuy. You would have to go West down the north Service Rd. to Centennial Phinay & then go South to Barton St. then you would go West on Barton St. until you get to the Red Hill Pkuy access point. Your looking at travelling about 3 miles + going through a lot of traffic. So therefore, people will drive East on the north Service Rd. + take the Fruitland Rd. access off ramp to Q.E.W. Toronto whereas they'll be able to get onto the Red Hill Pkury Southlound. This adds another straw on the camels already becken back concerning excess traffic going through Lakeriew Drive to get to the Fruitland Rd. access to the Red Hill Pkury .! 5th Complaint" - how we go to mr. De Santis's planned 42 stacked townhouses" t" 98 back to back townhouses.

42 stacked townhouses" #"98 back to back townhouses. Allowing 2 zars per family adults + 1 extra for their adult children. We're looking at over 200 zars in this area alone if not more with guests. I see on this planned area by m. De Santis, that there are 2 separate roads >

Page 3.) going in t out of that survey. I feel that separate melge lanes off the east I west main lanes won't help. That's because if you get 30 to 50 cars backed up either way or both I before 9 am, or after 5 p.m.], how would cars get in or out of that survey? 6th Complaint - adding everything cloud together, what if someone had a heart attack. How would the ambulance be able to get to that person in that area at the prime busy times. What if there was a house fire, how would the fire truck also be able to get there during the prime busy times? "Conclusion" There are 2 ways to solve these traffic problems. Firstly, the north Service Road going onto Lakeview (\mathbf{J}) Drive must be "eliminated "I refer to my map # 2]. The north Service Road (A) will be re-routed to go "along side of the off ramp that goes Toron to bound from Fruitland road. Refer to B. on my map #2. Where m. De Santis will lose land at (B), he will gain it back from (A). The two entrances to his survey will then be made to go directly onto our Lakeview Drive. Our problem concerning traffic will be reduced to a few hundred cars instead of a few thousand vehichles. 2.) The other main traffic problem is the access to the >

(Page 4.) Red Hill Pkuy. Go to my map *2 + look at where () is marked at the corner of the north Service road & Dewitt road. Here is exactly where an on ramp to the Q.E.W. Toronto bound must be made. This will be the new access way to get to the Red Hill Pkuy. instead of going to Fruitland road. Even if you didn't eliminate my A. horth Service road, it would help to take away massive traffic trying to get to the Red Hill Pkuy. from the Fruitland road access. I think the new people moving into m. De Santis's new survey would appreciate my number () + (2) being done. If you's refuse to make any changes here, do you's "guarantee" to the new home buyers that the real estate agents will point out all of my concerns "before" they decide to buy? Overall, if my () + (2) road changes are <u>not</u> made, I'm 100% against Im. De Santis's new survey here. You might as well put back the 4 residential homes that were here before "or" make it another park. Thank You, For reading this,







Fax				
To:	Valeria Maurizio	Fax:	905-546-4202	
From:		Date:	3/22/2017	
Re:	: Development Lakeview Drive Stoney Creek		7 including Co	ver
⊠ Urge	ent 🗇 For review 🗆 Please co	mment	Please reply	Please recycle

We fully agree and support what our neighbor Robert Lloyd Hampson is requesting. We agree with the complaints and the ways to solve the traffic problems.

We support his recommendations as we are concerned about the traffic situation.

Thank-you,

March 20/2017. RECEIVED To Valeris Maurizia, RECEIVED MAR 2 4 2017 麻根:24 辺辺 Planning + Economic Development Department Development Planning, Herilage+Design-Suburban Tean 71 main Street wet, 5th floor Mamilton ONT, L&P-4/5 Re= UHOPA-17-009 * ZAC-17-020, My Hisband and I we officially moved here endof Decomber 2016, Already we notice lot of traffic sometimes tates along time just to back out of my drivenay, when gew Tronts bound is busy we see truck trailers conches go past our trace and is always busy See Alad of traffic, especially Since mens houses from Green Road lake side and almost ready houses on millen Kood. These people in their cars will be using north Service Road to fritland to use highways going to Toronto, Niagang Fulls, and Red hill exit, it's the fastest and easylest win form residental Peoples meeting concerning Deservices project of

building. 1110 town hauses, which MOONS A.S. coming to ころいろ hasol want to make a vike They つ へんしょう e park; north Sertice Road is Ver. 9 area, with people crossin ふくいろ bike viding, mothers with Stipler Till le Kits with bikes and 10 waiting for an traffics Contractory. accident to happen we'do not -S.CC ... any access for Ambulances or Fire bruck boget in + out of this great culy i e would agree Jac Desan has Ζ£ traffic no e rout use nó ice Koud lien dritles. akeri be quet + - peaco Much Less Luffle. deage Area just Convert traf Jam Aver +1C eRout is vivoos Thank You et 125

March 23, 2017

To: Valeria Maurizio, City of Hamilton Planning and Economic Development Department 71 Main Street West, 5th Floor, Hamilton, On, L8P 4Y5

Re: UHOPA-17-009 and ZAC-17-020

Hello Valeria

I, has some serious reservations about your subject project facing my property. Even right now, we are facing traffic hazards on our street. Every time, the QEW has some sort of traffic Jam, Our street is used as an alternate to pass by hundreds of vehicles. Rush hour is always tedious for us to take our own vehicles from our driveway.

I strongly oppose this project as it will create so much traffic on our street. I want the city to come up with better solution to tackle the traffic situation on Lakeview drive before we can give our consent to you to go ahead with such project.

Hoping my suggestion would be of consideration.

Sincerely,

Appendix "G" to Report PED18085 Page 12 of 27

Attention: Ms. Valerie Maurizio City of Hamilton Planning and Economic Development Department

RE: New Housing Developments along the North Service Road at Gray's, Millen, and Fruitland Road

Dear Ms. Maurizio

I am concerned about the traffic congestion that is happening now and will only be compounded by the number of new residents who will shortly move into this area.

The 2 lane road with call the North Service Road (NSR) will no longer be suitable for the car and truck traffic (add the bike lanes) once all these new housing units are sold. It is sheady a dangerous drive between Dewitt and Lakeview due to that S curve. Oftentimes I feel I am taking my life in hand when I am being followed too closely and must left turn onto that zigzag to Lakeview going west... you must try it one day and see for yourself. The incoming cars from Fruitland aren't visible until it's pretty much too late. Better to turn on Dewitt... sufer

The City must look into this situation. Some reconfiguration of the NSR and possibly a new entrance onto the QEW going North would be most appropriate before any additional homes are built. Presently, the NSR is very narrow it doesn't have shoulders on either side due to the bike lanes. That road needs to be widened like at Millen and Green with right turn lanes and a median space in between.

A new entrance going QEW Toronto bound would save a lot of people time and gasoline as well as aiding in their congestion before reaching Fruitland Road. This would clear the traffic quit a bit. I'm thinking at the intersection of Gray and NSR which a lot of the truckers borrow, put up a set of lights as well...

Another alternative or add-on would be to decrease the 80 kph speed limit in this area. That S cutve is why too sharp for that speed, taking in consideration that many people drive even faster than 80... maybe bringing it down to 50 or 60 would be more secure for bikers and dog-walkers as well as residents trying to turn into their respective side roads.

Alternatively, a few STOP signs on the NSR would help slow things down, corner Dewitt and definitely at that major curve leading into Lakeview (west).

We have thought about the DeSantis development and the need thereafter of a new configuration for the NSR in that area. From the curve, maintain the name Lakeview, and make it a side street for home owners. Have the NSR continue straight through to where DeSantis wants to build and have it merge to the side of the existing QEW entrance.

Traffic congestion was not intended when this service road was originally built. It is not meant for the heavy trucks, the bike lanes, the constant flow of cars that it presently bears. It needs to be widened, made secure with the addition of lights and stops and even better, a new exit to the QEW heading to Red Hill or Toronto bound.

Thank you for considering our ideas. They are meant to help all of us feel more secure on our roads,

Sincerely

March 23, 2017

Valeria Maurizio

City of Hamilton Planning and Economic Development Department Development Planning, Heritage and Design ~ Suburban Team 71 Main Street West, 5th Floor, Hamilton, ON, L8P 4Y5

Re: UHOPA-17-009 / ZAC-17-020

I am writing this letter with regards to the proposed 140 townhome development located at the corner of Lakevlew Drive and Fruitland Road.

In my opinion, the transportation infrastructure is not present to support a development of this size. Traffic backlogs in this area are already a problem for local residents. Those of us that live in the lakeside community that is bordered by the Lakeview/N. Service Rd bend on one side, and Dewitt Rd on the other, are already experiencing difficulty leaving our community to head east toward Fruitland.

Traffic is frequently lined up from Fruitland Road to past Dewitt on the North Service Road, making it next to impossible to turn left toward Niagara. One sometimes is required to turn west, toward Hamilton, and travel until a suitable spot to turn around is found. One is then sitting at the end of a long line of traffic waiting to pass through the Fruitland/N. Service Road intersection.

When problems occur on the Queen Elizabeth Way, Dewitt road and Lakeview are used as an ineffective throughway for travelers, as they then face the same issue turning left. This further compounds the problem for local residents.

With the current development of the area north of the QEW already under way, (townhomes, condominium complexes, and a seniors' residence), this issue only stands to get worse. Not to mention the massive development taking place on the other side of the highway, from Fruitland to Fifty Road. I believe I read somewhere that there will be an additional 10,000 homes being erected in that area. This, as well as the commercial development that is ongoing (COSTCO etc) will only bring more traffic to our already overburdened roads.

Clearly, one cannot stop development, and i understand the value to the city with regards to property taxes etc, but the density of this project is simply too high. I'd estimate an additional 300 vehicles will reside in the proposed development, travelling in and out daily, compounding the traffic issue.

Effective public transit is not available in this area, so people have no choice but to drive everywhere they go, whether that be shopping, work, or out for recreational activities.

Please consider a density reduction of the proposed development. Somewhere in the neighborhood of 80 townhomes or less would be more appropriate for this area that mainly consists of single family homes. I am opposed to the current development proposal as it currently stands.

Hello,

I have some serious concerns regarding the density of the proposed development referenced by UHOPA-17-009 and ZAC-17-020. While I do prefer a residential development and I understand the importance of intensification, I believe that the density of the proposed development is significantly too large for the area and existing neighborhood. I believe the major issues will be parking and traffic.

As many people noted at the public meeting, the traffic on this curve is already a serious problem that the addition of 140 units will only exacerbate. If we assume that most homes will have two vehicles, especially in a location handy for commuters, then we are talking about adding 280 vehicles to this local route.

The other issue is parking. We were told that each unit has parking for two vehicles. However, when I questioned the presenter for more details, the reality is that there is a single car garage with one space in front of the garage. I don't believe this provides enough parking given that:

- many people use their garage for storage (especially since the units do not have basements)
- a two car family will likely need to be shifting cars around depending on work schedules.

I believe that the reality will be that many people will use the visitor parking lot or park on the closest side street, Lakeview Drive.

Which brings me to my next concerns. There are not enough visitor parking spots. As I understand the rules, there are to be .5 parking spaces per unit; which amounts to 70 spaces. In order to allow for this number of visitor parking spaces, the developer has placed 37 parking spaces on MTO (Ministry of Transportation) land allowance. If the MTO ever needs to expand the QEW these spaces will be lost. The 37 MTO parking spaces must be considered "extra" visitor parking and not counted as the mandatory required.

As well these parking spaces are quite far from many of the homes that will line the North Service Road. I fear that people in that section will use Lakeview Drive for their regular parking, as it is closer, which will impact the Lakeview residents.

Based on these concerns, I request the following:

- significantly reduce the density of the proposed development to something that is reasonable;
- ensure that the required minimum visitor parking is on site (not on MTO land);
- visitor parking is in close proximity to the units on the north west section.

Thank you,

Hello :

As was quite evident at the meeting, traffic is an issue. Thank you for responding to my plea. If the root cause of the majority of the volume was addressed, at least some of the traffic volume would be alleviated – *please see below. Of course with the traffic apps there is also the requirement to deter traffic from using the North Service Road instead of the QEW. Perhaps this could be done by introducing more stop lights/stop signs at the major intersections along the North Service Road – Grays, Green, Millen, Dewitt, Lakeview. Even before the issues arose from congestion or development, we've been concerned about the danger at Lakeview Drive and the North Service Road which should have a 3 way stop. (see collage below)

*The congestion on the QEW Niagara bound is a regular occurrence and is not due to construction or an accident. It is a sure thing during rush hour and is also experienced during spring/summer weekends with the Niagara bound volume. Traffic then spills over onto the North Service Road and it is not a rarity that the traffic is backed up from Fruitland around to the other side of the park. People are utilizing Lakeview Drive to cut in making it difficult for us from the neighbourhood to turn left from Lakeview onto the North Service Road as those who have waited think we are cutting in.

We propose that the congestion could be reduced by ending 'right hand merge lanes' earlier at two points along the QEW Niagara bound:

1) Extra far right (fourth) lane used to pass - Currently the extra far right (fourth) lane that starts just before Skyway Niagara bound ends 1300 meters past the Centennial Parkway exit and drivers are using it as a passing lane to merge in front of those cars that were ahead of them in the 3rd right lane. Drivers in the 3 standard lanes observe these inconsiderate drivers and prevent them from butting in thereby causing the congestion.

Suggested solution: either end after the Red Hill exit or shortly after (500m) the Centennial Parkway exit. Paint a solid line just after the Centennial Parkway exit to prevent passing on the right.

2) Two lanes merging from Red Hill and Centennial onto QEW Niagara bound – Currently two lanes merge to the QEW, far right hand lane ends after the left lane starts to merge with the QEW. Inconsiderate drivers pass on the right to get in front of those first to merge. As well, traffic on the QEW in the right (third) lane are required to consider to merges rather than just one.

Suggested solution: end the far right merging lane before the left lane starts to merge with the QEW, with the result being that only one single lane merges with the QEW.

In 2010, we raised the issue of congestion to the Ministry of Transportation. The Ministry's response was that they had not identified any issues and the planning was correct, that we should report drivers who move to the right hand lane to pass those that have already merged onto the QEW to the Police.

Thank you for your attention and action to this matter

Appendix "G" to Report PED18085 Page 17 of 27





1) Extra far right (fourth) lane used to pass - Currently the extra far right (fourth) lane that starts just before Skyway Niagara bound ends 1300 meters past the Centennial Parkway exit and drivers are using it as a passing lane to merge in front of those cars that were ahead of them in the 3rd right lane. Drivers in the 3 standard lanes observe these inconsiderate drivers and prevent them from butting in thereby causing the congestion.

Suggested solution: either end after the Red Hill exit or shortly after (500m) the Centennial Parkway exit. Paint a solid line just after the Centennial Parkway exit to prevent passing on the right.



2) Two lanes merging from Red Hill and Centennial onto QEW Niagara bound – Currently two lanes merge to the QEW, far right hand lane ends after the left lane starts to merge with the QEW. Inconsiderate drivers pass on the right to get in front of those first to merge. As well, traffic on the QEW in the right (third) lane are required to consider to merges rather than just one.

Suggested solution: end the far right merging lane before the left lane starts to merge with the QEW, with the result being that only one single lane merges with the QEW.



Lakeview/North Service Road intersection

See issues in collage below.

Suggest: 1) 3 way stop 2) as was presented at the neighbourhood meeting before the intersection was changed, there was to be a neighbourhood sign and vegetation. This would deter cars from driving right through (this occurred as recently as 3 weeks ago)



To: Valerie Maurizio Sent via Email City of Hamilton Planning and Economic Development Dept. 71 Main St. W., 5th Floor, Hamilton L8P 4Y5

Dear Valerie

Further to our conversation today we have the following input regarding projects/flies UHOPA -17-009 and ZAC – 17-020 84-96 Lakeview Drive, Stoney Creek (DeSantis Rose)

The bottom line is the current proposal is not in the best interests of the community at Lakeview Drive as it will more than double the size of the current freehold community without any contribution other than maximizing the developers return.

Single family dwellings would be far more consistent and /or traditional townhomes. Back to back towns are no better than cages and not suited in an established waterfront community where homes are now selling over \$1,325,000. Two sold in the last few months for \$1,450,000 and \$1,470,000.

- Demographics Almost all the houses in the Lakeview area are freehold detached single family dwellings with a few freehold townhomes on the other side of Fruitland. This is an aspirational neighbourhood with the older homes being replaced with upscale larger single family dwellings. Typical lot value alone is over \$550,000.
- 2) The Conservation Authority needs to become involved as the drainage/water table is now under pressure from the overloaded drainage and catch basins between the QEW and the Lake. We are concerned about the impact of more than doubling the infrastructure and changing or eliminating natural drainage for this proposal.
- 3) Existing traffic on the North Service Rd is sporadic to dead stop as it is also the overflow for the QEW traffic, including Casino buses and Go Transit. This will undergo huge traffic increase with over 300 cars (2 per family + visitors) in the DeSantis proposal. The egress back up and merging, will be compounded by other developers just coming on line from the North Service Rd. as well.
 The Erwitland/OEW interchanges in the only oppose to the Red Hill Perkursy for current.

The Fruitland/QEW interchange is the only access to the Red Hill Parkway for current and future traffic.

- 4) The access for the DeSantis proposal is on a sharp S curve on the North Service Rd with limited visibility both ways. The only way for DeSantis tenement residents to access the only public park is to cross the already heavy traffic on the North Service Rd at the blind spot. Compound this with more vehicles and it certainly will not be a safe passage for anyone let alone children!
- 5) The specifics of the commercial segment of the project facing Lakeview has not been disclosed. Since it fronts on our house as well as other neighbours we have a right to know what the proposal is. Where will the access be, how many stories, parking, garbage handling just to name a few concerns.

Many of the neighbours are not in favor of this high-density project because of the already heavy traffic we need to contend with not to mention the safety factor for the children and cyclists. Lakeview is a residential street, not a main artery for commuters which is what it will

become if this is approved against our wishes. One solution is rerouting the North Service Rd to run parallel to the QEW and exit onto Fruitland bypassing Lakeview altogether. This will eliminate congestion, traffic load and provide safety for the residents. DeSantis will gain the road property and be joined with the existing park - a win win! Without this option, we are not in favour nor support this project.

Regards

Appendix "G" to Report PED18085 Page 24 of 27

(1, RECEIVED NOV 2 7 2017 hovember 22, 2017. Dear Valerie maurizio, Stoney Creek. I live at On hovember 18th, I attended an open house on Green Road whereas mr. De Santis was showing his new home development. I've attached a picture of his new planned survey. I've written to you in the past if you remember. my concern now is about where his "entrance + exit" are to be located. cl've included a map drawn by me to show you what I'm trying to explain. At the speeds that people travel nowadays, there's going to be a lot of accidents + even deaths in putting the entrance + exit in that place A. Drivers going East or West will have no time to slow down if cars are going into or out of that development. elf (A) is eliminated + placed at (B), people going eastward can go easily get, into that new survey non-stop. People leaving that area survey can easily see traffic both ways before going onto the horth Service Road westward. You must also see that putting a main highway [horth Service Road] going onto a residential side road [Lakeriew Drive] is 100% wrong !

2 as cl've said before, the north Service Road to Lakeriew Drive should be eliminated whereas it should go eastward along the north side of the West bound lane going Toronto way from off Fruitland Road. The traffic congestion from all the new surveys now being built at millen Road, Green Road & now near Fruitland Road is going to be a nightmare a hundred times worse then it already is now ! I'm referring to the future time when those new surveys are finished & lived in. Thank You,



