

September 2, 2016

**DELIVERED VIA EMAIL:**     [gerry.tchisler@hamilton.ca](mailto:gerry.tchisler@hamilton.ca)

Mr. Gerry Tchisler  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
City of Hamilton  
71 Main Street West, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y5

Dear Mr. Tchisler:

**Re: ZAC-16-046**

---

I am writing to you today in response to a notice received, regarding a proposal for a new townhome complex development in my neighbourhood. The notice describes a zoning change request and construction pitch which will be directly behind my home on Tragina Avenue North, Hamilton Ontario.

The neighbourhood surrounding Vansitmart Avenue, is currently zoned as a *C Urban Protected Residential* site and the proposal for zoning, if approved, will make it an *E Multiple Dwellings, Lodges, Clubs, etc.* area.

I have many concerns with this application and feel passionately that a townhouse complex will not benefit our neighbourhood:

- Proposed 62 3-story units: There are currently no buildings of this height in the vicinity. There will be major overcrowding, parking and privacy issues, more noise, and traffic in a quiet neighborhood
- The scope and scale of the proposed dwellings may have an impact on the existing property values of the single dwelling homes in the area, possibly resulting in the devaluation for any profitable re-sale in the future
- Tragina Avenue North is in the end stages of road and sidewalk re-construction for sewer work. With the possibility of an additional 62 units, this will definitely have an impact on the sewer system, thus later resulting in more construction work on this road to support the townhomes. This will undoubtedly create more work to re-dig the road and cause more congestion in the area

- The number of new units will have an adverse effect on utilities in the immediate area, more specifically in regards to taxes

In the best interest of our neighbourhood, the property can certainly be redeveloped for residential use - - perhaps to a downscaled version of the proposed plan. This will accommodate the current style of the homes in the surrounding area. Changes to the current zoning should be kept within the guidelines and constraints that are in our neighbourhood.

I would like to reiterate that I am writing to you as a concerned resident in this proposed area and as such am requesting that my name and address not be disclosed in any public record at this time. I would however like to be updated on any and all future developments, announcements or public meetings regarding this ZAC-16-046.

Thank you,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature and name of the sender.

**Tchisler, Gerry**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** August-19-16 2:51 PM  
**To:** Tchisler, Gerry  
**Subject:** Regarding ZAC-16-046

Hello Gerry

I am resending this email as I seem to be having trouble with the email delivery.

Thanks

[REDACTED]  
To:  
Mr. Gerry Tchisler, City of Hamilton  
Planning and Economic Development Department.

Dear Mr. Tchisler

I recently received notice in the mail regarding a zoning change request & construction proposal for a new townhome complex development in my immediate neighborhood ( vicinity of 121 Vansitmart Ave. Hamilton.)

The zoning change proposed going from a "C" Urban Protected Residential to a site specific "E" multiple Dwellings, Lodges, Clubs, etc.

As a homeowner and resident of the area, I am deeply concerned and believe that the rezoning will have a significant negative impact on the neighborhood and surrounding area.

I would like to express my concern/ objection to have the current area zoning changed for the following reasons:

1. The proposed townhome development implies that a 62 unit 3 story town home complex would be constructed which will not be conducive to the current style of the existing residential homes in the area. In my opinion cramming 62 units into an area that would normally only accommodate approximately 15 or 16 single unit houses would certainly result in overcrowding.
2. The increased height of the proposed 3 story dwellings would have a severe & adverse impact on the visible sky line for the homes currently in the neighborhood, resulting in obstructed views and less light during the day, as well as creating privacy issues.
3. The scope & scale of the dwellings proposed may have an adverse effect on existing property values in the area, resulting in significant devaluation of the current home values.
4. The complex would definitely result in greater traffic congestion locally if completed as planned. Parking for 62 additional vehicles in such a small area would undoubtedly lead to spill over onto the adjoining streets resulting in further parking congestion.
5. The number of units proposed may also have an adverse effect on utilities in the immediate area, specifically taxing the current capacity of the older sewer system & possibly the water supply as well.

6. Increased noise pollution in the area.

Although I have no objection to the property being re-developed for residential use, I would strongly suggest that the size & style of the homes proposed for this area should be re-worked to accommodate a downscaled version of the original proposal, that would fit in better with the current style of the homes in the surrounding area.

In short, I would simply re-iterate my concern that there should be no changes / amendments to the current Zoning By-Law, thus ensuring that any future development will take place within the guidelines and constraints that are currently specified for our neighborhood.

I hope that you will forward my comments to the Counsel in your staff report.

Please keep me informed of any further developments, announcements, or public meetings with regard to proposed changes outlined above.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully yours

[Redacted signature block]

Note: I formally request that my name & address NOT appear on any public records at this time.

Cc: Fred Eisenberger, Sam Merulla

*NOTICE: The information contained in this electronic mail transmission is for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed or intended and may contain information that is privileged, personal or otherwise confidential. It is not intended for transmission to, or receipt by, any individual or entity other than the named or intended addressee (or a person authorized to deliver it to the named or intended addressee) except as otherwise expressly permitted in this electronic mail transmission. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please delete it without copying or forwarding it, and notify the sender of the error. Although the sender takes measures to protect its network against viruses, no assurance is given that this transmission is virus-free. Thank you.*

**Tchisler, Gerry**

---

**From:** Dorilyn [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** August-19-16 2:07 PM  
**To:** Merulla, Sam; [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Tchisler, Gerry  
**Subject:** rezoning of John Kemps property to E/S-xxxx

Sept. 17th 2016

Councillor Sam Medulla Ward 4

Dear Sir,

I have received from the city the proposed changes to the zoning bylaw for the Kemp site and a description of the proposed development. I and my neighbours are very disturbed and have many objections to this redevelopment.

I moved to this area a few years ago as a senior. All my life savings are invested in my home. This proposed development will undermine the character of the neighbourhood and subsequently reduce home value. Practically, this plan is not in keeping with the rest of the neighbourhood which consists of single family homes of 2 stories or less. The proposed development has many flaws. The main problem is that the developer wishes to build 3 story, tightly packed triplexes, with absolutely no green space, and not enough parking to accommodate a 2 car family. The infrastructure in this area is also old, the water pressure is very low, and the sewers have been a constant source of problems. It is doubtful they could handle a project of this size. The height of the buildings is also a concern as the third floor would look into the homes on either side. The overflow parking would clog the streets in the area which are already overburdened by parked cars and roads in terrible condition. These are a few of the issues that come to mind at this early stage.

I have no objection to a carefully planned row of single family townhouse condominiums, or single family freehold homes. The space is big enough to build a beautiful complex in keeping with the neighbourhood, and one that no one would object too. This is clearly a case of a developer trying desperately to gain the maximum amount of revenue from the property, without consideration to the nature of the community or to green space.

I would like to know if you are in support of this project, or in support of this community, which has been undergoing rapid renovation and a subsequent increase in property values.

The community, I am sure, would work with the developer to create a beautiful and community enhancing project, that would be in keeping with the neighbourhood and its residents.

Please let me know if you are prepared to help the community you serve to create a beautiful development.

Sincerely

Dorilyn Boutette  
372 Tragina Ave. N.  
Hamilton, ON  
L8H5E5  
[REDACTED]

Property owner

**Tchisler, Gerry**

---

**From:** dwaine trowbridge [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** August-27-16 1:52 PM  
**To:** Tchisler, Gerry  
**Subject:** ZAC-16-046

Mr. Tchisler  
City of Hamilton  
Planning and Economic Development Department.

After receiving and reading the purposed zoning change from "C" Urban Protected Residential to site specific "E " Multiple Dwellings, Lodges, Clubs, etc.

As both a home owner and resident for over 10yrs, I find the purposed rezoning very distasteful and very concerning. I believe that with the purposed changes will cause a very negative impact on the neighbourhood.

I am including a list of items that I believe are of major concern. Both now and in the future.

1. units being 3 storey. that means both no privacy and limited sun.
2. although hard to see on your plans mailed out, I do not see any greenery (trees) or they going to be planted in the 7.00m backyards?
- 3 possible adverse value of our property.
- 4 increased property taxes
- 5 increased traffic in an already congested area.
- 6 purposed 62 units with average of 1.5 cars is 93 parking spots required. Plans only show 86 parking spots. where are they going to park, not to mention if they have visitors?
- 7 increase strain on an already old and week water and sewer supply.

Although I would prefer nothing in that area. I would be open to a re-development of the property to be conducive to the existing neighbourhood.

At this time I would simply like to re-iterate my concern that I would like to see NO changes/amendments to the current Zoning By-law. this will ensure that any future development will take place within the guidelines and constraints that are currently specific for our neighbour hood.

I would like to be informed of any and all further developments, announcements or public meeting with regards to proposed changes outlined above.

I hope you pass on my comments to both your peers and council regarding my concerns.

Dwaine and Candice Trowbridge

367 Tragina Ave N  
Hamilton Ont  
L8H 5E4

[REDACTED]

**\*\*\* feel free to put this into any public record**



**Tchisler, Gerry**

---

**From:** Norma Gera - [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** August-29-16 4:57 PM  
**To:** Tchisler, Gerry; Merulla, Sam; [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Zoning Amendment - 121 Vansitmart Avenue

In our conversation this morning I mentioned that I only learned of the above application from a neighbour who did receive a notice. I also explained to you that it is imperative that everyone in this small but unique community be notified because of the ramifications of the intent to possibly parachute 200 people (62 units x 3 persons, plus plus) into this relatively small area. (Judging from the blueprint, 200 is a conservation figure.)

This is a bound community as Vansitmart ends at Strathearne on the east, Kenilworth on the west and the CNR on the north. There are only eight streets north and south with two blocks each. Please ensure that this notification is distributed to all households in this community

Vansitmart, although a tertiary road, is the main transportation route through this area, offloading traffic from Kenilworth that cannot turn left on Barton, traffic route for citizens' and transportation vehicles to and from both the Strathbarton Mall and Centre Mall. This road is in extreme need of replacement, particularly between Tragina and Kenilworth.

**Concerns:**

**Traffic safety:** Additional volume. No two-way stop between Cope St. and Fairfield Ave. Speedster love hill from 121 Vansitmart to Fairfield.

**Parking:** There is never enough parking in such confined spaces as townhouses/ [REDACTED] apts. Our community is approximately 100 years old with 25 ft lots in most cases and only on-street parking. Very few household today have only one vehicle.

**Privacy:** The definition of stacked townhouses as I know it is one up and one [REDACTED] down. A three storey building does not fit that term and does not fit the neighbourhood it is encroaching upon in terms of daylight and privacy.

**Security:** I am a senior whose family has lived in this neighbourhood for almost [REDACTED] eighty years. This a diverse community with many families, seniors and singles of all ages. I cannot tell from the blueprint, the square footage or price point of these suites and that is a concern.

I look forward to the next step in this process. Please keep me informed.

Norma Gera  
367 Fairfield Ave. (cor. Vansitmart)

**Tchisler, Gerry**

---

**From:** Rick DeLaplante [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** August-19-16 3:42 PM  
**To:** Tchisler, Gerry  
**Subject:** Re new zoning of lands at 121 Vansitmart

Hello Jerry

My name is Rick DeLaplante I live at 356 Tragina Ave North, I received a notice about changing the zoning of the property of Kemp at 121 Vansitmart Ave in Hamilton, I talked to you about this and wanted to know the size of these dwellings, from what I see on the notice they sent me on each block they are three storeys high and each storey is a dwelling. They seem very small a one bedroom at best not a family dwelling, they look just like the ones on Barton Street just before Strathern. At those places there seems to be a lot of problems always garbage out on the side walks and the Police are there for problems many times a week, they are not looked after very well by the owners. Also are these new dwellings for sale or are they rentals, from what I understand even if they tell us they are for sale they can change this to rentals after the zone changes are made and it can't be stopped, at that point we have the same as the other buildings on Barton St. , only thing this is much bigger.

I feel this area has enough and we don't want any more problems, please keep me up to date on this and I will pass it on to the neighbours, all the best have a good day Rick

**Tchisler, Gerry**

---

**From:** Rick DeLaplante [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** August-21-16 2:20 PM  
**To:** Tchisler, Gerry  
**Subject:** Zoning By-law File#ZAC-16-046

Gerry I am sending this email for my neighbour,he has no internet

From Sam and Gail Thorogood-355 Tragina Ave North I would like to say that I do not want this type of site on the Kemp property,looking at the info you sent to me the dwellings are stacked three high and it looks as there is also one dwelling in the basement.The size of these apartments are only for one person not a family,they look just like the units on Barton just before Strathern.Those units are not kept very well and the police are there a lot,we don,t need any more like this in this area.I don,t know if these are rentals or for sale,even if they say the are for sale they can change this to rentals at any time I was told and these units would be right in my back yard and I don,t want that,Sam Thorogood

ED BAREY

155 VANSITMART AVE

L8H 3A7

905-543 8651.

OBJECTING TO THIS  
TYPING OF HIGH  
DENSITY DEVELOPMENT.

1. TRAFFIC CONCERNS.
2. FAIRNESS TO THE  
REST OF THE  
NEIGHBOURHOOD.

Sept 1st 2016

*Edward Barry*

John and Sarah Todd  
379 Weir St N  
Hamilton, On  
L8H 5G6

RECEIVED  
AUG 26 2016

August 23, 2016  
File(s): ZAC-16-046

City of Hamilton  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
Development Planning, Heritage and Design-Urban Team  
71 Main St. West, 5th Floor  
Hamilton, On  
L8P 4Y5

In response to the letter we received re the proposed zoning by-law amendment for lands at 121 Vansitmart Avenue, Hamilton. We feel the proposed amendment should not be approved. One parking spot per unit and 24 visitor spots is not enough. Street parking is already a problem as is the amount of traffic and vehicle speeds on Vansitmart.

John and Sarah Todd

cc: Councillor Sam Merulla, Ward 4

August 25, 2016

Gerry Tchisler  
City of Hamilton Planning and Economic  
Development Department  
71 Main st West 5<sup>th</sup> floor  
Hamilton ON L8P 4Y5

RECEIVED

AUG 29 2016

**ZAC-16-046**

I'm writing with regards to development of town houses in the area. However, some questions come to mind.

Is each unit going to be individually up for sale? Or is all units going to be owned by one person / company with the intent to rent out all units?

One concern is three level units does not fit the look of the existing neighbourhood, as majority of houses are 2 level / 1 level. As well, 2 rows of three levels units will block the view of sun and other views for existing units on Cope and Tragina St.

So I'm **only in favour** of this plan if **each unit is up for sale for individuals, and not for a cooperation renting out all units**. As well, **make each unit to be 2 levels to fit the look of existing neighbourhood**, and to respect the view for existing units on Cope and Tragina Street.

Sincerely



NOTE: I request that my personal information be removed from general public view.



August 30, 2016.

To:  
Gerry Tchisler  
City of Hamilton  
Planning and Economic Development Department  
71 Main St W.  
5<sup>th</sup> Floor,  
Hamilton, ON L8P 4Y%

cc: Sam Merulla, Councillor, Ward 4

RE: ZAC-16-046


Dear Sir

We do not support the Application for By-law Amendment by 1349010 Ontario Inc (c/o John Kemp) for Lands Located at 121 Vansitmart Ave for a number of reasons, including but not limited to the following.

- 1.) The number of units is too much for the proposed area to be developed. Adding 60 units will make this area too dense.
- 2.) Parking. There is not enough parking at present and by bring this many units into the mix it will create undo hardships for the surrounding area especially persons who work nights.
- 3.) We don't believe that the infrastructure of the neighbourhood can support this many units. We hold our breath every torrential rainstorm.
- 4.) Traffic will be a problem with adding another street mid block. Tragina and Vanistmart is already a short cut to the Centre Mall.
- 5.) The timing of this notice is dated August 15, with submissions requested by September 2. This does not give adequate time to study or reach a neighbourhood consensus on the matter. It seems this item is being rammed through without proper consultation. We can say that the consensus on Tragina IS NOT SUPPORTIVE OF THIS MOTION. A petition is in the works to be presented at a later date.
- 6.) We have a lot of questions that are not answered in this application. For example, are these units owned or rented, are pets going to be allowed, or children, is any part or all low income housing etc. There doesn't seem to be a lot of information being offered to the neighbourhood.

We would like answers to the above before giving any support of this project.

Sincerely

Douglas Scott  
Lorraine Van Zee  
344 Tragina Ave N  
Hamilton, ON  
L8H 5E3  


This submission sent August 30/16

RECEIVED Aug 23/16  
AUG 26 2016

% Gary Schuler.

My name is [REDACTED] I reside at [REDACTED]. I oppose this development. This is a relatively quiet neighborhood. There will be more traffic in this area if this happens. The traffic of the construction is also another concern. I feel this is all to do with greed, keep making more money as if they don't have enough. There greed at our expense. Who wants to look at 3 story 62 unit building, when it is quite new. I totally oppose this development and hope it doesn't happen.

Thank you for your time  
I do not wish this to be put  
public.



**Tchisler, Gerry**

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September-01-16 9:57 PM  
**To:** Tchisler, Gerry  
**Cc:** smeurella@hamilton.ca  
**Subject:** Zoning By-law application for 121 vansitmart

Hello Gerry,

We are writing to you to voice our concerns about the application for a zoning By-law change at 121 Vansitmart.

My wife and I are very concerned about the possible reconfiguration of our neighborhood. The concerns we have are as follows.

- Loss of Privacy
  - Infrastructure can't handle 60 units (200+ people)
  - excessive noise during and after construction of proposed multi townhouse complex
  - limited parking on streets that are already scarce using tragina and other streets for overflow from the complex.
  - Loss of green space (mature trees along the property lines on both sides of proposed lot.
- These are a few of our concerns we hope to bring forward in all up coming meetings regarding this application for the zoning By-law change.

Regards,

Kim and Paul Klanjscek

**Barnett, Daniel**

---

**From:** PAUL KLANJSCEK [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** September-01-17 10:39 PM  
**To:** Barnett, Daniel  
**Subject:** UHOPA-17-026

Hello Daniel,

We are writing to you to voice our concerns about the application for a zoning By-law change at 121 Vansitmart.

My wife and I are very concerned about the possible reconfiguration of our neighborhood. The concerns we have are as follows.

- Loss of Privacy
  - Infrastructure can't handle 40units 1 separate dwelling(200+ people)
  - excessive noise during and after construction and the possibility of property damage (foundation issues) of proposed multi townhouse complex
  - We were informed that it would be condominiums that are privately owned and not a townhouse complex run by Hamilton housing but yet to have confirmation on this.
  - limited parking on streets that are already scarce using Tragina and other streets for overflow from the complex.
  - Loss of green space (mature trees along the property lines on both sides of proposed lot.
- These are a few of our concerns we hope to bring forward in all up coming meetings regarding this application for the zoning By-law change.

Regards,  
Paul and Kim Klanjscek