From:	Derek Brodie <brodiederek@gmail.com></brodiederek@gmail.com>
Sent:	June-01-17 8:23 AM
То:	Fiorino, Michael
Subject:	Plan on Montreal Circle

Hi Michael,

I have been playing phone tag with you, sorry for this. I am inquiring about the revised plans across from my home at 442 Montreal circle in Stoney Creek. Can you please tell me some information about this project and how many houses are going in? Thanks,

1

Derek

Fiorino, Michael

From:	Patrick StickaInd <patrick@syer.ca></patrick@syer.ca>
Sent:	June-08-17 11:17 PM
То:	Rybensky, Yvette
Cc:	Johnson, Brenda; Fiorino, Michael
Subject:	Regarding Application ZAR-17-033
Attachments:	Stickland.pdf; Property Map.pdf; Watercourse.pdf

Please find attached our comments in regards to Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 90 Creanona Blvd. file ZAR-17'-003.

Kind Regards

Patrick Stickland 96 Creanona Blvd. Stoney Creek, Ontario L8E 5T3

905-667-2007

This communication, including attachments, is confidential, may be subject to legal privileges, and is intended for the sole use of the addressee. Any use, duplication, disclosure or dissemination of this communication, other than by the addressee, is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete or destroy this communication and all copies.

Cette communication, ainsi que tout fichier y étant rattaché, est confidentielle, peut être protégée par le secret professionnel et est à l'usage exclusif du destinataire. Toute utilisation, copie, divulgation ou diffusion de cette communication par toute autre personne que le destinataire est interdite. Si vous avez reçu cette communication par erreur, veuillez aviser l'expéditeur immédiatement et supprimer ou détruire cette communication ainsi que toutes les copies.

Alicia Syer & Patrick Stickland 96 Creanona Blvd. Stoney Creek, ON, L8E 5T3

June 8, 2017

City of Hamilton Planning & Economic Development Department Development Planning, Heritage & Design – Suburban Team 71 Main Street West, 5th Floor Hamilton, ON, L8P 4Y5 Attn: Yvette Rybensky

RE: Zoning By-law Amendment Application ZAR-17-033

This letter is in regards to the application by Massimo & Melissa Cretaro for a Zoning By-Law Amendment for Lands Located at 90 Creanona Boulevard (Stoney Creek) (Ward 11) Application ZAR-17-033

- The creek that runs behind several properties and empties into the lake serves the valuable purpose of diverting heavy rains and spring thaw thereby preventing flooding. It is our opinion that converting this creek into residential land will require substantial re-grading and will threaten the integrity of our homes and properties. It is also a watercourse (Image Attached) for our community stretching to the QEW.
- Our property deed includes an area approximately ten feet deep that runs behind our home (labeled Part 5, Plan 62R-5186 on attached drawing). We were informed by the previous owner of our home as well as long-time members of our community that this area is considered a "one hundred year flood plain" and therefore protected from any further development of any kind. The wooded lot behind us heavily influenced our decision to buy our property. Our quality of life will be greatly impacted if this green space is developed.
- Preserving this land is integral to the survival of many at-risk birds and animal species. The area of trees and vegetation that would be cleared in the development provide a noise barrier from the adjacent park as well as oxygen, shade, wind protection and much-needed green space to an already well-developed neighborhood.
- Developing this land will increase population density, automobile traffic, pollution, noise and will require roads emptying into the busy Montreal Circle curve where there have already been multiple motor vehicle and pedestrian altercations or will require a new roadway onto Creanona Court which will endanger the safety of our children and alter our community beyond recognition.

In closing, we found your application confusing and lacking clarification of future development and planning. As we previous stated regarding application SC/B-16:68 and SC/B-16:69 is confusing, misleading and inaccurate and needs further clarification and study.

Yours Truly,

Alicia Syer & Patrick Stickland



