

GOOD MORNING

(First Slide)

THE REASON FOR OUR PRESENTATION TODAY IS THREEFOLD

1. QUICKLY CLEAR UP SOME MISCONCEPTIONS REGARDING THE HISTORY AND PROVIDE YOU WITH OUR VERSION OF THE BACKGROUND USING INFORMATION WE PULLED FROM CITY RECORDS.
2. SHARE WITH YOU THE TOOLS THAT YOU HAVE AT YOUR DISPOSAL. WHAT YOU OPTIONS ARE ACCORDING TO OUR CONSULTATIONS WITH OUR LEGAL TEAM; AND
3. WHAT WE BELIEVE ARE THE REASONS FOR YOU TO USE THE TOOL BAG AVAILABLE TO YOU.

ALTHOUGH THE PREVIOUS ZONING HAD NO HEIGHT RESTRICTIONS, .THERE WAS A MAXIMUM DENSITY IN ORDER TO INDIRECTLY CONTROL THE HEIGHT

In addition, we're guessing the minimum density was put in place to indirectly control the form of housing. The Parent RM5 Zoning allows for townhomes & maissonettes, but by putting in a minimum density, the previously approved City of Stoney Creek zoning basically "locked – in" an apartment building for this site.

This Neighbourhood Plan has resurfaced. NP in OP do have official status, however, this plan was never approved by Council. Either this Council or the City of SC Council. We're puzzled why it gets referenced for our area when it has no status as a planning tool and is really nothing more than a Land Use Plan that gets updated as zonings get changed.

Regardless, the subdivision agreement was approved. It was approved for a total of 11 apartments (my opinion reasonable & respectful to the area & the environment)

In 2010, The City of Hamilton Council approved a complete community. A waterfront development that would provide:

911 Housing Units,

2 Hectares of Land for Institutional uses

1,400 sq ms (minimum) to a max of 14,000 sq ms for Commercial/Retail; and

1.34 hectares for a new additional Neighbourhood Park.

Without Council's oversight at Site Plan stages, a bedroom community has been built.

993 housing units

Zero hectares left for Institutional uses

Zero Commercial/retail built so far

On the table at Site Plan right now, is an application for:

1,842 additional housing units (from 1BRs to 3 BRs); with only

400 sq ms Commercial/retail space.

The full build out of the Waterfront will end up being:

2,735 Housing Units (not 911 Council & the public was told in 2010);

Zero – Institutional

400 sq ms of Commercial, maybe, instead of somewhere between 1,400 to 14,000sq ms

And NO additional neighbourhood park.

Highlights,

It is interesting that in 2010 Council approved a minimum density of 585 units on this site.

The land is just shy of 2 hectares, so Council approved @ 300 units / hectare.

It's interesting because although we don't have a Secondary Plan, we do have maximum densities city-wide in our Neighbourhoods.

That max density is 200 units / hectare; yet 300 units were approved here. To the best of our knowledge, no studies were submitted in 2010 to support that zoning change.

That is our version of the historical background.

Now we'll move on to the Site Plan application on the table.

Council has Options. To the best of our knowledge, 3 options (besides do nothing)

1.     Oversee the Site Plan process
2.     Give Staff Direction
3.     Implement an Interim Control Bylaw.

In regards to the Site Plan provincial regulations.

Not only is it entirely appropriate for this massive build to face significant scrutiny to ensure good planning; the Planning Act makes it clear, it is **Council's** responsibility.

Just because Council has delegated your authority under Section 40.13, that doesn't mean you have to relinquish here; or for every application.

As an aside, our legal team had some comments here if you don't take back control . No slight against the sole person who you've relinquished your authority to. According to the city's website, you've given delegated authority for approval to the Manager, Development Planning. I don't even know who that person is – want to ensure no one takes offence. No matter how great that person may be, a build of this significance should be overseen by Council as a whole.

Your 2<sup>nd</sup> option, is giving Staff Direction to 'pause'. Pause for some much needed Peer Review work on the Studies provided.

We haven't gone thru them in detail, but on the surface there are major gaps & issues.

Starting with the Traffic Study.

I'd like you to think of a number in your head of how many vehicles you think will be exiting this complex after full build out. Somewhere between 1 and say 3500 estimated vehicles owned.

Got that # in your head? Does it come anywhere close to the 422 the engineers are predicting?

We think @ 400 vehicles is a gross under estimation.

In addition to that, the Traffic Study is only showing 10% or 42 of those vehicles will travel down Frances Avenue to Grays Road.

For those that don't know, Frances to Grays is the only route that will take you to – the gas station to fill up your car, to Timmies, to the high school grade school, library, grocery store, pharmacy, etc.

It will also be the quickest most convenient route to take to the new Confed GO when that opens.

Although experts, experts who don't live in our area don't know how we go about our daily activities.



In regards to the Wind Study, this was an interesting tidbit we picked up when we attended the Design Review Panel meeting last week. We had no idea that Wind Study fail when it comes to an EDI lens. According to one of the professionals on our DRP, those studies use a male in the base modelling. No elderly (tom are you listening); no children, and no female parents pushing a baby stroller.

The Sun/Shadow – the new residents in the townhomes can kiss the sun good-bye. No sun in Winter months ; which is a safety & energy consumption concern, but also no sun in their front or back yards in the summer.

The parkland is just as inadequate. The justification report is stating a new North Service Road park will be built, but this is factual incorrect. There will be no active park. It is a protected woodlot.

And lastly, the parking study is completely unreasonable. The applicant is applying for a reduction of hundreds of spaces. The justification is using a Proxy site in Burlington.  
(next slide)

Shown with the black dot. As a reminder, we do not have conventional public transit in our area. We have TransCab. Which means another 2 vehicle trips – arrival to pick up and drive back down Frances Ave to the Drop off location.

Lastly, your 3<sup>rd</sup> option.

Implement an Interim Control By-law.

An ICB moved today will put a 'pause' on all development applications in the area (or just this site) until an unbiased comprehensive study is completed. A study of your choosing, but a Transportation Demand Study, incl all modes of traffic, is our recommendation

ICB aren't as drastic as they use to be and are becoming more common. This year Newmarket passed an ICB on all residential builds on vacant lots in established areas. Oakville, did one for Glen Abbey, and we did one in 2015 for LRT/Transit corridor. We need an Interim Control By-law approved before this application gets approval (which by all indication will be in 2 weeks).

If we didn't get you at "HELLO", we have just a few additional reasons we feel you, as a Member of Council, should care enough to act.

**For surrounding citizens –**

**not going to dwell on lack of trust & community engagement. A *possible* Letter to Residents after the Site Plan application receives approval is quite honestly extremely disrespectful. Trust is an uncomfortable topic, but it's a reality. A reality we have to acknowledge. We do think that a more transparent process will be an opportunity to rebuild some trust & follow our engagement policies.**

**Interesting, DRP comments:**

**For future residents – lack of amenities (only 'close' muni service we have is Saltfleet Library**

**Lack of 'walkability' - commercial reduced down to 400 sq ms & plaza across the st is in planning for a residential only build.**

**For your own constituents & the city as a whole - This is a greenfield development. 1,842 units here means pressure to build 3,684 units within the urban boundary.**

**We strongly believe this application is Precedent Setting & not in a good way – suburban neighbourhood – dead end of local road – infills at 950 units/hectare on a floodplain to boot!**

**We can't imagine how legal staff will be able to go before LPAT on any denials. We also think any Secondary Plans approved before 2010 won't pass the test.**

**And lastly, Infrastructure Costs – This site is in unplanned growth area. It exceeds the # of units planned for at Pier 8. And There are Zero \$ in the City's Projected Budgets to accommodate this growth.**

**In closing, we would just like to emphasize we are not anti-development.**

**Not everything has to be black & white, or yes and no, or us vs. them.**

**As a member of this Committee, and of Council, you have the ability, the authority & the responsibility to make this a process other than the status quo to ensure we build responsibly.**

**Thank you for your time and consideration today.**