

RE: Development Proposal: Jackson Heights Extension, Binbrook ON
2341 & 2365 to 2431 Highway 56 and Tanglewood Drive
Applicant: Rob-Geof Properties Limited
Owner: 1583123 Ontario Limited – Losani Homes (1998) Ltd

In preparing our response, we referenced the following two documents –

- 1) The Urban Hamilton Official Plan, Binbrook Village Secondary Plan – Land Use Plan, Map B 51-1, effective date August 16, 2013 identifies these lands as Mixed Used – Medium Density, Pedestrian Predominant.
- 2) The Glanbrook Secondary Plan for Binbrook Village, dated November, 2016, Volume 2 – B.5.1, Section 5.1.5.1, Mixed Use – Medium Density Designation and Section 5.1.5.2 District Local Commercial and have the following comments.

We are opposed to the proposed development for the following reason.

1) Building Height

As per the Glanbrook Secondary Plan, Medium Density Designation (Page 6, Item h):) and Local Commercial (page 7, item b)) building heights shall not exceed three storeys. The height of the proposed building is 4 storeys and does not meet this criteria.

We understand the developer has the opportunity to justify the need for the additional 4th storey however, if justification is for recouping rising development and/or building costs, it should not be at the expense of Binbrook residents. The developer should have taken into account rising costs at time of purchasing the property.

Granting such height amendments now opens the door to future proposals with heights greater than 4 storeys. In fact, there is a current proposal for a 10 storey development on Binbrook Road.

- 2) Commercial and Retail uses are permitted however, every future development that we are currently aware of includes such uses. When does it become too much for the village resulting in an abundance of vacant units. There are empty units in the Freshco plaza, Binbrook plaza and the 3 storey building located at Windwood/Hwy. 56.
- 3) Needs of the community
Existing single residential dwellings are being demolished to accommodate this development. It displaces residents, some who are aging. Binbrook needs more senior citizens complex, much like the existing one on Library Road and the proposed one at the corner of Southbrook and Binbrook Road. Future developments, including this one, should keep the needs of the village in mind.

Thank you.

March 29, 2017

Greg Macdonald
City of Hamilton
Planning and Economic Development Department
Development Planning, Heritage and Design – Rural Team
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor
Hamilton, Ontario
L8P 4Y5

Sent via email to: greg.macdonald@hamilton.ca

Dear Mr. Macdonald:

**Re: Rob-Geof Properties Ltd. Applications at 2341 and 2365 to 2431 Highway 56
City Files UHOPA-17-012; ZAC-17-027; 25T-201706**

We are in receipt of the Notice of Complete Applications for the above noted property dated March 24, 2017, and as the abutting property owner of 2289 Highway 56 to the north (and 2498 Binbrook Road to the east) we wish to submit the following comments for your consideration.

Of primary concern is the Draft Plan prepared by A.J. Clarke and Associates Ltd. which indicates a proposed 9m wide Storm Sewer Easement, a proposed 6m wide Major Overland Flow Easement, and an alleged "existing" storm water management pond all to the north of the subject property.

The northern property line of the subject property represents the urban boundary of Binbrook, with rural undeveloped land beyond that boundary. What is the purpose of a 9m wide Storm Sewer Easement, and what exactly are the intentions? Is this storm sewer anticipated to outlet to the north and flood our farm land?

The same concern applies to the 6m wide Major Overland Flow Easement. What are the intentions, and has any consideration been given to the resulting negative impacts to our property?

We are puzzled by the claim that there is an "existing" storm water management pond to the north of the subject property, as this is not in fact the case. There is an old man-made irrigation pond used during the time our property was farmed as an orchard, however that pond was not designed as a storm water management pond, nor is it capable of acting as one, nor have we granted permission for this pond to be used for that purpose.

In general, there appears to be a serious misunderstanding regarding the lands north of the subject property, and what impacts this proposed development will have on those lands.

No engineering or grading plans have been made available for review as part of this notice, therefore is it possible to obtain copies in due course and be given an opportunity to review to ensure any potential negative impacts to our properties can be addressed prior to the approval of these applications?

Thank you in advance for your co-operation.

From:
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2017 9:27 PM
To: Johnson, Brenda
Subject: Jackson heights extension

Good afternoon councillor Johnson

As you know changes have been made to the proposed development that abuts the south side of our property, 2311 regional rd 56 in Binbrook. While we did informally discuss the issues at the town meeting, we feel it necessary to document our opposition to same

To be clear, we are not opposed to the proposed development as per the original plan which accommodated a number of homes as well as green space that abutted our property. The new plan eliminates the green space thereby significantly increases the density of homes.

This not only causes us concern in that the development of the size proposed ought to be balanced with green space, but it also causes us very serious concerns regarding the water retention pond that runs along the rear of our property.

As I have advised city officials previously to no response in past years, the said pond does not function properly currently and is insufficient for the property it is currently serving therefore bringing water back on to our property. It is my understanding that the new plan does not contemplate this issue and rather, the developer intends to rely upon the

existing water retention pond to service the newly proposed homes. I reiterate that the existing pond is inadequate for these purposes.

Accordingly, the changes to the said proposed development will negatively impact our property and we respectfully submit that they ought not be permitted.

We thank you for your consideration and look forward to discussing this matter with you further.