

Re: Official Plan Amendment File No. UHOPA-20-007 & Zoning By-law Amendment
File No. ZAC-20-012

Good Day. Appreciate you providing the time for me to speak to the application received for Official Plan & Zoning By-Law amendments and comment on the applicant's plans.

I'd like to thank Sean Stewart from Planning. He was very cooperative & helpful, always provided the information & answers to my questions in a timely manner. It's a difficult task when you're trying to juggle the interests of multiple parties; the City, the applicant & the affected residents.

That said, I've read the staff report and it's pretty clear that we have a different view. **"Residential Intensification shall enhance and be compatible with the scale & character of the existing residential neighbourhood"** and we just don't see that with this project. We can debate all day long whether the intent of a zoning requirement has been met but our interpretation is quite different when it comes to scale, character, height, massing and density to name just a few.

Parking - So because there's no restriction to on-street parking, it's ok? We voiced the same concern with the Amica property and what we've got is significant daily street parking, sometimes on both sides of Dawson. We've submitted pictures and would reference Miles Budnark's recent letter as an example. (taken on a recent Thursday morning) So the parking standard has been met but unless everyone is driving a Smart car, we know where the vehicles will be parked.

Traffic - The staff report does not identify any traffic or road concerns but we have a 2 year open traffic calming file (CSR15008105) which has not been addressed.

How can a decision be taken on this application when the starting line isn't accurate? I don't agree with the current zoning as being "IS". That's an old town Stoney Creek Zoning. The property should be zoned "I1, Neighbourhood Institutional" as defined under the parent By-Law 05-200. Every other institutional property (Amica, Stoney Creek Baptist Church, Cardinal Newman High School, Collegiate Ave Public School, Church of Christ Stoney Creek) has been re-zoned according to the new by-law except 19 Dawson. When questioned, Zoning wasn't able to provide an explanation or any rationale for the property not being included. Curious! Why do I feel this is important? The "IS" zoning does not permit any residential use, either single or multi dwelling. However, "I1" zoning allows for single, semi-detached or duplex dwellings. So there was a residential option already available if it was zoned correctly.

I further refer to the "City Initiative – New Institutional Zoning By-Law document PED06405(a) that the city task force created as the framework for 05-200 that recommended 3 Institutional Zones that have been legislated & phased in. Under "I1", Neighbourhood Institutional, it states "Lastly, any residential redevelopment that may

occur on an existing institutional property would be permitted ***“in a form consistent with the surrounding area (e.g.)single detached, semi-detached, duplex dwellings”*** and goes on to state that it **“allows lands that are no longer required for institutional uses to be developed without an Official Plan Amendment.”** This all seems to align with the permitted uses under Section 8.1.1 and was designed to protect established neighbourhoods against plans like the one proposed. What’s changed with the rationale?

In Ancaster, an “ER” zone was created to protect the character & integrity of mature neighbourhoods by regulating the redevelopment process (“Monster” homes replacing smaller ones). Every argument put forward in objection to the Oakley Court development that resulted in the successful “ER” zoning would apply here. The proposed multi-unit development does not change the fact that the building footprint will be as large or larger than many of the homes the City found objectionable when considering the By-Law.

Why wouldn’t our neighbourhood be afforded the same consideration?

To what lengths do you go in the name of “residential intensification? Regardless of what’s on the property now, at 62.5 x 120, it’s a single family lot. That’s why 7 modifications to the RM2-46 are required to stuff this project on the site. Why would 2 designations be allowed to accommodate the scale of this project that produces a higher density? Our independent consultant review calls it excessive and an attempt to “shoehorn” the project onto the site. It’s just too big!

The reduction in units from 6 to 5 “as a result of feedback” to the proposal should not be viewed or interpreted as a sign of goodwill from the applicant. The original plan was for 6 units @ 5.56 m wide or 33.36m north to south, the revised 5 units are 2 @ 6.62 & 3 @ 6.52 for 32.8 m. So, the footprint is virtually the same which should explain why all the modifications are still required. There’s a simple reason why the applicant doesn’t support Planning’s recommendation for 2 ½ story & no end unit sideyard modifications.

The original plan did not include a sidewalk proposal but one is now part of the staff report. Why? Is this a requirement of the zoning or is this a precursor to some future plan for the neighbourhood?

Multiple references have been made in the report about a “vacant” building being an improvement to the neighbourhood. Nobody is arguing that. We’re not against redevelopment, it’s about the scale of the proposed plan.

We appreciate the recommendation of 2 ½ stories & not supporting the sideyard setback (end unit) but we don’t think it goes far enough. We’re asking you for more consideration of the proposed plan and, at the very least, have the applicant comply with the requirements for the zoning applied for with no variances/modifications.

Brad & Barb Ackles, Stoney Creek