

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

Written Submission regarding the redevelopment of 19 Dawson Avenue, Stoney Creek.



Here we go again!!

Ancaster Coun. Lloyd Ferguson says "monster" home bylaw will preserve existing neighbourhoods. Streetscape will remain, says councillor

I am a long-term resident of this neighborhood and specifically moved here because of the established streetscapes, and the scale and character of the existing neighbourhood. I also took into consideration the R1 zoning which provided some assurance that future development in this established area would not negatively impact the existing residences.

I would like to register my objection to the proposed development for the following reasons.....

1. The proposed construction does not respect the adjacent single-family homes character and scale. It is essentially a "Monster Home" in every respect and should be treated in the same fashion as the city chose to support the residents in the Ancaster community. Every argument put forward in objection to the Oakley Court development, that resulted in the successful development of the "ER" zoning amendment, would apply to this situation. The fact that this will be a multi-unit home does not change the fact the building footprint will be as large or larger than many of the homes the City found objectionable when considering the By-law. The proposed 3 storey height will tower over any of the homes in the neighbourhood as well. It is just too big for the lot.
2. I also have an issue with the mysteries surrounding the zoning of this property. The lot size of 19 Dawson Ave indicates that the original zoning was most likely intended to be the same as the adjacent properties. There was certainly no consideration for on-site parking, which would have been a requirement for an Institutional usage. The city officially adopted the "IS" zoning to allow the usage thanks in part to the Dairy allowing them to use their parking lot. My concern is how the City cannot explain how the City recommendation letter of 2007 (that was enacted August 14, 2019) amended the by-law to standardize the permitted uses by changing the "IS" zones

to “I1” zones **EXCEPT** for 19 Dawson Ave! The “I1” zoning recognized a trend of small-scale Institutional facilities failing and provided an alternative use without having to apply for a zoning change. Had this been applied to 19 Dawson Ave., there would have been a provision to convert the property back to a residential use but limited to a single-family dwelling or one duplex or semi-detached home. I realize that the Provincial Government is promoting intensification of land use but to allow a duplex between two single family dwellings is intensification enough without changing the character of the neighbourhood.

3. Why bother to change the zoning to RM2 if the proposed construction will not even be able to meet the revised requirements such as building height, side yard and rear yard setbacks, lot frontage and lot coverage. Why not just send the whole thing to the Committee of Adjustment? The proposed construction will not meet zoning requirements even if changed to RM2. This proposed building just will not fit on this lot regardless of the zoning!

I realize that it is desirable to the City to encourage development, especially on properties that are no longer viable for their intended use. Intensification is the Provinces mandate and it does make sense to develop in areas that are already being provided city services and infrastructure. That being said, I do believe that any development respect the existing residents and taxpayers. After an initial consultation with a local planning firm, they suggested that you would need a shoe horn to get the proposed building on this lot.

I would like to conclude by quoting LPAT Tribunal chair Hugh Wilkins’ comments from the Ancaster appeal.....

He stated the bylaw “is sympathetic to existing built form, established streetscapes and neighbourhood character (that) respect the scale and character of existing neighbourhoods (and) address overlook and privacy issues ...”

I hope the City will extend the same commitment to the residents of Stoney Creek as they did to those in Ancaster.

Thank you for your consideration.

David Reid
Stoney Creek, ON