

Hello to you all,

I am writing out of concern that the presentation given on Dec 8, 2020 to the planning committee by Mr. James Webb of Webb planning and developer Mr. Joseph Veloce contained some inconsistencies which I wish to address.

1) This home suffered a fire in the attic only in Feb 2018. Mr. Veloce incorrectly stated at the planning meeting that the home "has been vacant for sure since the fire four or five years ago, I believe" In fact the fire was minor and occurred 2 years ago.

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/hamilton/monday-ancaster-house-fire-1.4542302>

He also stated that he acquired the property "substantially after the fire" which he said occurred "4 or 5 years ago" Records show that numbered company 2692544 purchased the property in April 2019 which was one year after the fire. Mr. Veloce led the committee to believe the home has been vacant and rotting for well over five years but in fact this home had been vacant for one year when he bought it and after the fire, this rare Arts and Crafts style home got a new roof and so has been protected from the elements. He bought it last year, one year after the fire. It is stripped to the studs but according to the heritage consultant, is salvageable and given that it could take years to be designated as a heritage building (the backlog is up to 2040 according to Yvette Rybenay from the Heritage department) we obviously don't have that long.

*As set out in section **B.3.4.2.6** of the Urban Hamilton Official Plan (UHOP), Volume 1, the City recognizes that there may be cultural heritage properties worthy of conservation that are not yet included in the Register of Property of Cultural Heritage Value or Interest, nor designated under the Ontario Heritage Act. **This may include properties that have yet to be surveyed or otherwise identified, or where a property's significance and cultural heritage value has not been comprehensively evaluated.***

I believe 15 Church st could be one that has not yet been recognized.

2) At 2:07:30 into the meeting, Mr Webb stated misleadingly that this project: "Is very much in keeping with a lot of the recent approvals for townhouse developments throughout Ancaster".

However his own slide to support this disagrees and shows this:

APPROVED 125 Wilson st E 49.2% coverage - **Condo**

APPROVED 393 Wilson st E 62 %coverage - **Condo**

APPROVED 515 Garner 55 % coverage - Townhomes

PROPOSED 154 Wilson st 40% coverage - Single Family

His slide included one example that was only a proposal and three other examples that weren't even townhouses. If you didn't look carefully you would have heard him say all these townhomes were approved but you may not have noticed that his own slide contradicts that. Furthermore, I believe at least some of these that exceed coverage were granted before the Monster home bylaw came into effect. This is to be confirmed when Permits returns my call.

3) At 2:07:46 in the video Mr Webb states "**The coverage in its entirety if you were to treat it as a condominium or rental project, is 70%**" yet his slide says 37%. He also states there is a minimum 30% available for landscaping which supports the 70%. I have reached out to Mr. Webb to clarify what he meant by 70% coverage.

4) This proposal requires 12 variances - even from the zoning and bylaws that the developer is asking for. This is outrageous. The lot is far too small for this monster home development on this narrow street.

5) Each of these units will be sold individually as freehold units on their own parcel of land. **Once severed, the two interior units of the freehold properties will be 49% lot coverage. Therefore, each of these two freehold properties, when severed, will violate the Monster home bylaw considerably.**

6) Church Street, which has a sidewalk only on one side, is far too narrow to accommodate even its current traffic, without the addition of 12 additional vehicles. Since the two parking spaces are single car garage and driveway, this will result in the "car shuffle" every morning as one person leaves earlier than the other and needs to park one vehicle illegally on Church Street in order to move the other vehicle back onto the drive.

7) Many vehicles will be too long to park on the short driveways. **The most popular truck in Ontario, the Ford F-150 is up to 6.3 meters in length not including a trailer hitch which is an additional one foot at least.** Larger vehicles or those with hitches will overhang the sidewalk by a considerable amount and force pedestrians into the road, where traffic is dangerous.

8) The modern design of this development is not consistent with the neighbourhood by any means and it does not reflect genuine heritage design. It will be white siding with black trim and roof and massive picture windows overlooking the street. Adding red bricks salvaged from the demolished century home as chimneys to these townhouses is a lame and colour-clashing attempt to incorporate "heritage features"

9) This development is similar to the Losani townhomes at John Fredrick and Garner. It has single garages and single driveways and to avoid the car-shuffle problem that comes with two vehicles being forced to park on behind the other in the garage and the drive, people have resorted to simply parking the second vehicle in the visitor parking spaces. With this proposed development, **visitors and services will either park illegally on Church st, or move over to Lodor, Academy, the Medical building or the Fire hall.** I doubt very much that any of these would appreciate extra cars and service vehicles in their spaces and streets.

10) **Net zero ready??** Pwaa. It has a roof that will accomodate a solar panel 'somewhere down the line'. Just like my 1950s house does. Thank you for asking the question **Councillor Wilson.** His answer was not satisfactory and further, he claims he has several locals who wish to move into these townhomes, especially given each unit will have its own elevator. I'm guessing he means millionaires from Toronto when he says 'locals'.

If any of you want to take a little drive to Ancaster village, I would encourage you to swing by the house and envision the monster townhouses that would dominate that small spot. Pictures in the planning application don't tell the full story.

I am honestly not sure who will be involved in this decision so I am initially sending this to the councillors I saw in the meeting as well as Mr. Van Rooi.

Thank you for your time and attention to this pressing matter. With Christmas coming we are racing against the clock to be heard and understood by Jan 12, 2021.

Thank you for your time and concern and thank you for the work you do under these strange Covid circumstances.

Nancy Hurst
Ancaster