

COUNCILLOR MARIA PEARSON, WARD 10 - STONEY CREEK

RESIDENT SIGN-IN SHEET**NEIGHBOURHOOD MEETING****RE: RYKKA CARE CENTRES DEVELOPMENT****466, 478, 482, 490 HIGHWAY 8 STONEY CREEK****THURSDAY, MARCH 5th, 2020 6:00PM – 8:00PM****STONEY CREEK MUNICIPAL CENTRE, SALTFLEET ROOM**

NAME (Please Print)	ADDRESS & POSTAL CODE	TELEPHONE
	L8G 5E1	
	Y 495 HWY #8 UNIT 110	
	✓ unit 711	
	27 HARBRIDE DR.	
	511 HWY 8 Unit 205	
	495 HWY 8 UNIT 706 ST. CRK	
	409 Hwy #8	
	6 Farmingdale Cres	
	15 Farmingdale Cres	
	49 Dynasty Ave.	
	51 DYNASTY AVE	

COUNCILLOR MARIA PEARSON, WARD 10 - STONEY CREEK

RESIDENT SIGN-IN SHEET**NEIGHBOURHOOD MEETING****RE: RYKKA CARE CENTRES DEVELOPMENT****466, 478, 482, 490 HIGHWAY 8 STONEY CREEK****THURSDAY, MARCH 5th, 2020 6:00PM – 8:00PM****STONEY CREEK MUNICIPAL CENTRE, SALTFLEET ROOM**

NAME (Please Print)	ADDRESS & POSTAL CODE	TELEPHONE
	39 Dynasty #59	
	34 Dynasty Ave #41	
	101 Deenhi Dr	
	#95 - Hwy 8 - Apt 203	
	" " "	
	29 Salina Place	
	" " "	
	11- Prestige Dr	
	" " "	
	10 Redhaven Ct. L8G 4G6	

COUNCILLOR MARIA PEARSON, WARD 10 - STONEY CREEK

RESIDENT SIGN-IN SHEET**NEIGHBOURHOOD MEETING****RE: RYKKA CARE CENTRES DEVELOPMENT****466, 478, 482, 490 HIGHWAY 8 STONEY CREEK****THURSDAY, MARCH 5th, 2020 6:00PM – 8:00PM****STONEY CREEK MUNICIPAL CENTRE, SALTFLEET ROOM**

NAME (Please Print)	ADDRESS & POSTAL CODE	TELEPHONE
	54 DYNASTY AVE #14	
	30 Salina Place	
	495 Hwy 8	
	495 Hwy 8	
	54-30 Dynasty Ave Stoney Creek L8G 5C8	
	7 PRESTIGE DRIVE	
	6 Prestige dr.	

RESIDENT SIGN-IN SHEET**NEIGHBOURHOOD MEETING****RE: RYKKA CARE CENTRES DEVELOPMENT****466, 478, 482, 490 HIGHWAY 8 STONEY CREEK****THURSDAY, MARCH 5th, 2020 6:00PM – 8:00PM****STONEY CREEK MUNICIPAL CENTRE, SALT FLEET ROOM**

NAME (Please Print)	ADDRESS & POSTAL CODE	TELEPHONE
	371 Macintosh Dr. Stoney Creek	
	34 DYNASTY AV #62 STONEY CREEK L8G 5G8	
	34 Dynasty Ave #61	
	500 Highway #8	
	15 Prestige Drive Stoney Creek - Ont L8G 4Z8	
	City of Hamilton planner	
	City of Hamilton.	
	135 Glenashelen Drive.	
	19 Prestige Dr.	

RESIDENT SIGN-IN SHEET

STONEY CREEK MUNICIPAL CENTRE, SALTFLEET ROOM

[illegible]



February 18, 2021

Yvette Rybensky
Melanie Schneider
Development Planning, Heritage & Design Section, Planning Division
71 Main Street West, 5th Floor
Hamilton ON, L8P 4Y5

Dear Melanie,

RE: 466-482 Highway 8 – Summary of Consultation

Rykka Care Centres (“the applicant”) is proposing to redevelop the lands at 466-482 Highway 8 (“the site”) to accommodate a new long-term care facility and two rental buildings geared to seniors (“the proposal”). SvN is the planning agent for an Official Plan Amendment and Zoning By-Law Amendment to facilitate the proposal. SvN submitted a public consultation strategy with its first submission in the fall of 2018 and supplementary information with a second submission in November. Planning staff have requested a summary of feedback heard at the public meeting in March 2020 and a detail of how the proposal has responded to this feedback. This letter has been prepared in response to this request.

Types of Input

Input from the community was received both through written letters submitted to the City of Hamilton which were subsequently shared with SvN via email as well as input heard at the community meeting. The community meeting provided two opportunities for community input. The first was the open house portion of the evening where information panels were posted. SvN and the applicant were available to answer questions and receive input. The second opportunity was the question and answer period following a presentation by SvN on the proposal. This was facilitated by Councilor Maria Pearson.

Summary of Feedback

Both the content of public letters and input received at the community meeting were analysed to create the following summary. Each piece of feedback is followed by a response. Where the proposal has been revised in response to a feedback item this notes. Additional responses and information are provided to



respond to each concern and in some cases provide justification as to why it is our opinion no change is required..

1. Concern about the height and massing of the proposal, as relating to visual impacts, privacy, and shadowing on adjacent residences:

In response to input from the community as well as Hamilton planning and urban design staff, the proposal's massing was revised to minimize visual impacts, potential privacy concerns, and the impact of shadowing. Specifically, Building B was modified by increasing the eastern building setback and modifying the upper level setbacks (stepbacks) to so that the development complies with a 45 degree angular plane measured from a height of 11 metres. On Building C, an additional upper level setback at the 6th storey has been introduced to provide a more human scaled face to the neighbouring park. Building A (the long-term care facility) has also been reduced in height.

2. Concern that the development will obscure the view of the escarpment to residents of neighbouring buildings:

No revisions to the design have been made in response to this concern.

Prior to submission, the Niagara Escarpment Commission (NEC) was consulted to ensure the policies of the Niagara Escarpment Plan did not prevent development of the site for a building of the proposal's scale. Compliance with the plan was documented in the Planning & Urban Design Rationale submitted with the first application. NEC staff were circulated on the application. NEC staff have not objected to the proposal.

While we have not analysed the view impacts each nearby home, we do not contest that some views to the escarpment will be compromised by the proposal. We respectfully disagree with the notion that protecting existing views for a small number of homeowners should take priority over intensification of an underutilized parcel of land for a critically required new Long-Term Care facility and additional apartment housing that will improve Stoney Creek's housing choices for its ageing citizens.



3. Concerns regarding the apartment buildings being out of character for the neighbourhood and how they will impact existing development patterns, and how they will result in overcrowding, noise, and a strain on municipal servicing infrastructure.

SvN respectfully disagree that the apartment buildings are out of character with the neighbourhood. A standalone multi-residential building is located directly opposite Highway 8 and a number of other apartment buildings from various eras are located along Highway 8 further west.

We agree that the proposal represents a modification to the existing property, however the changes to site organization and layout improve the parcel's compatibility with neighbouring blocks as the existing property is an outlier in terms of lot size. Other departures from existing development patterns, such as the building massing and campus-style development represents a desirable departure from older apartments in the area and recent infill projects. The introduction of an expanded pedestrian network provides greater mobility choice to area residents, improves the condition of the neighbouring park, and beautifies the public realm.

In terms of concerns about “overcrowding” and noise, the LTC follows strict Provincial standards in their design which deliver the optimal sizing, safety and organization for efficient and safe service for residents. The presence of three buildings on the lot provides a greater mix of housing choice for area and City residents. Potential impacts that are a result of intensification have been examined as part of the zoning application. The proposal has been demonstrated to not have an undue impact on area transportation and the civil analysis identified a requirement for upgrades to the City's sanitary sewer which the applicant is contributing costs towards.

Increased noise and activity may occur through the introduction of more people to the site but there are no proposed uses or aspects of the development which contravene the appropriate noise levels set out by the Provincial Ministry of the Environments noise standard documents or local noise by-laws. Further the presence of more people and activity is good for local business and provides safer communities through the increased presence of people with eyes on the streets.



4. Concerns that the proposed dense apartment uses are in conflict with the proposed LTC use.

No changes were made in response to this concern as we do not agree the density of the apartment buildings present any conflict with the Long-Term Care Facility. Long-Term Care facilities are located in a range of environments, from lower density suburbs to dense urban centres and in neighbourhoods, on main streets and even in Industrial Districts. The diversity of settings for Long-term Facilities is because they are largely internal in their operations. The residents of Long-Term Care facilities often have limited mobility or have cognitive challenges which limits their ability to travel far from home. To this end, there are few locations where a use is “in conflict” with a long-term care home.

Two senior's apartment buildings, in our opinion, are not only “not a conflict”, but are actually highly desirable. The proposal is an example of the “Continuum of Care” model which has become a best practice in providing housing for seniors. The model is based on the idea that locating multiple housing types for seniors (independent living, assisted living, long-term care) within the same building or complex provides significant benefits to well-being. The model reduces the stress associated for those moving into a new home at a later stage in life and provides opportunities for housing in close proximity for couples where different partners have different needs. It allows for a greater range of options for seniors to stay in the communities they've lived their adult years in and fosters a sense of community.

5. Concerns regarding the traffic impacts on the surrounding road network with respect to added vehicular volumes, pedestrian safety, traffic violations, and general circulation, particularly regarding the westernmost exit out to Dynasty Road.

A transportation study by Paradigm Consulting demonstrated the impacts of traffic on the surrounding road network does not result in significant traffic impacts and that future queue times are acceptable under engineering



standards. City of Hamilton transportation staff have accepted Paradigm's justification.

6. **Concerns about insufficient on-site parking supply to meet new demand, and how the surrounding neighbourhood's parking supply will be impacted. Specific concern was raised regarding sufficient future access along Dynasty Road, where parking supply is already limited and overcrowding could impact emergency and maintenance vehicle access:**

No changes were made in response to this comment. The parking provided meets the requirements of Zoning By-Law 05-200 which represents City Council's current endorsement of appropriate parking for development. Because the eastern half of the site is under the former Stoney Creek zoning by-law, a justification to amend these rates was required. The study observed similar proxy developments as the proposal to observe use at different times of day. This analysis concluded that the proposed parking is sufficient for the site uses.

7. **Questions about the legal mechanism to target rental agreements to senior citizens; concern is that the apartment buildings have too many 2 and 3 bedroom units which would attract younger families needing multiple cars:**

The Ontario Human Rights Code prohibits the discrimination of housing based on a number of criteria including age. However, Section 15 of the Code exempts the rule for people over 65. Accommodation, such as rental apartment, can have requirements of give preferential treatment for those over 65.

Retirement apartments offer a range of unit sizes due to different family sizes, living habits, cultures and income levels.

8. **Concerns about the noise to be generated from the loading area and impacts to the Townhouse development behind the LTC facility.**

The loading area has been moved northwards in order to increase the distance between the loading area and the townhomes to the south.



Additional visual and noise barriers will be explored through the Site Plan Approval process.

9. **Concerns about the type of lighting that will be used within the development site and how impacts to surrounding residences will be avoided and/ or mitigated:**

Lighting design will be determined at the Site Plan Approval stage. We will consider the impact of lighting on neighbours during this process and strive to limit impact.

10. **Concern about the fencing to be used between the existing residential neighbourhoods and the development:**

Currently a landscape buffer which complies with the zoning by-law is planned to border the site. Where the property flanks a residential property a fence already exists. While it is our opinion additional fencing is not necessary, we will work with staff to ensure matters of privacy and security are adequately addressed.

11. **Requests for more information on where waste receptacles will be stored on-site and how pests will be managed:**

Since the first submission, waste removal for the Long-Term Care facility has been relocated towards the centre of the site further away from existing residential areas.

A Pest Control Management plan a City of Hamilton Site Plan Approval requirement and will be submitted during Site Plan Approval.

12. **Safety concerns related to the direct access to the development from Dewitt Park, and how this will bring about undesirable visitors:**

Providing a new connection between Highway 8 and Dewitt Park is a positive improvement that reflect good urban design. It increases connections to the park and will provide residents of the apartment buildings access to the park for leisurely walking and physical exercise.



Details about whether or not access will be available 24 hours of the day has yet to be determined by the applicant and the Councillor.

- 13. Safety concerns with respect to the social changes of the neighbourhood, and that the tenants of apartment buildings will not care about the aesthetics and safety of the neighbourhood as much as permanent residents:**

Renters are also residents. Home ownership does not equal greater care about one's neighbourhood.

- 14. Questions about impacts from construction and how dust will be mitigated/ removed from neighbouring properties:**

A Construction Management Plan will be completed prior to construction.

- 15. Question relating to the construction timeline and how it will impact the existing congregation that is a tenant of the church at 482 Highway 8:**

Construction is expected to occur over three phases as documented in the phasing diagram included in the architectural set submitted in the second submission. The Skyway Chapel will be demolished in the first phase. The congregation of 25 people, who are the venue's second congregation, is aware of the plans for the property and given a long period to find a new venue. The chapel has released a statement supporting the increase of housing for seniors.